

**CENTRE FOR CRIME
AND JUSTICE STUDIES**

**Scoping study on a community based centre
for male adult offenders with multiple
needs**

Dr Roger Grimshaw and Enver Solomon

September 2007

About the authors

Dr Roger Grimshaw is the research director at the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies and Enver Solomon is the deputy director.

Produced by:

Centre for Crime and Justice Studies

King's College, London

Strand

London WC2R 2LS

Tel: 020 7848 1688

Fax: 020 7848 1689

www.kcl.ac.uk/ccjs

The Centre for Crime and Justice Studies at King's College London is an independent charity that informs and educates about all aspects of crime and criminal justice. We provide information, produce research and carry out policy analysis to encourage and facilitate an understanding of the complex nature of issues concerning crime.

Registered Charity No 251588

A Company Limited by Guarantee

Registered in England No 496821

Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter One: Context	6
The sentencing framework	6
Commissioning structure and regional action plans	13
Relevant statutory and voluntary sector initiatives	15
Chapter Two: Needs and Interventions	22
Defining the target group and group profiles	22
Needs of the target group	25
Addressing needs	27
Integration with the pathways	30
Engagement of clients	37
Overarching principles	39
Chapter Three: The proposed model: a demonstration project	40
Aims objectives and principles	40
Eligibility criteria, referral routes, links with other agencies	42
Service delivery and models of working	44
Monitoring and evaluation	49
Size, staffing and indicative costs	50
Risk assessment	54
Conclusion and next steps	55
Appendix One	57
Appendix Two	62
References	63

Introduction

Three years ago the charity, Tomorrow's People, developed plans to set up a project called 'The Junction' based on the Delancey Street project in the United States¹ and The San Patriano facility in Italy². The Junction project was conceived as a mainly residential facility for ex-offenders who have complex multiple social needs, many of whom will have recently been in prison. Significantly the project was not intended to be integrated into the current sentencing framework and was therefore perceived as operating on the fringes of the criminal justice system unlike the Delancey Street Project which receives many of its clients as a sentencing disposal from Californian courts.

It is, however, possible to be more radical by considering options for a project which is directly linked to current sentencing disposals, as is the case with some of the innovative projects being developed for female offenders in the UK that are set out in chapter one of this report. These projects are community based centres that provide both diversion from prosecution and an alternative to custody for offenders who have complex multiple needs in both a non-residential and/or residential setting.

In May 2007 Lady Edwina Grosvenor who had been involved in the Junction Project commissioned the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies at King's College to conduct a scoping study to consider the feasibility of setting up a more radical project. Lady Grosvenor recognised that a study was needed in order to consider practicable options within the current legislative and policy environment in England and Wales. Furthermore, for the project to be informed by evidenced based practice it was acknowledged that there should be a thorough assessment of current research to synthesize the disparate and contradictory evidence on what models are most effective. It was also understood that it was critically important for a scoping exercise to take account of the current sentencing framework and other related policy developments, for example the creation of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and a commissioning framework. Lessons needed to be learned from a range of innovative voluntary sector run projects that have been set up to work with women offenders and also young offenders. Ultimately unless the initial scoping phase was conducted it was felt that it would not be possible to make informed decisions about what type of models should be considered for further development into a detailed financial business case and service specification.

The aims and objectives of the scoping study were to:

- Conduct a review of relevant academic, government and voluntary sector research in order to draw together a clear evidence base of good practice models.

¹ See www.eisenhowerfoundation.org/grassroots/delancey/

² San Patriano is a residential drug treatment Centre in Italy.

- Examine the current legislative framework in terms of sentencing disposals, diversion from prosecution and post release provisions to establish how a community based project would relate to current criminal justice sanctions and disposals.
- Set out how the project would relate to current probation practice and the development of the National Offender Management's regional commissioning structures.
- Identify relevant learning from voluntary sector projects, especially innovative projects working with female offenders, young offenders and young people with multiple needs.

It was agreed that the study would provide a model or options for future development that would set out:

- Client referral routes and steps required to establish those referral routes.
- Types and models of service provision.
- How the project would relate to current statutory and voluntary sector provision.

The intention was not to set out detailed financial costings, however, it was agreed that any proposed model would include indicative costs based on an analysis of current service provision budgets in the voluntary and statutory sector.

This report sets out the results of the scoping study. Chapter one provides the context examining the current sentencing framework and the commissioning structures being created by the National Offender Management Service. Chapter two reviews the needs of offenders with multiple needs and considers the most effective interventions. Based on the detailed recommendations in the first two chapters, in chapter three we set out the model for a proposed demonstration project.

The report provides a blue print for an innovative, radical model for working with adult male offenders with multiple needs that is enlightened, visionary and evidence based. Critically, it provides the foundation for developing a detailed service specification that should be formulated in the next stage of the project's development.

Chapter One: Context

In recent years there have been a number of legislative changes to the sentencing framework and structural changes to the delivery and commissioning of interventions for offenders. The Criminal Justice Act 2003 has radically reconfigured community sentences and the creation of the National Offender Management Service and the introduction of the 'Offender Management' model is changing probation practice. There have also been new approaches piloted by both the statutory and voluntary sector to working with young offenders and female offenders that provide instructive examples of good practice and valuable learning points. This chapter examines: the current sentencing framework; the new commissioning structure; relevant examples of statutory and voluntary sector service delivery and makes recommendations relating to these.

The sentencing framework

It is vital to set out how any project would relate to the current sentencing framework and identify which particular sentencing options are most relevant.

Custodial sentences

A custodial sentence is imposed when a court forms the view that the offence (or the combination of the offence and one or more offences associated with it) was so serious that neither a fine alone nor a community sentence can be justified. It is important to note that there are currently no statutory provisions that enable adult offenders given a custodial sentence to be held in any custodial setting other than a prison or secure psychiatric hospital.

Under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 the government was intending to introduce a new sentence of Custody Plus. This is a custodial sentence of no more than 51 weeks made up of a custodial period of between 2 and 13 weeks and a period on licence in the community completing various requirements of at least 26 weeks. Plans to introduce Custody Plus have been put on hold and at present it is not clear when or if it will be implemented.

The government was also intending to introduce a new sentence of Intermittent Custody which allows the offender to serve the custodial element of the sentence either at the weekend or only on weekdays. A key aim of intermittent custody is that prisoners can retain their jobs or discharge their childcare responsibilities more successfully if they serve a custodial sentence only at weekends or only on weekdays. Intermittent custody was piloted at two prisons but has since been put on hold and there are currently no plans to implement it.

Licence provisions

Adult offenders who are given a custodial sentence of less than 12 months are not currently under any statutory requirements to be on licence in the community after being released from prison unless they are aged 18-20.³

Offenders who are given a determinate sentence of more than 12 months are automatically released at the half way point of their sentence and then remain on licence in the community for the remainder of their sentence.

Community sentences

Community sentences were radically reconfigured under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 with the creation of a new Community Order and a Suspended Sentence Order. Both have been in operation since April 4th 2005.

Community Order - The Community Order replaces all existing community sentences for adults. It consists of one or more of 12 possible requirements and could last for as short a time as a few hours or as long as three years.

The Suspended Sentence Order (SSO) - The Suspended Sentence Order is technically a custodial sentence and should only be used where the court is minded to pass a custodial sentence of less than 12 months but agrees to suspend the custodial element. It is made up of the same requirements as the Community Order, so, in the absence of breach, it is served wholly in the community. The SSO consists of an 'operational period' (the time for which the custodial sentence is suspended) and a 'supervision period' (the time during which any requirements take effect). Both may be between six months and two years and the 'supervision period' cannot be longer than the 'operational period', although it may be shorter.

The new Community Order and Suspended Sentence Order enable judges and magistrates to create hybrid orders by combining several requirements, the number of which must be in proportion to the seriousness of the offence. The 12 requirements are available for sentencers constructing both the Community Order and the Suspended Sentence Order.

The 12 requirements are:

- Unpaid work (40 to 300 hours) An unpaid work requirement must be completed within 12 months. It involves activities such as cleaning up graffiti, making public areas safer and conservation work. The work is intended to benefit the local community, and in some probation areas residents are able to suggest projects for offenders with an unpaid work requirement to carry out.

³ All 18-20 year olds leaving prison are currently supervised by the Probation Service for a minimum of 3 months post-release. This will only change as and when Custody Plus is implemented.

- Supervision (up to 36 months; 24 months maximum for Suspended Sentence Order) An offender is required to attend appointments with an offender manager or probation officer. The focus of the supervision and the frequency of contact are specified in the sentence plan, which is based on the particular issues the offender needs to work on. The supervision requirement lasts for the period of time the Community Order is in force.
- Accredited programme (length to be expressed as the number of sessions; should be combined with a supervision requirement) These programmes aim to change offenders' thinking and behaviour. For example, the Enhanced Thinking Skills Programme is designed to enable offenders to understand the consequences of their offence and make them less impulsive in their decision-making. This requirement is particularly intended for those convicted of violence, sex offending, drug or alcohol abuse, domestic violence and drink impaired driving
- Drug rehabilitation (six to 36 months; 24 months maximum for Suspended Sentence Orders; offender's consent is required) If offenders commit a crime linked to drug abuse, they may be required to go on a Drug Rehabilitation Programme. Programmes may involve monthly reviews of an offender's progress.
- Alcohol treatment (six to 36 months; 24 months maximum for Suspended Sentence Orders; offender's consent is required) This requirement is intended for offenders who are alcohol dependent and need intensive, specialist treatment.
- Mental health treatment (up to 36 months; 24 months maximum for Suspended Sentence Orders; offender's consent is required) After taking professional advice, the court may decide that the offender's sentence should include mental health treatment under the direction of a doctor or psychologist.
- Residence (up to 36 months; 24 months maximum for Suspended Sentence Orders) An offender may be required to live in a specified place, such as in a probation hostel or other approved accommodation.
- Specified activity (up to 60 days) Specified activity may include community drug centre attendance, education and basic skills or reparation to victims.
- Prohibited activity (up to 36 months; 24 months maximum for Suspended Sentence Orders) Offenders may be ordered not to take part in certain activities at specified times, such as attending football matches.

- Exclusion (up to 24 months) An offender may be prohibited from certain areas and will normally have to wear an electronic tag during that time.
- Curfew (up to six months and for between two and 12 hours in any one day; if a stand-alone Curfew Order is made, there is no probation involvement) An offender may be ordered to stay at a particular location for certain hours of the day or night. Offenders will normally wear an electronic tag during this part of their sentence.
- Attendance centre (12 to 36 hours with a maximum of three hours per attendance) The court can direct offenders under the age of 25 to spend between 12 and 36 hours at an attendance centre over a set period of time. The offender will be required to be present for a maximum of three hours per attendance. The attendance centre requirement is designed to offer 'a structured opportunity for offenders to address their offending behaviour in a group environment while imposing a restriction on their leisure time'.

As set out below the statutory sector does not have a monopoly on the delivery of provision of the 12 requirements that make up the Community Order and Suspended Sentence Order.

Deferred sentence

A court can decide to defer a sentence for no more than six months providing it is deemed to be in the interests of justice and the offender consents to the deferment. The period of deferment can have the same requirements attached to it as outlined above for the Community Order and Suspended Sentence Order which the probation service is be required to monitor.

Bail

Bail can be granted by the courts or the police. Where bail is granted, the offender is released from custody until the next date when they attend court or the police station. If bail is refused, this will be because the police or the court believes that, if released on bail the person will abscond (not turn up to court), commit an offence, interfere with witnesses or otherwise interfere with the criminal justice process.

The police and courts can impose any requirements which are necessary to make sure that defendants attend court and do not commit offences or interfere with witnesses whilst on bail. Common conditions include not going within a certain distance of a witness's house, or being subject to a curfew or residence in a bail hostel.

It is important to note that the number of places available in bail hostels is declining as they are increasingly being used to house offenders,

particularly, sex offenders on licence in the community. Home Office research has found that the proportion of residents who are on bail has declined from 69 per cent to 27 per cent in the ten years to 2003 (Foster, 2004). The courts have therefore been remanding increasing numbers into custody rather than giving them bail in the community. This has particularly been the case for defendants who do not have a fixed address. There is clearly a need for additional bail accommodation.

In response to the current situation the National Offender Management Service is setting up a new bail accommodation and support service to enable the courts to make greater use of bail on a strict curfew. The accommodation is currently being developed and is intended to allow the appropriate use of bail for 'low risk, adult defendants who are currently unable to provide a bail address or who could not be bailed without support' (Office for Criminal Justice Reform 2007).

Diversion from prosecution - conditional cautions

When deciding whether a case should be prosecuted in the courts Crown Prosecutors can consider alternatives to prosecution of either a simple caution or conditional caution. For a conditional caution a rehabilitative, reparative or restorative justice process can be considered. The key to determining whether a Conditional Caution should be given - instead of prosecution or a simple caution - is that the imposition of specified conditions will be an appropriate and effective means of addressing an offender's behaviour or making reparation for the effects of the offence on the victim or the community.

Rehabilitation can include taking part in treatment for alcohol or drug dependency, anger management courses or involvement in restorative processes. Reparation might include repairing or otherwise making good any damage caused to property (e.g. by cleaning graffiti), restoring stolen goods, paying modest financial compensation, or in some cases a simple apology to the victim.

