



Ministry
of Justice

Justice Data Lab Statistics

August 2014

14th August 2014



Ministry of Justice

Contents

Introduction	3
Key findings	4
Producing re-offending reports for round 1 of the NOMS CFO programme	5
Summary of findings from the analyses	6
Summary of all results	11
Contact details	27

Introduction

This report presents a summary of the requests for re-offending information through the Justice Data Lab for the period 2nd April 2013 to 31st July 2014.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Key Findings

To date:

This publication reports on the Justice Data Lab requests received in the fifteen months between the launch of the Justice Data Lab on the 2nd April 2013, and 31st July 2014. During this period there were 142 requests for re-offending information through the Justice Data Lab. Of these requests;

- 62 reports have been published previously. 55 analyses covered in three reports are being published this month, bringing the total published up to 117.
- 16 requests could not be answered as the minimum criteria for a Data Lab analysis had not been met.
- 1 request was withdrawn by the submitting organisation.
- The remaining 8 requests will be processed in due course.

The following activity has taken place this month:

- 55 analyses have been completed which assess the effectiveness of Round 1 of the NOMS CFO programme in 2011. These 55 analyses are covered within three reports. The following pages detail our approach to assessing the effectiveness of this programme, including why so many analyses have been completed.

Producing re-offending reports for Round 1 of the NOMS CFO programme

A single request was received from the organisation NOMS CFO to assess the impact on re-offending of this programme. The request included all individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO Employment Programme in 2011 in the nine regions of England. The programme in each region is delivered by a supplier who receives a contract from NOMS CFO, funding in partnership with ESF. The regions and providers are shown in the table below:

Region	Provider
East Midlands	Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust
East of England	Serco
London	London Probation
North East	Pertemps Recruitment
North West	Merseyside Probation
South East	Serco
South West ¹	A4E
West Midlands	Manchester College
Yorkshire and the Humber	SOVA

In each region, the provider will aim to deliver similar interventions, but each provider will have different targets based on the characteristics of the population they deliver to.

In agreement with NOMS CFO, the Justice Data Lab has issued three reports looking at the effect on re-offending of Round 1 of the NOMS CFO Employment Programme in 2011; one report for each of the three groups of offenders described below:

- Individuals receiving employment support whilst in custody
- Individuals receiving employment support in the community, following release from custody (this group was not included in the previous Justice Data Lab analysis due to small numbers)
- Individuals receiving employment support during a community sentence (either a Community Order, or Suspended Sentence Order)

Each report contains a national assessment of the programme, and an assessment of the programme in each region. Two analyses are shown for each region; the first shows an assessment of the programme against a control group drawn from England and Wales; a second analysis was conducted to assess the effectiveness where the control group was drawn from that region only (this second analysis was not always possible for every region).

¹ There are currently no prisons based in Cornwall.

This second analysis was completed to ensure that the results remained applicable when regional factors were taken into account (introducing regional control groups where possible is a key improvement detailed in "[Justice Data Lab; The pilot year²](#)"). We have indicated in table 1 below the outcomes of both assessments where possible. In total, 55 analyses were completed showing the effectiveness of the programme.

In November and December 2013, the Justice Data Lab released findings for the first year of the NOMS CFO Employment Programme, 2010. These findings can be found at the following links:

www.gov.uk/government/statistics/justice-data-lab-statistics-november-2013

www.gov.uk/government/statistics/justice-data-lab-statistics-december-2013

Summary of findings from the analyses

For individuals who started receiving employment support whilst in custody:

- The national assessment of the programme suggests that for individuals who received support through the NOMS CFO Employment Programme in custody, there is currently insufficient evidence at this stage to draw a conclusion about the impact of receiving this support on re-offending³.
- This finding was consistent across the majority of analyses within each region; with the exception of the South East and the South West where small statistically significant increases in the one year proven re-offending rate were observed for those who received support through the NOMS CFO Employment Programme, compared to a matched control group.

