



Home Office

INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT: MEETING THE FUTURE CHALLENGES

Report of National Conference 2015
25th and 26th February

Disclaimer: The views expressed within this conference report are those of the key note speakers and do not necessarily reflect government policy.

MESSAGE FROM THE RT HON MIKE PENNING, MP MINISTER OF STATE FOR POLICING, CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND VICTIMS



I would like to thank you all for attending the Integrated Offender Management conference on 25 and 26 February.

I was very keen to ensure that the conference went ahead as one way to acknowledge the importance of Integrated Offender Management and the work that you do to drive down crime and reoffending in our local communities.

Your work is so important. The Integrated Offender Management way of working sees real and effective collaboration between agencies, working more smartly together with a shared vision of what you want to achieve based on shared intelligence, agreed priorities and clarity about respective roles and responsibilities. This is exactly the approach that is needed in the current difficult financial climate.

To support your efforts, I am delighted that we have been able to refresh the Integrated Offender Management Key Principles. These are intended to capture the essence of Integrated Offender Management, drawing on your experience of working in this way.

I encourage you to be ambitious moving forward, so that we can go further in reducing reoffending, cutting crime and reducing the number of victims.

Rt Hon Mike Penning MP

Day One – Wednesday 25 February 2015

Conference introduction by chair, Nick Hunt. Head of Tackling Crime Unit, Home Office.



Nick Hunt welcomed delegates to the 2015 national Integrated Offender Management conference, thanking the College of Policing for jointly funding the conference and for hosting it at their premises in Ryton-on-Dunsmore. He also thanked all those involved in the delivery of Integrated Offender Management for all that they were doing to tackle offenders and reduce crime.

Nick explained that the Home Office was the lead government department for Integrated

Offender Management, and that he had the lead responsibility as chair of the Integrated Offender Management national strategic board.

Referring to the overarching theme of the conference: ‘meeting the future challenges’, Nick said that these challenges included those presented by:

- the continuing pressure on public sector finance;
- changes to the delivery landscape, including the need to adapt to the Transforming Rehabilitation probation reforms: and
- the changing nature of crime.

Finally, Nick mentioned that refreshed IOM Key Principles had been uploaded onto GOV.UK to coincide with the start of the conference. The refreshed Key Principles were intended to help local areas to meet the challenges ahead and to build on the successes achieved so far.

Session 1: “All partners working together”

Three presentations, from:

- Adam Simmonds**, Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Northamptonshire;
- John Long QPM**, acting Chief Constable, Avon and Somerset Constabulary, IOM national policing lead;
- Rob Menary**, Chief Executive Officer, Dorset, Devon and Cornwall Community Rehabilitation Company.

i. Adam Simmonds, Police and Crime Commissioner for Northamptonshire

In his address to the conference, PCC **Adam Simmonds** set out a clear challenge, whether:

- to continue with tried and tested approaches, often excellent in themselves, to tackle the relatively small numbers of difficult, vulnerable and highly prolific offenders who cause disproportionate harm to communities; or

- look at new ways of tackling demand by investing in prevention and diversion to prevent reoffending, investing in what works to help people to genuinely change their lives.

He spoke about the transformational benefits of putting IOM at the heart of policing, to drive a shift from reactive approaches to crime to a more proactive, targeted and evidence based approach to reducing reoffending. He had placed prevention and early intervention at the heart of the Northamptonshire Police and Crime plan.



Adam spoke about his *Taking a Generation Out of Crime Initiative*, focused on those aged between 10 and 20 at risk of, or already engaged in, offending. The initiative used data from a range of agencies to build a more informed profile of offending and interventions used by partnerships. The aim was to stop young people falling through the gaps during the vital transition to adulthood.

He was also establishing a Free School for 1,260 learners aged 4 to 19, to open in 2016. The aim was to build resilience, encourage better decision making and help young people understand risky behaviours. The school would also work with families and share best practice across Northamptonshire.