The police, crown prosecution service and probation service are expected to work in collaboration with statutory and voluntary sector agencies to deliver the conditional caution.

Under the Criminal Justice Act 2003 conditional cautioning is being rolled out across England and Wales and expected to be fully operational across all police forces in 2008.

Options for provision within the current sentencing framework

Given the current sentencing arrangements and provisions for diversion from prosecution there are a number of ways in which a project would provide direct provision in relation to specific disposals.

Licence - Residential provision could be provided for relatively high risk multiple offenders on licence post custody. If custody plus is introduced provision could also be provided for offenders on the licence part of the sentence. However, such a service would be about resettlement after custody, rather than diversion.

Suspended Sentence Order - If an offender passes the custodial threshold the court and probation needs to be of the view that suspending the sentence will result in appropriate provision. For offenders with complex multiple needs there is the possibility of providing a combination of requirements that can be delivered under one roof. In particular a residence requirement and/or a specified activity requirement could be provided by a project. This would ensure effective diversion from short custodial sentences. However it is important to note that these requirements are being used rarely by the courts (Mair et al. 2007).

Community Order - In addition, conditions of residence, specified activity or other requirements that also make up the Community Order could be delivered at the project to provide an effective alternative to custody. For example a residence requirement of up to 36 months could be delivered by the provision of residential places.

Deferred Sentence - Provision can also be provided for offenders who are given a deferred sentence, which only lasts up to six months.

Bail - Given the shortage of accommodation in bail hostels there is a real opportunity to provide residential accommodation for offenders given bail who are not able to access bail hostel approved premises.

Conditional caution - There is also great potential to provide a facility that is used as a diversion from prosecution acting as a preventative measure that avoids the use of custody in the long term and breaks the cycle of offending. Rehabilitative and/or reparative programmes could be provided that meet the requirements of a conditional caution.

Recommendation

Modest residential provision should be considered for offenders on bail or serving a residential/specified activity requirement of a Suspended Sentence Order or Community Order run possibly in partnership with a local accommodation provider. This would ensure the project is able to act as a diversion from custody. For this reason residential provision should not be provided for offenders on licence in the community post-custody.

The creation of the NOMS bail accommodation and support service provides an opportunity to provide much needed bail accommodation.

A Supervision, Rehabilitation and Support Centre should be linked to the residential unit providing programmes, interventions and supervision for offenders on community sentences and suspended sentence orders.

Use of the Centre should also be extended to other offenders given either a deferred sentences or conditional caution in order to act as an effective diversion from prosecution.

Overall the main focus of provision should be for offenders on:

- Community Orders or Suspended Sentence Orders
- Deferred Sentences
- Bail
- Conditional Cautions

It should be recognised that to begin with the project may be used more as a diversion from *prosecution* rather than as a diversion from *custody*.

Commissioning structure and regional action plans

The creation of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) has established a single correctional organisation with the intention of creating a division between purchasers and providers. There are nine regional offender managers in England and one in Wales whose role is to commission services for offenders in their region. The state, private and voluntary sector will have to bid for contracts through a process of market competition, known as contestability. In theory an entire probation area could be put out to tender, although this is unlikely to happen for many years.

As part of the creation of a purchaser/provider split in the delivery of services to offenders a new model of working with offenders is being implemented that involves multiple providers. The offender management model is based on the idea of the seamless management of an offender with an individual professional, the offender manager, co-ordinating the delivery of the required interventions. In the context of offender management, probation will be the 'purchaser' of interventions for offenders. The expectation is that a fixed percentage of services/interventions will be delivered by, and thus purchased from, the private, voluntary, or community sectors.

The current plan is that by 2010/2011 there will be 'a plural marketplace with multiple providers from the public, private and third sectors delivering offender services' (Home Office 2007). Currently around a quarter of the total value of adult offender services is delivered by private and voluntary sector organisations. However the vast majority is in prisons with only 2 to 3 per cent of probation budgets delivered by the private or voluntary sector. A target has been set to increase this to 10 per cent by end of the current financial year (2007-2008) and the Home Office has made a commitment that '...where private or voluntary sector providers can show they can do a better job, or fill gaps in provision, they will get the chance to show what they can do' (Home Office 2006).

In relation to community sentences, for example, the 12 requirements will be delivered by a combination of public, private and voluntary sector organisations. At present electronic monitoring is delivered by private companies. In the future, drug interventions, supervision requirements and specified activities could be delivered by the voluntary and community sector.

Given the creation of NOMS and implementation of the offender management model it is clearly an opportune moment to put forward an innovative service specification for a project that could be commissioned by a Regional Offender Manager or by a Probation area.

Regional reducing re-offending action plan pathways

Wales and the nine regional areas in England that make up the National Offender Management service each have reducing re-offending action plans that are broadly based on the National Reducing Re-offending Action Plan (Home Office, 2006). The regional plans are intended to provide a set of regional actions that support and facilitate local delivery. The overall aim is, of course, to reduce re-offending but the plans are also intended to deliver co-ordinated and integrated responses by government departments, statutory agencies and the voluntary and community sector.

Each action plan is made up of seven pathways. These are:

- Accommodation
- Employment, learning and skills
- Physical and mental health
- Drugs and alcohol
- Finance
- Children, families and social support
- Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

In addition some regional areas have an eighth pathway, 'victims of crime and the community'.

In chapter two we set out specific interventions in relation to each of the pathways. It is vital that any project which is established provides services which relate directly to the seven pathways

Recommendation

Any project should be integrated into the current commissioning structures and should therefore seek to have a service level agreement with either a Regional Offender Manager and/ or a Probation area.

A service level agreement with Probation is vital to ensure effective co-ordination with probation officers/offender managers and pre-sentence report writers.

Any project must relate to the reducing re-offending action plan pathways.

Relevant statutory and voluntary sector initiatives

There are a number of statutory and voluntary sector initiatives, particularly working with female offenders, that provide examples of potential models and also significant insights into the development and planning of any project.

Sherborne House

Sherborne House was a probation centre based in Bermondsey south London that began in 1974 running group work programmes for young offenders. The project was a partnership between the Inner London Probation Service and the Sherborne House Trust who provided the property and a management committee. It was intended to provide the courts with a full programme for young male offenders aged 16 to 20 whose offending was so serious and/or persistent that they would have received a custodial sentence. Young offenders attended the centre as a requirement of what was then a Probation Order or a Supervision Order (both are now the Community Order).

As part of a government initiative to provide intensive probation programmes in 1989 Sherborne House was selected as one of ten pilot areas. The programme was non-residential and offenders were required to attend for 4 and a half days a week for 10 weeks. It included a combination of offending behaviour group work, life skills sessions, offence focused sessions including victim sessions, workshop training including an element of reparation, education support and future planning sessions as well as planned and purposeful activities. Each offender was required to sign an agreement asking them to abide by certain 'rules'. Those who breached the agreement either through failure to attend or their behaviour were removed from the programme and the offender was returned to court.

Referrals to Sherborne House were by probation officers in their pre sentence reports or direct from the court. Offenders were assessed whilst on bail during a two stage period or whilst on remand in custody. The assessments were completed before the court date or within a two week period if a further adjournment was required. Every effort was made to promote the centre with judges and magistrates.

An analysis of reconviction data showed that for those completing a Sherborne House programme reconviction rates were 16% lower than predicted and that 43 per cent of those completing the programme had not re-offended during a twelve month period following completion (Wilkinson 1998).

Sherborne House was closed in 2002 after a London probation area review of programme centres and the national implementation of accredited programmes.

Together Women Programme

Following the 2004 Spending Review which pledged to establish 'radical new approaches to meet the specific needs of women offenders, including one-stop centres...to tackle the causes of crime and re-offending among this group and reduce the need for custody' the Treasury provided £9.15 million to fund demonstration projects in two regions for women offenders and those at risk of offending (HM Treasury 2004). The Home Office subsequently set up the Together Women Project framework proposing a combination of one-stop shop type provision with linked 'Women's Offending Action Teams'. The action teams would provide a floating service from point of arrest to release from prison, helping to locate resources in the community that would support diversion from the criminal justice process or from custody, or support resettlement. The one-stop shop would provide a focal point for the delivery of services to women offenders and those at risk of offending.

According to the Home Office the Together Women Project has been set up to 'address the needs of women offenders and will also offer preventative services, particularly diversion from prosecution and from custody. It will support an integrated approach to service delivery, building on existing services...[and] demonstrate how a coordinated multi-agency approach, tailored to meet women's complex and interrelated needs, can be effective in achieving the stated objectives' (Yorkshire and Humberside NOMS 2006).

The responsibility for delivering the projects has been allocated to Regional Offender Managers in the North West and Yorkshire and Humberside regions. Both areas have contracted voluntary sector providers to set up the projects.⁴

There are likely to be learning points from the setting up these projects that would provide valuable input into the creation of any similar projects for adult male offenders.

Glasgow 218 Centre

The 218 Centre is an innovative project providing residential and non-residential support services for women offenders in Glasgow. The Centre is run by Turning Point and receives an annual grant of £1.54 million from the Scottish Executive. It serves as a diversion from prosecution and as an alternative to custody, and more generally it offers support - residential or daily - for detoxification, and support and outreach to health, social work and housing services. Up to fourteen women can be accommodated in the residential unit at any one time.

⁴ In Yorkshire and Humberside the *Foundation Housing Consortium* has been commissioned to deliver the project in Doncaster, Leeds and Bradford and began operations in Doncaster Women's Centre at the beginning of 2007. In the North West the project is being delivered by *Lighthouse* in Liverpool and the *Salford Foundation* in Greater Manchester.

Women from Glasgow can access 218 from the courts, from prison, or as part of a criminal justice order. They can be referred or can refer themselves as long as they have been in custody - even police custody - at some time in the previous 12 months. Programmes are available for women at risk of becoming more and more enmeshed in the criminal justice system, for those who are on court orders, and for those who have left prison. There are three main programmes: SAFE, CONNECTIONS, and LOSS (drawing on attachment theory in psychoanalytic thinking). Each programme combines a number of individual sessions for women each week with group programmes. Another distinctive feature of the Centre is that women can attend the programmes repeatedly until they are ready to move on to the next stage (the next programme) or feel stable enough to draw on mainstream community resources (with whom contacts will have been made whilst attending the Centre). Programmes are never shorter than any court order imposed, though they may be longer. Women may complete a programme and return later to take part in another.

Women have a key worker and services are generally designed to be 'person-centred and designed with the woman, her needs and capabilities in mind'. Services can include alternative therapies such as acupuncture, Indian head massage, and yoga, detoxification, psychological and psychiatric services, reproductive health, food programmes, dental and physical health, emotional support, and in-house 12-step attendance (i.e. Narcotics Anonymous, Cocaine Anonymous, and Alcoholics Anonymous).

An evaluation of the centre has highlighted a number of notable points:

- The Centre was used as a diversion from prosecution, for deferred sentence and for direct bail, and as a condition of probation. These approaches successfully prevented offenders from entering custody, at least in the short term.
- There were also a large number of referrals from addiction services and voluntary sector agencies of people who were not currently going through the criminal justice system but were recent ex-offenders.
- Levels of involvement were highest among women referred by non-criminal justice agencies, although these were often offending-related, for example, agencies working with women involved in prostitution.
- Staff members were concerned that a time-limited residential service relegated the residential unit to crisis intervention, though longer-term support was available through the day programme.
- The Centre experienced considerable difficulties in establishing clear links with outside agencies so as to facilitate women's reintegration into the community. This partly arose from confusions about responsibilities between project workers and designated outreach staff or external caseworkers, and a perceived failure to consult with outside agencies when the Centre was first conceived.

- The average length of involvement or stay at 218 was 2.6 months. (Loucks et al 2006)

The 218 Centre provides a potential model for a similar project to be established for adult male offenders with multiple needs.

Clear Track

Clear Track is a three year pilot established by Community Service Volunteers(CSV) and Springboard Sunderland, with support from the Home Office Voluntary Sector Unit to provide an innovative custodial setting for young adult offenders aged 18 to 21. Its original aim was to work closely with probation, magistrates and other relevant organisations 'to provide a realistic, viable and effective alternative custodial sentencing option through addressing the needs of young adult offenders, and addressing a holistic, intensive, rehabilitative and reparative regime in a supervised, residential setting'. The project intended to develop 'a large portfolio of properties which will offer different levels of support for participants, with at least one property offering continuous enhanced support for those individuals requiring such levels of care and supervision' (Campbell et al 2006).

Despite the project's initial ambitious aim it has experienced significant start up difficulties, largely because it has struggled to find a place within the current sentencing framework after the government postponed its plans to introduce custody plus. The project has had to scale back its operation and is now providing an intervention as part of a specified activity requirement of a Community Order.

