

**Draft Scrutiny Inquiry report
Integrated Offender Management
September 2010**

DRAFT



Introduction and Scope

Introduction

1. As from April 2009, the Environment and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Board was assigned to act as the Council's 'Crime and Disorder Committee'. In line with the provisions set out within the Police and Justice Act 2006, the Scrutiny Board is responsible for scrutinising the local Community Safety Partnership (Safer Leeds) in relation to its crime and disorder functions.
2. At the Scrutiny Board's meeting in June 2009, the Chairs of the Safer Leeds Executive and Board highlighted the Partnership's key priorities and discussed possible areas where a Scrutiny inquiry could provide added value.
3. Particular concerns were raised about the rise in serious acquisitive crime in Leeds and most notably domestic burglary. At that stage, it was highlighted that in 2008/09, there were 9,248 recorded domestic burglaries in Leeds, which is equivalent to a 9.5% increase (799 more offences) when compared with the previous year.
4. It was clear that reducing burglary would be critical to realising the overall target for serious acquisitive crime. To help achieve this, particular importance was placed upon effectively reducing and managing offending behaviour.
5. Reducing and managing offending behaviour is identified as one of the strategic outcomes within the Safer Leeds Partnership Plan 2008 – 2011. By managing or modifying the behaviours of those offenders who create most harm in our communities, it was felt that this would help reduce the risk of them offending again and in turn reduce crime.
6. The terminology of "Offender Management" was first introduced by the Correctional Services Review in 2003 (Carter Report). Looking across the correctional services as a whole, the Carter Report observed that: "the system remains dominated by the need to manage both Services [HM Prison Service and the National Probation Service] rather than having a focus on the offender and reducing re-offending" and that "No single organisation is ultimately responsible for the offender. This means there is no clear ownership on the front line for reducing re-offending".
7. The Carter Report therefore concluded that a more strategic approach to the end-to-end management of offenders across their sentence is needed.
8. Following this review, a National Offender Management Service (NOMS) was created on 1st June 2004. The NOMS was established to join up prison and probation services; to enable offender management to be delivered more effectively; and to strengthen and streamline commissioning to improve efficiencies and effectiveness. In July 2008, NOMS was launched as an executive agency of the Ministry of Justice.
9. Whilst the Ministry sets strategic policy and direction for the delivery of end-to-end offender management, the NOMS commissions and operates offender management services. It seeks to ensure offenders are managed in a consistent, constructive and coherent way during their entire sentence,



Introduction and Scope

whether in a custodial or community setting.

10. A National Offender Management Model was also developed in 2004 setting out the broad specification for the approach expected by those managing individual offenders to deploy. This model acts as the basis for the development of standards and performance measures.
11. In adopting a whole system approach, the IOM model requires that organisational support functions support the core business process of offender management. In targeting those offenders of most concern, IOM aims to manage them consistently, using pooled local resources to turn them away from crime, punishing and reforming them as appropriate. The IOM model therefore builds on and expands the current offender focused programmes such as Priority and Prolific Offenders (PPO) Multi Agency Public Protection Panel Arrangements (MAPPA) and Drug Intervention Programme (DIP).
12. However, we learned that whilst the model describes what has to be delivered, it is far less prescriptive about how.
13. We learned that in July 2008 West Yorkshire had been identified as one of six nationally recognised IOM pioneer police/probation areas to explore how the concept of IOM can be applied in practice.
14. As a result of this, one of the key activities identified within the Safer Leeds Partnership Plan for 2008/09 was to develop an Integrated Offender Management system for Leeds.
15. In doing so, we learned that the Leeds Drug Interventions Programme (DIP) Strategic Board and the PPO Board had merged to become one Strategic Integrated Offender Management Board. This group is directly accountable to the Safer Leeds Partnership and takes a lead in the strategic development of IOM in Leeds. It therefore oversees the planning and implementation of the IOM model, identifying gaps in services and making recommendations regarding commissioning requirements as necessary.
16. A Leeds IOM Project Board was also set up. This is chaired by the Safer Leeds Strategic IOM lead and feeds any issues to the Leeds IOM Strategic Board, which then has the ultimate responsibility to sanction decisions made around tactical delivery and implementation.
17. We noted that the Policing and Crime Act 2009 extended the existing duties of all Community Safety Partnerships, requiring them to formulate and implement a strategy to reduce re-offending in their areas from April 2010.
18. Whilst acknowledging that an IOM framework had already been set up in Leeds, it was considered appropriate for Scrutiny to explore ways of further strengthening this framework to ensure that the IOM principles and local processes are being embedded across the wide range of partners involved in managing or modifying the behaviour of offenders, including those outside of the criminal justice system.



Introduction and Scope

Scope of the Inquiry

19. In consultation with the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive, terms of reference for this inquiry were agreed by the Scrutiny Board in October 2009.
20. The purpose of this inquiry was to make an assessment of and, where appropriate, make recommendations on the following areas:
 - The current IOM framework in Leeds, identifying any barriers or gaps in relation to the range of partners/interventions/resources available;
 - The mechanisms in place for information sharing between partner agencies to ensure a successful IOM process in Leeds;
 - The local selection/de-selection arrangements for PPOs, ensuring that the intensive management of offenders delivered through the PPO approach is provided for those who need it;
 - The role and development of Offender Health in Leeds;
 - The local IOM performance management framework, ensuring that auditing processes are in place to monitor delivery against agreed outcomes.
21. We welcomed the contribution of a wide range of services and organisations during our inquiry. These included Leeds Community Safety; NHS Leeds; Leeds Youth Offending Service; West Yorkshire Probation Trust; Leeds Offender Management Unit; Crown Prosecution Service; DISC; and the West Yorkshire Drugs and Offender Management Unit.
22. This inquiry has enabled Scrutiny to acknowledge the excellent work arising from the Leeds IOM scheme. However, it also provided an opportunity to highlight where improvements can be made to help raise the profile of offender management and strengthen existing partnership working and intelligence-sharing mechanisms. It is clear that by improving the integration of information held by different agencies, this will help ensure that no offender falls through the gaps in current service provision.
23. In accordance with the provisions set out within the Police and Justice Act 2006, we have produced this report to summarise our findings and conclusions to the local authority on a particular crime and disorder function of the Safer Leeds Partnership – Offender Management.
24. In view of its new statutory duty to reduce re-offending and its responsibility for overseeing and delivering the IOM model in Leeds, we have directed many of our recommendations to the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive, or its Strategic IOM Board, for action.
25. However, our recommendations also reflect the vital role and contribution that other partners outside of the local Community Safety Partnership have in delivering the Leeds IOM model. In particular, the Crown Prosecution Service.



Conclusions and Recommendations

Understanding and embedding the IOM principles and local processes

26. Many offenders will have complex needs associated with their offending, including difficulty in accessing suitable accommodation, substance misuse issues, mental health issues, poor educational achievement and work histories. Whilst historically the Probation Service would have been left to work in isolation to manage offenders, it is now widely recognised that a number of different partners, including partners outside of the criminal justice system, will be involved in the lives of offenders to help address their needs.
27. Integrated Offender Management (IOM) aims to reduce the number of victims of crime by managing and modifying the behaviour of those offenders who create the most harm in communities.
28. At the beginning of our inquiry, we learned that the main principles of the IOM model are based around the existing national Prolific and other Priority Offender Strategy and Programme. These were introduced in 2004 as a way of targeting the small number of offenders known to commit a disproportionately large amount of crime.
29. Responsibility was placed upon local Community Safety Partnerships to establish local schemes, usually multi-agency partnerships primarily involving Police and Probation, to work with Prolific and other Priority Offenders (PPOs).
30. The PPO Strategy consists of 3 complementary strands, each designed to tackle prolific offending and its causes. In summary, these are as follows:
- *Prevent and Deter* – to stop young people becoming prolific offenders
 - *Catch and Control* – actively tackling those who are already prolific offenders
 - *Rehabilitate and Resettle* – working to increase the number of such offenders that stop offending by offering a range of supportive interventions.
31. These 3 strands also need to be utilised effectively across the IOM model, ensuring that the right interventions are being provided at the right time to the right individuals.
32. It is clear that effective offender management relies upon the accurate assessment of offender risk and needs to best inform the selection, sequencing and targeting of interventions for each offender.
33. We noted that Offender Managers/Case Workers take on much of the responsibility to assess the needs of offenders, preparing pre-sentence reports and then managing the sentence across the prison and community settings. In doing so, they make recommendations to personalise the services provided to each offender according to the risk they present and what is required to reduce re-offending.
34. However, as previously acknowledged, the IOM model is very much about



Conclusions and Recommendations

adopting a multi-agency approach in managing and modifying the behaviour of offenders.

