



Ministry  
of Justice

# Justice Data Lab Statistics March 2014

13<sup>th</sup> March 2014



# Ministry of Justice

## **Contents**

Introduction	3
Key findings	6
Summary of requests	9
Contact details	42

## **Introduction**

This report presents a summary of the requests for re-offending information through the Justice Data Lab for the period 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2013 to 28<sup>th</sup> February 2014. This report is published alongside the tailored reports which have been produced for individual organisations requesting information through the Justice Data Lab.

This report has been produced and published in line with the Code of Practice for Official Statistics. This report will be updated and published on the second Thursday of each month for the duration of the Justice Data Lab pilot.

### **What is the Justice Data Lab initiative and how does it work?**

The Justice Data Lab has been launched as a pilot from April 2013. During the pilot, a small team from Analytical Services within the Ministry of Justice (the Justice Data Lab team) is supporting organisations that provide offender services by allowing them easy access to aggregate re-offending data, specific to the group of people they have worked with. This service is intended to support organisations in understanding their effectiveness at reducing re-offending.

Participating organisations supply the Justice Data Lab with details of the offenders who they have worked with, and information about the services they have provided. The Justice Data Lab team matches these individuals to the re-offending datasets held within the Ministry of Justice and uses statistical modeling techniques to generate a matched control group of individuals with very similar characteristics. As a standard output, the Justice Data Lab supplies aggregate one-year proven re-offending rates for the group of offenders the organisation has worked with, and those of the matched control group of similar offenders.

The re-offending rates for the organisation's group and the matched control group are also compared using statistical testing to assess the impact of the organisation's work on reducing re-offending. The results are then returned to the organisation with explanations of the key metrics, and any caveats and limitations necessary for interpretation of the results.

Finally, the tailored reports produced for each organisation are published on the Ministry of Justice website to promote transparency and ensure that findings produced through this service can be used by others to improve the rehabilitation of offenders.

## Updates on the Justice Data Lab service

We are pleased to announce that the Justice Data Lab will continue to be piloted for another year. The service will continue to be free at the point of use, and the same service model will continue to operate, as detailed in our guidance.

We are keen that the Justice Data Lab service continues to improve and, following feedback from users and internal consideration on our processes, we are hoping to bring in improvements to the service. We will need to ensure that we balance continuing to deliver the Justice Data Lab service alongside bringing in the improvements which are mentioned below. The following bullet points detail the specific improvements to the service that we will look to make:

- To improve our communications with users, so that users to the service feel that we have responded accurately and professionally to their queries. This is something that we have actioned and will continue to improve on.
- Improving the Data Upload Template with further questions about referral routes to the organisation and where the intervention or programme was received. We will release an updated version of our Data Upload Template over the next few weeks alongside updates to our guidance documents.
- Providing greater detail on the selection of individuals for analysis in the section "Processing the Data", giving fuller detail about why individuals were not included where possible. If it is possible to indicate for persons who were not included in the analysis because they are still in prison, approximate dates of when they were released from custody. We want to bring this improvement in over summer 2014.
- Providing additional metrics on the re-offending outcomes; such as the severity of re-offending or re-incarceration rates. This will help us understand more fully how the intervention or service may have affected re-offending; we are currently investigating these ideas as this is the main improvement we would like to make, and will start including as standard any measures which meet the expected quality standards over the coming months.
- Availability of underlying data; at the moment the annual cohorts have been used to identify the relevant follow up period for individuals within our underlying dataset. These cohorts are produced on a rolling quarterly basis, and could be included in our underlying methodology. We want to bring this improvement in by summer 2014.
- Enhancing understanding of the criminogenic needs of individuals - we are aiming to bring Offender Assessment (OASys) data into our service, to see if it is possible to take more specific needs of individuals into account in our analyses. Related to this, requests for those organisations that target accommodation needs of offenders have shown the greatest mix of results - we are eager to investigate how we can control more accurately for the type and strength of accommodation needs an individual may have. We

- Account for regional data when matching the treatment and control groups. Currently the matched control group will consist of individuals across England and Wales; however we think there is an increasing case for controlling for area where possible. We are aiming to start the feasibility of this work in summer 2014.
- Within a request, giving the re-offending outcomes by different demographic profiles where possible – for example, giving the re-offending outcomes for those in different prisons; or intervention type; or demographic variables such as gender. This will have to be done on a case-by-case basis because as a minimum requirement there must be enough individuals in each category for us to be confident in these results and not to disclose personal data. We hope to bring this improvement in from spring 2014.
- An assessment of the statistical power within each published request; for those organisations who receive an inconclusive result, they may want to know how many individuals would have made the findings statistically conclusive. We hope to bring this improvement in from spring 2014.

### **Recommendations for users of the service**

This document has also detailed recommendations about how users of the service could improve their access to the Justice Data Lab. These recommendations are reiterated below:

- Ensure that the Data Upload Template is completed to the fullest and most accurate extent, including the individual level data and the information about the intervention or service.
- Ensure that an application to the Justice Data Lab has been approved through the relevant governance within the organisation.
- If an organisation submits their Data Upload template through Criminal Justice Secure eMail (CJSM), that they provide alternative contact details to allow us to get in touch with them (or that they check this CJSM account regularly).

These improvements are discussed in further detail in the document “Justice Data Lab; The pilot year” which is published alongside these summary statistics.

## Key Findings

### To date:

This publication reports on the Justice Data Lab requests received in the ten months between the launch of the Justice Data Lab on the 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2013, and 28<sup>th</sup> February 2014. During this period there were 80 requests for re-offending information through the Justice Data Lab. Of these requests;

- 55 reports have been published previously. A further 2 are now complete and ready for publication, bringing the total of completed reports to 57. The headline finding of each request is presented in Table 1 on the following pages, and a tailored report is also available for each, giving further detail about the analysis. All of these reports can be found at the following link: [www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-justice/series/justice-data-lab-pilot-statistics](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-justice/series/justice-data-lab-pilot-statistics)
- 12 requests could not be answered as the minimum criteria for a Data Lab analysis had not been met.
- 1 request was withdrawn by the submitting organisation.
- The remaining requests will be processed in due course.

### Of the above, this includes the following activity that has taken place this month:

- 2 requests have been fully answered.
- 1 request has been rejected as it is not currently possible to find a suitable control group in order to carry out an analysis.

This month the Justice Data Lab team have also produced a document reflecting on the successes and challenges of the pilot, called “Justice Data Lab; The pilot year”. This document shares learning from the experience of running the pilot, details the future of the Justice Data Lab and demonstrates the commitment to continual improvement in the Justice Data Lab service. This document is published alongside the Official Statistics published this month.