The courts can require that an offender attends Clear Track for up to 60 days as part of an activity requirement as long as it has been specified by the Probation Service in a pre-sentence report. Once assigned to the programme, offenders work towards challenging their offending behaviour through the delivery of interventions that are intended to be tailored to addressing the needs of young adult offenders

The 16 week programme aims to:

- discourage participants away from crime whilst on the project
- keep participants occupied
- provide participants with a sense of purpose
- provide a range of work-based learning activities, interventions and voluntary work
- help and support participants with emotional, physical and mental health needs including substance misuse
- rebuild the confidence and self-esteem of participants in doing everyday things
- help and supporting the rebuilding of relationships with families and personal development

- develop improved cognitive skills
(*ibid*)

Thus far the project has struggled to gain referrals. By March 2007 only 17 young adult offenders had been referred to the programme of whom only seven were assessed as suitable (Campbell et al 2007).

The difficulties that Clear Track has faced demonstrate the immense challenges of getting a project started that is linked directly to sentencing disposals. Gaining sufficient referrals is a slow process and takes many months. Establishing effective working links with probation is critically important. However, it provides a potential model of how a project could receive offenders as part of a specified activity requirement of a Community Order.

Community justice programme

A number of community justice pilots are being established by the Ministry of Justice across the country. According to the Ministry of Justice, the core objectives of the programme are to:

- Make the court and criminal justice agencies more responsive to the local community by ensuring that community needs are listened to, acted upon and, crucially, do not then recur.
- Break cycles of re-offending through a problem-solving approach.
- Ensure offenders comply with court orders and to make compliance highly visible to the local community.

Two projects are already up and running. The Community Justice Centre in Liverpool was the first project and has dedicated funding for a unique court led by a high profile district judge with a range of services on the same site. The Centre has received a great deal of attention and been hailed by government as a great success. However it is very expensive and the other community justice centres will not have the same funding.

The second project, the Salford Community justice initiative in Greater Manchester is different from the Liverpool Centre as it is the first project to deliver community justice principles within a mainstream Magistrates' Court. It does not have the same level of funding as Liverpool and services are not co-sited with the court.

The community justice programme is currently expanding to 11 areas across England and Wales. These are Birmingham, Bradford, Devon & Cornwall, Kingston-Upon-Hull, Leicestershire, Merthyr Tydfil, Middlesbrough, Nottingham; there are also three projects in London in Wandsworth, Newham and Haringey. The projects are due to commence by March 2008.

Each project is intended to be a partnership involving the court, the judiciary, criminal justice agencies, the local authority, the wider voluntary sector and the local community. The local areas have the freedom to design structures which are consistent with the projects' objectives but which match particular local needs and circumstances.

Given the innovative nature of the project there is an opportunity to link directly with any of the individual community justice court centres. For example the Together Women programme project in Manchester is working closely with the community justice centre in Salford and has a team based in the court to receive referrals.

Learning points

There are a number of key learning points from the development of similar projects, particularly the 218 project and the Clear Track experience:

- A project is most effective if it provides both diversion from prosecution and a condition of probation.
- Having a variety of referral routes is critical to the sustainability of a project
- To establish multiple referral routes the eligibility criteria would probably need to be opened up to people who are not currently going through the criminal justice system but have been in custody, either police or prison, in the last six or 12 months. This would also result in referrals from both statutory and voluntary sector agencies, including drug agencies working with offenders.
- It is possible for a project to provide a specified activity requirement of the Community Order and also the Suspended Sentence Order.
- Effective links with probation to ensure recommendations are made in Pre-Sentence Reports are vital. The Sherborne House project which was a partnership with Inner London Probation clearly demonstrates this as does the approach of the Together women programme in the north west.
- Establishing effective links with outside agencies to ensure effective reintegration into the community poses particular challenges.

Recommendations

An advisory group should include people involved in setting up the 218 project and the Clear Track project in order to draw on their experience and advice.

Early support and 'buy-in' needs to be gained from all the key statutory agencies. In particular effective links with probation and PSR writers is vital.

A project should provide both diversion from prosecution and diversion from custody. The latter is best achieved by providing requirements of the Community Order and Suspended Sentence Order.

Serious consideration should be given to having an eligibility criterion that includes people who have recently been in custody in order to ensure multiple referral routes.

The possibility of linking directly with one of the community justice court centres should be considered.

Chapter Two: Needs and effective interventions

The aim of this chapter is to define the client group and to provide a concise overview of what is known about their needs. It will then make a review of what is known about the most effective interventions for the identified client group, given those needs.

The chapter also makes recommendations about kinds of interventions the proposed community centre model should seek to provide for its clients.

The target group for intervention is defined by its frequent involvement with the criminal justice system. However the ways in which the actions of such offenders repeatedly come to police attention remain unexamined. Unlike the 'middle class criminals' coming less often to attention, their actions are readily exposed to police scrutiny.

In the 1980's it was accepted as part of government policy that probation centres should be used to reduce the frequency of custodial sentencing (Nellis 2001; Wilkinson 1998). In this context, an advantage of such centres has been that interventions delivered in community settings are more likely to reduce offenders' reconvictions than those delivered in prisons and similar secure settings (Lowenkamp et al 2006). By the late 90's the probation centres were delivering programmes designed along lines recommended by the *What Works* movement (Wilkinson 1998).

Nonetheless, the recent social scientific literature on community-based probation centres and 'half-way houses' for adult offenders is very sparse. Searches for articles on 'probation centres' and 'halfway houses' published since 2000 produced few relevant results (Yeboah 2000; Yser et al 2007; Liau et al 2004). It may not be an accident that the silence of the literature overlaps with the period since 1990 which has seen a substantial rise in the prison population as a result of sentencing changes and up-tariffing (Solomon 2007). In such a climate alternatives to custody have been accorded a diminished significance.

There are other gaps in the literature on intervention pathways (Elliott-Marshall et al 2004). However, information about particular projects, such as the now closed Sherborne House Probation Centre, is available, including individual case studies and statistical reports (Graef 1992; Wilkinson 1998).

Defining the target group and group profiles

The target group for the project consists of men with multiple needs who are involved in the criminal justice system. It will be aiming to address the needs that lie at the roots of their offending behaviour, in particular, substance misuse, mental health problems, and poverty.

Several particular groups will be identifiable. It is critical that all the groups will have multiple risks and needs that are likely to lead to further offending.

The target group will be diverse in terms of age and criminal justice experience. We expect that the men will be aged from 18 to 40 years-old, at which age their offending is likely to decline.

It will be important to focus on men with significant risks and needs manifested in patterns of previous offending behaviour and to avoid 'net-widening', in other words, sweeping men with less pressing needs into a systematic intervention suited to quite different needs (Bottoms et al. 2001).

The project should not be simply administering in a blanket fashion to offences such as conditional cautions or responding to bail cases; instead the indicative level of needs should be recorded on referral forms and assessed before providing services.

In terms of criminal justice experience, a focus of the centre will be on the needs of men with recent brief custodial experiences. Hence a key part of this population will be a group who have received a variety of sanctions short of a major custodial sentence.

Among the target group will be a proportion currently on community sentences. The population who have received community sentences displays a wide range of multiple needs (Solomon and Rutherford 2007).

Recent evidence suggests that young adults are now coming before the courts with a more versatile pattern of offending that causes sentencers concern (Soothill et al. 2007).

Objectively, higher risks will be associated with early onset of offending and long criminal careers.

Another possibly key group will be those with longer periods of previous custody who have finished supervision under licence and are showing signs of returning to offending. Their offences will have included more serious offences and they will have more experience of the disruption associated with imprisonment and have already shown more long term needs.

The strategies of the centre should be adapted to meet these different experiences and needs.

The backgrounds of people on community sentences

'(Where I live) everyone's got a criminal record round here, so it doesn't really matter.'

Offender at Sherborne House, quoted in Roger Graef (1992 P. 94)

To understand the circumstances of adults on community sentences we have to look backward before looking forward. A range of typical personal characteristics and social influences have been confirmed by research.

Social influences on the offending of young people include the wider context of social and economic opportunities linked to their social structural position. A dearth of opportunities especially in poor areas reduces residents' confidence in achieving the security and rewards of well-paid employment. Services such as education are often inadequate to meet all the needs. The difficulties of bringing up children in such conditions cause further conflict and stress, thus reinforcing disaffection among children. In addition social networks and relationships with other young people are important; one of the negative influences on an offending career is the formation of relationships with friends and associates who are also disposed to offending (Hagan 1993). If relationships with the police are also problematic, as frequently is the case in poor areas, the pathways into criminal justice involvement are solidified and can appear more rewarding than any visible alternative. The bleakness of poverty contrasts with the excitement generated by much petty offending while the watchful presence of the police can lead to escalating distrust and official repression. The road to increased sentencing intervention is therefore set.

It is this context that often forms the environment for offenders, especially young adults in contact with the criminal justice system. Friends and associates lack connections with the job market that could otherwise have been helpful in getting worthwhile jobs. Education has not been a fruitful experience for the offenders, who typically lack the qualifications to obtain well-paid jobs. Family relationships can be weakened by conflict or by the strains of criminal justice involvement. Poverty is a major factor in the lives of clients who have a reduced potential for employment. Alongside immediate living needs, there are needs to address debt and to secure welfare benefits for families.

Needs of the target group

We see the project as both a means of reducing re-offending and of attacking social exclusion and promoting social justice. It is helpful to divide needs into *directly criminogenic* needs, and *additional social and personal* needs arising from poverty and social exclusion.

Criminogenic needs

Research conducted over several years and reviewed in various official and academic publications forms an authoritative basis for considering the needs of offenders (Bottoms et al. 2001). These needs are described as criminogenic in the sense that they bear directly on the likelihood of re-offending as measured by reconvictions. While there are questions about their interpretation, it is clear that they set an important agenda for any proper assessment of need. The research has identified needs for interventions in the fields of accommodation, education, training and employment, finance, debt and benefits, psychological and behavioural needs, substance misuse and family needs (Harper and Chitty 2004).

Dealing with social exclusion

While some needs are unambiguously linked to a cycle of offending, others may be less directly linked to patterns of offending but have a powerful impact on the ability of individuals to lead fulfilled and productive lives alongside the rest of society. Fulfilling a range of social and personal needs also has a long term effect on people's capacity to reduce their offending. These needs have practical consequences in terms of lack of access to social networks, as well as to information, and therefore affect the users' capacity for informed and effective decision-making.

Because of social exclusion, a number of health-promoting, social, physical, cultural and wider learning opportunities will have been inadequately accessed. Moreover it is likely that the prospect of achieving a wide range of social and personal goals can make the Centre's offer more attractive to the user. For example the addition of sports and similar activities to the menu of the Sherborne House Centre appears to have been popular and successful (Graef 1992).

Recommendation

As well as interventions to address criminogenic needs we suggest a number of ways of reducing social exclusion including:

- health-promoting activities such as exercise and sport
- cultural activities that bring safe and productive social contacts with non-offenders
- arts, crafts and drama based activities
- improving access to sources of information such as the internet and libraries.

Needs of victims and communities

The focusing of resources and attention on offenders is sometimes criticised as unjustified because of the moral primacy of the victims of crime. However it is often the case that the offenders have been themselves victims of abuse, violence and ill-treatment that may be ongoing.

It will be necessary for any provision dealing with offenders to create a safe environment in which opportunities for offending are reduced, victims are protected from re-victimisation, and communities are shielded from significant risks.

Restorative justice is often seen as a way of reconnecting offenders with victims and communities. Moreover there is growing evidence that forms of restorative justice, if tailored to victim needs and the capacities of offenders, can produce positive outcomes for victims, offenders and communities. These outcomes can be primarily understood in terms of providing information, increasing mutual understanding and moving towards reconciliation. However there must always be a risk assessment that considers the wisdom of bringing the most vulnerable into contact with powerful and possibly intimidating perpetrators. There is no clear evidence that restorative justice, of itself, leads to lower re-offending, but, for some young adult offenders, and for more serious crimes, there is evidence of effectiveness in reducing re-offending (McIvor 2001; Sherman and Strang 2007).

Restorative justice can take many forms, from a full-scale family group conference to 'making amends' by voluntary and charitable endeavour directed towards a proxy victim. The range of restorative practices and outcomes means that it is not a simple option and there are choices to be made about its focus and organisation. It should not be seen as a mechanical procedure, or as an obligation imposed by an outside authority. There is not likely to be much gained from compulsion, which goes against the spirit of restorative justice. It should be emphasised that the development of Enhanced Community Punishment and Unpaid Work initiatives forefronts communities as the beneficiaries of offenders' unpaid work, and changes in

the relationship between offender and victim do not appear to be the focus (HMIP 2006).

Recommendation

Restorative justice schemes should be contacted and efforts should be made to work with them.

Even if the victim indicates a willingness to take part, a risk assessment should use case information to assess the scope, viability and possible outcomes of restorative justice measures

Offenders should have access to clear information and advice if faced with choices about taking part in restorative justice.

Restorative actions should be clearly formulated to lie within the capacity of offenders.

Offenders who take part should be given feedback that recognises their progress in re-evaluating their actions and changing their relationships with victims

Addressing needs

Matching provision to risk

It is a well-known principle of What Works? that provision should be matched to need and that higher risk cases should receive more intensive provision. Hence for each referral there should be a process of gathering information about risk and need, and it should be followed by a planning process that identifies appropriate programmes and services.