35. We learned that in July 2008, West Yorkshire had been identified as one of six nationally recognised IOM pioneer police/probation areas to explore how the concept of IOM can be applied in practice. In view of this, West Yorkshire Police received Ministry of Justice funding towards establishing a strategic process for IOM. However, it was stressed that funding for IOM was not for service delivery.
36. The Government made it clear in its IOM Policy Statement in June 2009 that IOM is principally about doing core business differently to achieve enhanced outcomes. In view of this, the majority of resources that IOM requires are in local partners' hands. It therefore relies heavily on effective partnership working.
37. During our inquiry, particular attention was given to the role of the Leeds IOM Hub. Based at Mabgate Mills, this is the central partnership point of contact for IOM administration and management and comprises of representatives from both statutory and non-statutory partner agencies.
38. The Hub delivers the operational coordination and information processing for all IOM cases that are managed under the rehabilitation and resettlement strand of IOM.
39. It was highlighted that IOM case management relies upon the timely and accurate flow of information between partner agencies involved in the management of offenders. We learned that the assessment, management and support of an offender require their informed consent to disclose information relating to their ongoing engagement and compliance in line with the IOM Information Sharing Agreement, which we considered as part of our inquiry.
40. It was stressed that should an individual refuse to the sharing of information relevant to the attempts to support them addressing their offending behaviour, then a decision would be taken by the Police to allocate the offender to the Catch and Convict strand of IOM until such time that they agree to co-operate.
41. We learned from the Hub Coordinator that much of the partnership working within the Leeds IOM Hub is based around negotiation. Whilst we were pleased to note that there has been no reluctance amongst partners to provide and share information, it was highlighted that the structures and lines of accountability within the Hub could be made clearer to partners.
42. At the time of our inquiry we noted that operational guidelines for the rehabilitation and resettlement strand of IOM in Leeds were being drafted. These guidelines aimed to clarify delivery and communications across providers and identify the support mechanisms for effective management of cases within the relevant frameworks. In view of this, we recommend that the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive ensures that these guidelines provide sufficient clarity about the structures and lines of accountability within the Leeds IOM Hub and are widely disseminated amongst all partners.



Conclusions and Recommendations

Recommendation 1
That the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive ensures that the Leeds IOM Operational Guidelines for the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Strand of IOM provides sufficient clarity about the structures and lines of accountability within the Leeds IOM Hub and are widely disseminated amongst all partners.

Focusing on the pathways out of offending

43. The Social Exclusion Unit report *Reducing Reoffending by Ex-prisoners*, published in 2002, recognised that there are a range of factors that contribute significantly to the likelihood of an individual reoffending, known as 'pathways out of offending'. These were subsequently refined in the 2004 National Reducing Reoffending Action Plan into seven 'pathways' covering:

- Accommodation
- Employment, learning and skills
- Mental and physical health
- Drugs and alcohol
- Finance, benefits and debt
- Children and families
- Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

44. By working through each of these pathways, the key challenge is to transform the offender into the citizen. We noted that these pathways are also adopted as part of the Leeds IOM model and during our inquiry it was highlighted that the main barrier facing offenders is

around securing employment, learning and skills.

45. We noted that many people will enter the criminal justice system with a history of educational under-achievement, exclusion from school, truanting, low levels of literacy, poor skills and high levels of unemployment. In view of this, we recognised that the worse thing would be to exclude them even further. If they are not in a supportive environmental then they will remain a high risk.

46. We acknowledge that the National Offender Management Service introduced a number of national programmes aimed at addressing this particular pathway. This included the development of a new integrated learning and skills service to bring together education and training for offenders in custody and the community which focuses on individual offenders.

47. However, it is clear that more support is still needed locally to assist offenders secure employment, learning and training.

48. As a Scrutiny Board we conducted a separate review this year around worklessness. As part of this review, particular reference was made to the development of a Works and Skills Plan.

49. The overarching objective of Work and Skills Plans is to set out how local authorities, working within their partnerships, can help deliver a reduction in worklessness and promote economic inclusion. These are to have a major role in identifying synergies in funding streams and service delivery



Conclusions and Recommendations

and potential efficiencies through better alignment of resources.

50. These Plans are also seen as the means to bring together core delivery elements of existing strategies, such as the Local Area Agreement, to form a single, coherent and delivery-focused Plan that identifies the roles of respective partners and what they will, individually and collectively, be responsible for undertaking.
51. It is anticipated that the first full Work and Skills Plans will be required to be in place for April 2011 and to cover the three year period to April 2014.
52. The development of a Works and Skills Plan for Leeds provides a valuable opportunity to encompass a more holistic approach towards tackling worklessness. In particular, we believe that this Plan should also be used as a means of improving the connectivity of employability support services for offenders.

Recommendation 2

That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods leads on ensuring that particular attention is given to improving the connectivity of employability support services for offenders as part of the Leeds Works and Skills Plan.

Selection and De-selection of IOM nominals

53. We learned that the initial cohort of 219 Leeds PPOs was selected by the three

Leeds Divisions in 2008 to populate the current IOM list. However, it was highlighted that 219 PPOs was later considered too ambitious to manage and therefore had been recently revised to 90 PPOs.

54. There is a requirement to measure any reduction in re-offending amongst the cohort. However, divisions and partners may also wish to nominate further individuals whom they perceive to be appropriate for IOM interventions or to remove individuals from the cohort.
55. In June 2009 the Ministry of Justice published a guidance document around maximising the impact of the PPO Programme. As part of this, local Community Safety Partnerships were asked to review their PPO schemes, particularly in light of the introduction of IOM arrangements. The Ministry advised that by setting the PPO approach within the context of IOM, this will help to ensure that the intensive PPO approach is concentrated on the most prolific, difficult and damaging offenders.
56. A more dynamic approach to selection and de-selection was therefore encouraged to ensure that the programme remains focused on those offenders who commit most crime and cause most damage to their local communities. The Ministry also advises that the PPO caseload, within IOM, should not be a static one and that once offenders begin to respond positively to the programme, it will not be necessary for them to continue to be subject to the intensive PPO style of intensive management. It should be possible for their continuing need for support to be



Conclusions and Recommendations

provided by other agencies including third sector partners.

57. In view of this, we learned that a scoring system is initially used for selection/de-selection of IOM nominals. During our inquiry, we considered the criteria used as part of this scoring system.
58. However, we were also pleased to note that the selection and de-selection of IOM nominals also involves a case conferencing approach where each of the relevant partners also discuss local intelligence held on a particular individual to complement the results of scoring system. It was stressed that in very few circumstances would the scoring mechanism be used in isolation to determine selection and/or de-selection.
59. Professional judgement of partners plays an important part in determining suitability and it was highlighted that none of the partners are given greater authority over the others. Influence on the decision making process is therefore very much based around the evidence put forward by the partners.
60. However, during our inquiry we were surprised to learn that for those offenders serving a custodial sentence less than 12 months, there is no statutory duty for that offender to receive any form of intervention and support following their release. As a result, there is a danger for such individuals to be missed off the radar and fall back into the cycle of re-offending.
61. Whilst we acknowledge that IOM services are usually commissioned for those considered to be a high risk, we believe that there should be the facility

for other offenders to gain access to mainstream services as we have already established that the key to successfully addressing re-offending is around inclusion and not exclusion.