Additionally, the team have been examining early extracts of Offender Assessment (OASys) data for the suitability of including this information routinely in our modelling.

## **Changes to this publication**

The main table in this publication has been changed this month to make the outcomes of our analysis clearer. We have replaced the column on the number of participants shared and matched with a column instead on the frequency of one year proven re-offending, which is now included in our analyses as standard.

**Feedback from users on these changes, or any other any other aspects of our publications is welcomed. Please email your feedback to [justice.datalab@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:justice.datalab@justice.gsi.gov.uk).**

## **Caveats and Limitations**

The statistical methods used in the Justice Data Lab analysis are based on data collected for administrative purposes. While these data include details of each offender's previous criminal, benefit and employment history alongside more basic offender characteristics such as age, gender and ethnicity, it is possible that other important contextual information that may help explain the results has not been accounted for. Where any additional limitations specific to an analysis are relevant, these limitations will be clearly explained in the organisation's report.

The tailored reports contain information about re-offending behaviour only. The services or interventions to which these figures relate may have had an impact on other outcomes that have not been captured in these reports.

When matching to administrative datasets, it is likely that not all individuals will be matched. This is called attrition, and may be due to a variety of reasons, including sampling to select individuals whose intervention falls within a specific time period after release from custody or start of a non-custodial sentence. The Justice Data Lab is a service providing a new analysis of administrative data, and we know that matching between an organisation's individual level data, and the administrative data held by the Ministry of Justice will not be perfect. Reasons for the attrition are given below:

- The single largest reason for individuals being lost from analysis is that individuals have been selected where the intervention or service falls within a specific time period after release from custody or start of a non-custodial sentence. This selection criteria is imposed to make the analysis of the impact of that intervention more robust; including by supporting us in finding a matched control group of individuals with similar sentences within an equivalent time frame.
- The minimum criteria to match individuals has not been provided (name, date of birth, gender etc);
- The identifying information about the individual may not be the same as what is held on the administrative databases (name, date of birth, gender etc) meaning that we could not be confident about the match;

- There may be more than one individual with the same identifying information, and it is not possible to establish which identity is correct;
- Information about the sentence (including sentence type) does not match what is held on the administrative records to an extent where we cannot be confident that a re-offending follow up would be appropriate;
- Individuals who received the intervention or service in custody may have still been in custody after 31<sup>st</sup> December 2011;
- The individuals cannot be matched to offenders with similar characteristics.

Where possible, in each organisation's report we will detail how many individuals have been lost in the stages listed above, and any additional reasons which are relevant.



Table 1: Requests through the Justice Data Lab for the period April 2013 to February 2014. Requests are ordered first by most recent publication, then alphabetically.

	Organisation and Programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending	Date of Publication
1	The Footprints Project	<p>The Footprints Project charity provides a mentoring service to individuals leaving custody or serving a community sentence in the Dorset, Somerset and Hampshire areas. Footprints aim to reduce the risk of re-offending by helping offenders re-integrate into their local community, offering a “through-the-gate” mentoring service. Many of the individuals that Footprints work with have mental, physical, social, and educational/employment issues, alongside difficulties with relationships, substance misuse and housing. Trained volunteers from the community act as mentors by guiding and supporting individuals with various needs, often signposting them to where they can further access particular support that they need including accommodation, finance, health services, substance misuse agencies and access to training/voluntary work. This analysis refers to those individuals who received mentoring provided by The Footprints Project when leaving custody between 2009 and 2011.</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of mentoring provided by The Footprints Project on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 10 percentage point reduction, and a 14 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 72 offenders targeted by The Footprints Project was 3.61 offences per individual, compared with 2.90 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p>	March 2014
2	Safe Ground Family Man programme (third request)	<p>Safe Ground is a charity working with offenders on a range of projects both in prison and in the community with the aim of reducing re-offending by developing relationship skills. Family Man is a programme about family relationships, which uses drama and group work to develop offenders' relationship skills and challenge attitudes, thinking and behaviour. This</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of attending the Family Man programme on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 131 offenders attending the Family Man programme was 1.10 offences per individual, compared with 1.43 per</p>	March 2014

		analysis relates to offenders who completed the Family Man programme between 2005 and 2011 in HMP Belmarsh, HMP Birmingham, HMP Bristol, HMP Highpoint, HMP Leeds, HMP Parc and HMP Wandsworth. This analysis includes offenders from the two previous Safe Ground requests published in October and November 2013.	15 percentage point reduction, and a 2 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	
3	Adelaide House	<p>Adelaide House Approved Premise is an independently managed Female Approved Premises based in Liverpool that accommodates statutory referrals of female offenders across the risk of harm continuum. Referrals to Adelaide House are statutory and are taken from Probation, Prison and Courts for those with a variety of needs, particularly multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases. This includes cases where the offenders are considered to fall in the very high and high risk of harm and medium risk/complex needs categories. Whilst residing at Adelaide House the offender is accommodated and monitored, and will receive support in various ways, with work being targeted to the individual and addressing the 9 recognised pathways out of offending.</p> <p>For this analysis the offenders that were residing with Adelaide House were placed on community orders or released from prison on licence between 2006 and 2010 with mandatory residence to Adelaide House.</p>	This analysis shows that women residing at Adelaide House Approved Premises experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending of between 1 and 30 percentage points.</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for the 49 offenders who resided at Adelaide House and were matched was 0.86 offences per individual, compared with 1.21 per individual in the matched control group. In this case the change in frequency of re-offending was not statistically significant.	February 2014
4	Everyday Skills	<p>The programme run by Everyday Skills in the community, aims to provide an enhanced level of information, advice, guidance, and access to learning for offenders in the Northumbria Probation Trust area with the aim of improving skills and supporting offenders to prepare for secure employment.</p> <p>Through the programme, offenders can access a range of non accredited learning opportunities based</p>	This analysis looked at the impact of a programme run by Everyday Skills on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 9 percentage point	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 214 offenders who participated in the programme run by Everyday Skills was 0.75 offences per individual, compared with 1.06 per	February 2014