Speaking about Transforming Rehabilitation, Adam said that many PCCs had wanted to have greater involvement in the commissioning of probation services. In addition, he and other PCCs had expressed concerns about the pace of the reform

programme. The reforms did, however, offer a significant opportunity to think about the future management of offenders, although there were challenges around ensuring that Community Rehabilitation Companies and the National Probation Service saw the benefits of mainstreaming the radical possibilities of IOM. He also spoke about health needing to play a more central role.

In concluding, Adam thanked everyone involved in IOM for all their work. He recognised that IOM is a challenging arena to work within. But with the right leadership and transformational thinking, the approach had the power to change people’s lives for the better. If IOM approaches were successfully embedded across policing and other sectors, it would achieve the ambition of making our country a much safer place.

ii John Long, Acting Chief Constable Avon & Somerset Constabulary and National Policing Lead for IOM



Acting Chief Constable **John Long** also spoke on the theme of innovation and change. Key developments that he referred to included:

- the refresh of the IOM Key Principles on GOV.UK;
- the inclusion of IOM in Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary’s inspection programme; and
- Transforming Rehabilitation.

There was no doubt that IOM arrangements would need to adapt to changes brought about through Transforming Rehabilitation, and the financial climate brought additional

challenges, including around resourcing 'upstream' activities. A number of areas were responding to these challenges with innovation, including around developing **new IOM models**, such as that in Bedfordshire (a presentation on this model followed later in the day).

Building on the success of IOM to date, many areas were now extending their arrangements to manage **new IOM cohorts**. John cited the IRiS project in Bristol as one example, working with dangerous offenders. Many areas were also focusing specifically on women offenders to ensure that the response was relevant to the needs of women, and to help to break negative intergenerational impacts. There were many other examples of, and opportunities to, broaden the local cohorts.

Technology also presented opportunities to introduce new ways of working and to enable more effective work with offenders, for example through real time information sharing. IDIOM was a specific example of technology supporting the delivery of IOM.

John also spoke about developments around predictive and cognitive analytics and GPS tracking, both of which presented real opportunities to transform the management of offenders in the community.

On the theme of **more integrated services**, particularly linked to prevention and early intervention, John mentioned work already underway to join-up services, and there were further opportunities, for example in strengthening the links with Troubled Families, Multi-agency Safeguarding Hubs, integrated work on foreign national offenders and integrated approaches to mental health.

The future of IOM was one of greater collaboration between organisations to increase capabilities, and greater integration and innovation to ensure that our communities are safer. To achieve this required real integration at three levels: policy at central government level; collaboration at strategic agency level; and

finally in local operational and service delivery.

iii. Rob Menary, Chief Executive, Dorset, Devon and Cornwall Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC)



Rob Menary focused his presentation on some of the issues that would need to be addressed if Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) were to play their full part in IOM.

The issues raised followed from a recent survey of the 21 CRCs.

Firstly, while the new owners of CRCs would have expressed their enthusiasm for IOM during the Transforming Rehabilitation competition, there were some questions to be answered:

- would CRCs be ready to share information about reoffending with the police if this resulted in arrest and conviction, which could cost the CRC money under the Transforming Rehabilitation payment mechanism?
- would the police, and other agencies, be as ready to continue working collaboratively if CRCs were seen as commercial organisations with the potential to make a profit from the success of IOM?
- was the voluntary sector's role in IOM sustainable, given reductions in many services available?

So, while IOM was generally seen to be 'the right thing', could this be afforded in the

current financial climate? As a consequence, all partners would need to be clearer about the outcomes or benefits that they were securing from the approach.

There were challenges for IOM, which would differ from area to area, around the fit with the differing operating models that CRCs would introduce over time.

Rob also spoke about the use of psychologically informed environments ('PIE') with a general question about whether the physical environment that IOM operated from always supported the objectives of the arrangements. For example, did a steel office door or posters about drugs send the right message to the individual looking for a positive and trusting environment?