62. We were therefore pleased to learn that West Yorkshire Probation Trust is working to address this situation and that the Leeds IOM Hub is also beginning to share intelligence in order to effectively monitor and offer support to such individuals where needed.

Improving links with the Crown Prosecution Service and Court system

63. Throughout our inquiry, particular importance was placed upon the term 'integrated' offender management. Whilst referring to the end-to-end management of an individual's case, we found that local links with the court system and Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) continues to be an area that requires strengthening.
64. It was noted that the timely gathering and dissemination of court information and results are vital to the effective management and tracking of offenders throughout the criminal justice system.
65. We were informed that a key challenge faced by IOM Case Managers/Workers is being able to influence the courts and CPS during pre-sentencing stage. Whilst local intelligence about a particular client is often made available to the Crown Prosecutor, it was noted that a lack of consistency in how this



Conclusions and Recommendations

information is used within the courts often frustrates the IOM process.

66. There was a clear message from all partners during our inquiry that a closer working relationship with the CPS in particular is needed to help address such issues in future. We therefore decided to raise this matter directly with West Yorkshire Crown Prosecution Service and welcomed the contribution of the Area Crown Prosecutor for the Eastern Area to our inquiry.
67. During our inquiry, particular reference was also made to a report of the Criminal Justice Inspectorates regarding the PPO Programme. The Inspectorates collectively assessed the progress made with the PPO programme during 2008 and published their findings in July 2009. We noted that the findings arising from this inspection had also raised issues about the relationship with the CPS and the courts. We have therefore made references to this inspection alongside our own findings where appropriate.
68. We understand that prior to commencing the court process for any case, the CPS would need to determine whether or not to prosecute. We learned that Crown Prosecutors take such decisions on the basis of the criteria provided in the *Code for Crown Prosecutors*. This Code provides general principles that apply to the way in which Crown Prosecutors must approach each case. Guidance is provided within the Code regarding the evidential test and public interest test.
69. The evidential test is the first stage in the decision to prosecute. Crown Prosecutors must be satisfied that there is enough evidence to provide a "realistic prospect of conviction" against each defendant on each charge. If the case does not pass the evidential test, it must not go ahead, no matter how important or serious it may be.
70. The public interest test requires Crown Prosecutors to consider, even though there may be sufficient evidence to charge, whether it is in the public interest to do so.
71. In order to facilitate efficient and effective early consultations and make charging decisions, we learned that Chief Crown Prosecutors are required to make arrangements for the deployment of Crown Prosecutors to act as Duty Prosecutors in locally agreed locations.
72. We noted that the Area Crown Prosecutor for the Eastern Area was responsible for the West Yorkshire Charging Team, which is made up of Crown Prosecutors from across West Yorkshire and operates a 9 am to 5 pm service. We also learned that this service is complemented by a centrally managed out of hours Duty Prosecutor arrangement to ensure a continuous 24 hour service (CPS Direct).
73. It was highlighted that a National Premium Service Specification was developed in 2005 to support the implementation of the PPO Strategy and sets out the minimum standards for working with PPOs.
74. This National Premium Service Specification states that a full offender history (including pre-convictions, bail history, intelligence packages, and multi-agency information) should be shared with the CPS at the point of



Conclusions and Recommendations

seeking pre-charge advice. It also places responsibility on the Police to inform the Duty Prosecutor that the person they are dealing with is a PPO.

75. In every PPO case, the investigating officer and the Duty Prosecutor should discuss the objectives to be achieved in the case and agree a prosecution strategy with clearly recorded actions.
76. During our inquiry, the Area Crown Prosecutor stressed that Crown Prosecutors often receive large amounts of information when dealing with cases. In view of this, they will only know if an individual is a PPO if this is made clear to them by the Police.
77. Whilst it was highlighted that every Chief Inspector should be fully aware of the PPO cohorts within their areas, it was recognised that further work is still required to ensure that the principles of working with PPOs and around IOM in particular, are embedded within all policing divisions. There was also a recognised need to improve the information flow to Police Officers so they are able to indicate to Duty Prosecutors when a person is on the cohort list.
78. As part of the inspection carried out by the Criminal Justice Inspectorates, we noted that they too found that the Police did not always identify the status of the PPO to the Duty Prosecutor. However, the Inspectorates found that whilst most of the Duty Prosecutors could gain access to an up-to-date list of PPOs, this was not being used to double check the information supplied by the Police.
79. Whilst it is not generally considered to be the role of the CPS to proactively

seek clarification about an offender's status, there is a joint responsibility for the CPS and the Police to work together to build up the best case. We therefore believe there is merit in putting in place procedures where Duty Prosecutors are prompted to check whether an individual is a PPO and part of an IOM cohort at the point of providing pre-charge advice and sharing responsibility with the police.

80. Whilst the Area Crown Prosecutor acknowledged that such procedures could be incorporated into the West Yorkshire Charging Scheme, it was considered more difficult to impose this for cases handled by CPS Direct (the out-of-hours telephone service) as this service is not area-based and therefore involves Duty Prosecutors from across the country. However, it was felt that CPS Direct may be receptive to this given that the identification and effective management of PPOs is a national issue.

Recommendation 3

That the West Yorkshire Crown Prosecution Service

- (i) incorporates procedures within the West Yorkshire Charging Scheme which ensures that Duty Prosecutors double check whether an individual is a Prolific or Priority Offender and part of an Integrated Offender Management cohort at the point of providing pre-charge advice.**
- (ii) liaises with CPS Direct to consider the feasibility of adopting similar procedures as part of the out-of-hours charging service.**



Conclusions and Recommendations

81. In line with the evidential test, it was stressed that there needs to be sufficient evidence for a conviction. The CPS therefore depends on the Police to secure that evidence. It was highlighted that previously there have been delays in gathering such evidence, which consequently has led to cases being lost. We were therefore pleased to learn from the IOM Hub Coordinator that a programme is in place to look at uniform officers and how they deal with evidence at the scene.
82. We also acknowledged that, due to resource pressures, much of the liaison between Crown Prosecutors and the Police is now conducted via telephone. Previously a charging lawyer would attend the police station on a daily basis to provide pre-charge advice only. This was therefore considered to be another barrier in terms of developing a close working relationship with the CPS.
83. The IOM Hub Coordinator explained that Offender Managers/Case Workers would be able to demonstrate to the CPS and the Police a pattern of behaviour relating to an offender which could influence the pre-charge decision process. In particular, the Offender Manager/Case Worker will have a wealth of information about how the offender has engaged with the IOM programme in terms of trying to modify their behaviour.
84. The Criminal Justice Inspectorates found during their inspection that the fact that an individual was identified at the pre-charge stage as a PPO did not, of itself, introduce any new factors. However, the Inspectorates agreed that previous convictions and misconduct would only be relevant to the evidential test if they related to matters capable of being admitted as evidence of bad character. The existence of previous convictions would always be material as regards the public interest test.
85. As a result, they found that even when a PPO was identified at the pre-charge stage, Duty Prosecutors treated it no differently to any other case with similar characteristics. Only a small minority of the Duty Prosecutors had stated that additional attention was paid to PPO cases at the pre-charge stage including prioritisation over other cases on the waiting list. However, the Area Crown Prosecutor highlighted during our inquiry that the use of a centralised telephony based charging team has significantly reduced the waiting time for pre-charge advice. The current queuing time for incoming calls is now under three minutes. In view of this, prioritisation of PPO cases was not considered to be an issue.
86. During our inquiry, we learned that pre-sentence reports are prepared by the Probation Service to assist the court in the sentencing process. Such reports are often disclosed to the Crown Prosecutor at court for the purpose of ensuring that they are factually accurate. The Crown Prosecutor's role is then to outline the facts of the case, the impact on the victim, the defendant's previous history and record and the making of ancillary applications such as costs and compensation. However, the IOM Hub Coordinator highlighted that with pre-sentencing reports, there was a tendency generally to portray a more positive message and not to focus particularly on any negative aspects



Conclusions and Recommendations

regarding the offender's willingness to engage with the IOM programme. It was therefore felt that a more balanced view was needed during this process and for a more consistent approach to be taken by Crown Prosecutors towards cases involving PPOs and the IOM cohort.