		<p>around improving their likelihood of securing employment, such as helping to create CVs and covering letters of application, interview techniques and support on how to disclose offences. For those with complex barriers, signposting support is given to access further services.</p> <p>Eligibility for the programme was persons under the supervision of Northumbria Probation Trust that were either serving a community order or released from custody on licence, currently unemployed and over the age of 18.</p>	<p>reduction, and a 4 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b></p>	
<p>Relevant for all Home Group requests (5-10)</p>		<p>Home Group is a charity and social enterprise that is one of the UK's largest providers of quality housing and supported housing services and products. Stonham (which is part of Home Group) provides housing and support services for vulnerable people with a wide range of support needs, including people with a history of offending behaviour. Individuals are referred to the services run by Home Group (Stonham) from courts, other housing associations, community mental health teams, health services, social services, voluntary agencies, youth offending teams, police services, probation offices, and prisons across England and Wales. Direct applications/self-referrals can also be made to the services provided by Home Group. Referrals are rejected if the individuals present an unacceptable level of risk to staff, other clients, or the community. Home Group (Stonham) sent data to the Justice Data Lab for three services they provided to offenders: Residential and support, Support Only and Short Term Accommodation (STA).</p> <p>Six distinct groups of individuals were identified for separate analyses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Individuals who received the Residential and support service whilst on community sentences;</li> <li>2. Individuals who received the Residential and support service after prison sentences;</li> <li>3. Individuals who received the Short Term Accommodation (STA) service (also known as Bail Accommodation and Support Service (BASS)) whilst on Home Detention Curfew following release from custody. This is the only service provided by Home Group (Stonham) where the referral is statutory;</li> <li>4. Individuals who received the Support Only service whilst on community sentences;</li> <li>5. Individuals who received the Support Only service after prison sentences;</li> <li>6. Individuals who received the Support Only service whilst on community sentences or after prison sentences (i.e. aiming to develop a more precise estimate for reports 4 and 5 combined).</li> </ol>			

		The results of these analyses are below (table numbers 5-10).			
5	Home Group Residential and support service  Delivered whilst on community sentences	<p>The Residential and support service run by Home Group (Stonham) primarily provides secure accommodation to referrals, but also includes support to retain and maintain existing housing or to obtain suitable and settled accommodation elsewhere. The service houses offenders in shared accommodation where they have a tenancy to their own room within a shared block or house with on-site staff presence. In addition to this, offenders will typically receive support around a range of other support need areas, predominantly ensuring the offenders are enabled to achieve improvements across some or all of the reducing re-offending pathways. This will include working with other specialist agencies to achieve a positive outcome around the offender's particular needs such as accommodation, finances, meaningful use of time, physical health, mental health, family and friends. The intensity of the service varies widely; this is due to what the commissioners in each Local Authority will have asked Home Group to deliver in the contract for each service. The work conducted varies with each offender over a period of up to two years in small residential services, with the aim of helping the individual progress to independent living within two years.</p> <p>This analysis relates to offenders who received the Residential and support service provided by Home Group whilst on community sentences.</p>	<p>The one year proven re-offending rate for people who were on community sentences and received the Residential and support service provided by Home Group was 52%; <b>this rate is higher than the matched control group by between 3 and 14 percentage points.</b> It is possible that this could be explained by characteristics (in particular factors associated with homelessness or accommodation issues) of this cohort which are not reflected in the MoJ underlying data.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 393 offenders who received the residential and support service run by Home Group and were on community sentences was 1.82 offences per individual, compared with 1.39 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates <b>is statistically significant.</b></p>	February 2014

6	<p>Home Group Residential and support service</p> <p>Delivered after prison sentences</p>	<p>See explanation in number 5 above.</p> <p>This analysis relates to offenders who received the Residential and support service provided by Home Group after release from custody.</p>	<p>The one year proven re-offending rate for people who received the Residential and support service provided by Home Group after release from custody was 49%; <b>this rate is higher than the matched control group by between 4 and 10 percentage points.</b> It is possible that this could be explained by characteristics (in particular factors associated with homelessness or accommodation issues) of this cohort which are not reflected in the MoJ underlying data.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 1,025 offenders who received the residential and support service run by Home Group after release from custody was 1.76 offences per individual, compared with 1.54 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates <b>is statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>February 2014</p>
---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

7	<p>Home Group Short Term Accommodation (STA) service</p> <p>Home Detention Curfew Order following release from custody</p>	<p>Home Group (Stonham) took over the Bail Accommodation and Support Service (BASS) contract across England and Wales in June 2010, this is also known as the STA service. The Bail Accommodation and Support Services run by Home Group (Stonham) provide support to those persons who have been referred to them by the prisons across England and Wales. These persons would normally be living in the community on Home Detention Curfew (HDC) or Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC), but do not have a suitable address or are in need of some extra support during this period.</p> <p>The STA service is statutory for all individuals that are referred from prisons across England and Wales to the service. Individuals receiving this service are intensively monitored, with tightly defined requirements and the service helps the offenders comply with the conditions of their release. The service includes support to retain and maintain existing housing or to obtain suitable and settled accommodation. In addition to this, offenders will typically receive support around a range of other support need areas, predominantly ensuring the offenders are enabled to achieve improvements across some or all of the reducing re-offending pathways. This will include working with other specialist agencies to achieve a positive outcome around particular needs such as accommodation, finances, meaningful use of time, physical health, mental health, or relationships.</p> <p>This analysis supersedes the analysis "NOMS Bail Accommodation and Support Services, individuals on Home Detention Curfew" published in January 2014.</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who received the STA service run by Home Group whilst on HDC after release from custody, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 3 and 13 percentage points.</b></p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 388 offenders who received the STA service provided by Home Group whilst on HDC after release from custody was 1.03 offences per individual, compared with 1.40 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>February 2014</p>
---	--	--	---	--	----------------------

8	<p>Home Group Support Only service</p> <p>Delivered whilst on community sentences</p>	<p>The Support Only service run by Home Group (Stonham) provides support to people in the community in their own homes. The service includes support to retain and maintain existing housing or to obtain suitable and settled accommodation. In addition to this, offenders will typically receive support around a range of other need areas, predominantly ensuring the offenders are enabled to achieve improvements across some or all of the reducing re-offending pathways. This will include working with other specialist agencies to achieve a positive outcome around the offender's particular needs such as accommodation, finances, meaningful use of time, physical health, mental health, family and friends. The offenders are visited at their homes on a weekly or fortnightly basis by a staff member for approximately one hour, for a support session which includes dealing with any current issues they may have and to follow the support plan that has been agreed with the offender. The work conducted varies with each offender over a period of up to two years.</p> <p>This analysis relates to offenders who received the Support Only service provided by Home Group whilst on community sentences.</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of the support service run by Home Group for those during a community sentence on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 4 percentage point reduction, and a 6 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 349 offenders who received the support service run by Home Group and were on community sentences was 0.78 offences per individual, compared with 0.87 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p>	<p>February 2014</p>
9	<p>Home Group Support Only service</p> <p>Delivered after prison sentences</p>	<p>See explanation in number 8 above.</p> <p>This analysis relates to offenders who received the Support Only service provided by Home Group after release from custody.</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of the support service run by Home Group for those after release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 15 percentage point reduction, and a 3 percentage point increase</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 106 offenders who received the support service run by Home Group after release from custody was 1.20 offences per individual, compared with 1.26 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical</p>	<p>February 2014</p>