Both the extension of statutory supervision through the Offender Rehabilitation Act and 'Through the Gate' arrangements would benefit IOM. However, thought would need to be given to how IOM would contribute and add value to these arrangements in the future and support the objectives and role of CRCs.

Rob concluded by saying the future of IOM would be determined by how local arrangements adapted to the changes that are taking place and the opportunities and challenges that these presented. There is a very positive future for IOM if it reviews and renews its approach to making a social difference.

Session 2: “Local response to local problems: the evolving nature of the voluntary sector”

Three presentations, from:

- i. **Nathan Dick**, Head of Policy and Communications, Clinks;
- ii. **Hugh Sherriffe**, Director of Midlands and South West, Barnardo’s
- iii. **Trevor Holden**, Chief Executive of Luton Borough Council and **Nikki Middleton**, Interim Director of YouTurn Futures

i. Nathan Dick, Head of Policy and Communications, Clinks



Nathan Dick spoke about the role of the voluntary sector in IOM, the potential impact of Transforming Rehabilitation, and the current state of the voluntary sector. He noted that there are almost 1,500 voluntary sector organisations who work solely with offenders, and a further 14,500 working with offenders as one of their client groups. However, the recent announcement of providers in Transforming Rehabilitation showed only 14 organisations listed, with around 270 listed in bids as sub-contractors.

The sector has a long tradition of working with offenders subject to short term custodial sentences through resettlement and work with families. The sector was also delivering women’s centres, drug and alcohol services, family led services and low level mental health services; to name a few.

Clinks were now talking to the new owners of Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) about how they will, and could, work with the voluntary sector. CRCs are in the early stages of thinking about supply chains, and Nathan felt it would take some time for

the voluntary sector’s role to become clearer.

In terms of IOM in the context of Transforming Rehabilitation, Nathan noted that the new probation providers were unlikely to have all the answers about how to work with the most chaotic or vulnerable offenders, and the voluntary sector would have much to offer here in terms of supporting the rehabilitation of these offenders and bringing a focus on prevention. The sector brought greater flexibility, specialist expertise, and a range of different approaches. It was important for IOM partnerships to think about how to make the best use of the voluntary sector. Voluntary sector organisations might not be aware of IOM arrangements, but they do have the expertise and skills to work with IOM offenders.

Nathan stressed that it would be a mistake to think about the voluntary sector just within the context of Transforming Rehabilitation and as a commissioned supply chain provider. Many organisations will not be commissioned, but provide valuable and effective services that can reduce crime and reoffending. The voluntary sector needs to be recognised as more than just a provider of services, it can contribute to service re-design, and complement commissioned services.

Clinks’ most recent ‘state of the sector’ survey confirmed that the voluntary sector is comprised of small organisations, with income of less than £1 million and employing less than 25 people. Many charities had seen an increase in service

user need, and 80% reported these were becoming more severe and complex. Many were also reliant on their reserves to keep their services going in the current financial climate and 70% of organisations had reported that this was not sustainable for a further 12 months.

Nathan set out some of the benefits that the sector provided, including identifying and addressing need and acting as the voice for the marginalised.

He concluded by saying that IOM provided the opportunity to bring all the sector together in order to deliver flexible services that better meet the needs of the most marginalised people in our communities.

ii. Hugh Sherriffe, Director of Midlands and South West, Barnardo's



Hugh Sherriffe opened his presentation by talking about how the voluntary sector was focused on local responses to local problems and how the sector was evolving.

He explained that voluntary sector agencies could achieve more when working with partners including the police, Community Rehabilitation Companies and the National Probation Service. Barnardo's had made partnership working a cornerstone of their approach in working to achieve better outcomes for children and families, delivering 900 services to around 200,000 children and families. Barnardo's focused in particular on the most vulnerable, including victims of child sexual exploitation, children leaving care, children in Young Offender Institutions and Secure Training Centres and children affected by parental imprisonment.