Probation assessment criteria and procedures are codified (Probation Circular 59/2004). For higher risk cases, the level of risk and needs would be signalled by an assessment under OASys-the joint probation and prison offender assessment system. It addresses the known criminogenic risks and needs in a comprehensive manner.

For current offences that would not generate an OASys assessment, it will be appropriate to produce a report that identifies previous risk and need assessments and seeks to update them. However it would be disproportionate to conduct an extensive assessment for an offence that would not by itself have led to a community sentence.

Recommendation

Provision should be matched to need and higher risk cases should receive more intensive provision.

Planning of interventions should address all the needs identified and the interventions should be commensurate in length and intensity with the significance of the needs: greater needs will mean longer and more intensive interventions. Otherwise there is a danger that the interventions will be counterproductive (Lowenkamp 2006).

Motivational turning points and investment in changing behaviours

'At twenty it's not good not to be working. And it's a real disappointment.'

Offender at Sherborne House, quoted in Roger Graef (1992 P. 90)

'What changed me was that I had too much going for me at the time- I got my flat. I felt as if I had something to live for.....I've got everything to go for at the moment. My flat, college, my wife.'

Offender at Sherborne House, quoted in Roger Graef (1992 P. 245)

Recently there has been a movement in thinking about rehabilitation which recognises that offenders make choices and that the subjective dimension to change is critically important. The significance of motivation to change means that dialogue with the user and the formulation of shared goals must be a major principle of intervention (Raynor and Vanstone 1994).

Motivational and therapeutic work will be crucial aspects of the project.

In order to effect change it is necessary to understand how desistance from crime is motivated over a period of time (McNeill 2006). This approach suggests that after listing needs we should examine *key motivational turning points* that give the offender a major reason for changing behaviour- a commitment to a partner, a steady job, etc. (Laub and Sampson 2001). In effect, these become investments in conforming with accepted norms of behaviour.

In the ordinary course of events it is suggested that the process of change is unreflective. A recent summary of this view has been given by Barry Vaughan (2007).

'... employment and marriage make the prospect of criminality less alluring, usually 'without [the offenders in question] even realising it' (quoting Laub and Sampson 2003: 278-9).

The key to changing behaviour is therefore to incentivise a change process, through attention to improving clients' prospects and increasing their social as well as economic assets. The objective of the project should be to

recognise existing strengths and to construct paths towards shared and respectful relationships with non-offenders and towards the legitimate acquisition of economic assets.

In relation to work, for example, the emphasis should therefore be on turning something that can appear routine and uninvolved into a set of personal resources –skills, contacts, rewards, savings- that the person owns and identifies with.

In relation to partners and families, the project needs to address the positive advantages of sustained relationships and the rewards of investing in fatherhood.

Research has shown that the subjective and the objective dimensions of change need to come together in people's minds, so that objective changes (qualifications, etc) are fully appreciated by the users and they can also see themselves reflected in those changes (Farrall 2002). It is vital to offer a sequence of motivational narratives that present the users with the opportunity to see increasing resemblances between themselves and other people on a journey of change, and to insert themselves imaginarily, but with growing confidence, in those stories (Vaughan 2007).

The role of therapeutic interventions is to facilitate the emotional changes, to release the person emotionally from a self-image that denies any relevance to the pro-social elements in the narratives. Instead the personality of the offender comes to accept identification with positive roles in the narratives.

In a prison-based therapeutic community (Smartt 2001), a bank robber tells the story of a past robbery during which a child showed distress. The emotional impact of the child's distress was experienced by the offender only after therapy during which the offender had fully acknowledged his own experience of being abused as a child. Previously any sympathy would have been ruled out as too distressing; with the growth of a sympathetic capacity, on the other hand, the path to establishing new identities is cleared of obstacles. Taking on the parental role, the former robber then advises his nephews to stay off drugs (Smartt 2001 p86).

In the same way, people who have failed in school and have built defensive emotional barriers against participation and success in education can be given therapeutic help to acknowledge the pain of past failure and to prepare themselves to accept praise for their achievements.

The project itself can prefigure some of the important changes for the individual by creating social bonds and group purposes that in themselves become a rationale for reducing involvement in offending.

The motivational, group-based and therapeutic focus of the project should be reflected in the title of the project, following the example of *Kids' Company*, which uses its title to indicate the importance of relationships and financial prospects.

A good title would be 'The Prospectors', or 'The Good Life Company', raising the motivating prospect of membership levels which lead to status gains as participants stay for longer periods and eventually transition to productive roles in society.

Recommendation

Dialogue with the user and the formulation of shared goals must be a major principle of intervention.

The project must incentivise a change process, through attention to improving clients' prospects and increasing their social as well as economic assets.

It must address therapeutic goals and seek to use the group context to develop a common purpose in achieving change.

The motivational, group-based and therapeutic focus of the project should be reflected in the title of the project.

Integration with the pathways

The importance of meeting criminogenic needs has been addressed by the creation of seven strategic Pathways to reduce re-offending. The project should be integrated with the Pathways, but will provide a focused approach that creates additional value by investing knowledgably in targeted inputs, and addressing fundamental needs in innovative ways.

There are seven pathways:

1. Accommodation
2. Education training and employment
3. Health
4. Drugs and alcohol
5. Finance benefits and debt
6. Children and families
7. Attitudes thinking and behaviour

(Home Office 2005)

Each Pathway is discussed in the following sections.

Accommodation

There is a high prevalence of accommodation need among people on community sentences: almost a third have a problem and over an eighth lack stable accommodation (Solomon and Rutherford 2007). Access to stable accommodation helps to make other needs more open to intervention.

Meeting needs is achieved through provision of both accommodation and support. The project will offer its own residential provision to the most vulnerable especially for those with mental health and drug-related needs. It will need to operate within the framework of *Supporting People*, the strategic plan that governs the housing of the vulnerable and needy.

An agreement with an accommodation provider will give the project access to additional supported accommodation facilities. For this group the concept of 'floating support' is that the support is delivered continuously wherever the person happens to be living, thus avoiding the service being tied up in inflexible accommodation units. There is evidence that the provision of floating support to service users with problematic drug misuse can assist in the effective management of such problems (Fraser et al 2003). The agreement will also help to access 'move-on' accommodation for the users as they make progress.

The project staff will agree the level of support required in an individual case. The greatest support will be given to the most vulnerable.

Housing can give drug misusers a platform to engage with services and to address their behaviour. Social support from recovering problematic users and other project participants is helpful, as is breaking ties with former associates by moving accommodation; however, weaknesses in housing supply are a challenge for this strategy of removal from drug-using influences. Good partnerships between the DAT and the Supporting People boards are essential to the building of effective pathways for this group (Homeless Link 2007).

Recommendation

The project should provide some residential accommodation to the most vulnerable, especially those with mental health and drug misuse needs.

For those who can cope individually or have families, the project should seek a service agreement with an accommodation provider to give users access to accommodation facilities and the project staff can then agree the level and type of floating support required. This will form the basis for 'move-on' accommodation as the clients make progress.

The project should develop positive relationships with the DAT and the Supporting People framework.

Education, training and employment

'People only stop thieving if they want to. It's work, having enough money coming in, that will do that.'

Offender at Sherborne House, quoted in Roger Graef (1992 p 72).

'I think an alternative to (this day centre) would be a sort of training scheme where you come out with a qualification at the end, and if you don't turn up you go to prison. Then at least you have something under your belt when you've finished.'

Offender at Sherborne House, quoted in Roger Graef (1992 P. 107)

Data from OASys has indicated that ETE difficulties are the most frequent of problems for people on community sentences, affecting over 50 per cent (Harper and Chitty 2004). Not only do offenders tend to lack skills and qualifications, but also their networks consist of people without good links with the labour market (Hagan 1993). As well as making ETE opportunities available, the project should give social support by group involvement and discussion.

Education programmes have been found to be effective in reducing re-offending but the evidence base for probation education programmes is too thin to support conclusions. It appears that length of involvement- at least 300 hours- is associated with better results (Elliott-Marshall et al 2004). Innovation in education delivery is now possible through ICT schemes which have been successfully implemented (Wilson and Logan 2007).

Employment of offenders has a positive effect which could make a difference of over one third to offending rates (Webster et al 2001). In order to reduce re-convictions, the stability and quality of that employment are important, as well as the level of satisfaction expressed towards it (Motiuk and Brown 1993; Farrington 1989). However, once again, the evidence base for probation programmes is not especially robust and not very encouraging in demonstrating significant effects on re-offending. One factor may be that probation supervision has hitherto focused on other needs and tended not to prioritise employment (Elliott-Marshall et al 2004).

Social enterprises have been supported under EU schemes. The impact of social enterprise schemes has been exemplified by the evaluations of the San Francisco Gardening Project which is aimed at enhancing prisoner resettlement and serving communities' food needs. A study by Stone-Rice and Remy (1994) compared prisoners participating in the San Francisco Garden Project with a control group who were not in the Garden Project. Inmates were blocked on sex, race, and age and then randomly assigned the two conditions. The 57 subjects were assessed at baseline, monthly, at discharge and 3 months post-discharge (Stone-Rice and Remy 1994: 211-212). Treatment effects included: reduced post-release substance abuse by Garden Project Participants, lower depression in Garden Project Participants with emotionally detached mothers, and sustained hope and

desire for help throughout treatment and follow-up (Stone-Rice, Remy and Whittlesea 1998: 275).

Other employment avenues will be required to meet the needs of all users. The project should be addressing both supply and demand for labour. It has been found that employment schemes can work effectively after offenders have been through a cognitive behavioural programme. Incentives for service users include a good hourly wage that increases retention rates (Kethineni and Falcone 2007). Employers need to be reassured and given incentives to employ ex-offenders ((Kethineni and Falcone 2007).

Recommendation

The project should work to deliver the aims of the Pathway which include an Employability Contract agreed with the offender. The project should seek initially to offer at least what is on offer regionally to offenders with the same risks and needs, and in due course it is expected that the offer should be improved.

It should ensure good connections are made with the 'Reducing Re-offending Corporate Alliance', that is promoting the employment of offenders in areas of recruitment difficulties and skills shortages.

The project should explore the delivery of educational programmes through *LearnDirect* as well as traditional methods.

As part of its contribution to the Pathway the project should seek to develop a social enterprise that serves as a motivational example, expresses and reinforces group solidarity, provides a transition for offenders who are progressing in their capacity to work, gives them an income, and meets wider economic needs, whether serving other disadvantaged groups or grasping opportunities in the market.

Mental health

Mental health needs among people on community sentences are known to be prevalent and significant (Solomon and Rutherford 2007). These needs frequently include experiencing the consequences of loss and abuse (Renn 2004). Therapeutic work should therefore encompass the emotional as well as the 'thinking' problems associated with mental health needs.

The project will not be aiming to divert the seriously mentally ill from prison even though the importance of such programmes is becoming more widely recognised as the relatively high proportion of prisoners with mental illness is better understood. Even where criminal justice practitioners play a role, we see such programmes requiring substantial health service staffing and resources as well as good links with the courts (Gordon et al 2006).

Progress among the users of the service should be recognised and reinforced positively (Farrow et al 2007). Effective practice depends on building a therapeutic working alliance that deals closely with emotions. It should also be acknowledged that complex therapeutic needs in particular may require attention that goes beyond the period of criminal justice supervision (Renn 2004).

Recommendation

The project should instigate assessments of the mental health needs of those referred and in partnership with the NHS should provide a therapeutic service to those with problems that would normally be managed at a community level.

It should not provide a crisis intervention service nor should it address the needs of men with dangerous and severe personality disorders, many of whom need considerable support and supervision.

The project should provide therapeutic services that are addressed to the types of need assessed clinically. These should include attachment-based therapies that function to bring out unresolved personal issues, and other therapies that help make offenders aware of alternative solutions to problem situations.

Drugs and alcohol

Alcohol and drug services are equally important in seeking behaviour change. Drug treatment is known to be effective in reducing re-offending (Harrison 2001).

Evidence on drug treatment for people on community sentences is sparse. Drug courts and mandatory treatment have been evaluated and were found to be promising (Harrison 2001; Young and Belenko 2002). The results of the Drug Treatment and Testing Orders pilots are to be considered encouraging but not conclusive (Turnbull 1999; Eley et al 2002). Non-violent drug offenders in California showed abstinence after being given community-based treatment. The main predictors of success in treatment were being in employment, residential rather than outpatient treatment, number of days in treatment, urine testing, low psychiatric severity, and gender, with women benefiting more often than men (Hser et al 2007).

To prevent relapse, the project should be capable of providing specialist support to problematic drug misusers after a short phase of residential rehabilitation. The role for the project in facilitating residential rehabilitation should be accepted but there are disadvantages in focusing too many expensive resources around one set of short-term needs when there are other facilities available.

Offenders have been involved in 'therapeutic community' approaches to drug treatment, which imply offenders taking co-responsibility for one another's progress, and these have been evaluated with positive findings

(Harrison 2001). A study of a modified therapeutic community for probationers showed impact on social functioning but not on recidivism (Hiller et al 2006).

Recommendation

The project should be ensuring that alcohol and drug treatment services are provided in a timely fashion to enable the users to take advantage of other interventions.

A therapeutic community approach should be explored by the project.