			compared to the matched control group.	significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	
10	Home Group Support Only service  Overall - delivered whilst on community sentences or after prison sentences	See explanation in number 8 above.  This analysis relates to offenders who received the Support Only service provided by Home Group whilst on community sentences or after release from custody.	This analysis looked at the impact of the support service run by Home Group for those after release from custody, or during a community sentence on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point reduction, and a 2 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 455 offenders who received the support service run by Home Group after release from custody, or during a community sentence was 0.88 offences per individual, compared with 1.01 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	February 2014
11	Warwickshire Youth Justice Service	Warwickshire Youth Justice Service provides statutory interventions to young offenders in the community in the Warwickshire area, with a small number of interventions started in custody but completed in the community, as well as forming part of voluntary diversion programmes. It is a multi-agency service comprising social, probation, education, police, substance misuse and health service representation, all of which can be accessed directly. For the particular group in this analysis, all participants had an index offence of violence against the person and had an intervention programme that	This analysis shows that individuals participating in an intervention provided by Warwickshire Youth Justice Service experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 2 and 24 percentage points.</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 82 offenders targeted by Warwickshire Youth Justice Service was 1 offence per individual, compared with 1.7 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-	February 2014



		<p>addressed issues of violence, anger management and victims.</p> <p>All participants in this analysis had an intervention programme that started between 2008 and 2010 and was closed in 2010. These individuals had received a statutory court order following conviction and sentencing for offending behaviours.</p>		<p>offending rates is statistically significant.</p>	
	<p>Relevant for all NOMS BASS requests (12-14)</p>	<p>National Offender Management Services (NOMS) Bail Accommodation and Support Services (BASS) provide support to persons who have been referred to them by the probation trusts, courts and prisons across England and Wales. These persons would normally be living in the community on bail, Home Detention Curfew (HDC) or Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC), but do not have a suitable address or are in need of some extra support during their Order or Licence. BASS provide either a support only service or both accommodation and support, aiming to address the needs that are thought to drive offender behaviour such as housing and education, as well as helping offenders comply with their Order and Licence conditions. These requests look at the effectiveness of BASS from June 2010 which is when Stonham took over the service.</p> <p>Three distinct groups of individuals were identified for separate analyses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Individuals on bail and subsequently convicted of either a prison or probation sentence;</li> <li>2. Individuals on bail and subsequently convicted of either a conditional discharge or fine;</li> <li>3. Individuals on Home Detention Curfew following release from custody.</li> </ol> <p>The results of these analyses are below (table numbers 12-14).</p>			
<p>12</p>	<p>NOMS Bail Accommodation and Support Services (BASS)</p> <p>Bail with a prison or probation sentence</p>	<p>This analysis relates to offenders who received support provided by BASS who were on court bail and subsequently were convicted of either a prison or probation sentence.</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of the support provided by BASS for those who were on court bail and subsequently were convicted of either a prison or probation sentence on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 6 percentage point reduction, and an 11</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 152 offenders who received support from BASS whilst on court bail, and subsequently were convicted with either a prison or probation sentence was 1.97 offences per individual, compared with 1.89 per individual in the matched control group.</p>	<p>January 2014</p>

			percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	
13	NOMS Bail Accommodation and Support Services (BASS)  Bail with a conditional discharge or fine	This analysis relates to offenders who received support provided by BASS since Stonham took over the contract in June 2010, were on court bail and subsequently received a conditional discharge or fine.	This analysis looked at the impact of the support provided by BASS for those who were on bail and subsequently were convicted of either a conditional discharge or fine on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 9 percentage point reduction, and a 25 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 37 offenders who received support from BASS whilst on court bail, and subsequently were received a conditional discharge or fine was 3.35 offences per individual, compared with 2.11 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	January 2014
14	NOMS Bail Accommodation and Support Services (BASS)  Home Detention Curfew Order following custody	This analysis relates to offenders who received support provided by BASS whilst on Home Detention Curfew following a release from custody. This analysis has been superseded by the analysis of Home Group (Stonham) Short Term Accommodation service (also known as BASS) which is number 7 in this table.	This analysis looked at the impact of the support provided by BASS for those who were on HDC following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 17 percentage point reduction, and an 8	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 70 offenders who received support from BASS whilst on HDC after release from custody was 1.39 offences per individual, compared with 1.59 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical	January 2014

			percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	
Relevant for all Prisoners Education Trust requests (15-19)		<p>Prisoners Education Trust (PET) provides grants to offenders in prison throughout England for a distance learning course or to purchase materials for arts and hobbies. Learning is supported through a combination of PET's charitable funds and grant funding to PET from the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) and the Welsh Assembly Government for courses falling into specified criteria. Information on the availability of distance learning grants is available in prisons via distance learning co-ordinators generally in education departments. Prisoners complete applications (which need prison endorsement) for the grants including personal letters. They are then awarded by a panel of Prisoners Education Trust trustees on the basis of the strength of the application including such issues as suitability of the course sought, evidence of ability and commitment to complete it successfully, and rationale for wanting to undertake the study.</p> <p>One analysis (number 15 in this table) looks at all individuals who received a grant, approximately half of whom are known to have undertaken one of four specified course types. Four further analyses looked at these course types separately which were grants for: Open University courses (number 16); accredited courses funded through a BIS grant (number 17); non-accredited courses funded through a BIS grant (number 18); and art and hobby materials (number 19).</p>			
15	Prisoners Education Trust Overall	<p>This is a re-offending analysis of offenders who received a grant for various types of study between 2002 and 2010; these included grants for Open University courses; courses currently accredited and unaccredited, which are funded by PET through grants from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills; and art and hobby materials grants.</p> <p>Please note that the total number of individuals in each of the further analyses for these course types do not equal the total number individuals in the overall analysis, as course type was specified for only approximately half of the individuals submitted.</p>	This analysis shows that individuals receiving a grant through the Prisoners Education Trust experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 5 and 8 percentage points.</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 3,085 offenders targeted by Prisoners Education Trust was 0.5 offences per individual, compared with 0.8 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	January 2014

16	<p>Prisoners Education Trust</p> <p>Grant for Open University courses</p>	<p>This analysis includes a sub-group of offenders who received a grant from the Prisoners Education Trust to undertake an Open University course between 2002 and 2010.</p>	<p>This analysis shows that individuals receiving a grant from the Prisoners Education Trust to undertake an Open University course in custody experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 2 and 8 percentage points.</b></p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 805 offenders receiving a grant from the Prisoners Education Trust to undertake an Open University course was 0.4 offences per individual, compared with 0.7 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>January 2014</p>
17	<p>Prisoners Education Trust</p> <p>Grants for accredited courses funded by PET through BIS grants.</p>	<p>This analysis includes a sub-group of offenders who undertook a course categorised as currently accredited which was funded by the Prisoners Education Trust through its grant from the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS), between 2002 and 2010.</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact receiving a grant from the Prisoners Education Trust to undertake an accredited course on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point reduction, and a 7 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 152 offenders who received a grant from the Prisoners Education Trust to undertake an accredited course was 0.65 offences per individual, compared with 0.71 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p>	<p>January 2014</p>