Hugh set out why it was important to focus on children with a parent in prison - the hidden victims of crime. Around 200,000 children were in this position and often overlooked. Families could descend into chaos from the moment of a parent's arrest, sometimes thrust into poverty, the children vulnerable to stigma and bullying at school, and all too often left to deal with such issues in isolation. Children with a parent in prison were also said to be twice as likely to have mental health and behavioural difficulties. 65% of boys with a parent in prison go on to offend themselves.

Hugh explained that family separation often had a profound impact on parents as well. Maintaining family ties reduced the likelihood of reoffending by as much as 39%. Barnardo's had been working in prisons for the last 20 years running parenting programmes, family visits, the development of innovative programmes such as Community Support for Offenders' Families (CSOF), I-HOP and 'Hidden Sentence' training.

CSOF had been piloted in Wales, Bristol and the Isle of Wight, providing direct support to families and training for professionals. It had raised greater awareness and improved effective practice in local services and most importantly the programme included family support as an intervention. The approach was different as it targeted families who were hard to reach, who had multiple needs, and reached diverse communities.

In South Wales, Barnardo's had worked with probation to provide training to 700 frontline staff on how to advise families about prison visits and family support. The Welsh Government had included a "children and families of offenders" pathway within their Reducing Reoffending Strategy Delivery Plan. In Essex, Barnardo's had developed a specific pathway with a multi-agency approach and provided services which bridged the gap between the secure estate and the community.

Hugh concluded by stressing the importance of joint working to support families in order

to tackle reoffending and intergenerational crime, from arrest through to reintegration. Supporting children and families of offenders should be central to offender management and family engagement should be placed at the heart of Community Rehabilitation Companies' operating models.

Barnardo's were proud of what they had achieved and were continuing to achieve in improving the life chances of children and reducing reoffending.

iii. Trevor Holden, Chief Executive, Luton Borough Council and Nikki Middleton, Interim Director, YouTurn Futures



Trevor Holden spoke about the origins and development of YouTurn Futures, the Charitable Incorporated Organisation now responsible for the management and co-ordination of Bedfordshire's IOM scheme. He explained how the local "chiefs" who comprised the Chief Executives of public agencies, including Health, Police, Local Authorities and Fire, had wanted to ensure that they were properly able to manage the response to the local crime and offending threats. Transforming Rehabilitation had brought concerns about the potential loss of probation as a key strategic partner within IOM, and about whether the leadership of the new probation providers would be focused on the issues that were most important locally. There was also concern that in the period between the announcement of Transforming Rehabilitation and the involvement of new providers there was the risk that IOM could stagnate, unable to develop or innovate

while partners awaited the input of the new Community Rehabilitation Companies.

Instead, the Chief Executives were keen to create a model that sat across different organisations' agendas and enabled services to be delivered to the people who needed them, at the time they needed them and in the places where they needed them. They took the decision in October 2013 to establish a new public interest charity, with Trustees were drawn from the relevant Chief Executives, with YouTurn Futures registered with the Charities Commission in March 2014.

Creating this entirely new model brought agencies together, created increased flexibility, removed constraints and provided the potential to grow beyond the pre-existing IOM model to address wider issues such as child sexual exploitation, drugs and alcohol.

Nikki Middleton spoke about the impact that YouTurn Futures has had in Bedfordshire. She explained that the approach meant that no one organisation dominated or shaped the agenda, with all the partners' interests fully represented.



The charitable status enjoyed by YouTurn Futures meant that Bedfordshire were able to access different funding streams and were able to move quickly in different directions and develop new approaches. This had resulted in greater collaboration and improved co-ordination and integration across multi-agency initiatives beyond IOM, including Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements, child sexual exploitation and serious youth violence.

The model allowed Bedfordshire to identify where there were gaps between initiatives, ensure that these were addressed, and reduced the risk of duplication. It also improved the level of support for those individuals at risk and in need.