Finance, benefits and debt

Crime is often seen by offenders as a response to problems of poverty and debt. They are also impoverished by criminal justice sanctions such as imprisonment that can lead to loss of jobs and property assets, while offering very little in the way of remunerated work. Poverty is in addition often an acute family problem, making it less easy to keep families together (Smith et al 2007).

Schemes to address problems of benefits and debt can be accessed in the community. The network of Citizen Advice Bureaus (CAB) offers free advice and can do casework on behalf of families. There have been CAB telephone advice schemes directed at prisoners, and CCJS has ongoing contacts with knowledgeable service managers at *Citizen Advice*, the national organisation. A CAB project staffed by prisoners giving advice to the public by telephone has been successful and could offer a model of social enterprise for the project (Burnett and Maruna 2004).

Recommendation

The project should consult with *Citizen Advice*, the national organisation, and consider if a service level agreement should be instigated to provide free and timely advice and casework to families.

The project should also consult with *Citizen Advice* about setting up a community-based advice scheme staffed by the project users, as part of its social enterprise portfolio.

Children and families

'The way that I check it is, that if you got a youth, you must cater for it, even if you don't get on with the girl, the youth is part of you.'

Offender at Sherborne House, quoted in Roger Graef (1992 P. 160)

Interventions that aim to encourage men's involvement with children have a role in promoting desistance from offending. There are courses in parenthood that address the needs of fathers who may have had

comparatively little preparation for their parenting role. The organisation *Fathers Direct* is a national information source.

Courses involve family planning, knowledge of child development, relationships, discipline and child abuse, public child care provision, etc. Delivery can be assisted by professionals such as health visitors or marriage guidance counsellors (Mardon 1996).

Courses should be made responsive to offenders' needs: for example, it is evident that male offenders from abusive backgrounds need the opportunity to discuss their own childhoods before coming to terms with parenthood (Mardon 1996). Sensitive issues about relationships are likely to emerge from discussions about sexual health, pregnancy and termination. Good practice suggests that work be 'gender-positive' towards men, and involve male as well as female staff (Sherlock 2004).

The London -based *boys2MEN* project seeks to support young men from black and minority groups who are considered to be at risk or have been in care. It fosters their development into adulthood and towards the responsibilities of fatherhood.

Recommendation

The project should consult with national organisations like *Fathers Direct* to help develop a course in relationships and fatherhood.

Any work on families and fatherhood should be sensitive to the experiences of men with abusive backgrounds.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

Cognitive-behavioural programmes are a primary component of the *What Works* policies that drive the Probation Service. The provision of cognitive-behavioural programmes by the Probation Service is regulated so that only nationally accredited programmes are made available. Local provision is controlled and evaluated by Probation Service management. There are criteria for admission to the programmes, pre-set group work and attendance requirements, and careful evaluations that are meant to standardise all aspects of programme delivery. A total of 22 community programmes are approved for use in probation areas.

Examples of accredited cognitive behavioural programmes include:

- Reasoning and Rehabilitation
- Aggression Replacement Training
- Drink Impaired Drivers programme
- Think First
- Integrated Domestic Abuse programme
- Community Domestic Violence programme

Programmes are designed to be delivered in a varying number of sessions: for example, Think First requires 22 sessions, while Reasoning and Rehabilitation calls for 38.

The impact of several such programmes on achieving a reduction of reconvictions is still debateable. While some programmes seem to 'work' for some offenders, there is still a gap in fully understanding the pattern of results for all those who take part. Results are better for those who complete the programmes (Hollin et al 2004; Harper and Chitty 2004; Raynor 2004; Wilkinson 2005).

Moreover it is argued that the widespread dissemination of cognitive behavioural methods has made it very difficult to compare results of particular programmes (Wilson 2005). The impact of a psycho-educational programme in a community correctional facility that delivered a combination of other interventions was positive for women but not for men (Liau et al 2004). Distinguishing the impact of one intervention from another is therefore complex.

It is clear that good implementation and practical expertise are necessary if the programmes are to have a chance of working (Raynor 2004). There are literacy challenges for some offenders in such programmes that affect their capacity to take part in speaking and listening (Davies et al 2004).

Recommendation

Programmes accredited by the Probation Service should be adopted

if there are sufficient suitable candidates with literacy skills

if there is evidence of motivation

if implementation can be assured to be of high quality

if there is support to reduce drop-out to a minimum

Engagement of 'clients'

Induction

Induction should be concerned with assessment of need and of 'responsivity' to programmes, using motivational interviewing to assess readiness for programme involvement and pro-social modelling to reinforce the project's image and aims.

Pro-social modelling

There is some evidence that supports the effectiveness of 'pro-social modelling', which means demonstrating 'pro-social' behaviour personally, as well as praising and rewarding pro-social behaviour by the project users (Rex 2001).

Positive engagement

Though projects have used sanctions to demand compliance (Wilkinson 1998) this project should engage users by positive dialogue and avoid coercion wherever possible.

Case management

It has been a major principle of the *What Works* literature that case managers are uniquely placed to support the learning processes which offenders undertake. Case managers can provide preparatory and motivational work prior to a programme, supportive work during the programme and opportunities to reinforce learning thereafter (Robinson 2005).

Group solidarity

The group should be seen as a focus for developing a common purpose and for taking mutual responsibility, as in a therapeutic community.

Recommendation

Induction should have a strong element of motivational interviewing.

Staff should be instructed in the methods of 'pro-social modelling' and its impact should be monitored by user feedback and other observations.

Engagement should be enhanced by positive dialogue, rewarding compliance and avoidance of coercion wherever possible.

Case managers or key workers should be responsible for managing programme engagement, sequencing interventions and promoting communication with the individual.

The group focus of the work should be clearly communicated with regular community meetings, group and individual activity.

Overarching principles

The evidence base supports development of a project design that will reduce risks and meet needs by targeting the factors in the process of desistance. It is not as comprehensive as we might like, nor is it suggesting easy paths to success. There are few 'off-the-shelf' models that deliver impressive results, especially in terms of reducing the reconvictions of this group.

We return therefore to the concept of desistance. In sum we envisage that the project will be starting from the perspectives of offenders and seeking to engage them and to enhance their motivation in the context of multi-modal services.

Motivation and desistance

Motivation is a major factor in the success of centres dealing with offenders (Yeboah 2000). While there is a case for trying to select candidates on the basis of their existing motivation, it is fundamental to effective practice that motivation to change is increased and maintained during the programme itself. The motivation is needed to accelerate movement along the natural path towards desistance that offenders themselves describe.

Coherent and 'multi-modal' services that engage the user

The Pathways suggest a wide range of interventions but it is not appropriate to regard them as separate interventions. It has been authoritatively recommended that services should be 'multi-modal' in addressing a spectrum of individual needs (Elliott-Marshall et al 2004; Webster et al 2001). The specification arising from this present report should acknowledge the importance of a coherent model and not just present a collection of disparate services. As well as tailoring services to the individual it is crucial to engage the individual by effective case management and communication that ensures the best possible level of participation.

Chapter 3: The proposed model - a demonstration project

Based on the findings and recommendations of the proceeding two chapters which are listed in appendix one we now set out a proposed model for the project. Firstly we propose a set of aims, objectives and principles. We then look at eligibility criteria, referral routes and links with other agencies. Having established those all important elements we set out how the project will work with the targeted client group making proposals on assessment, support planning, key working, service delivery, models of engagement including dealing with non-engagement and desistance, and service user involvement. Finally we make proposals on monitoring and evaluation.

The chapter then briefly considers the staffing and costs. We do not provide a detailed costing for the proposed model. However, based on the analysis of likely staffing requirements and costs of interventions for current projects we set out some indicative costings.

Given that the nature of the work is extremely challenging and that establishing such a project is fraught with difficulties as identified in the examination of other projects in chapter two, we end the chapter by providing a basic risk assessment. This is intended to highlight potential barriers to setting up an effective project in order to minimise the likelihood of implementation failure.

It is important to emphasise that the model we are proposing is envisaged as a demonstration project. A demonstration project can set new benchmarks for service development but its results require careful evaluation in order to deliver guidance about future developments and it is important to focus on including practicable and realistic elements of service. It is intended to provide a working example of a service delivery model that provides both a diversion from prosecution and custody for men with multiple problems who are caught up in the criminal justice system.

Aims, objectives and principles

The project is a service for men with multiple needs who are involved in the criminal justice system. The overall aim of the model is:

To provide men with multiple needs who are involved in the criminal justice system integrated programmes and services of care, support and development designed to reduce the likelihood of further offending by tackling the root causes of offending, in particular substance misuse, trauma and poverty.

The objectives are to:

- Provide a specialist facility for men with multiple problems who are involved in/subject to/ caught up in the criminal justice system

- Provide a safe, positive environment for these men to address the causes of their offending behaviour
- Address the multiple needs that are at the root of their behaviour
- Help them to avert crises in their lives
- Enable them to move on to lead self-fulfilling lives
- Demonstrate how the specific needs of male offenders with multiple problems can be met most effectively and disseminate good practice
- Provide a diversion from prosecution and a diversion from custody
- Reduce re-offending on a long term basis by addressing fundamental risk factors

Guiding principles

Some basic principles were outlined at the end of the previous chapter. They have been integrated into the following set of guiding principles that will direct and shape the project's work:

Dedicated multi- agency working - Given that the project is targeted at offenders with multiple needs it will provide coherent multi-modal services that cross boundaries between agencies to take a whole system approach. Staff will ensure there is a co-ordinated response and a shared responsibility for meeting the needs of the project's clients.

Low, manageable caseload - The caseload of the project will be kept purposefully low to ensure that quality relationships with clients are maintained to allow staff sufficient time to draw together a multi agency response and to reflect on emerging learning.

Assessment alongside support - Assessment will take place alongside the provision of support rather than as a condition of it. Clients who return to the project after a period of disengagement should not be required to start afresh with a new assessment. The assessment process should therefore not get in the way of people joining the project when they need help. This approach will be vital given that some people are likely to go through a process of referral, disengagement followed by re-referral.

Client led - The project should be based not only on the assessment of staff and other professionals but also on the client's own assessment of his need. Clients should also have the opportunity to determine the design and function of the project's programmes through an effective mechanism of user engagement. Motivational dialogue with the user and the formulation of shared goals will be a major principle of the project.

A therapeutic ethos - The project should seek to develop a working structure that draws on principles established in therapeutic communities that involve regular meetings, openness about information, shared activity and shared decision-making among staff and users, though this will be subject to any criminal justice conditions or requirements.

Engagement based on persistence and continuity - The project will provide clients with consistent and reliable contact with known key worker staff. The project will not penalise clients if they fail to engage, although clients serving court orders will be bound by legal sanctions. For clients attending the project who are not subject to any court orders or other legal sanctions, engagement will be on a voluntary basis. The project will seek to develop a system of rewarding compliance and progress.

Locally owned - The project will be part of the local service network, working alongside and through other professionals, assisting others to meet their outcomes. A local multi agency stakeholder group will monitor and advise on the development of the project.

Action research - The project will be based on action research. Monitoring and recording the project's work in a systematic way will allow the staff to actively feed their research findings into discussions about the project's development.

Eligibility criteria, referral routes, links with other agencies

We propose the following basic eligibility criteria:

- Male offenders 18 years old or more who are involved in the criminal justice system
- Men assessed as particularly vulnerable to custody or re-offending
- Men who present with multiple problems

Based on this criteria the following men would be eligible:

- Men serving community sentences on probation caseloads (subject to risk assessment)
- Men serving a suspended sentence order or a deferred sentence
- Men on bail or remand
- Men arrested and cautioned who have been in prison custody in the last twelve months but are not on post-custody licence
- Men engaged with community substance misuse services and other services who have been in prison or police custody in the last twelve months but are not on post-custody licence
- Men who have had a number of spells in custody, including sentences of more than twelve months who have finished supervision under licence and are showing signs of returning to offending.

The men would have to present with at least two of the following:

- Homelessness
- Drugs Misuse
- Alcohol Misuse
- Mental health problems
- Acute family/relationship crises
- Debt/Poverty/Financial

- Abuse
- Self Harm
- Unemployment/Training/Learning Needs
- Anti Social Behaviour

Referral routes

Establishing clear and effective referral routes will be vital to the project's success. We propose that the project should seek to establish the following referral routes:

Magistrate courts and crown court probation staff - The project will have an assessment team based in the local courts on a daily basis to work closely with probation to consider the suitability of offenders who are at the pre sentence stage, given a deferred sentence, a community order or a suspended sentence. Alternatively the project will seek to have probation officers seconded to it. Given the fact that court referrals will be a key referral route the project may be linked to one of the community justice projects outlined in chapter one.

Police stations - Good links need to be established with local police stations, the crown prosecutors based in the police station and the agencies working with the police in the delivery of conditional cautions to gain referrals of offenders who are given them. The project will not seek to provide an arrest referral service, only accepting offenders given conditional cautions.

Criminal justice related services - These will include drug action teams; addiction services operated by drugs charities such as Cranstoun; housing services working with people involved in the criminal justice system; mental health services.

Self-referral - The project will accept men who self-refer on the basis of hearing about the project from criminal justice staff, other statutory agencies or voluntary sector organisations.

