

Report to:

Charnwood Community Safety Partnership

The 'Policing and Crime Act 2009', and 'Reducing Reoffending' in Charnwood

Initial report and preliminary reoffending 'audit'

A. BACKGROUND

This initial report to the Partnership is prepared to follow-on from the statutory changes to CSP duties and membership which came into force on 1st April 2010

Prepared by: Simon Doran, Reducing Re-offending Co-ordinator, Leicestershire County Council, Room G48, County Hall, Glenfield. (Contact details are offered at the end of this report).

Context:

The statutory changes to CSPs which came into effect on 1st April 2010, included a new duty on CSPs to “formulate and implement a strategy to reduce re-offending by adult and young offenders”. The changes also marked the ‘graduation’ of probation to the status of a ‘responsible authority’ of CSPs (formerly, probation simply had a ‘duty to co-operate’).

Full details of the changes are included within specially produced joint reports from the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice.

The full report ‘Reducing Re-offending, Cutting Crime, Changing Lives’ (or an executive summary), is available on the Home Office’s Crime Reduction website, which can be accessed via the following link:

<http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/crimereduction055.htm>

The government ‘Gateway Notice’ indicates that the guidance *“is intended to support all CSP partners to implement the changes. It includes a range of case studies which illustrate what some local partnerships are already doing to tackle re-offending. The changes will enhance the key role CSPs can play in bringing together and co-ordinating the actions of housing providers, health services, local authorities and other key players, all of which have a vital role in cutting crime and reducing re-offending. They will also bring closer together the crime reduction and reducing re-offending agendas and deliver a seamless service to the public, making communities safer and building public confidence.”*

This initial report represents an initial attempt to support Hinckley and Bosworth Community Safety Partnership in respect of these changes in line with guidance.

As such, the report will address *together* the three suggested areas of activity:

1. “Strategic planning to identify the profile of offender activity and needs in the area”.
2. “Operational activity informed by information shared among partners, and based on a problem-solving approach to target and reduce offending and protect the public”.

3. "At the individual level, case management...to assess individual offender need, to plan interventions based on this need, and to co-ordinate access to these interventions".

The full report offers a helpful series of practical examples of how partnerships could develop these activities in line with their own local priorities and arrangements.

Notes:

- The author's seconding authority is Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust, and as such this report predominantly addresses issues relating to adult offenders - those who are 18+.
- Leicestershire and Rutland Probation Trust (LRPT) is responsible for the supervision of adult offenders in the community, and - with the Prison Service - the offender management of adult offenders under 21 in custody, and adult offenders 21 and over who have been sentenced to a period of imprisonment of 12 months or greater. It is also responsible for the supervision of such offenders following their release into the community under licence.
- LRPT is responsible for duties in respect of offenders whose confirmed home address lies in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.
- Allowing for some variability according to definitions and boundaries, LRPT personnel supervise **1,778** adults throughout the county areas of Leicestershire (including the seven District authorities).
- Within this subset, LRPT personnel are responsible for **524** adults whose home address lies within the Charnwood Borough Council area. Of course, those who actually *offend* within this area can have home addresses that lie over a very wide area. With the use of offender data provided by Leicestershire Police, and matched against home address data maintained by LRPT it should be possible to estimate the approximate proportion of offences which can be attributed to persons *not* routinely resident in the area, but this will be the subject of a separate and subsequent report.
- This report attempts an initial analysis of adult offenders known to LRPT whose recorded home address are within the Charnwood Borough Council area itself.

B. ANALYSIS (of offender cohort)

1. Introduction:

This analysis is based on a 'rolling' analysis period ending at the end of September 2009. This is latest data that we have with the re-offending data.

The total number of LRPT service-users under supervision (and therefore within the 'NI 18' cohort) with a home address in 'Hinckley and Bosworth District Council' area who are included within this analysis = 524 (this total will be greater than the actual 'snapshot' total).

Of these, in the period under review, 86 were found to have re-offended, a rate of 16.41%. This percentage is at the highest end of the range of re-offending rates amongst Leicestershire District authority areas. Specifically, the comparable rate is 9.6% in Harborough, 10.3% in Blaby, 12% in Oadby and Wigston, 14.8% in Hinckley and Bosworth, and 16.2% in Melton,.

Of the 524, there are 77 women, and 447 men. So women make up around 14.7% of the caseload. This proportion is towards the higher end of a limited range within the county.

Of the 524 people, 449 were subject to Community Orders (85.7%), and 72 were on licence, and three were subject to both (so the total proportion with a post-custody licence was 14.3%).