Session 3: “Drivers of crime”

Presentation by **Mike Warren**, Head of Crime and Policing Knowledge Hub, Home Office

i. Mike Warren, Head of Home Office Crime and Policing Knowledge Hub



Mike Warren explained that his role included focussing on understanding why crime overall was falling, and on explaining trends in individual crime types. He said that the two main measures of crime, the Crime Survey for England and Wales and Police Recorded Crime were both showing that overall crime was down. The Crime Survey was showing a fall of 63% in crime since 1995.

There were many different theories as to why crime was falling, from improved home and vehicle car security, to more effective policing, to the removal of lead from petrol and paint. What seemed clear was that there was no single factor that could provide the whole explanation. Crime was a complex issue and the level of crime was the result of millions of individual decisions taken by individuals in a wide range of circumstances.

Mike said that the Home Secretary had recently talked about six key drivers of crime:

i. **drugs** – which are strongly linked to acquisitive crime, and to organised crime, gangs and violence. Heroin and crack users were responsible for around 45% of acquisitive crime. Home Office research published last year had suggested that the

fall in the number of heroin and crack users, helped by the development of drug treatment services and initiatives, could explain around a third of the substantial falls in acquisitive crime since 1995;

ii. **alcohol** – which was strongly linked to violent crime. Alcohol related crime and disorder was estimated to cost around £11 billion a year. However, having peaked in 2005, alcohol consumption and binge drinking were falling, particularly amongst the 16-24 age group. This had likely contributed to substantial falls in violence over that period;

iii. **effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System (CJS)** – the CJS was important both in practical terms (i.e. catching, punishing and rehabilitating offenders) and as a deterrent (i.e. the more likely offenders thought they were to be caught, the less likely they were to commit an offence in the first place). Speed in delivering justice, the effectiveness of offender rehabilitation and management, and targeted hotspot policing and problem solving all had an effect on crime;

iv. **character** – or in other words, an individual's propensity to commit crime. Parents, friends, schooling and neighbourhoods all helped to shape a child's upbringing and propensity to offend. There was some evidence that 'character' was improving - young people now were less likely to take drugs, smoke or binge drink. This could potentially help explain falling crime, although there was little academic consensus on why young people were behaving better than previous generations – some had suggested the internet and social media had changed the way young people socialised and spent their leisure time;

v. **opportunity** – for those with a high propensity to offend, the more opportunities they had, the more crime they were likely to

commit. Designing out these opportunities in homes and various consumer products (such as vehicles and mobile phones) had contributed to the falls in crime;

vi. **profit** – profit motivated many criminals, but through the work of the National Crime Agency, we were increasingly seeing that organised crime groups exploited new commercial opportunities more quickly and systematically than other criminals.

These crime drivers were likely to interact in all sorts of different ways, and to different degrees in different areas. Understanding the drivers at local level would help partners to join-up their approaches to reducing crime and maximise their impact in protecting victims. IOM had a key role to play in understanding how the drivers

played out locally and within the criminal population.

Mike referenced the collective response by government, industry, police and other agencies to both metal theft and mobile phone theft as good examples where a detailed analysis of drivers had underpinned effective efforts to tackle emerging crime problems.

Mike concluded by saying that at both the national and local level, IOM could help identify and respond to current and emerging crime threats. In particular, intelligence and insight from the frontline was vital to help inform that response.

Session 4: “Future crime challenges”

Three presentations, from:

- i. **Serious and organised crime: Sara Skodbo**, Head of Prevent, Strategic Centre for Organised Crime, Home Office;
- ii. **Drugs: Chloë Dunnett**, Head of Drugs, Drugs and Alcohol Unit, Home Office and **Kieran Lynch**, Criminal Justice Programme Manager, Public Health England;
- iii. **Mental health and policing: Chris Witt**, Health and Policing Team, Public Protection Unit, Home Office

i. Sara Skodbo, Strategic Centre for Organised Crime, Home Office



Sara Skodbo provided the conference with an overview of the Serious and Organised Crime Strategy.

She explained that serious and organised crime is a risk to our national security. The scale is significant, with over 37,000 crime group members, costing the UK more than £24 billion a year.