The core purpose of the project will be referrals from criminal justice sources in order to fulfil its objective to provide both a diversion from prosecution and a diversion from custody. However, there will be a recognition that taking referrals from other sources and accepting self referrals of men who clearly meet the eligibility criteria is legitimate.

It is important to recognise that establishing effective referral routes is a time-consuming process requiring considerable development. Advance 'marketing' of the project and its service is vital. Establishing contacts with staff in key agencies and winning their trust and support is part of this process. In the next steps section of the conclusion we highlight the significance of having a substantial period of development and preparation.

Links with other agencies

The project is designed to enhance existing services not to duplicate them. It provides holistic, wide ranging support that will complement current statutory and voluntary services/interventions. The project will therefore work closely with a variety of partners including:

Courts	Local Authority Departments
Police	Colleges
Probation	Employers
Health	Benefits Agencies
Housing	Citizens Advice
Mental health	Voluntary sector groups
Community Groups	Family support

The list is not exhaustive and there will be other partners. In order to ensure effective joint working the project will set up a multi agency advisory group of key local stakeholders who will meet regularly to ensure the project fits strategically into local systems and that it has the support required from operational services in the locality. The group will act as an important support mechanism, offering guidance and links so that the project meets the needs of its clients and delivers an effective service.

Service delivery and models of working

Assessment and induction

Each man will be entitled to an in-depth and holistic assessment of his needs. The assessment will be carried out in different stages and will explore the full range of areas in which each person may require support.

The first stage initial assessment will be made in court or on initial referral. The second stage will primarily focus on medical history and physical and mental health. The third stage will focus on wider issues including:

- Current accommodation
- Education, training and employment
- Benefits, finance and debt
- Personal arrangements including family and any care arrangements for children or other family members
- Offending behaviour
- Risk assessment

This stage of the assessment could also form part of the initial induction process and involve the establishing of initial goals and objectives to be included in a more detailed support plan.

To provide an example of a possible assessment process we have included the assessment framework used at the Glasgow 218 Centre in appendix two.

It is vital that each client is actively involved in the assessment process so that a positive dialogue is commenced. A motivational focus should be adopted as early as possible. Any goals should be shared by both the project and the individual service user.

Finally, the assessment process should be on-going so that it takes place alongside the support plan of each client. It should be regularly reviewed and updated as necessary. As a client builds relationship with staff and gains trust it is inevitable that information will be disclosed which will not have been given early on.

Support plan and key working

Following assessment or as part of the final stage of assessment a client will work with a key worker to devise an achievable and task orientated support plan based on agreed shared goals. The plan will set out the goals to be worked on identifying how they will be achieved and who is responsible for them.

The support plan will very much focus on empowerment, building confidence, incentivising change and increasing opportunities to develop. It will be designed to improve and increase a client's social and economic assets. It will also address therapeutic goals and seek to use the group context to develop a common purpose in achieving change.

The support plan will include objectives around:

- Accessing and sustaining housing
- Accessing benefits
- Accessing employment and education
- Accessing family support
- Accessing leisure/ arts opportunities
- Accessing appropriate health care
- Accessing other services
- Improved lifestyles and wellbeing
- Reduction in substance misuse

The key worker will be responsible for overseeing and reviewing the support plan. They will be responsible for managing programme engagement, sequencing interventions and promoting communication with the individual. The key worker will also be instructed in the methods of pro-social modelling and will monitor its effectiveness.

Service delivery

The project will consist of both a residential unit and a supervision, rehabilitation and support centre providing a range of programmes and interventions. The residential unit of 10 beds will support men who require more structured support (which can include men who self refer as well as agency referrals) or who would otherwise be taken into custody (for example, on remand). The residential unit will not be a secure facility and staff will not be able to detain those clients who choose to leave.

It will be necessary to devise specific programmes that clients will be able to progress through in a logical sequence depending on their personal development and improvement. The programmes should be made up of a flexible package or menu of services and individual as well as group sessions intended to meet the needs of each client.

The actual design, structure and organisation of the programmes will be determined by the service provider that wins the contract to operate the centre. However, clients will be able to access the programmes repeatedly until they move on to the next stage.

The following services will be made available with the majority being provided 'in-house'. It should be noted that the services link directly, but not exclusively, to the pathways of the national reducing re-offending action plan.

➤ Accommodation:

- An accurate assessment of accommodation needs, including support to access and maintain suitable accommodation, reducing the risk of homelessness.
- Referrals to housing providers and tenancy support services as appropriate.
- Support with budgeting skills, making a house a home and living harmoniously with others in the community.

➤ Education, Training and Employment:

- Support advice and guidance in accessing learning opportunities that will promote personal development and enhance skills in finding and retaining employment, including support with C.V. writing and employment searching
- Internal access to ICT courses and basic skills in English and Maths
- External referrals to Job Centre Plus, Pathways to Work and local businesses and companies involved in the 'Reducing Re-offending Corporate Alliance'
- Educational programmes delivered through *Learndirect*
- Access to a social enterprise that provides a transition for offenders who are progressing in their capacity to work, gives them an income, and meets wider economic needs. One option is to consult with *Citizen's Advice Bureau* about setting

up a community-based advice scheme staffed by the project users, as part of its social enterprise portfolio.

- **Physical and Mental Health:**
 - Assessment and support to address physical and mental health needs, including supporting clients to increase their use of health services through the provision of information, advice and guidance
 - Assisting clients to register with doctors, dentists, and other health professionals as appropriate
 - Access to NHS run therapeutic services including attachment-based therapies that function to bring out unresolved personal issues, and other therapies that help make offenders aware of alternative solutions to problem situations.

- **Substance Misuse:**
 - Address issues around substance and alcohol misuse by providing support, advice and information around the risks and contributory factors, including advice and guidance to access clinical support from specialist services.
 - Provision of a 12 step programme to address drug misuse

- **Finance, Benefit and Debt:**
 - Provide information, advice and guidance around finances including advice and support with budgeting, setting up payment plans, access to grant assisted programmes and referrals to Citizens Advice Bureau and Legal Advisors.
 - Easy Access to Citizens Advice Bureau for free and timely advice and casework to families.

- **Children and Families:**
 - Skills and support to enable clients to maintain good relationships with family and children and develop parenting skills.
 - Courses in relationships, parenting and fatherhood.

- **Emotional Support, Thinking and Behaviour:**
 - Support in dealing with life changes, reducing isolation and promoting integration, including exploring relationships and building external networks
 - Support to identify alternative coping strategies to promote a reduction in destructive behaviour such as depression, self harm, suicidal behaviours and inappropriate anger
 - Peer and mentor support.
 - Support and programmes to develop skills that improve thinking and reasoning skills and anger management based on What Works principles

- **Counselling:**
 - Access to a fully trained counsellor for issues around:
 - Anxiety and Depression

- Relationships
 - Loss and Bereavement
 - Substance and Alcohol Misuse
 - Trauma and Loss
- **Victims and communities:**
 - Access to suitable restorative justice schemes
 - **Additional activities - sport, arts, craft, drama and technology**
 - Health-promoting activities such as exercise and sport
 - Arts, crafts and drama based activities
 - Basic computing and technology courses

As well as providing the services outlined above the project will also have out reach workers who ensure that there is an effective transition for clients once they have completed programmes and moved on from the project so they can link up with community support services.

Engagement and retention

The success of the project will very much depend on clients effectively engaging with the services on offer. The staff will therefore be persistent and enthusiastic in supporting clients to engage, to maximize opportunities and tackle issues that lie behind their offending behaviour.

There will be an emphasis on supporting clients to identify and build on their strengths, to motivate and develop positive lifestyle changes and to empower them in building their confidence and self esteem.

The client group will have had negative experiences of other services in the past. They may not want to engage, present barriers or even diversionary tactics. The project will adapt a number of strategies to engage clients by using various tools and models of support, training, group work and one to one sessions. It will set up a specific system to reward compliance. There should be a support service providing diary assistance and reminders to ensure that users meet criminal justice requirements. Overall clients will be steered into the most appropriate support packages that will be tailor made to meet their individual needs.

User involvement

Given that a guiding principle of the project is that it will be client-led, user involvement will play a key role. There will be a strong focus to involve service users in:

- Being pro-active in their own support planning and changing lifestyles
- The development and delivery of the project's programmes

User involvement will be achieved in the way that the support planning process is implemented and the way that relationships are formed with

clients. In terms of relationships, the standards of therapeutic communities are very demanding and require trust and good communication to maintain. A critical element will be the creation of an active user group that meets regularly and is initially supported by an outside specialist in the area of user involvement. Once the project is set up it will seek to gain further advice and guidance about the most effective strategies for effective user involvement.

Monitoring and evaluation

Given that it will be a demonstration project, monitoring and evaluation will be an integral part of the project's development. An operational statistical database to record key information will need to be in place from day one. Staff will be required to keep the database regularly up to date recording information such as:

- Number of men referred
- Source of referral
- Reasons for unsuitability
- Number of men assessed
- Characteristics of clients who enter the project
- Number of support plans
- Numbers of men attending services/ particularly programmes/ schemes
- Number of men referred to other agencies
- Numbers of drop-outs and reasons for this

It will also be important to record outcomes. The road to desistance is rarely easy but we know that it starts with commitments to job preparation and employment, thereby giving clients a sense of something that could be lost if they lapse into offending. Meaningful involvement in education, training and employment (part-time or full-time), for example, will be measured as part of the evaluation of the ability of the programme to deliver assistance towards achieving the goal of desistance.

The following outputs and outcomes will be targeted:

- Completion of employment, training or education programmes
- Access to earned income
- Completion of substance misuse programmes
- Reductions in alcohol and drug misuse
- Reductions in emergency health treatment
- Effective engagement with mental health services
- Effective engagement with offending and other programmes
- Sustaining accommodation tenancies
- Sustaining independent living
- Sustained contact with children
- Self-chosen cultural/sporting activities

- Reconvictions

These will be measured and used as a basis for assessment of the results of the project in its first stages.

In our view it is important that outcomes in addition to reconvictions are recorded and measured from the beginning of the project. A reconviction study could be commissioned at a later date; however we do not consider this to be a primary task.

Of more significance and importance will be the putting in place of monitoring and evaluation which make broad-based comparisons with the outcomes of prison-based programmes for similar men. This will demonstrate the value of the project's community based provision compared to custody.

Size, staffing and indicative costs

Optimum size

The optimum service offer to the individual should be the primary basis of any estimate of the project's optimum size. The second important criterion should be the capability of the project to provide a full range of services at a reasonable cost.

Early experiences among the therapeutic community movement in North America suggested that the minimum size of a therapeutic community is 25 people and the optimum size is 80, at which point the community's growth tends to be promoted (Ottenberg 1982). A more recent study refers to 80-120 people as a frequently mentioned 'ideal' size; there is a contrast here with the Delancey Street project which does not identify itself as a therapeutic community and contains facilities with 450-500 beds (Gibbons et al. 2002). A community is therefore larger than a primary face-to face group and probably needs a significant block of members if it is to establish a profile beyond its doors, but there are limits to its effective growth.

It will be important to make the community accessible, and for this purpose a small group unit is best equipped to provide a social and therapeutic environment. Official standards for group work programmes have envisaged numbers between 4 and 12 (HMIP 2002). In order to derive the benefits of a group approach, there should be group units consisting of no more than 8 people each (for discussion of small group therapy, see Bond 1984 and also Cohen and Rice 1985). This unit size would be adequate to promote regular communication among all concerned, to sustain the provision of group programmes by the Centre, and to help maintain a distinctive and purposeful ethos. Initial intake should be no more than eight (or 5-10 according to Gibbons et al. 2002). Smaller subgroups would be able to access programmes delivered on a sessional basis or under the auspices of other providers. Users would receive individual programmes in addition.

Optimum size should therefore be a function of combining groups of eight, and we believe that this also needs to be done in ways that maximise the development of a staff group committed to common aims and able to share experience and expertise. A community would be formed at the point where three groups combined. At least three group facilitators should be visibly working in parallel.

As drop-out rates can be high, it is likely that the community will need to grow significantly in order to create generations of exemplars who are progressively reaching the stage of independence, and who are due to become both drug- and crime-free. These progressing generations should have the capacity to influence the intake (Gibbons et al. 2002).

Overall we would propose that the initial intake should be 8, the threshold size for full operation should be 25, with no more than ten in the residential unit. The total population at any one time could be expanded in due course to 80.

Financial questions

The main questions to be posed about finances concern:

- the set-up costs and any capital costs;
- revenue streams;
- the running costs;
- and budgetary planning.

In addition, after a significant period of operation, there should be a cost-effectiveness analysis included in the evaluation (Knapp and Netten 1997).

Capital costs

The specification for the 218 Centre included several capital items that need to be supplemented for the proposed project as follows.

- Residential accommodation - en suite
- Lounge and rooms for group meetings and hobbies
- Kitchen and dining rooms
- Library and teaching spaces with video facilities
- 'One to one', medical, and quiet rooms
- Administrative offices and staff meeting rooms

An outdoor area was felt by 218 residents to be necessary. We suggest a garden area, and a basketball/five a side football pitch.