18	<p>Prisoners Education Trust</p> <p>Grants for unaccredited courses funded by PET through BIS grants.</p>	<p>This analysis includes a sub-group of offenders who undertook a course categorised as currently unaccredited which was funded by the Prisoners Education Trust through its grant from Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS), between 2002 and 2010.</p>	<p>This analysis shows that individuals receiving a grant from the Prisoners Education Trust to undertake a course categorised as currently unaccredited while in custody experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 1.4 and 21 percentage points.</b></p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 76 offenders who received a grant from the Prisoners Education Trust to undertake an unaccredited course was 0.3 offences per individual, compared with 1 offence per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>January 2014</p>
19	<p>Prisoners Education Trust</p> <p>Grants for art and hobby materials</p>	<p>This analysis includes a sub-group of offenders who received a grant from Prisoners Education Trust for art and hobby materials between 2002 and 2010.</p>	<p>This analysis shows that individuals receiving a grant for Arts and Hobby Materials provided by Prisoners Education Trust while in custody experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 0.3 and 14 percentage points.</b></p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 173 offenders who received a grant from the Prisoners Education Trust for Arts and Hobby Materials was 0.8 offences per individual, compared with 1.1 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>January 2014</p>

20	Time for Families  Relationship course in prisons	Time for Families is a charity that specialises in providing relationship education. One of Time for Families' main areas of focus is prisons. Within the prison work that Time for Families carries out, the charity run a six-day relationship education course for self-selected prisoners and their partners, focusing on strengthening their relationships and addressing their key issues. The aim of the course is to build a firm foundation for the future of the relationship, with the intention that strong relationships will hopefully lead to reduced re-offending.	This analysis looked at the impact of an education course provided by Time for Families on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 5 percentage point reduction, and a 14 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 101 offenders targeted by Time for Families was 1.02 offences per individual, compared with 0.94 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	January 2014
21	West Yorkshire Community Chaplaincy Project	The West Yorkshire Community Chaplaincy Project is an independent resettlement organisation, based at HMP Leeds, which provides "through-the-gate" support for prisoners, both in prison and post-release in the community. The support works as a mentoring scheme for offenders, providing role models, advice, and intensive support where necessary with the hope that the offenders will resettle back into community and re-offending will be reduced. Often work is carried out with individuals who are known to have particularly complex needs, and who are at very high risk of re-offending.	This analysis looked at the impact of support provided by the West Yorkshire Community Chaplaincy Project on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 17 percentage point reduction, and a 22 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 30 offenders targeted by the West Yorkshire Community Chaplaincy Project was 2.43 offences per individual, compared with 2.46 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	January 2014

22	A4e  First Steps Programme	A4e targeted offenders who were furthest away from the labour market, skills, activity and learning with referrals from local Probation Trusts. First Steps supported offenders through training, provision of qualifications, confidence building and job searching.	This analysis looked at the impact of the first Steps Programme provided by A4e on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 11 percentage point reduction, and a 5 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 168 offenders targeted by A4e while on the First Steps Programme was 1.37 offences per individual, compared with 1.74 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	December 2013
23	HMP Downview  D Wing Resettlement Unit	HMP Downview D Wing Resettlement Unit is designed to enable women offenders suitable for open conditions to work or learn in the community. The unit works with employers from the voluntary sector as well as national employers to secure employment for women offenders whilst they are still in custody, as well as housing support.	This analysis looked at the impact of residing in the D Wing Resettlement Unit at HMP Downview on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 14 percentage point reduction, and a 14 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 33 offenders who resided in the D Wing Resettlement Unit at HMP Downview was 0.45 offences per individual, compared with 0.53 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	December 2013

24	Foundation	<p>Foundation is a charity that provides a support service for offenders, adults with drug and alcohol problems, women suffering from domestic violence, the young and the vulnerable, the homeless and people at risk of homelessness. Foundation supports offenders in the five “Every Child Matters” outcomes and provides a holistic service that includes current circumstances that facilitate criminality. This includes addressing issues such as unemployment and other areas around social exclusion. It also includes support needs around substance abuse. Typically the work done in this sort of area is to refer the offender to a local specialist service, building on the work that the specialist services provides, and make sure that the offender maintains their accommodation to provide a stable base to engage with treatment.</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of a support service run by Foundation on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 8 percentage point reduction, and a 5 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 257 offenders who received the support service run by Foundation was 0.95 offences per individual, compared with 1.11 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p>	December 2013
25	Prince’s Trust	<p>The Prince’s Trust is a charity which aims to help disadvantaged young people. One pilot service they provided was “through-the-gate” support for young adults nearing the end of their prison sentence. Each offender willing to participate was matched with a mentor who had previous experience of being in prison and who would mentor the offender around 3 - 6 months before release, and continue doing so for 3 - 6 months post release. The aim of the service was to help the offenders break the cycle of crime and progress into positive outcomes, for example education, training and employment. This analysis relates to offenders who received mentoring between 2007 and 2010 in South West (Guys Marsh, Portland) and South East (Reading, Winchester, Lewes), UK.</p> <p>As this scheme was a pilot, which was significantly further developed between 2011 and 2012, it would be recommended to repeat this exercise when</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of “through-the-gate” mentoring provided by the Prince’s Trust on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 24 percentage point reduction, and a 12 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	N/A	December 2013