Serious and organised crime includes drug trafficking, human trafficking and organised illegal immigration, high value fraud and other financial crimes, organised acquisitive crime and child sexual exploitation. As with the counter terrorism response, the Serious and Organised Crime Strategy is based on the four 'P' approach:

- **pursue** – prosecuting and disrupting people engaged in serious and organised criminality. Good intelligence sharing is vital to this strand of the strategy;

- **prevent** – preventing and deterring people from engaging in serious and organised crime;
- **protect** – increasing the protection against serious and organised crime by protecting our borders, the national and local government;
- **prepare** – reducing the impact of serious and organised crime.

Activities contributing to the Prevent strand recognised that there were many different pathways into serious and organised crime through various vulnerabilities, such as gangs, solicitors, family members, children and partners. A number of pilots are underway, some with explicit links to local IOM arrangements, utilising different approaches to this theme of the strategy. The intention is to develop a catalogue of effective or promising Prevent approaches.

There are challenges presented by the serious and organised offender group. The lifetime management approach recognised the different offending profile of this group when compared to IOM. Sara noted that there are around 7,000 organised crime group members in prison, and that these may not be visible to existing multi-agency arrangements such as Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements or IOM.

Over the longer term the challenges are to identify organised crime group members, put in place intelligence systems and ensure effective information sharing, make best use of existing criminal and civil powers, and ensure an appropriate fit in with existing offender management structures including IOM.

Sara concluded by stressing the importance of IOM as part of the local response. She emphasised the real opportunities for closer working between IOM and the Strategic Centre for Organised Crime through the pilots and projects underway, their frontline team, through identifying and disseminating good practice and the work to establish a network of champions.

ii. Chloë Dunnett, Drugs and Alcohol Unit, Home Office and Kieran Lynch, Public Health England



Chloë Dunnett said that despite the long term downward trend in drug use, heroin and crack cocaine users were still responsible for around 45% of acquisitive crime. The number of users in England had fallen to 294,000 and better access to treatment had played a key part in this. However, the cohort was changing: users were aging, had multiple needs, were harder to reach and engage in treatment and wider recovery and there had been a concerning increase in opioid drug related deaths in the last year.

Chloë also spoke about the emergence of new synthetic opioids which were potentially as addictive, toxic and damaging. The United States (US) had reported significant rises in heroin use since 2007 though the US context including the scale and nature of prescription opioid abuse was very different to the United Kingdom (UK). Activity to tackle the current threat posed by heroin/crack included:

- tracking and control of synthetic opioids;
- review by the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs on the diversion and illicit supply of prescription medicines and on older users of heroin and crack;
- heroin assisted treatment pilot;
- roll out of liaison and diversion;
- local drug intervention programmes;
- Integrated Offender Management;

- tackling known supply routes;
- engagement with key partners such as Police and Crime Commissioners;
- re-establishing voluntary central drug testing on arrest data collection to identify new trends and patterns;
- developing early warning indicators;
- supporting local areas with particularly high rates of drug related crime to target problematic drug users.

Chloë encouraged areas to think about how IOM could support this work.

New psychoactive substances (NPS) presented a new challenge. They were produced largely in China and India and sold in head shops and through the internet. Use was generally low compared to more traditional illicit drugs and the links to crime and organised crime was not yet well established. However, they could cause a range of harms including paranoia, psychosis and were responsible for a number of drug related deaths.

New generic controls had been introduced and alongside controls on individual NPS had been used to control over 500 substances. Temporary Drugs Control Orders had been introduced to allow the supply of certain new NPS to be controlled for up to 12 months whilst the harms were investigated further. There was also a range of other legislation that could be used including new powers under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. For example, Lincoln Council had just banned the consumption of new psychoactive substances from the city centre.

Chloë concluded by talking about further action to tackle new psychoactive substances. An expert panel review had been set up and the government had published its response in October setting out how it would take forward the vast majority of the recommendations. Proposals were being developed for a general ban on supply across the UK. Work was underway to improve the prevention and education response. World leading drug treatment

guidance was being developed. The UK was also leading international action and, through the G7 and United Nations, was seeking to introduce the first international control of an NPS: mephedrone.