To provide practical learning opportunities, the capital costs will include some adjacent workshop space linked to the project business (Gibbons et al. 2002).

The evidence on development of therapeutic community buildings is that opportunities can be found in areas scheduled for redevelopment (Gibbons et al. 2002). We have asked the 218 evaluators for more information on its capital costs.

Potential revenue streams

These could include: Supported People housing budget; Drug Action Teams; Regional Offender Manager budgets; Probation area budgets; new bail accommodation and support service; Offender Learning And Skills Service (OLASS), funded by the Learning and Skills Council; market-based income from a social business portfolio.

Running costs

The majority of the annual running costs of the project will be on staffing. Providing the majority of services in-house will mean a large staffing quota. For example the 218 centre in Glasgow has the following staffing posts

- Project managers
- Team Leader - Residential
- Team Leader - Day Programme
- Project Workers - Residential
- Project Workers - Day Programme
- Support Workers - Residential
- Support Workers - Day Programme
- Assessment Workers
- Team Nurses
- Health Team Leader
- GPs contracted for work at 218
- Psychologists
- Occupational Therapists
- Community Psychiatric Nurse
- District Nurses

Based on the actual service take-up over a year, the cost of a month of programme service to users who engaged with the 218 programme was calculated to be £4,144. It follows that a user who completed two of the specific programme sequences (SAFE and CONNECTIONS) over 30 weeks would generate costs of £31,080.

30 took part only in the residential programme; 55 took part only in the day programme; and 58 took part in both. The mean day service cost per person in 2004-5 was £5,731; the mean residential service cost per person was £10,161.

The annual grant from the Scottish Executive for the 218 Centre is £1.54 million.

On the basis of the experience at 218 we expect that the annual running costs of the project will be at least £1 million. This excludes the start up costs associated with providing suitable accommodation.

We recognise that a detailed costing analysis will be required and we have not attempted to provide that at this stage. Once the service specification has been drawn up, a detailed set of cost estimates should be carried out. Interventions will need to be costed on the basis of hours delivered per individual per week. The weekly cost of the intervention will be calculated on the basis of all staffing costs.

The cost data for interventions should include:

- Average intervention hours per individual
- Average cost of all staff involved in delivery and other functions (project admin., etc)

The costs of such a complex set of interventions require a great deal of careful assessment (Knapp and Netten 1997). The estimation of costs at 218 produced a figure of £4,144 per user per month, or £1,036 per week.

Looking more widely the estimation of current health and social care costs is based on services dealing with a range of users, some of whom are comparable with the target group while others may be less so. So for example for 2005-2006 we can cite relatively varied costs of:

- £227 per resident per week for a residential group home for people with mental health problems
- £732 per resident per week for residential rehabilitation for people who misuse drugs/alcohol (Curtis and Netten 2006).

The figure for the proposed project seems likely to be at the upper end of these estimates, and not less than £1,000 per week.

Several programme costs will need to be combined. In particular the current funding rate for a training course delivering 500 guided learning hours to disadvantaged people is estimated at £2,895 per learner (Learning and Skills Council 2007, p. 70)

At this stage it is difficult to provide a detailed cost estimate but we are confident in our forecast of running costs being at least £1 million annually. As the data from 218 show, the more users complete programmes successfully, the more the costs could rise. However, as research suggests (Gibbons et al. 2002; Lees et al. 2004), we expect that the benefits could also rise and more funding could be obtained from external revenue streams.

Budgetary planning

Costed proposals for the Centre should be needs-led. Hence the budgets should address the relationship between levels of service and costs, so that services are not squeezed by a small proportion of demanding cases that take up a high proportion of budgets. The budgets will be prepared in such a way that the levels of service at any one time can be met by the budgets to accommodate ebbs and flows of need.

Risk assessment

The project will be vulnerable to a number of risks that could easily undermine effective progress. Identifying these in advance will reduce the likelihood of implementation failure. It also provides an indication of the potential pitfalls and key challenges.

We have therefore identified the following risks:

- Too few referrals due to a lack of established referral routes
- Low occupancy in the residential part of the project
- Poor partnerships with outside agencies and organisations affecting the number of referrals and/or the quality of service delivery.
- Failure of clients to engage after completing assessment.
- Too few completions: low rates of participation and high drop-outs from the project.
- Failure to establish workable service level agreements with key agencies or ineffective service level agreements.
- Taking in clients who do not fit the eligibility criteria in order to fill places resulting in net-widening.
- Inappropriate pressure to reduce re-offending rates, without consideration being given to the outcomes of prison-based programmes. An effective programme will be one that reduces re-offending below the rates achieved by prison-based programmes.
- Pressure from statutory agencies to meet requirements of court orders and accredited programmes.

At an early stage it will be important to carry out a thorough risk analysis and to ensure that it is reviewed after the first six months, after the first year and then on an annual basis.

Conclusion and next steps

Based on an analysis of the recent reforms to the sentencing framework and the development of the National Offending Management Service, and a review of offender need and effective interventions, the report has outlined a proposed project model that is evidence-based and relates to contemporary policy developments. We have found that whilst there is a lot to be taken from the current approach to creating community based projects for women offenders there are also key lessons from recent research and practice.

Our analysis has led us to conclude that a demonstration project should be set up that aims:

To provide men with multiple needs who are involved in the criminal justice system a service of care, support and development designed to reduce the likelihood of further offending by tackling the root causes of offending, in particular substance misuse, trauma and poverty.

The demonstration project would have the following key features:

- A residential unit
- A multi modal day care programme
- A key working model
- A motivational group working ethos
- A therapeutic ethos
- Thorough and holistic assessments
- A wide toolkit of interventions
- Community and service user involvement
- It enhances and adds value to existing provision - not replaces it
- It is supported through NOMS
- It is supported locally by a group of stakeholders whose expertise will help shape the services and look at long term futures
- Be developed on the basis of action research monitoring and evaluation.

We are confident that such a project is worthy of further development and below we set out the next steps that we think should be taken. However, we recognise the challenges and risks associated with the creation of the proposed project. We follow the distinguished criminologist, Michael Tonry, in making a cautionary assessment. With a rising prison population in over-crowded conditions, the appeal of alternative intermediate provision begins to grow. It can be seen as a way of cutting re-offending rates, saving money, increasing employment, promoting families, etc. -all at a stroke. However there are dangers in expecting too much. The attractiveness of intermediate provision can be 'oversold' if it is not clear what the main aims are and how the outcomes are to be evaluated. Some aims may prove to be incompatible and the selected objectives require careful calibration if they are not to appear over-ambitious (Tonry 1998).

This is not to say that innovative projects should not be pursued. It is to stress that the potential risks should be fully understood and openly acknowledged at this early stage. To this end we suggest that an effective risk assessment is developed and carried out at an early stage.

Next steps

To take the project forward we propose the next steps:

- The creation of a start up advisory group
- Creation of a project planning team
- Communications strategy developed
- Expressions of interest from regional offender managers
- The identification of key project champions at central and regional government level
- The drawing up of a service specification with detailed cost estimates
- Expressions of interest from possible service providers
- Commissioning of project business plan
- Appointment of chief executive
- Implementation of business plan
- Strategic and business reviews as needed

A lengthy development and planning period will be vital to the project's success. Whilst we believe that the project we have set out can be successful and effective the challenges of making it happen and then making it work should not be underestimated.

Appendix One - List of recommendations set out in chapters one and two

Chapter One recommendations

- Modest residential provision should be considered for offenders on bail or serving a residential/specified activity requirement of a Suspended Sentence Order or Community Order run in partnership with a local accommodation provider. This would ensure the project is able to act as a diversion from custody. For this reason residential provision should not be provided for offenders on licence in the community, post-custody.
- The creation of the NOMS bail accommodation and support service provides an opportunity to provide much needed bail accommodation.
- A Supervision, Rehabilitation and Support Centre should be linked to the residential unit providing programmes, interventions and supervision for offenders on community sentences and suspended sentence orders.
- Use of the Centre should also be extended to other offenders given either a deferred sentence or conditional caution in order to act as an effective diversion from prosecution.
- Overall the main focus of provision should be for offenders on:
 - Community Orders or Suspended Sentence Orders
 - Deferred Sentences
 - Bail
 - Conditional Cautions
- It should be recognised that to begin with the project may be used more as a diversion from *prosecution* rather than as a diversion from *custody*.

- Any project should be integrated into the current commissioning structures and should therefore seek to have a service level agreement with a Regional Offender Manager and/or a Probation area.
- A service level agreement with Probation would be vital to ensure effective co-ordination with offender managers and pre-sentence report writers.
- Any project must relate to the reducing re-offending action plan pathways.

- An advisory group should include people involved in setting up the 218 project and/or the Clear Track project in order to draw on their experience and advice.
- Early support and 'buy in' needs to be gained from all the key statutory agencies. In particular effective links with probation and PSR writers is vital.
- A project should provide both diversion from prosecution and diversion from custody. The latter is best achieved by providing

requirements of the Community Order and Suspended Sentence Order.

- Serious consideration should be given to having an eligibility criterion that includes people who have recently been in custody in order to ensure multiple referral routes.

Chapter Two recommendations

- As well as interventions to address criminogenic needs we suggest a number of ways of reducing social exclusion including:
 - health-promoting activities such as exercise and sport
 - cultural activities that bring safe and productive social contacts with non-offenders
 - arts and crafts
 - improving access to sources of information such as the internet and libraries.
- Restorative justice schemes should be contacted and efforts should be made to work with them.
- Even if the victim indicates a willingness to take part, a risk assessment should use case information to assess the scope, viability and possible outcomes of restorative justice measures
- Offenders should have access to clear information and advice if faced with choices about taking part in restorative justice.
- Restorative actions should be clearly formulated to lie within the capacity of offenders.
- Offenders who take part should be given feedback that recognises their progress in re-evaluating their actions and changing their relationships with victims
- Provision should be matched to need and higher risk cases should receive more intensive provision.
- Dialogue with the user and the formulation of shared goals must be a major principle of intervention.
- The project must incentivise a change process, through attention to improving clients' prospects and increasing their social as well as economic assets.
- It must address therapeutic goals and seek to use the group context to develop a common purpose in achieving change.
- The motivational, group-based and therapeutic focus of the project should be reflected in the title of the project.

- The project should provide some residential accommodation to the most vulnerable, especially those with mental health and drug misuse needs.
- For those who can cope individually or have families, the project should seek a service agreement with an accommodation provider to give users access to accommodation facilities and the project staff can then agree the level and type of floating support required. This should form the basis for 'move-on' accommodation as the users make progress.
- The project should develop positive relationships with the DAT and the Supporting People framework.
- The project should provide some residential accommodation to the most vulnerable, especially those with mental health and drug misuse needs.
- For those who can cope individually or have families, the project should seek a service agreement with an accommodation provider to give users access to accommodation facilities and the project staff can then agree the level and type of floating support required. This will form the basis for 'move-on' accommodation as the users make progress.
- The project should develop positive relationships with the DAT and the Supporting People framework.
- The project should work to deliver the aims of the Pathway which include an Employability Contract agreed with the offender. The project should seek initially to offer at least what is on offer regionally to offenders with the same risks and needs, and in due course it is expected that the offer should be improved.
- It should ensure good connections are made with the 'Reducing Re-offending Corporate Alliance', that is promoting the employment of offenders in areas of recruitment difficulties and skills shortages.
- The project should explore the delivery of educational programmes through *Learndirect* as well as traditional methods.
- As part of its contribution to the Pathway the project should seek to develop a social enterprise that serves as a motivational example, expresses and reinforces group solidarity, provides a transition for offenders who are progressing in their capacity to work, gives them an income, and meets wider economic needs, whether serving other disadvantaged groups or grasping opportunities in the market.
- The project should instigate assessments of the mental health needs of those referred and in partnership with the NHS should provide a therapeutic service to those with problems that would normally be managed at a community level.

- It should not provide a crisis intervention service nor should it address the needs of men with dangerous and severe personality disorders, many of whom need considerable support and supervision.
- It should provide therapeutic services that are addressed to the types of need assessed clinically. These should include attachment-based therapies that function to bring out unresolved personal issues, and other therapies that help make offenders aware of alternative solutions to problem situations.
- The project should be ensuring that alcohol and drug treatment services are provided in a timely fashion to enable the users to take advantage of other interventions.
- A therapeutic community approach should be explored by the project.
- The project should consult with *Citizen Advice*, the national organisation, and consider if a service level agreement should be instigated to provide free and timely advice and casework to families.
- The project should also consult with *Citizen Advice* about setting up a community-based advice scheme staffed by the project users, as part of its social enterprise portfolio.
- The project should consult with national organisations like *Fathers Direct* to help develop a course in relationships and fatherhood.
- Any work on families and fatherhood should be sensitive to the experiences of men with abusive backgrounds
- Programmes accredited by the Probation Service should be adopted
 - if there are sufficient suitable candidates with literacy skills
 - if there is evidence of motivation
 - if implementation can be assured to be of high quality
 - if there is support to reduce drop-out to a minimum
- Induction should have a strong element of motivational interviewing.
- Staff should be instructed in the methods of 'pro-social modelling' and its impact should be monitored by user feedback and other observations.
- Engagement should be enhanced by positive dialogue, rewarding compliance and avoidance of coercion wherever possible.
- Case managers or key workers should be responsible for managing programme engagement, sequencing interventions and promoting communication with the individual.