A summary of the findings for this analysis type is shown below:

Number of analyses: 19

Inconclusive results: 15 (this includes the national assessment of the programme)

Statistically significant reductions in re-offending: 0

Statistically significant increases in re-offending: 4

² This document can be found at:

www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289250/justice-data-lab-pilot-year.pdf

³ The **one year proven re-offending rate** is defined as the proportion of offenders in a cohort who commit an offence in a one year follow-up period which was proven through receipt of a court conviction, caution, reprimand or warning during the one year follow-up or in a further six month waiting period. The one year follow-up period begins when offenders leave custody or start their probation sentence.

For individuals receiving employment support in the community, following release from custody:

- The national assessment of the programme indicates that individuals who received support through the NOMS CFO Employment Programme in the community, following release from custody experienced a statistically significant reduction in re-offending of between 1 and 5 percentage points, compared to a matched control group.
- In contrast, the majority of the regional analyses of the effectiveness of this programme suggested there is currently insufficient evidence at this stage to draw a conclusion about the impact of receiving support through the NOMS CFO Employment Programme in the community, following release from custody. In most cases, a reduction in re-offending was seen compared to a matched control group, but these reductions were not statistically significant.
- The exception to these results is the assessment of the programme in the South West, where a statistically significant reduction in re-offending was observed compared to a matched control group, for both analyses completed with a national and regional control group.

A summary of the findings for this analysis type is shown below:

Number of analyses: 17

Inconclusive results: 14 (1 has a statistically significant decrease in the frequency of re-offending)

Statistically significant reductions in re-offending: 3 (this includes the national assessment of the programme)

Statistically significant increases in re-offending: 0

For individuals receiving employment support during a community sentence:

- The national assessment of the programme indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO Employment Programme delivered by providers during community sentences experienced a statistically significant reduction in re-offending of between 0.02 and 3 percentage points compared to a matched control group.
- However, the majority of the regional analyses of the effectiveness of this programme suggested there is currently insufficient evidence at this stage to draw a conclusion about the impact of receiving support through the NOMS CFO Employment Programme during a community sentence. In some cases, a reduction in re-offending was seen compared to a matched control group, but these reductions were not statistically significant.
- For both the South West and Yorkshire and the Humber, a statistically significant reduction in re-offending was observed when the analysis was carried out using a national control group. In both cases, the assessment using a control group of individuals from that region only did not show a statistically significant decrease.

A summary of the findings for this analysis type is shown below:

Number of analyses: 19

Inconclusive results: 16 (5 have a statistically significant decrease in the frequency of re-offending)

Statistically significant reductions in re-offending: 3 (this includes the national assessment of the programme)

Statistically significant increases in re-offending: 0

A summary of the findings for all analyses is shown below:

Totals for all analyses

Total number of analyses: 55

Total inconclusive results: 45 (6 have a statistically significant decrease in the frequency of re-offending)

Total statistically significant reductions: 6

Total statistically significant increases: 4

Why are these results different to last time?

In November and December 2013, the Justice Data Lab released findings for Round 1 of the NOMS CFO Employment Programme where the programme was started in 2010. For both years of the programme where support was started during a Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order, we have found that there is a statistically significant reduction in re-offending when looking at the programme nationally. Where the programme was started in custody, in both years we have seen no statistically significant difference in re-offending where the programme was assessed nationally. In both cases, the size of the impact in 2011 appears to have reduced compared to 2010, and the effects seen in some regions of the 2010 analyses, have not been found in the analyses of 2011.

Whilst the re-offending rates included in this analysis **should not** be compared directly against those from the previous analyses, it is helpful to describe possible reasons why the changes in impact may have been seen:

- In most regions where the programme is started in the community, a reduction in re-offending is observed, however the effect is not statistically significant, and the effect size appears to be smaller compared to the equivalent region in the previous year. It is more challenging when a smaller effect size is observed to say this difference is statistically significant; because the size of the cohort in that region is too small to say with certainty that a true difference in re-offending behaviour has occurred – i.e. the statistical test does not have enough power. This explains why an equivalent reduction seen at the national level is statistically significant, where reductions seen at the regional levels are not always significant.
- The characteristics of those receiving support from the NOMS CFO Employment Programme may have changed. Whilst the matching process takes into account information about an individual's demographics, offence, criminal history and

employment and benefit history, there may have been genuine changes in the characteristics that this programme was aiming to address (employability, motivation, aptitude, etc), that cannot be statistically controlled for.