Of the 524, 82 were 'Tier 1' cases (15.6%), 202 were 'Tier 2' (38.5%), 210 were 'Tier 3' (40%), and 25 were 'Tier 4' (4.8%).

2. Comparisons of percentages of overall cohort contrasted with percentages of the re-offender cohort

(a) Gender:

There was no significant difference between the 'general' set, and the reoffender subset.

(b) Mode of supervision: 'licence' cases were marginally more likely to re-offend. It is a point of interest that all three of the service-users who were subject to both licence and supervision reoffended. This may well reflect the fact that they were sent into custody for reoffending whilst on supervision – with the original order left to run-on.

(c) Tier:

Tier 1 and Tier 2 cases were under-represented in the reoffenders set, and Tier 3 and Tier 4 cases were over-represented. (Tier 4 cases were over-represented by a factor of two).

(d) OGRS. The two-year OGRS3 scores provided an accurate forecasting tool in relation to reoffending. The 'general' score was around 49.7%, but the score for the reoffenders was 67.7%. This score is calculated from 'static' factors, at the start of supervision, and may well represent one of the best predictors of reoffending.

(e) Criminogenic need:

The proportion of the cohort with identified *accommodation* problems was 22%, but the **proportion of the reoffenders was 40%** (almost **twice** the proportion for the whole cohort).

The proportion of the cohort with identified *ETE* (employment) problems was 40%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 62%**

The proportion of the cohort with identified *financial* problems was 15%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 28%**

The proportion of the cohort with identified *relationship* problems was 29%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 42%**

The proportion of the cohort with identified *lifestyle* problems (e.g. choice of friends) was 20%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 41%**

The proportion of the cohort with identified *drug* problems was 17%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 32%**

The proportion of the cohort with identified *alcohol* problems was 40%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 57%**

The proportion of the cohort with identified *emotional* problems was 42%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 45%**

The proportion of the cohort with identified *thinking and decision-making* problems was 39.5%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 58%**

The proportion of the cohort with identified *attitude* problems was 26%, but the **proportion of reoffenders was 51%**

Thus: in EVERY area of criminogenic need, the reoffending cohort was significantly more 'needy' than the whole cohort. For each area of criminogenic need, it is possible to propose local ways of addressing those needs in order to reduce the propensity to reoffend.

(f) Age band:

There was a higher proportion of all the younger age bands (up to 35) in the reoffender cohort than in the general cohort. The oldest age band (40+) was significantly under-represented in the reoffender cohort. Put another way, nearly **90% of all reoffenders were aged under 40.**

(g) Postcode;

Reoffenders are over-represented in the Loughborough town area, but are slightly under-represented elsewhere in the Borough.

(h) Ethnicity:

87% of the whole cohort was white. The equivalent figure for the reoffender cohort was 91%, this is slightly raised, but probably not to a significant degree.

(i) Offender Management Teams:

LRPT has recently reorganised all team structures into 'Local Delivery Units' (LDUs). The LDU which covers Charnwood also covers Hinckley cases (although the cases considered here have been selected purely by their designated home address, and thus are true Charnwood cases).

The cohort considered in this report was analysed prior to the re-organisation, but even had it not been, there would still have been considerable variety in the 'home' location of the Offender Managers who supervise Charnwood cases. In this cohort, the 'home' teams of the Offender Managers supervising the cases analysed here were as follows:

Leicester City Team 1 (based at Friar Lane, Leicester)	33
Leicester City Team 2 (based at Cobden Street, Leicester)	79
Leicester City Team 3 (based at Cobden Street, Leicester)	14
Coalville Team	3
Loughborough Team	322
Melton Team	2
MAPPOM	27
Offender Management Drugs	43
Wigston Team	2

C. LINKING THE ANALYSIS TO LOCAL PRIORITIES

The Community Safety Partnership has set as one priority, the reduction of acquisitive crime, violent-and-hate crime and anti-social behaviour. The other key

priority relates to the raising of community confidence.

The 'Integrated Offender Management' initiative in Hastings Ward, Loughborough is an example of a targeted, proactive response to a perceived challenge within the spirit of these priorities. Again, the two priorities are closely inter-related. Intensive anti-crime activity in the area appears to be associated with improving levels of community confidence.

The 'Hastings' initiative, however, is focussed upon only 10 known adult offenders (of whom only around half are *currently* under supervision on a statutory order). This represents only a very small fraction of the total number of adults under supervision in the Borough.