87. In view of this, we would like to see the Leeds Strategic IOM Board and the West Yorkshire Crown Prosecution Service working together to explore and develop appropriate mechanisms for ensuring that a consistent approach towards PPO cases is being adopted by the regional charging team, with particular focus on how evidence and the advice provided by the Police, Probation Service and Offender Managers/Case Workers is used.

Recommendation 4

(i) That the Leeds Strategic IOM Board and the West Yorkshire Crown Prosecution Service work together to explore and develop appropriate mechanisms for ensuring that a consistent approach towards PPO cases is being adopted by the regional charging team, with particular focus on how evidence and advice provided by the Police, Probation Service and Offender Managers/Case Workers is used in the public interest.

(ii) That the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive conducts a progress review over the next 12 months and shares its findings with the Scrutiny Board.

88. Once a decision has been taken to prosecute and proceed into the court process, we noted that the National Premium Service Specification requires courts to ensure that processes are in place to enable staff to identify PPO cases, although they must not reveal the status of the defendant as a PPO to sentencers.

89. The National Premium Service Specification also requires PPO files and case documents to be marked before proceeding into the court process. Specifically, this means that the PPO status should be flagged on:

- the front cover of the case files, at least with regards to police and CPS
- the front information sheet that contains basic information about the defendant and is completed by the police
- the summary sheet that is prepared initially by the Police and details the circumstances and evidence relating to that individual case. It is subsequently added to by the Duty Prosecutor who details the reasons for making a charging decision.
- the charge sheet which is completed by the Police and is the primary means by which court staff identify PPO cases.

90. In addition to the above, all PPO cases need to be marked as such on the CPS computerised Case Management System (CMS).

91. The Criminal Justice Inspectorates found that the case file sample used during their inspection had shown that



Conclusions and Recommendations

not all cases involving PPOs were being identified by the Police and clearly marked on the relevant paperwork. Even where cases were identified as being PPO at the pre-charge stage, they were not appropriately marked on the Case Management System or front cover.

92. During our inquiry, we noted that the Leeds IOM Hub is normally informed when an arrest is made. In response, attempts are made to send an appropriate representative from the IOM Hub to the court to check that the information and status of the offender is clear within their file.
93. However, to alleviate the need for such checks to be made, we discussed the potential benefits of having a dedicated IOM court within Leeds.
94. Court lists are the most common form of what is known as a dedicated or specialist court – examples include a traffic court or a domestic violence court; such courts are not separate courts, but court lists within the Magistrates Courts. It is common place however to refer to them as “courts”.
95. Particular reference was made to the dedicated drug court model that was piloted in Leeds in 2005. This model makes use of specialist panels of magistrates or district judges to provide continuity when sentencing and reviewing offenders' progress on drug treatment orders to completion or any breach, seeking to improve offenders' motivation to stay in treatment and so reduce drug use and related offending.
96. Pilots were launched at Leeds and West London Magistrates' Courts in December 2005. An independent

evaluation of these pilots was undertaken in 2008 and gave positive indications of the impact of continuity of judiciary on several key outcomes, including offenders being less likely to miss a court hearing, less likely to be reconvicted and more likely to complete their community order.

97. The Judiciary of England and Wales has produced a protocol for establishing dedicated courts which sets out the procedures to be followed depending on whether the initiative for the establishment of a dedicated court is national or local.
98. There are three ways in which a proposal for a local initiative may arise:
- If an Area Director or Justices Clerk for an area proposes establishing a dedicated court in that area, a proposal must be formulated and submitted to the Justices Issues Group (JIG) for that area.
 - If a Criminal Justice Agency or the Local Criminal Justice Board wishes the Magistrates Court in an area to consider establishing a dedicated court in that area, a proposal must be formulated and submitted to the JIG for that area.
 - If the judiciary of the Magistrates Courts in an area wish to consider establishing a dedicated court in that area, a proposal must be formulated and submitted to the JIG for the area.
99. In view of this, we recommend that the Leeds Strategic IOM Board and the West Yorkshire Criminal Justice Board give further consideration to the



Conclusions and Recommendations

potential benefits of having a local dedicated IOM court with a view to formulating and submitting a proposal to the Justices Issues Group.

Recommendation 5

That the Leeds Strategic IOM Board and the West Yorkshire Criminal Justice Board give consideration to the development of having a local dedicated IOM court in order to best utilise partnership resources.

100. Whilst the statutory duty to formulate and implement a strategy to reduce reoffending has fallen upon Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), it is evident from our inquiry that Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) also share a common interest with CSPs in terms of reducing crime and reoffending and targeting prolific and other priority offenders.

101. The 42 Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJB) in England and Wales were set up in April 2003 to manage the criminal justice system at a local level and to ensure all criminal justice agencies are working together to tackle crime. They report to the National Criminal Justice Board (NCJB) which brings together ministers and senior officials across Government. The NCJB supports LCJBs in their work to meet Public Service Agreement targets at a local level to bring more offences to justice and increase public confidence in the Criminal Justice System.

102. Current national policies now recognise that when LCJBs, the CPS and CSPs work together to tackle problems, there is far greater potential for success. Whilst we do not understand why the CPS and LCJBs did not form part of CSPs when originally established by the Criminal Justice Act 1998, it is clear that close dialogue between these key agencies is a key factor in realising the success of the Leeds IOM model. There needs to be mutual acknowledgement and awareness of LCJB and CPS priorities.

103. In acknowledging that the West Yorkshire Criminal Justice Board is now beginning to engage more effectively with the Safer Leeds Partnership in terms of its work around IOM, our attention was focused around the level of engagement shown by West Yorkshire Crown Prosecution Service.

104. We noted that whilst the Leeds Strategic IOM Board continues to invite representation from West Yorkshire CPS to its meetings, it continues to receive apologies from the CPS.

105. We very much welcomed the contribution of the Area Crown Prosecutor to our inquiry as this gave us a valuable insight into the work of the CPS and also the challenges it faces in terms of resource pressures.

106. The Area Crown Prosecutor explained that resources across the service have reduced significantly, putting pressure on the workload of Crown Prosecutors. In view of this, CPS representation at meetings has tended



Conclusions and Recommendations

to fall upon the Area Crown Prosecutors and other senior managers, whom need to prioritise their time and therefore make judgements in terms of the benefits of their attendance to such meetings.

107. In view of this, it was suggested that the agendas and minutes of the Leeds Strategic IOM Board be forwarded to West Yorkshire CPS for consideration and that a commitment is given to arrange for CPS representation at future meetings where input from the CPS is deemed necessary. However, we do believe that there should be regular CPS representation at the West Yorkshire IOM Board, which only meets on a quarterly basis.

Delivering effective Offender Health services

108. Offender health encompasses all those in contact with the criminal justice system, including police, courts, prison, probation and those on bail. It is recognised nationally that when people are in the criminal justice system, they often experience significant problems in gaining access to adequate health and social care services.
109. We also acknowledge that the health of offenders not only has an impact on the offenders personally, but has a health impact on those around them (children and families). Improving the health and well-being of people in the criminal justice system is an important element of the reducing re-offending and health inequalities agendas along with being a key component of IOM.

110. In view of this, we agreed to consider the current national policy drivers around offender health and how these were being delivered regionally and locally.