- In 2011, DWP launched the Work Programme. This programme improves the employment support provision for individuals in the community receiving certain out of work benefits. It has not possible within these analyses to statistically control for support received through any other employment programme, including the Work Programme. It is likely that individuals in the control group will have received employment support after leaving prison through the Work Programme. This would mean that we are less confident that the control group are not receiving similar or equivalent employment support; so it is possible that the effect size of the NOMS programme is affected.
- Generally in 2011 there was an increase in the employment level in England, and a reduction in the number of out of work benefit claimants. This could suggest that the control group generally were experiencing better employment outcomes, or that the competition for employment opportunities was stronger.

Why are differences significant in the National Assessment, but not with a regional assessment?

These publications cover differences in re-offending rates between the treatment group (NOMS CFO) and a control group. There are instances where a difference observed in the National Assessment of the programme is statistically significant, but the same apparent difference at the regional level is not statistically significant. This occurs for a number of reasons, including the following:

- Small changes in re-offending behaviour are relatively difficult to identify compared to large changes. A very large treatment group is needed to accurately identify a small change in re-offending⁴.
- The National Assessment will be based on a much larger group of individuals. This means that with a national assessment, the confidence level around any assessment of the difference will be much higher – usually resulting in much tighter (smaller) confidence intervals around the National Assessment of the difference. With the regional assessments, the confidence intervals may be quite large – often crossing zero, meaning that while a difference may have been observed, this difference does not appear to be statistically significant.
- If the characteristics within the treatment group are varied (for example the age range is very wide, or there is a lot of variation in the criminal history of the individuals within the group), this will mean that the confidence around the estimate of re-offending will be weaker compared to assessing a group who have very similar characteristics. This

⁴ This is explained in more detail in “Justice Data Lab, the pilot year” www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/289250/justice-data-lab-pilot-year.pdf

means that a larger change in re-offending will have to be observed to say that the difference is statistically significant.

Table 1: Requests being published this month. The following findings were published over 3 reports

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
1	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: National Analysis (August 2014)</p>	<p>This is a national analysis of all the NOMS CFO participants in England who started their intervention in custody in 2011; regional results are below.</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by providers in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 2 percentage point decrease and a 3 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 3,291 offenders targeted by NOMS CFO providers while in custody was 2.13 offences per individual, compared with 2.15 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p>
2	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: East of England (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Serco in the East of England in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point decrease and a 5 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 292 offenders targeted by Serco in the East of England while in custody was 2.57 offences per individual, compared with 2.38 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
3	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: East Midlands (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust in the East Midlands in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 8 percentage point decrease and a 4 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 292 offenders targeted by Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust in the East Midlands while in custody was 2.02 offences per individual, compared with 2.08 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
4	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: London (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by London Probation Trust in London in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 3 percentage point decrease and a 10 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 288 offenders targeted by London Probation Trust in London while in custody was 2.54 offences per individual, compared with 2.30 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
<p>5</p> <p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: North East (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Pertemps Recruitment in the North East in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 1 percentage point decrease and a 12 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 252 offenders targeted by Pertemps Recruitment in the North East while in custody was 2.71 offences per individual, compared with 2.36 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
<p>6</p> <p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: North West (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Merseyside Probation Trust in the North West in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point decrease and a 3 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 576 offenders targeted by Merseyside Probation Trust in the North West while in custody was 1.72 offences per individual, compared with 1.92 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
<p>7</p> <p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: South East (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Serco in the South East in custody experienced an increase between 0.3 and 12 percentage points in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 289 offenders targeted by Serco in the South East while in custody was 2.09 offences per individual, compared with 1.96 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
<p>8</p> <p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: South West (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by A4E in the South West in custody experienced an increase between 0.2 and 12 percentage points in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 282 offenders targeted by A4E in the South West while in custody was 2.12 offences per individual, compared with 2.05 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
9	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: West Midlands (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by The Manchester College in the West Midlands in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 8 percentage point decrease and a 1 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 556 offenders targeted by The Manchester College in the West Midlands while in custody was 2.06 offences per individual, compared with 2.23 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
10	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered in custody: Yorkshire and the Humber (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started in custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by SOVA in Yorkshire and the Humber in custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 5 percentage point decrease and a 5 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 452 offenders targeted by SOVA in Yorkshire and the Humber while in custody was 1.93 offences per individual, compared with 2.00 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