		<p>further years of re-offending data are available through this service. This would mean a more accurate and recent reflection of the impact of mentoring through The Prince's Trust would be available.</p>																							
<p>Relevant for all NOMS CFO requests (26-46)</p>	<p>NOMS CFO service providers work with offenders in prison and the community, to help them access mainstream services – such as those provided by Skills Funding Agency and Department for Work and Pensions - with the aim of gaining skills and employment. This initiative is funded in partnership with the European Social Fund (ESF). The interventions are targeted at offenders considered to be 'hard to help', and who are typically unskilled, unqualified or de-motivated, and can often have drugs/alcohol, behavioural, debt or accommodation problems. This analysis relates to offenders who were involved in Phase 1 of the programme in 2010, starting the intervention either in custody or during a probation sentence. The programme uses a case management model which involves assessment, support in light of offenders' identified barriers to employment e.g. training; education; housing; finance; health; alcohol; drugs; relationships; attitude/life skills, and access to further learning or employment.</p>																								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="645 662 1400 726">Region</th> <th data-bbox="1400 662 1966 726">Provider</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 726 1400 805">East Midlands</td> <td data-bbox="1400 726 1966 805">Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Probation Trust</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 805 1400 869">East of England</td> <td data-bbox="1400 805 1966 869">Serco</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 869 1400 949">London</td> <td data-bbox="1400 869 1966 949">London Probation Trust</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 949 1400 1029">North East</td> <td data-bbox="1400 949 1966 1029">Pertemps People Development Group</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 1029 1400 1109">North West (including Merseyside)</td> <td data-bbox="1400 1029 1966 1109">Merseyside Probation Trust</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 1109 1400 1189">South East</td> <td data-bbox="1400 1109 1966 1189">Serco</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 1189 1400 1268">South West (including Cornwall)</td> <td data-bbox="1400 1189 1966 1268">A4E</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 1268 1400 1348">West Midlands</td> <td data-bbox="1400 1268 1966 1348">The Manchester College</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="645 1348 1400 1353">Yorkshire and the Humber (including South Yorkshire)</td> <td data-bbox="1400 1348 1966 1353">SOVA</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Region	Provider	East Midlands	Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust	East of England	Serco	London	London Probation Trust	North East	Pertemps People Development Group	North West (including Merseyside)	Merseyside Probation Trust	South East	Serco	South West (including Cornwall)	A4E	West Midlands	The Manchester College	Yorkshire and the Humber (including South Yorkshire)	SOVA
	Region	Provider																							
	East Midlands	Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust																							
	East of England	Serco																							
	London	London Probation Trust																							
	North East	Pertemps People Development Group																							
	North West (including Merseyside)	Merseyside Probation Trust																							
	South East	Serco																							
	South West (including Cornwall)	A4E																							
	West Midlands	The Manchester College																							
Yorkshire and the Humber (including South Yorkshire)	SOVA																								

		<p>A single report was received from the organisation NOMS CFO to assess the impact on re-offending of this programme. The request included all individuals who had participated in the programme during 2010 in the nine regions in England. The programme in each region is delivered by a supplier who receives a contract from NOMS CFO, with the funding provided in partnership with ESF. The regions and providers are shown in the table above.</p> <p>In agreement with NOMS CFO, the Justice Data Lab has issued two reports for each region / provider; one report which covers individuals who participated in the programme whilst in custody; and a further report which covers individuals who participated in the programme after leaving custody or during a community sentence. In December 2013 we are also publishing two national reports for where the programmes started in custody or in the community, these show the impact of the programme nationally. There are two reports in the North West, which covers the North West region (excluding Merseyside), and Merseyside separately. In this instance, there were enough individuals in this area to do a separate re-offending analysis. In each region, the provider will aim to deliver similar interventions, but each provider will have different targets based on populations they deliver to.</p> <p>More information on this and on wider aspects of the NOMS CFO project can be found here:  <a href="http://co-financing.org/about_main.php">http://co-financing.org/about_main.php</a></p>			
26	<p>NOMS CFO</p> <p>Delivered in custody</p> <p>National Analysis</p>	<p>This is a national analysis of all the NOMS CFO participants in England who started their intervention in custody; regional results are below.</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by providers in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 3 percentage point reduction, and a 2 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 2,045 offenders targeted by NOMS CFO providers while in custody was 2.44 offences per individual, compared with 2.41 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p>	<p>December 2013</p>
27	<p>NOMS CFO</p> <p>Delivered in the community</p>	<p>This is a national analysis of all the NOMS CFO participants in England who started their intervention in the community; regional results are below.</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by providers while in the</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 3,345 offenders targeted by NOMS CFO providers in the</p>	<p>December 2013</p>

	National Analysis		community experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 4 and 8 percentage points.</b>	community was 0.80 offences per individual, compared with 1.2 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that the difference in re-offending is <b>statistically significant.</b>	
28	NOMS CFO East Midlands  Provided by Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust	This programme was started in custody	This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust in the East Midlands on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 6 percentage point reduction, and an 8 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 220 offenders targeted by Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust while in custody in the East Midlands was 3.18 offences per individual, compared with 2.82 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	November 2013
29	NOMS CFO East Midlands  Provided by Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust	This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody	This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust while in the community in the East Midlands, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 1 and 11</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 371 offenders who were targeted by Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust in the community in the East Midlands was 1.01 offences per individual, compared with 1.76 per	November 2013

			<b>percentage points.</b>	individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	
<b>30</b>	NOMS CFO East England Provided by Serco	This programme was started in custody	This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by Serco in the East of England on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 10 percentage point reduction, and an 8 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	November 2013
<b>31</b>	NOMS CFO East England Provided by Serco	This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody	This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by Serco while in the community in the East of England, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 0<sup>1</sup> and 11 percentage points.</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 310 offenders who were targeted by Serco in the community in the East of England was 0.91 offences per individual, compared with 1.18 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that	November 2013

<sup>1</sup> This number lies just above 0, but due to rounding we have displayed 0 in the text

				this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	
32	NOMS CFO London Provided by London Probation Trust	This programme was started in custody	This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by London Probation Trust in London on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 4 percentage point reduction, and a 17 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	November 2013
33	NOMS CFO London Provided by London Probation Trust	This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody	This analysis indicates that individuals, who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by London Probation Trust while in the community in the London region, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 1 and 10 percentage points.</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 475 offenders who were targeted by London Probation Trust in the community in London was 0.79 offences per individual, compared with 1.02 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	November 2013

34	<p>NOMS CFO North East</p> <p>Provided by Pertemps People Development Group</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by Pertemps People Development Group in the North East on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 4 percentage point reduction, and a 10 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 235 offenders targeted by Pertemps People Development Group while in custody in the North East was 2.82 offences per individual, compared with 2.39 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p>	<p>November 2013</p>
35	<p>NOMS CFO North East</p> <p>Provided by Pertemps People Development Group</p>	<p>This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in the community by Pertemps People Development Group in the North East on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 11 percentage point reduction, and a 1 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 277 offenders targeted by Pertemps People Development Group in the community in the North East was 0.96 offences per individual, compared with 1.35 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>November 2013</p>

36	<p>NOMS CFO North West incl. Merseyside</p> <p>Provided by Merseyside Probation Trust</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by Merseyside Probation Trust in the North West (incl. Merseyside) on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 6 percentage point reduction, and a 5 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>November 2013</p>
37	<p>NOMS CFO North West excl. Merseyside</p> <p>Provided by Merseyside Probation Trust</p>	<p>This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by Merseyside Probation Trust while in the community, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 0<sup>2</sup> and 10 percentage points.</b></p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 413 offenders who were targeted by Merseyside Probation Trust in the community in the North West (excluding Merseyside) was 0.98 offences per individual, compared with 1.29 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates <b>is statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>November 2013</p>