Perhaps one particular challenge for this Community Safety Partnership is in relation to the new, **shared** duty to produce a strategy to reduce reoffending. This challenge could perhaps helpfully be re-framed as a challenge to identify generally those adult offenders under supervision who are considered to be most at risk of reoffending, and to:

- redouble efforts to engage with them,
- help them to desist from involvement in crime,
- help them to complete their supervisory commitments successfully, and
- help them to make pro-social life decisions that serve to enhance their range of positive engagements.

But how might this work? And how many adult offenders would we be looking at? Then, how best could there be integrated action by all partners to the Community Safety Partnership?

ALL of the offenders in question are currently under active supervision in the community. Each of them has a carefully framed sentence plan which has been based on meticulously compiled evidence. Each adult has a unique, nominated *offender manager*, who can, where appropriate, co-ordinate a range of targeted *interventions* such as:

- Completion of an offending behaviour programme
- Structured one-to-one advice and assistance
- Specialist input of education, training and employment advice
- Specialist substance misuse management
- Specialist accommodation management

Such interventions have been demonstrated to work in reducing re-offending when correctly delivered.

Thus, on the delivery side, offender managers can be actively supported by CSP partners.

And adult ex-offenders themselves can be encouraged to comply with the legitimate expectations which are placed on them through the criminal justice process.

Almost ALL of the criminogenic needs demonstrated by those adult offenders under supervision in the community are soluble given the necessary motivation, effort and – where necessary – resources.

Systematic problem-solving techniques often contain the basic structure:

Problem → Evidence → Priorities → Action → Review

This method is sometimes summarised as an ongoing, iterative process:

PERFORMANCE → FEEDBACK → REVISION, → PERFORMANCE → FEEDBACK → REVISION etc...

Through the application of this process, whether 'guided' or not, most offenders **desist** from offending as they mature, and engage with the criminal justice process, especially if they have respect for those who are offering the feedback. The process is by no means assured, however, and – especially in the case of those who represent a significant risk of harm – compliance with proper supervisory expectations must be constantly tested and monitored (with associated sanctions).

LRPT offender managers actively supervise all service-users to defined minimum standards. However, an identified cohort of offenders who are considered to be particularly at risk of re-offending could be identified to enable offender managers, and the infrastructure that supports them, to redouble the collective efforts in a focused way.

How could this 'at risk of reoffending' subgroup be selected from the offenders in the whole supervised cohort?

Which factors could we choose in order to refine the focus? Probation systems offer three suitable candidates for the starting point:

- The Offender Group Reconviction Scale (OGRS)
- The OASys 'General Reoffending Predictor' (OGP)
- The OASys 'General Violence Predictor' (OVP)

All three factors are employed for the regular 'progress summaries' undertaken for the ten 'nominals' in the Hastings Ward IOM initiative.

The CSP could create (or support) a system or process to monitor a similar, Borough-wide cohort of those assessed as being most at risk of reoffending. Such a sub-group would, however, require appropriate information-sharing agreements, protocols, and success criteria (as in the case of the IOM pilot). Short of this, a simpler, less resource-intensive system could involve the monitoring and oversight of a named cohort maintained entirely by the Probation Trust, but with mediated links and other-agency-actions being initiated by a Probation team manager or 'Practice Development Manager' and actioned on a case-by-case or ad hoc basis. This would not involve the creation of a new inter-agency forum or of separate new protocols. If the CSP is supportive of either of these approaches, a sub-group could be formed to take the matter forward in the context of the CSP's 'Reducing Reoffending Strategy'(when formulated).

Systematic attempts could be made to 'tease-out' common factors in relation to criminogenic need, such that regular reports could be offered to those bodies that are in a position to problem-solve at both a 'case' level, and a 'general' level.

A very helpful summary of the latest, national research in this whole area of practice is offered in the Ministry of Justice 'Research Summary' No. 2 of 2009 (author: Philip Howard): <http://www.justice.gov.uk/oasys-research-summary-02-09.pdf>

Specific guidance for CSPs on the formulation of a Reducing Re-offending Strategy is also available via the Ministry of Justice site.

Prepared by:

Simon Doran
Leicestershire County Council
Reducing Re-offending Co-ordinator
Community Safety Team

Room G48
County Hall
Glenfield
Leics
LE3 8RA

Phone: 0116 3056906, mobile: 07515 573797

Simon.doran@leics.gov.uk

Simon.doran@leicestershire.probation.gsi.gov.uk

June 2010