Organisation and programme		Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
11	NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: National Analysis (August 2014)	This is a national analysis of all the NOMS CFO participants in England who started their intervention following release from custody in 2011; regional results are below.	This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by providers following release from custody experienced a reduction between 1 to 5 percentage points in re-offending , compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.	The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 2,301 offenders targeted by NOMS CFO providers following release from custody was 0.95 offences per individual, compared with 1.08 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is statistically significant.
12	NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: East of England (August 2014)	This programme was started following release from custody in 2011	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Serco in the East of England following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point decrease and a 5 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 297 offenders targeted by Serco in the East of England following release from custody was 0.99 offences per individual, compared with 0.93 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

Organisation and programme		Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
13	NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: East Midlands (August 2014)	This programme was started following release from custody in 2011	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust in the East Midlands following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 16 percentage point decrease and a 1 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 128 offenders targeted by Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust in the East Midlands following release from custody was 0.97 offences per individual, compared with 1.05 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
14	NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: London (August 2014)	This programme was started following release from custody in 2011	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by London Probation Trust in London following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 4 percentage point decrease and a 5 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 517 offenders targeted by London Probation Trust in London following release from custody was 0.78 offences per individual, compared with 0.75 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
15	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: North East (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started following release from custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Pertemps Recruitment in the North East following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 12 percentage point decrease and an 8 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 98 offenders targeted by Pertemps Recruitment in the North East following release from custody was 1.03 offences per individual, compared with 1.08 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
16	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: North West (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started following release from custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Merseyside Probation Trust in the North West following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point decrease and a 4 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 386 offenders targeted by Merseyside Probation Trust in the North West following release from custody was 0.97 offences per individual, compared with 1.20 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was not the same (i.e. any difference was not statistically significant), and the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
17	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: South East (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started following release from custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Serco in the South East following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 10 percentage point decrease and an 8 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>An appropriate regional control group could not be found.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 129 offenders targeted by Serco in the South East following release from custody was 0.89 offences per individual, compared with 0.96 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>An appropriate regional control group could not be found.</p>
18	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: South West (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started following release from custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by A4E in the South West following release from custody experienced a reduction between 1 to 16 percentage points in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 175 offenders targeted by A4E in the South West following release from custody was 1.13 offences per individual, compared with 1.38 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
19	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: West Midlands (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started following release from custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by The Manchester College in the West Midlands following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 11 percentage point decrease and a 1 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 281 offenders targeted by The Manchester College in the West Midlands following release from custody was 0.98 offences per individual, compared with 1.09 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
20	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered following release from custody: Yorkshire and the Humber (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started following release from custody in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by SOVA in Yorkshire and the Humber following release from custody on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 5 percentage point decrease and an 8 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>An appropriate regional control group could not be found.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 250 offenders targeted by SOVA in Yorkshire and the Humber following release from custody was 0.99 offences per individual, compared with 1.11 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>An appropriate regional control group could not be found.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
21	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: National Analysis (August 2014)</p>	<p>This is a national analysis of all the NOMS CFO participants in England who started their intervention during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011; regional results are below.</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by providers during community sentences experienced a reduction between 0.02 to 3 percentage points in re-offending, compared to a matched control group.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 4,160 offenders targeted by NOMS CFO providers during community sentences was 0.67 offences per individual, compared with 0.74 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is statistically significant.</p>
22	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: East of England (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Serco in the East of England during community sentences on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point decrease and a 3 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 397 offenders targeted by Serco in the East of England during community sentences was 0.62 offences per individual, compared with 0.76 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
23	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: East Midlands (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust in the East Midlands during community sentences on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 8 percentage point decrease and a 3 percentage point increase in re-offending compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 260 offenders targeted by Leicestershire & Rutland Probation Trust in the East Midlands during community sentences was 0.66 offences per individual, compared with 0.70 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
24	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: London (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by London Probation Trust in London during community sentences on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 2 percentage point decrease and a 4 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 740 offenders targeted by London Probation Trust in London during community sentences was 0.66 offences per individual, compared with 0.59 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
25	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: North East (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Pertemps Recruitment in the North East during community sentences on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 7 percentage point decrease and a 4 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 284 offenders targeted by Pertemps Recruitment in the North East during community sentences was 0.72 offences per individual, compared with 0.81 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was not the same; the frequency of one year proven re-offending for 284 offenders targeted by Pertemps Recruitment in the North East during community sentences was 0.72 offences per individual, compared with 0.93 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the re-offending rates is statistically significant.</p>