---

<sup>2</sup> This number lies just above 0, but due to rounding we have displayed 0 in the text

38	<p>NOMS CFO Merseyside</p> <p>Provided by Merseyside Probation Trust</p>	<p>This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody in the Merseyside area only</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by Merseyside Probation Trust while in the community, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 3 and 14 percentage points.</b></p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 298 offenders who were targeted by Merseyside Probation Trust in the community in Merseyside was 0.88 offences per individual, compared with 1.10 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>November 2013</p>
39	<p>NOMS CFO South East</p> <p>Provided by Serco</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by Serco in the South East on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 3 percentage point reduction, and an 18 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 95 offenders targeted by Serco while in custody in the South East was 2.72 offences per individual, compared with 2.29 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p>	<p>November 2013</p>
40	<p>NOMS CFO South East</p> <p>Provided by Serco</p>	<p>This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by Serco while in the community,</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 234 offenders who were targeted by Serco in the community in the</p>	<p>November 2013</p>



			experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 4 and 16 percentage points.</b>	South East was 0.43 offences per individual, compared with 1.23 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	
41	NOMS CFO South West (incl. Cornwall and Isles of Scilly) Provided by A4E	This programme was started in custody	This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by A4E in the South West (incl. Cornwall & Isles of Scilly) on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 9 percentage point reduction, and a 3 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 95 offenders targeted by A4E while in custody in the South West was 2.25 offences per individual, compared with 2.31 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.	November 2013
42	NOMS CFO South West (incl. Cornwall and Isles of Scilly) Provided by A4E	This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody	This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by A4E while in the community, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 7 and 19 percentage points.</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 227 offenders who were targeted by A4E in the community in the South West was 0.79 offences per individual, compared with 1.30 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has	November 2013

				shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	
43	NOMS CFO West Midlands Provided by The Manchester College	This programme was started in custody	This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by The Manchester College in the West Midlands on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 12 percentage point reduction, and a 4 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 164 offenders targeted by The Manchester College while in custody was 2.19 offences per individual, compared with 2.57 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference is not statistically significant.	November 2013
44	NOMS CFO West Midlands Provided by The Manchester College	This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody	This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by The Manchester College while in the community in the West Midlands, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 7 and 17 percentage points.</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 319 offenders who were targeted by The Manchester College in the community in the West Midlands was 0.62 offences per individual, compared with 1.16 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	November 2013

45	<p>NOMS CFO Yorkshire and the Humber (including South Yorkshire)</p> <p>Provided by SOVA</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered in custody by SOVA in Yorkshire and the Humber (incl. South Yorkshire) on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 8 percentage point reduction, and a 3 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 164 offenders targeted by SOVA while in custody in the Yorkshire and the Humber region was 1.97 offences per individual, compared with 2.01 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p>	<p>November 2013</p>
46	<p>NOMS CFO Yorkshire and the Humber (including South Yorkshire)</p> <p>Provided by SOVA</p>	<p>This programme was delivered during community sentences or after release from custody</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme run by Sova while in the community, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 0<sup>3</sup> and 8 percentage points.</b></p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 700 offenders who were targeted by Sova in the community in Yorkshire and the Humber region was 0.83 offences per individual, compared with 1.21 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b></p>	<p>November 2013</p>

---

<sup>3</sup> This number lies just above 0, but due to rounding we have displayed 0 in the text

47	Pre-School Learning Alliance (YOI Stoke Heath)  'Being Dad' and 'Family Days'	The Pre-school Learning Alliance endeavours to fulfil many requirements of Care Pathway 6; Children and Families. The Pre-school Learning Alliance provides play activities for children visiting their parents in custody, facilitates parenting courses through the 'Being Dad' programme and offers Family Day activities. The aim is to give offenders opportunities to strengthen and maintain family bonds by offering visits, family days and making the visits hall a more pleasant environment. The parenting courses aim to give Fathers a better grounding in positive parenting practice, and how they can be good parents from prison. These programmes are delivered at YOI Stoke Heath.	This analysis looked at the impact of programmes delivered by the Pre-School Learning Alliance at YOI Stoke Heath on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 21 percentage point reduction, and a 19 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	November 2013
48	Riverside ECHG	Riverside ECHG is a charitable Industrial and Provident Society that provide social housing. Wigan Offender Accommodation Resettlement Service (Wigan OARS) is delivered by Riverside ECHG in prisons across the North West of England. The Wigan OARS works with offenders that have housing issues prior to release from custody and will be returning to the Wigan area. The service aims to help find accommodation for offenders to avoid homelessness on release from custody, but can continue to work with offenders in the community after release, whether they are accommodated immediately or not. If the client still requires further support 3 months after their release from custody, they are transferred to the "Floating Support Service" provided by Riverside ECHG. This analysis relates to offenders who received Wigan OARS provided by Riverside ECHG between 2009 and 2010 in 15 prisons.	This analysis looked at the impact of the Wigan Offender Accommodation Resettlement Service (Wigan OARS) run by Riverside ECHG on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 11 percentage point reduction, and a 25 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	November 2013

49	Safe Ground Family Man programme (second request)	Safe Ground is a charity working with offenders on a range of projects both in prison and in the community with the aim of reducing re-offending by developing relationship skills. This analysis relates to offenders who completed the Family Man programme between 2005 and 2011 in HMP Belmarsh, HMP Birmingham, HMP Bristol, HMP Highpoint, HMP Leeds and HMP Wandsworth. Family Man is a programme about family relationships, which uses drama and group work to develop offenders' relationship skills and challenge attitudes, thinking and behaviour. All programme participants were male.	This analysis looked at the impact of attending the Family Man programme on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 19 percentage point reduction, and a 3 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	November 2013
50	St Helens Integrated Offender Management (IOM)	The St. Helens Integrated Offender Management (IOM) programme identifies and targets offenders in the community and in custody who commit the highest volume of crime and disorder in the St. Helens area, using a range of multi-agency partners to offer support to address the seven offending 'pathways' on a case-by-case basis; these include issues around accommodation, employment, mental/physical health, drugs/alcohol, finance, family and attitudes and behaviours. Interventions aim to enhance participants' involvement in Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) schemes, Drug Interventions Programmes (DIP), Deter Young Offenders (DYO) schemes, Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) and Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA). The St. Helens programme aims to coordinate available programmes with a targeted focus on high priority/highly damaging offenders.	This analysis looked at the impact of a programme provided by the St. Helens Integrated Offender Management on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 3 percentage point reduction, and a 20 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	November 2013