National policy drivers on offender health

111. Whether in custody or under community supervision, it is recognised nationally that offenders display many times the average incidence of factors such as mental illnesses, personality disorders, learning disabilities, substance misuse, homelessness and poor educational achievement. In view of this, there is a need to ensure that appropriate strategies on a national, regional and local level are in place to start addressing these health inequalities and to facilitate the behavioural change to bring about a more positive health outlook for offenders.
112. We learned that a cross-governmental consultation into an integrated strategy for health and social care with respect to offenders was launched back in November 2007 – ‘Improving Health, Supporting Justice’.
113. Following this consultation, the Department of Health published its document ‘Improving Health, Supporting Justice. The National Delivery Plan of the Health and Criminal Justice Programme Board’ in November 2009.
114. It was highlighted that this new National Delivery Plan focuses on recommendations and actions relating



Conclusions and Recommendations

to adults in the criminal justice system. A separate Strategy 'Healthy Children, Safer Communities' aims to promote the health and well-being of those in contact with the youth justice system.

115. During our inquiry, particular attention was given to the objectives and deliverables set out within the National Delivery Plan.
116. We noted that the main purpose of this plan is to provide a strategic framework within which local services can deliver quality improvements and communicate that framework to the relevant NHS and criminal justice organisations. However, the plan also makes it very clear that there will be little scope, if any, for new resources in the foreseeable future. Importance is therefore placed upon maximising opportunities for improvement through system reform, better working practices and building on the capacity of the front line to innovate.
117. We also noted that many of the deliverables set out within the plan relate to how central government itself will take forward the work to improve the health and well-being of offenders.
118. Therefore, it is only once this work has been done that the government will be able to make firm commitments on the implementation of the deliverables that have costs to local services, taking into account the availability of resources in the next Spending Review and the capacity of local services to prioritise this agenda.
119. We learned that the government has set up a Health and Criminal Justice Programme Board comprising the relevant government departments and

agencies. This cross-government board will be responsible for the overall development and implementation of a national approach to health and social care for offenders and those in contact with criminal justice agencies.

120. Whilst many of the deliverables in the new National Delivery Plan relate to how central government itself will take forward the work to improve the health and well-being of offenders, we discussed the potential implications of the plan at a regional and local level.

Regional delivery of offender health policy

121. Given the complex cross-government agenda, the co-production of an offender health regional delivery plan is emphasised within the National Delivery Plan to ensure that all delivery partners, processes, incentives and communications are compatible with one another.
122. Offender health regional delivery plans are to deliver the Health and Criminal Justice Programme through a series of interrelated projects which reflect the priorities set out within the new National Delivery Plan.
123. To handle the complexity of this agenda, these offender health regional plans are to be agreed and monitored by a regional partnership board.
124. During our inquiry, we learned that the regional strategic lead for offender health is via the Yorkshire and Humber Improvement Partnership (YHIP).



Conclusions and Recommendations

125. The YHIP has established an Offender Health and Social Care Programme which acts as the regional presence for offender health in the region. Its role is focused around introducing policy, developing practice and supporting the Strategic Health Authority, the National Offender Management Service, the Director of Offender Management and the Area Office of the prison service with performance management for Health and Offender Partnerships.

126. The work of the Offender Health and Social Care Programme in Yorkshire and Humber also falls into 9 areas: Governance and performance management; Commissioning; Partnership working; Provider development and support; Information systems and management ;National policy; Workforce and training; Service user involvement and understanding diversity; and Regional arrangements.

Local delivery of offender health policies

127. We learned that Leeds had taken the initiative to set up a local offender health partnership board following the national consultation into an integrated strategy for health and social care with respect to offenders. We were pleased to note that Leeds was first in the region to set up such a partnership board.

128. The Leeds Offender Health and Social Care Partnership Board is a senior multi-stakeholder group with delegated authority from stakeholder organisations (these include NHS Leeds, Community Safety, Adult Social Care, Probation, Prison Governors, CPS, Police, Leeds

Partnership Foundation Trust, CAMHS Commissioners and Leeds Community Healthcare). The Partnership Board meets quarterly and its membership includes commissioners and providers, as well as service user/carers and clinical representation.

129. Whilst it was highlighted that many of the stakeholder organisations actively attend and contribute to the work of the Partnership Board, reference was again made to the CPS and the need to strengthen their commitment and input to the Partnership Board's work.

130. The National Delivery Plan also makes it clear that the CPS has a key role to play as gatekeeper to the criminal justice system. Through its charging decision, or in its advice to the Police on charging, the CPS determines whether an individual has no further action taken against them. In doing so, prosecutors are required to take account of a person's mental health when considering whether it is in the public interest for that person to be charged.

131. We therefore recommend that the Chief Crown Prosecutor of the West Yorkshire Crown Prosecution Service ensures that the CPS is actively involved in the work of the Leeds Offender Health and Social Care Partnership Board, particularly in taking forward the objectives set out within the new National Delivery Plan.

Recommendation 6
That the Chief Crown Prosecutor of the West Yorkshire Crown Prosecution Service consider how they can be more proactively involved in the development of policy and process for integrated management in Leeds .



Conclusions and Recommendations

The Deter Young Offender Scheme

132. Whilst the main focus of our inquiry was around adult PPOs, we acknowledged that many of the young adults in custody will have been convicted or cautioned through the youth justice system before the age of 18. The interface between Youth Offender Teams (YOTs) and Community Safety Partnerships is therefore equally important to ensure effective arrangements for reducing youth reoffending.
133. During our inquiry, particular reference was made to the Deter Young Offender Scheme. We learned that a Deter Young Offender (DYO) is a young person between 10 – 17 years of age who has been sentenced to a relevant community order or commenced the community element of a Detention and Training Order.
134. The Youth Offending Team will select DYO's on the basis that the young offender has a high Assessment Score (which is determined locally) and/or a high/very high assessment of Risk of Serious Harm and are assessed as posing the highest risk of causing serious harm to others and likelihood of re-offending.
135. It was reported that from 1st September 2009, the Deter Young Offender Scheme was introduced. This involves a single priority group of young offenders who are at greatest risk of re-offending and causing harm to the community. This scheme is characterised by a risk based approach and early identification of young offenders followed by intensive intervention. The DYO is actively managed in a multi-agency approach by the criminal justice and partner agencies to divert the young offenders from offending and support them to break the cycle of offending. It was highlighted that this DYO group is part of the IOM programme and replaces youth Prolific Priority Offenders.
136. The DYO's are identified by the Youth Offending Team on the basis that they are assessed as posing the highest risk of causing serious harm to others and likelihood of re-offending. The selection criteria may therefore include young people who have been convicted for the first time. The names of DYO's are shared with all relevant agencies to ensure a multi-agency response and appropriate resources and interventions are secured to change the DYO's behaviour to enable them to make a positive contribution in their community.
137. We noted that DYO's are monitored for their re-offending rates and timeliness through the criminal justice system. The emphasis is to ensure better offender management of each DYO through the court process. Reports to the Youth Justice Board and Local Criminal Justice Board assist in monitoring support received from agencies in improving DYO's access to services for children including education, training and employment, substance misuse, mental health, accommodation and leisure services.
138. Work carried out as part of the scheme includes a mixture of individual and group work activities.



Conclusions and Recommendations

We noted that officers work more intensively with those young people identified within the higher risk groups.

139. Particular emphasis is around motivating those young offenders to change their behaviours and a significant part of the work is about getting them into employment, school or training. We were particularly pleased to learn that the Leeds Youth Offending Service is regarded as the most successful across the core cities in terms of getting young offenders back into employment.
140. As a multi-agency service, importance was again placed upon partnership working and intelligence sharing mechanisms. Whilst acknowledging that the service is adequately resourced at the moment, it was highlighted that there continues to be a threat of reduced funding via the Youth Justice Board grant funding in view of the current financial pressures placed upon public services.
141. The success already brought about by the DYO scheme in diverting young offenders from offending and supporting them to break the cycle of offending is clear. In view of this, we would urge that the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods seeks to ensure that the DYO scheme remains a priority in terms of local authority funding and continues to champion the scheme amongst the criminal justice and other partner agencies in his capacity as Chair of the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive.