Organisation and programme		Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
26	NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: North West (August 2014)	This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Merseyside Probation Trust in the North West during community sentences on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 4 percentage point decrease and a 4 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 631 offenders targeted by Merseyside Probation Trust in the North West during community sentences was 0.83 offences per individual, compared with 0.85 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
27	NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: South East (August 2014)	This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by Serco in the South East during community sentences on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between an 8 percentage point decrease and a 5 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 222 offenders targeted by Serco in the South East during community sentences was 0.69 offences per individual, compared with 0.77 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
28	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: South West (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by A4E in the South West while in the community experienced a reduction between 0.2 to 9 percentage points in re-offending compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was not the same (i.e. any difference was not statistically significant), and the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 414 offenders targeted by A4E in the South West during community sentences was 0.69 offences per individual, compared with 0.97 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>
29	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: West Midlands (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis looked at the impact of participating in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by The Manchester College in the West Midlands during community sentences on re-offending. This analysis is currently inconclusive as the one year proven re-offending rate is between a 6 percentage point decrease and a 2 percentage point increase in re-offending, compared to a matched control group of similar individuals from England and Wales.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 546 offenders targeted by The Manchester College in the West Midlands during community sentences was 0.60 offences per individual, compared with 0.69 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is not statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

	Organisation and programme	Summary of Programme	Effect on the one year proven re-offending rate	Effect on the frequency of one year proven re-offending
30	<p>NOMS CFO Delivered during community sentences: Yorkshire and the Humber (August 2014)</p>	<p>This programme was started during a community sentence (Community Order or Suspended Sentence Order) in 2011</p>	<p>This analysis indicates that individuals who participated in the NOMS CFO programme delivered by SOVA in Yorkshire and the Humber during community sentences experienced a reduction between 0.2 to 7 percentage points in re-offending compared to a matched control group.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was not the same (i.e. any difference was not statistically significant), and the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>	<p>The frequency of one year proven re-offending for 638 offenders targeted by SOVA in Yorkshire and the Humber during community sentences was 0.53 offences per individual, compared with 0.68 per individual in the matched control group. Statistical significance testing has shown that this difference in the frequency of re-offending is statistically significant.</p> <p>When this analysis was repeated with a control group of similar individuals from this region only, the conclusion of the analysis was the same, although the estimate of the specific impact on re-offending was different.</p>

Contact points for further information

Nicola Webb

Justice Data Lab team

Justice Statistics Analytical Services

7th Floor, 102 Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ

Tel: 020 3334 4396

Email: justice.datalab@justice.gsi.gov.uk

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

www.justice.gov.uk/justice-data-lab

© Crown copyright 2014
Produced by the Ministry of Justice

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

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