Kieran Lynch spoke about the impact of drug and alcohol treatment on crime.



Drug treatment benefited communities, he said. There was hard evidence that drug treatment was one of the most cost effective ways to reduce drug related crime, with £2.50 saved for every £1 invested. The National Drug Treatment Monitoring System allowed areas to identify impact locally.

In terms of alcohol, misuse was said to cost the NHS around £3.5 billion a year. Public Health England (PHE) were testing out treatments, including brief interventions in custody. There were questions around community run brief interventions about who delivered the intervention.

There had also been significant changes to the health and justice care pathway, for example with NHS England, Clinical Commissioning Groups and local authorities. If NHS England, PHE, criminal justice agencies and local authorities did not work together then there would be a gap in provision of drug and alcohol services which would lead to a rise in crime.

Kieran concluded by saying that drug and alcohol treatment worked and helped to address very difficult and entrenched offending behaviours. There were various information and data sources available to support local areas and IOM arrangements. He specifically mentioned the drug and alcohol data packs that were available on a

police force area basis. Where areas were struggling to find a local contact in NHS England or PHE, Kieran offered to help.

iii. Chris Witt, Health and Policing Team, Public Protection Unit

Setting out some of the key facts around mental health, **Chris Witt** said that one in four British adults experience mental health problems in a given year; and within the prison population the proportion rose to at least 50%. There are also strong links between mental health issues and drug and alcohol misuse.

Chris explained that the government was working closely with the police, who were often the first responders to people in mental health crises; for example in the Metropolitan Police, 20% of police time was in response to people with mental health problems. These were often not people committing offences.



Action being taken was focused on early identification of vulnerability, early access to medical support from health professionals, positive information sharing, treatment in custody (safe management, appropriate adults) and better record keeping.

Chris talked about the development of Liaison and Diversion schemes to improve identification, assessment and referral in custody suites. The schemes were expanding rapidly and 50% of all custody suites in England would be covered by April 2015, with comprehensive coverage by 2017. 68% of people being seen by the schemes had either mental health, learning disability or substance misuse problems.

In relation to non-offenders, the National Crisis Care Concordat – published in early 2014 – sets the expected standard of response and over 20 national bodies had signed up to its principles.

The College of Policing was revising guidance for officers around mental health and learning disabilities. Some forces were also developing their own training packages and there had been a review of police powers under sections 135 and 136 of the Mental Health Act 1983 (published in December 2014).

Street triage was being used in around 30 police force areas. This brings the police and health professionals together to improve the response to vulnerable people. It was helping to improve health outcomes, save lives and the use of resources. Some forces were targeting known suicide spots in their areas, for example, Beachy Head in Sussex.

New data would be collected from April 2015 on a national basis to enable further analysis and ensure that the right actions were being taken to support people.

Chris concluded by saying that the work had clear links to IOM, particularly in relation to the need for prevention for people with multiple risks. He posed key questions around capacity and the availability of the right support services to meet these needs. There would be continued challenges around what more government could do to tackle these issues.

Session 5: “Challenges with offender groups”

Three presentations, from:

- i. **Local and cross border response to the violent and vulnerable. Tackling and identifying gangs: Paul Cullen**, Tackling Crime Unit, Home Office;
- ii. **Foreign National Offenders: Kerstin Thompson**, Deputy Director, Immigration Enforcement, Home Office
- iii. **Women Offenders: Inspector Mary Alston**, Metropolitan Police Service

i. Paul Cullen, Tackling Crime Unit, Home Office



Paul Cullen presented the learning from the Ending Gang and Youth Violence (EGYV) programme. The programme was set up following the disturbances in August 2011 to address youth and gang violence.