Recommendation 7

That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods seeks to ensure that the Deter Young Offenders Scheme within the Leeds Youth Offending Service remains a priority in terms of local authority funding and continues to champion the scheme amongst the criminal justice and other partner agencies in his capacity as Chair of the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive.

142. One of the main duties of the Partnership Board is to provide leadership to the delivery of the Offender Health and Social Care Strategy (national and local). It seeks to ensure resources are focussed on explicit commissioning objectives and priorities and that health and social care pathways for offenders are clear and processes are in place for effective delivery of such objectives.
143. Whilst NHS Leeds would generally drive the agenda of the Partnership Board, this would be done through the engagement of other stakeholders. We learned that whilst the Partnership Board has been eagerly awaiting the publication of the government's National Delivery Plan over the last 12 months, it had agreed to get on with developing its own local strategy in the meantime.
144. As many of the deliverables set out within the National Delivery Plan are centrally driven, it was highlighted that the Partnership Board now needs to determine whether and how its existing local strategy and work streams fit in with the new plan.



Conclusions and Recommendations

145. Whilst acknowledging the wide range of objectives and deliverables set out within the plan, particular focus was given to some of the headline activities that were due to take place during the initial six month period. These involved the following:
- Assessing the feasibility of transferring commissioning and budgetary responsibility for health services in police custody suites from the Police to the NHS;
 - Publishing World Class Commissioning guidance on commissioning services for offenders;
 - Piloting and evaluating a new learning disability screening tool.
146. There was a general acknowledgement that locally there is no continuity of care pathways coming from Police custody suites. Whilst recognising that NHS Leeds could potentially enhance this service and add value, the main issue was around the feasibility of doing so in terms of resources.
147. In acknowledging that the national Health and Criminal Justice Programme Board will be assessing the feasibility of transferring commissioning and budgetary responsibility for health services in Police custody suites from the Police to the NHS, it was felt that further clarity is needed as to the levels of funding to be transferred.
148. It was highlighted that other key issues relating to Police custody suites were around assessment and referral processes for those offenders with mental health and learning disabilities.
149. We learned that improving mental health services across the offender pathway was one of the key themes of an earlier review conducted in 2009 by Lord Bradley. This independent review was commissioned to examine the extent to which offenders with mental health problems or learning disabilities could, in appropriate cases, be diverted from prison to other services and the barriers to such diversion.
150. The new National Delivery Plan seeks to address many of the recommendations arising from Lord Bradley's review. In particular, we noted that the plan seeks to enhance the depth and quality of mental health, personality disorder and learning disability awareness training.
151. As a first step, the government will continue the roll-out of training for prison officers and customise the training materials for staff working at other points of the criminal justice process. It will then introduce a rolling programme in April 2010, with the aim of training all probation staff on mental health and learning disability awareness within five years.
152. In doing so, we noted that Regional Offender Health Boards will be required to develop and implement a training strategy, which they will be monitored on from April 2010. Importance was therefore placed upon ensuring that appropriate linkages were in place between the Regional Offender Health Board and the Leeds Offender Health and Social Care



Conclusions and Recommendations

Partnership Board in terms of this work.

Addressing alcohol related crime and disorder

153. Reducing alcohol-related crime and disorder is a key part of the Safer Leeds Partnership's Strategy.
154. We recognise that developments within alcohol crime and disorder and health agendas have picked up significant momentum over recent years, with continuing publication of guidance and legislation to tackle alcohol-related crime and anti-social behaviour, health awareness messages and campaigns, and guidance documents to support commissioners and service providers.
155. In 2008, the regional Government Office commissioned a project to scope the level of needs of offenders with alcohol misuse problems. The project, delivered by the Yorkshire and Humber Improvement Partnership (YHIP), highlighted high levels of need across the region and mapped out interventions that were in place to address these needs. It showed that service provision and commissioning for the treatment of alcohol users in the criminal justice system was progressing but that provision was inconsistent, and gaps and developmental opportunities were evident.
156. It was highlighted that the national Drug Interventions Programme (DIP), aimed at tackling drug-related offending, has proved to be effective in reducing drug-related re-offending and drug use levels. In view of this, it is envisaged that many of the processes and successes of DIP will also be applicable to alcohol arrest referral schemes and alcohol-related crime.
157. We were pleased to note that Leeds has been awarded a substantial grant from the European Union to provide a city-wide alcohol arrest referral programme for the next three years. This programme will initially be based at the Leeds Bridewell Police Station and there will be planned roll out at all custody suites over the next 36 months. The initiative will focus on all persons arrested in Leeds by West Yorkshire Police for offences of violence and/or disorder where alcohol is deemed to be the causal factor.
158. During our inquiry, we noted that one of the key deliverables set out within the new National Delivery Plan is to progress, across all regions, towards a provision of alcohol treatment for a minimum of 15% of offenders identified as potentially alcohol dependent.
159. A number of issues were raised during our inquiry regarding this target. In particular, it was felt that further clarity was needed about which cohort of offenders it was applicable to i.e. does it relate to particular types of offences; those offenders already within the prison system; or does it include all offenders coming through the custody suites, which would therefore have a significant resource impact.
160. We were informed that the number of dependent drinkers in treatment in



Conclusions and Recommendations

Leeds rose by nearly 100% between 2006/7 and 2008/9. Leeds currently has about 8% of dependent drinkers in treatment.

161. Whilst acknowledging that existing alcohol treatment services are already stretched, we learned that investment levels by NHS Leeds to alcohol treatment services were at the lower end of the spectrum nationally.
162. We acknowledge that the ongoing pace and delivery of alcohol policies and treatment services will be challenged by public sector cuts and will require more integration into wider health and social care agendas and opportunities in order to show cost effectiveness and innovation. However, it is vital that alcohol treatment services are recognised by NHS Leeds as a priority service for future investment.
163. We noted that another key deliverable within the National Delivery Plan is to issue joint Department of Health /NOMs guidance to Primary Care Trusts on commissioning alcohol services to ensure they meet the needs of offenders.
164. We are also aware that an Alcohol Management Board has been formed with senior level representation from key partners to review progress on the 2008 – 2010 Leeds Alcohol Harm Strategy and agree a revised action plan for 2010 – 2013. Particular focus is to be given on joint commissioning of alcohol treatment services and also reducing alcohol related violent crime and disorder.

165. In moving forward, we strongly recommend that Leeds Offender Health and Social Care Partnership Board effectively feeds into the work of the new Alcohol Management Board.

Recommendation 8

That the Leeds Offender Health and Social Care Partnership Board effectively feeds into the work of the new Alcohol Management Board in reviewing progress on the 2008 – 2010 Leeds Alcohol Harm Strategy and agreeing a revised action plan for 2010 – 2013.

166. At the same time as our inquiry, we acknowledged that the Council's Health Scrutiny Board was conducting a separate inquiry into the role of the Council and its Partners in promoting good public health. In doing so, it examined four specific areas of public health, which included promoting responsible alcohol consumption.
167. As part of its inquiry, the Health Scrutiny Board considered an overview of the Licensing Act 2003 and advised that this Act was underpinned by 4 licensing objectives, namely: the prevention of crime and disorder; public safety; the prevention of public nuisance; and the protection of children from harm.
168. From the evidence presented to the Health Scrutiny Board, it concluded that the introduction of a minimum price per unit of alcohol is highly likely to be the most effective intervention to reduce alcohol related harm and that immediate action was needed in this regard. The Health Scrutiny Board



Conclusions and Recommendations

therefore made the following recommendations:

- *That, as soon as practicable, the Director of Public Health and the Head of Licensing and Registration, jointly write to the appropriate Minister and Government Department in an attempt to secure changes to the current licensing legislation, that would result in 'public health' considerations becoming material consideration within the licensing application process.*
- *That, by July 2010, the Department of Health (in collaboration with any other appropriate Government Department) be strongly urged to work towards the introduction of a minimum price per unit of alcohol, as soon as practicable: This may include, but should not be restricted to, a review of current competition laws and regulations, as appropriate.*

169. In welcoming these recommendations, we look forward to receiving an update from the Health Scrutiny Board on the implementation and impact of its recommendations.