- The group focus of the work should be clearly communicated with regular community meetings, group and individual activity etc.

Appendix Two - Assessment process of Glasgow 218 Centre

Assessments of women referred to 218

All females in court for fresh charges are interviewed automatically by members of the Assessment Team at 218. The **court assessment** collects basic information including:

- Basic demographics;
- Information about any children and their carers;
- Contacts with other services;
- Current use of drugs and alcohol, and how she is funding this;
- Why she is in court, any current criminal justice orders and disposals; and
- Current accommodation and whether she feels this is safe.

Very briefly, the court assessment also looks at physical, mental, and emotional health and benefits. The assessor then summarises the level of need and asks the woman whether she is interested in making contact with 218.

Women who are referred to 218 or who are interviewed at the courts must go through three further assessments before they are accepted into a programme there. These assessments are not only to collect information on a woman's needs and appropriateness for the service, but also to test her motivation to attend the service; if she is able to appear for the requisite three assessments, she is more likely to turn up for the programme as well.

At the time of this research, the **first assessment** covered the following:

- Basic demographic details and contact information;
- Substance use
 - Severity Index (Scotland) (Asi-Lite) (Wilson et al.)
 - Fast Alcohol Screening Test (FAST) (Hodgson et al. 2002);
- Motivation for participating in 218; and
- Offending history and previous contacts with the CJS and Children's Panel.

The **second assessment** was conducted entirely by the District Nurse. This included:

- Detailed medical history;
- Physical examination;
- Physical and mental health (Avon Mental Health Measure); and
- Psychological functioning.

Finally, the **third assessment** consisted of:

- Goals for their time on the programme;
- Any personal circumstances, including care arrangements for children;
- Current accommodation;
- Employment and benefits;
- Life skills;
- Clinical assessment of life skills and access issues (Avon Mental Health Measure);
- Checklist of any prescribing; and
- Checklist of information given to the client about the programme.

Once the client has completed the assessments and has decided to take part in a programme, each programme has a final and very brief **check-in assessment** to ensure clients understand the policies and procedures that apply to them and whether they agree to these.

References

- Bond, G. (1984) 'Positive and negative norm regulation and their relationship to therapy group size' *Group* 8.2. 35- 44.
- Bottoms, A., L. Gelsthorpe, et al. (2001). Community Penalties. Change and challenges. Cullompton, Willan.
- Burnett, R. and S. Maruna (2004). Prisoners as Citizens' Advisers. The OxCAB-Springhill Partnership and its wider implications. Final Evaluation Report to the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation.
- Campbell, E., and Lewis, D. (2006) An evaluation report of clear track, phase 1 report, Newcastle upon Tyne: University of Newcastle upon Tyne
- Cohen, S. and Rice, C. (1985) 'Maximising the therapeutic effectiveness of small psychotherapy groups' *Group* 9.4. 3-9.
- Coulsfield, L. (2004). Crime, Courts and Confidence. Report of an independent inquiry into Alternatives to prison, Esmee Fairbairn Foundation.
- Curtis, L. and Netten, A. (2006) Unit costs of health and social care 2006. Personal Social Services Research Unit. The University of Kent
- Davies, K., J. Lewis, et al. (2004). An evaluation of the literacy demands of general offending behaviour programmes. Home Office Research Findings. London, Home Office.
- Eley, S., K. Gallop, et al. (2002). Evaluation of the Scottish Pilots Drug Treatment and Testing Orders Crime and Criminal Justice Research Programme Research Findings Scottish Executive.
- Elliott-Marshall, R., M. Ramsay, et al. (2004). Alternative approaches to integrating offenders into the community. The impact of corrections on re-offending: a review of 'what works'. G. Harper and C. Chitty. London, Home Office.
- Farrall, S. (2002). Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation, social context, and desistance from crime. Cullompton, Willan.
- Farrington, D. (1989). Cambridge study in delinquent development: long term follow-up. Cambridge, Cambridge University, Institute of Criminology.
- Farrow, K., G. Kelly, et al. (2007). Offenders in focus: risk, responsivity and diversity. Bristol, Policy Press.
- Foster, S. (2004). Approved Premises: Results of a snapshot survey 2003. (Findings 230). Research, Development & Statistics Directorate. London: Home Office.

Fraser, P., S. Wright, et al. (2003). Multi-site study of the impact of supported housing schemes on the lifestyles of problematic drug users, or those at risk of using drugs. London, NACRO.

Gibbons, W., Anderson, D. and Garm, A. (2002) *The Therapeutic Community Treatment Model*. Vancouver: The Social Planning Department, City of Vancouver and the John Volken Society.

Gordon, J., C. Barnes, et al. (2006). "The Dual Treatment Track Program: A Descriptive Assessment of a New "In-House" Jail Diversion Program." Federal Probation 70(3).

Graef, R. (1992). Living dangerously .Young offenders in their own words. London, Harper Collins.

Hagan, J. (1993). "The social embeddedness of crime and unemployment." Criminology and Criminal Justice 31(4): 465- 491.

Harper, G. and C. Chitty, Eds. (2004). The impact of corrections on re-offending. Home Office Research Studies. London, Home Office

Harrison, L. (2001). "The revolving door for drug-involved offenders: Challenges and Opportunities." Crime and Delinquency 47: 462- 484.

Hiller, M., K. Knight, et al. (2006). "Social functioning, treatment drop-out and recidivism of probationers mandated to a modified therapeutic community." Criminal Justice and Behavior 33(6): 738-759.

Hiller, M. L., K. Knight, et al. (2006). "Recidivism following mandated residential substance abuse treatment for felony probationers." Prison Journal 86(2): 230-241.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (2002) *Performance Standards Manual for the Delivery of Accredited Group Work Programmes*
<http://inspectrates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprobation/docs/perfstanmangroup.pdf?view=Binary>.

HM Treasury (2004) 2004 Spending Review: Stability, Security and Opportunity for All: Investing in Britain's Long-term Future, London: HM Treasury.

Hollin, C., E. Palmer, et al. (2004). Pathfinder programmes in the Probation Service: a retrospective analysis. Home Office Online Report. London Home Office.

Homeless, L. (2007). Clean Break. Integrated housing and care pathways for homeless drug users. London, Homeless Link.

Home Office (2007) National Commissioning Plan 2007/2008 Commissioning Framework, London: Home Office.

Home Office (2006) *Improving Prison and Probation Services: Public Value Partnerships*, London: Home Office.

Home Office, (2005). *The national reducing re-offending action plan*. H. Office, O. o. t. D. P. Minister, D. o. Health, D. f. E. a. Skills and D. f. W. a. Pensions, Home Office.

Hser, Y. I., E. Evans, et al. (2007). "Predictors of short-term treatment outcomes among California's Proposition 36 participants." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 30(2): 187-196.

Knapp, M. and Netten, A. (1997) 'The cost and cost effectiveness of community penalties: principles, tools and examples' in Mair, G. ed. *Evaluating the effectiveness of community penalties* Avebury: Ashgate.
Learning and Skills Council (2007) *Funding Guidance for Further Education in 2007/08* Coventry: Learning and Skills Council.

Kethineni, S. and D. Falcone (2007). "Employment and ex-offenders in the United States: effects of legal and extra legal factors." *Probation Journal* 54(1): 36- 51.

Laub, J. and R. Sampson (2001). *Understanding desistance from crime. Crime and Justice. A review of research*. M. Tonry. Chicago, University of Chicago. 28.

Laub, J. and R. Sampson (2003). *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives*. Cambridge, MA:, Harvard University Press.

Lees. J., Manning, N. and Rawlings, B. (2004) 'A culture of enquiry: research evidence and the therapeutic community' *Psychiatric Quarterly* 75.3. 279-294.

Liau, A., R. Shively, et al. (2004). "Effects of psychoeducation for offenders in a community correctional facility." *Journal of Community Psychology* 32(5): 543-558.

Loucks, N., Malloch, M., Mclvor, G., Gelsthorpe, L. (2006) *Evaluation of the 218 Centre, Edinburgh*: Scottish Executive.

Lowenkamp, C., J. Pealer, et al. (2006). "Adhering to the Risk and Need Principles: does it matter for Supervision-based programs?" *Federal Probation* 70(3).

Mair, G., Cross, N., Taylor, S., (2007) *The use and impact of the Community Order and the Suspended Sentence Order*, London: Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.

Mardon, J. (1996). *A parenting course for young men. Working with Men*. T. Newburn and G. Mair. Lyme Regis, Russell House.

McIvor, G. (2004). Reparative and restorative approaches. Alternatives to Prison. Options for an insecure society. A. Bottoms, S. Rex and G. Robinson. Cullompton, Willan.

McNeill, F. (2006). "A desistance paradigm for offender management." Criminology and Criminal Justice 6(1): 39-62.

Motiuk, L. and S. Brown (1993). Validity of Offender Needs Identification and Analysis in Community Corrections. Canada, Canada Correctional Service.

Nellis, M. (2001). Community penalties in historical perspective. Community Penalties. Change and challenges

Office for Criminal Justice Reform (2007) CJS in brief, July 2007, London: Office for Criminal Justice Reform.

Ottenberg, D. (1982) 'Therapeutic Community and the Danger of the Cult Phenomenon' in Kaslow, F. and Sussman, M. eds. *Cults and the Family* Binghampton: Haworth Press.

Probation, H. M. I. o. (2006). Working to make amends. An inspection of the delivery of Enhanced Community Punishment (ECP) and Unpaid Work (UPW) by the National Probation Service (NPS) London, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation

Raynor, P. (2004). "The Probation Service 'Pathfinders' : finding the path and losing the way?" Criminal Justice 4(3): 309-325.

Raynor, P. and M. Vanstone (1994). "Probation practice, effectiveness, and the non-treatment paradigm." British Journal of Social Work 24(4): 387-404.

Renn, P. (2004). The link between childhood trauma and later violent offending. A matter of security. The application of attachment theory to forensic psychiatry and psychotherapy. F. Pfafflin and G. Adshead. London, Jessica Kingsley.

Rex, S. (2001). Beyond cognitive-behaviouralism? Reflections on the effectiveness literature. Community penalties. Change and Challenges. A. Bottoms, L. Gelsthorpe and S. Rex. Cullompton, Willan.

Sherlock, J. (2004). Young parents. From Custody to Community. London, Prison Reform Trust.

Sherman, L. and H. Strang (2007). Restorative Justice: the evidence. London, The Smith Institute.

Smartt, U. (2001). Grendon Tales. Stories from a Therapeutic Community Winchester, Waterside Press

- Smith, R., R. Grimshaw, et al. (2007). Poverty and disadvantage among prisoners' families, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Solomon, E. (2007). Submission by the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies to the Home Affairs Committee Inquiry 'Towards Effective Sentencing'. London, the Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.
- Solomon, E. and M. Rutherford (2007). Community Sentences Digest. London, Centre for Crime and Justice Studies.
- Soothill, K., B. Francis, et al. (2007). Changing patterns of offending behaviour among young adults NCRM Working Paper Series ESRC National Centre for Research Methods
- Stone-Rice, J. and L. Remy (1994). "Evaluating Horticultural Therapy: The Ecological Context of Urban Jail Inmates". People-Plant Relationships: Setting Research Priorities. J. Flager and R. Poincelot. New York, Food Products Press: 203-224.
- Stone-Rice, J., L. Remy, et al. (1998). Substance Abuse, Offender Rehabilitation and Horticultural Therapy Practice. Horticulture As Therapy: Principles and Practice. S. Simson and M. Straus. New York, Food Products Press: 43-70.
- Tonry, M. (1998) "Intermediate sanctions" in Tonry, M. The Handbook of Crime and Punishment. Oxford. Oxford University Press
- Turnbull, P. (1999). Drug Treatment and Testing Orders. Interim Evaluation Home Office Research Findings London, Home Office.
- Vaughan, B. (2007). "The internal narrative of desistance." BRIT. J. CRIMINOL. 47: 390- 404.
- Webster, R., C. Hedderman, et al. (2001). Building bridges to employment for prisoners Home Office Research Study Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Wilkinson, J. (1998). Developing the evidence base for probation programmes, University of Surrey. Ph.D.
- Wilkinson, J. (2005). "Evaluating evidence for the effectiveness of the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Programme." Howard Journal 44(1): 70-85.
- Wilson, D. and M. Logan (2007). An evaluation of the Learndirect ESF Pathways Project in Prison and Probation, Learndirect.
- Wilson, R. (2005). "Are cognitive problem-solving skills programmes really not working? A response to 'Evaluating evidence for the effectiveness of the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Programme'." The Howard Journal 44(3): 319-321.

Yeboah, D. (2000). "The evaluation of New Zealand's Habilitation Centre's Pilot Programme." Journal of Criminal Justice 28(3): 227-235.

Young, D. and S. Belenko (2002). "Program retention and perceived coercion in three models of mandatory drug treatment." Journal of Drug Issues 32(1): 297-328.

Yorkshire and Humberside National Offender Management Service (2006)
Second Newsletter, September, 2006.