51	Blue Sky Short term, full-time employment contracts	Blue Sky offers ex-offenders up to six months, full-time employment contracts and aims to move them into onward full-time employment elsewhere. This analysis relates to offenders who undertook an employment spell with Blue Sky between 2005 and 2010, and relates to those individuals who were employed by Blue Sky <u>after leaving custody only</u> .	This analysis indicates that individuals who received short-term, full time employment with Blue Sky within 6 months of leaving custody experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 1 and 23 percentage points.</b>	N/A	October 2013
52	Brighton & Hove City Council Preventing Offender Accommodation Loss (POAL) Project	The POAL Project is a service delivered by Brighton & Hove City Council, in HMP Lewes. The Project specifically targets short term offenders (remand, and those sentenced to less than 12 months custody), although other cases are dealt with on a case-by-case basis beyond this remit. The POAL Project is funded to provide a homelessness intervention specifically for offenders in custody. For offenders who are homeless, this can take the form of assessing statutory duties under the Housing Act (1996, 2002), referrals to supported housing, rehabilitation, private sector Landlord and floating support providers; for offenders with accommodation, this can involve liaising with landlords and colleagues in housing benefit in order to sustain, or terminate, a tenancy; whichever is the more suitable. The POAL Project works in conjunction with established multi-agency frameworks such as Integrated Offender Management (IOM) and Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA). This analysis relates to offenders who were targeted by the POAL Project during 2009 and 2010 in HMP Lewes.	This analysis indicates that individuals targeted by the POAL Project, who had been convicted and served a custodial sentence, experienced a <b>reduction in re-offending between 1 and 38 percentage points.</b>	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 30 offenders targeted by the POAL Project was 0.77 offences per individual, compared with 2.03 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is <b>statistically significant.</b>	October 2013

53	The Koestler Trust Koestler Trust awards	The Koestler Trust has run arts Awards for over 50 years, with the aim of helping offenders lead more positive lives, by motivating them to participate and achieve in the arts. Entries to the Koestler Awards are accepted for original work in 60 artforms by offenders in a wide range of settings across the country. Every entrant receives a certificate, most receive written feedback, and around a third win Awards, some with cash prizes. Information on participants who entered the Awards in 2009 was shared with the Justice Data Lab to examine the impact of entering the Awards on proven re-offending.	This analysis looked at the impact of arts awards run by the Koestler Trust on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 5 percentage point reduction, and a 6 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	October 2013
54	Prison Fellowship Sycamore Tree	Sycamore Tree is a victim awareness programme that teaches the principles of restorative justice. Prisoners on the programme explore the effects of crime on victims, offenders, and the community, and discuss what it would mean to take responsibility for their personal actions. This analysis relates to offenders who undertook the Sycamore Tree programme between 2005 and 2008 in five prisons.	This analysis looked at the impact of the Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme run by Prison Fellowship on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 8 percentage point reduction, and a 5 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	October 2013

55	Safe Ground Family Man (first request)	Safe Ground is a charity working with offenders on a range of projects both in prison and in the community with the aim of reducing re-offending by developing relationship skills. This analysis relates to male offenders who completed the Family Man course between 2005 and 2008 in Wandsworth Prison. Family Man is a course about family relationships, which uses drama and group work to develop offenders' thinking.	This analysis looked at the impact of attending the Family Man programme on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 28 percentage point reduction, and a 2 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	October 2013
56	Shelter Housing advice / assessment sessions in HMP Leeds	Shelter is an organisation working with offenders to keep previous accommodation or to procure new accommodation upon release. Shelter's Prison Housing Advice Service in Yorkshire and Humberside provides information, advice, advocacy and support on all aspects of housing and housing related debt, including finding accommodation and securing existing homes or tenancies. The service is funded to work with offenders in custody and up to the point of release. Offenders can access the service through self referral or referral by an in-prison service, but does not target specific offenders. A face to face assessment is conducted which covers all aspects of an offender's housing situation and needs. Following the initial assessment the adviser will discuss with the client what their housing rights are and what options are available to them. From this initial appointment the adviser will carry out casework according to the client's wishes to resolve their housing issues/ concerns whether this is finding the client somewhere to go on release; dealing with housing related debts; securing an existing tenancy; mediating; or supporting the client to make a homeless applications or application to other	The one year proven re-offending rate for people whom Shelter worked with at HMP Leeds was 79%; <b>this rate is higher than the matched control group by between 0.4 and 18 percentage points.</b> It is possible that this could be explained by characteristics (in particular factors associated with homelessness or accommodation issues) of this cohort which are not reflected in the MoJ underlying data.	N/A	October 2013



		housing/ support provider. An advisor sees a client face-to-face for approximately 20-30 minutes. There may be further meetings depending on the case. The total amount of time spent with a client is approximately two hours, but this varies per case. There is no capacity to work with offender past the point of release but clients are referred on to other services as appropriate to their needs. This analysis relates to offenders who received advice from Shelter during 2010.			
57	HMP Swansea Community Chaplaincy Project	The Swansea Community Chaplaincy Project is a service delivered by the Chaplaincy Department at HMP Swansea. The project works with prisoners who volunteer to engage with the chaplaincy department, but working with individuals especially who are known to have particularly complex needs, and who are at very high risk of re-offending. The framework for engaging with prisoners is to work together for the six weeks prior to their release and for 12 weeks after their release (however there is some flexibility depending upon needs). The project does not specifically target prisoners' needs but aims to work alongside and enable the prisoner to engage with 'target set' agencies as required by the prisoner. The project will work with individuals with multiple interventions as is deemed necessary by the prisoner. The Project has been running since 2001, but this analysis is on interventions run in 2009 and 2010.	This analysis looked at the impact of the Swansea Community Chaplaincy Project on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point reduction, and a 16 percentage point increase compared to the matched control group.	N/A	October 2013

Notes:

Where the term community sentences has been used, it refers to analysis of individuals serving both Community Orders and Suspended Sentence Orders

Prior to January 2014, the frequency of re-offending measure was not given as a standard in the Justice Data Lab reports. The effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending is therefore not given in some of the above cases (denoted by N/A).

## **Contact points for further information**

Justice Data Lab team

Justice Statistics Analytical Services

7<sup>th</sup> Floor, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ

Tel: 020 3334 4396

Email: [justice.datalab@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:justice.datalab@justice.gsi.gov.uk)

For further guidance about the Justice Data Lab, and how to access the service, please refer to the guidance which can be found at the following link:

[www.justice.gov.uk/justice-data-lab](http://www.justice.gov.uk/justice-data-lab)

© Crown copyright 2014  
Produced by the Ministry of Justice

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/) or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.