IOM Performance Management

170. We decided to consider the local IOM performance management framework to ensure that auditing processes are in place to monitor delivery against agreed outcomes.

171. During our inquiry, we received details about the West Yorkshire IOM Strategic Partnership Traffic Lights system; a copy of the West Yorkshire

IOM Strategic Partnership Performance Report for January 2010; and details of the actual outcomes for Year 1 (2008/09) and up to quarter 2 (2009/10) for PPO reconviction rates and up to quarter 3 for IOM.

172. We were informed that monthly performance reports are generated in line with the requirement to report against DIP and PPO national targets. However, we also noted that the performance framework included a wide range of other local indicators in relation to IOM.

173. We queried why many of the local IOM indicators were still awaiting data and therefore incomplete. In response, we learned that West Yorkshire was the only area in the country that had formulated its own IOM local indicators based on what it would like to see being measured to complement the National Indicators. However, only half of these are populated as there is no automated way to capture some of the information. It was highlighted that Probation Services and the Police in particular have found it difficult to disaggregate their existing data to single out IOM individuals.

174. As a result, these remain within the performance framework as aspirational measures given that they would provide valuable information in the future in terms of IOM performance if an effective way of populating them was to be found.

175. We noted that the lack of accurate data, at either a local or central level, and of any meaningful discussion of PPO problems within the system also



Conclusions and Recommendations

made it difficult for the courts or CPS to focus on improving their performance or highlighting successes.

176. It was highlighted that a key solution to this problem was around the development of a more integrated IT support system, which has already been raised as a national problem.

177. We learned that in 2004, the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) initiated the National Offender Management Information System project (C-NOMIS) to implement a single offender management IT system across prison and probation services by January 2008.

178. C-NOMIS was intended to support a new way of working, known as end to end offender management, and to replace existing prison inmate and local probation area offender case management systems with one integrated system, allowing prison and probation officers and others to access shared offender records in real time.

179. However, we learned that this reform programme has been hindered by technical problems and many have claimed that it has increased bureaucracy, rather than reduced it.

180. We noted that the National Audit Office reported in March 2009 that by July 2007, C-NOMIS was already two years behind schedule and that the estimated lifetime project costs had risen to £690 million. As a result, the Minister of State imposed a

moratorium while options for reducing the project cost were sought.

181. In response, NOMS evaluated a range of options and, in January 2008, recommenced work on a rescope programme with an estimated lifetime cost of £513 million and a final delivery date of March 2011. Rather than introducing a single shared database with interfaces to other criminal justice systems, the programme now consists of five separate projects:

- replacement of several current prison systems with the C-NOMIS application;
- creation of a national probation case management system based on an existing package called Delius;
- the introduction of a read-only data share facility between prison and probation;
- the creation of a single offender risk assessment system; and
- replacement of the current prison Inmate Information System.

182. However, the National Audit Office concluded that the revised solution does not facilitate the sharing of information as initially envisaged, and has already led other agencies to develop their own databases, such as the Parole Board. A number of recommendations were therefore put forward to the National Offender Management Service at that stage.

183. In acknowledgement of this, we also share the frustration of the Probation Service, the Police and other key agencies in terms of the lack of progress made with the development



Conclusions and Recommendations

of an appropriate IT support system nationally. However, we do commend the West Yorkshire IOM Strategic Partnership for taking the initiative now to identify indicators they would like to measure and for continuing its work with partners to try and populate these as best as possible.

184. In acknowledging that all Community Safety Partnerships are now required to formulate and implement a strategy to reduce re-offending in their areas from April 2010, we recognise the key role that IOM will have as part of this task. In view of this, it is vital that the performance framework linked to future plans/strategies for reducing re-offending also includes clear measurements on the effectiveness of offender management.

Recommendation 9
That the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive ensures that the performance framework linked to the Partnership's future plans/strategies for reducing re-offending includes clear measurements on the effectiveness of offender management.

Generating greater awareness and publicity around IOM

185. Whilst we recognise that a referral to the IOM programme is not a soft option for offenders, we are aware that it can sometimes be perceived as such by the public. It is therefore important that further work is carried

out to raise greater awareness of the intensity of work undertaken in line with IOM and to better publicise how such an approach has helped to benefit local communities.

186. In discussing this, it was considered more appropriate to manage such publicity campaigns at a local level, as this would be more meaningful and less complex to local residents. Importance was also placed upon improving the use of performance data and reducing the use of criminal justice jargon when communicating to the public about IOM.
187. We therefore recommend that the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive leads on developing existing communication frameworks to help further raise the profile of offender management amongst local communities and provides a progress report to Scrutiny within 6 months.

Recommendation 10
That the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive leads on developing existing communication frameworks to help further raise the profile of offender management amongst local communities. In particular, attention should be given to better publicising how the IOM approach has helped to benefit local communities.

That a progress report is brought back to Scrutiny within 6 months.



Conclusions and Recommendations

188. We also questioned whether local intelligence about PPOs should also be shared with local Ward Councillors so that they could be in a position to help alleviate any concerns raised by local residents by explaining the level of support and interventions associated with a particular individual to help safeguard them and members of the public from any harm.
189. Whilst it was noted that decisions around sharing such information would be part of an overall risk assessment process and subject to formal consent by the individual concerned, the valuable role of local Ward Councillors in this regard was acknowledged.

Recommendation 11
That the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive ensures that appropriate information-sharing mechanisms are put in place to enable local intelligence about prolific and other priority offenders to be shared effectively with Ward Councillors.

Ensuring the long term sustainability of IOM

190. It was acknowledged that anticipated public spending cuts are likely to have an impact on criminal justice and other key partners. In view of this, it was noted that whilst IOM processes are still likely to continue, the intensity of such work is in danger of being reduced.
191. Our inquiry has clearly demonstrated that by working closely together, local agencies can form a clearer understanding of their local offending populations and ensure that responses focus clearly on priorities i.e. to reduce crime and reoffending further by focusing on the offenders of most concern, thereby helping to raise public confidence in the criminal justice system.
192. As more pressure is put onto the Probation Services in particular, we particularly acknowledge the valuable role and expertise of the third sector in terms of its outreach work with offenders within the community. The third sector is able to go into the offender's environment and provide more information about their family unit which helps to inform the IOM programme.
193. We understand that the Ministry of Justice and the Home Office are undertaking an evaluation of the six IOM 'pioneer' areas to identify and share effective practice, to look at the cost-effectiveness of IOM approaches through a break-even analysis and to consider the feasibility of conducting a further impact evaluation.
194. The evaluation of the IOM areas is due to be completed in March 2010 for publication in April 2010.
195. We would therefore like the Chair of Safer Leeds Partnership Executive to report back to Scrutiny with details of this evaluation and to include the response of the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive to this evaluation.



Conclusions and Recommendations

Recommendation 12

That the Chair of the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive reports back to Scrutiny with details of the evaluation conducted by the Ministry of Justice and the Home Office on the six IOM 'pioneer' areas and includes the response of the Safer Leeds Partnership Executive to this evaluation.

DRAFT



Glossary of abbreviations

CPS

Crown Prosecution Service: the Government Department responsible for prosecuting criminal cases investigated by the Police in England and Wales.

CSP

Community Safety Partnership: a multi-agency partnership set up in each local authority in England with funding from the Home Office to achieve a community-based approach to crime reduction. The statutory partners are the Police, the Local Authority, the Police Authority, the Fire Authority, the Primary Care Trust, and the Probation Service. Safer Leeds is an example of a CSP within West Yorkshire.

DIP

Drug Interventions Programme: a partnership programme which aims to break the cycle of offending by making the most of opportunities with the Criminal Justice System to redirect drug-motivated offenders away from crime and into programmes of treatment and rehabilitation. DIP has been operational in West Yorkshire since 2003 and has contributed significantly to reducing reoffending.

DYO

Deter Young Offender: a young person between 10 – 17 years of age who has been sentenced to a relevant community order or commenced the community element of a Detention and Training Order.

IOM

Integrated Offender Management: the aim of IOM is to provide an innovative multi-agency service, drawing upon mainstream resources to reduce the number of victims of crime by modifying the behaviour of offenders who create the most harm in communities.

JIG

Justices' Issues Group: operating at an area level, a major responsibility of the JIG is to address administrative/judicial matters for the magistrates' courts, such as listing, rota arrangements and case management.

LCJB

Local Criminal Justice Board: an alliance of representatives from the Police, Probation Service, Courts, Crown Prosecution Service, Youth Offending Teams, Legal Services Commission and Prisons with the aim of co-ordinating activity and sharing responsibility for bringing offenders to justice, working with victims and the local community and improving links between criminal justice agencies.

MAPPA

Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements: a mechanism by which the Police, Youth Offending Team, Probation Service and Prison Service (often referred to as the 'Responsible Authority') meet to jointly identify, assess and manage offenders with a history of physical or sexual violence and considered to pose a current risk of serious harm to the public.



Glossary of abbreviations

NCJB

National Criminal Justice Board: brings together ministers and senior officials across Government and supports Local Criminal Justice Boards in their work to meet Public Service Agreement targets at a local level to bring more offences to justice and increase public confidence in the criminal justice system.

NOMS

The National Offender Management Service: established in 2004 to join up prison and probation services; to enable offender management to be delivered more effectively; and to strengthen and streamline commissioning to improve efficiencies and effectiveness. In July 2008, NOMS was launched as an executive agency of the Ministry of Justice.

PPO

Prolific and other Priority Offender: the term refers to both the scheme and to the individual offenders managed on the scheme. PPO is a national scheme set up to tackle problematic offenders in a partnership context.

YHIP

Yorkshire and Humber Improvement Partnership: established in April 2009, the YHIP works across health and social care boundaries and with a range of partners from both health, social care, criminal justice agencies and independent and third sectors to create the best overall outcomes for people and families who need support and / or use services.

YOT/YOS

Youth Offending Team/Youth Offending Service: works with children and young people aged between 10 and 17 years who have offended or are at risk of offending. A partnership approach with workers from Children's Services, Police, Probation, Health, etc. managed under the auspices of the local authority.



Monitoring arrangements

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

Reports and Publications Submitted

- Prolific and other Priority Offender Programme. Five years on: Maximising the impact. Home Office. June 2009.
- Criminal Justice Joint Inspection report. Prolific and other Priority Offenders. A joint inspection of the PPO programme. July 2009.
- Ministry of Justice. National Offender Management Service. Strategic and Business Plans 2009-10 to 2010-11.
- Prolific and Other Priority Offender Strategy. Premium Service. National Premium Service Specification. Office for Criminal Justice Reform. August 2005.
- Integrated Offender Management. Government Policy Statement. Home Office and Ministry of Justice. June 2009
- National Support Framework. Reducing Reoffending, cutting crime, changing lives. Guidance on new duties for Community Safety Partnerships in England and Wales.
- National Audit Office Report. The National Offender Management Information System. March 2009.
- Final draft of the Leeds Integrated Offender Management Operational Guidelines (*this defines the processes of managing offenders, how that is jointly delivered and how the information is shared*);
- Leeds IOM Operational Group Meeting terms of reference (*this defines responsibilities of operational management team for IOM. Key responsibilities are to share information around agency issues and development areas*);



Reports and Publications Submitted....continued

- Leeds IOM Basic Command Unit (BCU) Case Conference Meeting terms of reference (*this provides clarity on the role of case conferencing in sharing information across the partnership and creating accountability*);
- PPO/IOM Case Conferencing Aide Memoire for chair (*this is for the Chair of BCU case conferencing in ensuring that information is shared*);
- IOM Multi-Agency Interventions Plan (*this is the joint delivery document that is owned across the partnership, documenting the actions to be undertaken by each organisation*);
- Information Sharing Agreement - Leeds Integrated Offender Management Process;
- Integrated Offender Management Risk Assessment. Process Map Guidance and Information Sharing Protocol (*these are the arrangements to share information relating to risk via MI-Case (the Drug Interventions Programme case management tracking system to be adapted for IOM)*);
- Copy of the draft West Yorkshire IOM Computer Systems Operating Guide (*this is a West Yorkshire Police developed document adopted across the partnership, but currently being updated*).
- Copy of the current selection/scoring method developed by West Yorkshire for PPOs
- Briefing paper from the Leeds Youth Offending Service on the Deter Young Offender Scheme (December 2009).
- Terms of reference for the Leeds Offender Health and Social Care Partnership Board
- Membership of the Leeds Offender Health and Social Care Partnership Board
- Improving Health, Supporting Justice. The National Delivery Plan of the Health and Criminal Justice Programme Board. Department of Health (2009).
- West Yorkshire IOM Strategic Partnership Traffic Lights system.
- West Yorkshire IOM Strategic Partnership Performance Report for January 2010.
- Actual outcomes for Year 1 (2008/09) and up to quarter 2 (2009/10) for PPO reconviction rates and up to quarter 3 for IOM.
- Alcohol and Offenders Project – Phase 2. Yorkshire and Humber Region. Final Report. April 2010.



Witnesses Heard

- Jim Willson - Chief Officer (Drugs and Alcohol)
- Vicky Clarke - Commissioning and Development Manager, Safer Leeds
- Maggie Smallridge - Chair of the Integrated Offender Management Strategic Group (also former Assistant Chief Officer at West Yorkshire Probation Trust)
- Detective Inspector Dave McDougal, IOM Hub Coordinator, West Yorkshire Police
- Danny Glew, Senior Manager of DISC (Developing Initiatives Supporting Communities)
- Louise Gartland - Drugs & Offender Management Unit (West Yorkshire Police)
- Jim Hopkinson, Head of Service, Leeds Youth Offending Service
- Gemma Hornby – Integrated Pathways Co-ordinator, Safer Leeds Partnership - Commissioning Team
- Carol Cochrane – Director of Development & Commissioning for Priority Groups, NHS Leeds
- Dave Cooper - Alcohol Intervention Coordinator, West Yorkshire Drugs and Offender Management Unit
- Beverley Taylor, Head of Performance and Commissioning, Drugs & Offender Management Unit
- Adrienne Gower, Area Crown Prosecutor for the Eastern area, Crown Prosecution Service
- Detective Chief Inspector Andy Williams, Crime Manager, North West Leeds
- Mike Cooper, Partnerships Manager, West Yorkshire Probation Trust
- Detective Superintendent Ian Wilson, West Yorkshire Police
- Judith Saynor, Leeds Integrated Offender Management Unit

Dates of Scrutiny

9th October 2009 – Scrutiny Board Meeting (agreed terms of reference)
23rd November 2009 – Working Group Meeting
17th December 2009 – Working Group Meeting
11th January 2010 – Scrutiny Board Meeting
27th January 2010 – Working Group Meeting
16th March 2010 – Working Group Meeting

Site Visits

1st February 2010 – Visit to the Leeds Integrated Offender Management Hub at Mabgate Mills

DRAFT

**Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods)
Inquiry into Integrated Offender Management
September 2010
Report author: Angela Brogden**