The programme started with 33 priority areas in England with high levels of gang activity. A frontline team had been established to provide peer support to the areas. The focus ranged from intensive support, improving early intervention and prevention, providing routes out of violent lifestyles, seeing violence as a public health issue, protecting gang associated women and girls, strengthening the criminal justice response, practical improvements in information sharing and understanding the links with organised crime and radicalisation.

The programme also highlighted a number of challenges faced by local areas:

- understanding the local problem and how to work together to tackle it;

- working with health and mental health partners, specifically around accessing A&E data;
- engaging communities and seeing them as part of the solution; and
- understanding the links to local drugs markets and the movement of gangs across areas.

The success of the programme has seen it expand to 43 areas.

Paul also spoke about ‘county lines’. This was where gangs moved out of their area to deal class A drugs, crossing one or more police force boundaries, often moving from urban to more rural areas. The gang would target areas where there were large groups of class A drug users and use violence to take over the local drug markets. The approach often involved exploitation of vulnerable females and/or using children (known as ‘youngers’). Gangs targeted missing looked after children as they were easy to groom as well as single females and single mothers.

The issue of safeguarding was a significant one. To support local areas the programme had produced two toolkits and the frontline team were also working with practitioners to examine the issue.

Paul concluded by saying that the work had clear links to IOM and cited examples of Sandwell and Enfield where they had integrated gangs’ teams working with their local IOM arrangements. Going forward the challenge was to integrate services more.

The definition of street gangs was also problematic as the county lines work had shown them to be more organised and committing serious group offending. Areas needed to consider how to pull their gangs work together more with IOM to mutual benefit.

ii. Kerstin Thompson, Deputy Director, Immigration Enforcement, Home Office



Kerstin Thompson talked about Operation Nexus, which saw police and immigration working together to target high harm foreign national offenders. She said that between 13% - 24% of organised criminals were foreign national offenders; in London, 30% of people arrested were recorded as foreign nationals; and around 10,500 offenders in prison were foreign nationals.

The scale and nature of the threat posed by foreign national offenders required a unified, strategic response. There were three key workstreams:

i. **custody** – includes the deployment of immigration officers in police custody suites and improved intelligence and information sharing, including with other European law enforcement agencies such as Europol and Interpol;

ii. **high harm** – proactive targeting of high harm foreign nationals of interest to the police. This included individuals with violent, sexual or prolific offending histories who may be in the UK either legally or illegally. Through collaboration and proactive working there had been 259 high harm removals since Nexus started in London in October 2012;

iii. **disruption & deterrence** – improved forensic matching of crime scene prints and systematic checking of biometrics across police and immigration databases.

Nexus had resulted in many more foreign national offenders being identified in custody suites on arrest and around 3,100 removals.

As with IOM, the success of Nexus to date was achieved through collaborative and integrated working, allowing informed decisions to be taken on what interventions should be used to protect communities.

The model was now being rolled out across the United Kingdom. It had been introduced in the West Midlands, Manchester, Scotland, Merseyside, Cheshire, Kent, Cleveland, West Yorkshire and North Wales. Further roll out was planned in Avon and Somerset, Lancashire, Northumberland and Sussex.

The model was being formally evaluated to explore the impact of Nexus in preventing harm, protecting the public and enhancing enforcement capabilities.

Kerstin concluded her presentation by stressing the importance of having Nexus aligned with local IOM arrangements and that areas needed to use immigration as part of the range of tools available to deal with foreign national offenders.

iii. Inspector Mary Alston, Metropolitan Police



Mary Alston's address focused on the importance of responding to the needs of women offenders. She said that there was a growing body of evidence to show that

women offenders' needs were different to those of male offenders, and that available interventions tended to be male orientated. The main differences included:

- i. **motivation** – a key driver; for example, women were more likely to offend in response to poverty, stealing food or nappies;
- ii. **carer responsibilities** – women tend to be the primary carer: This has an effect on children in particularly intergenerational offending; a survey showed that 31% women in custody were in care as a child, compared to 24% of men. Women sentenced to custody increased the likelihood of their children being taken into care;
- iii. **coercion** – for example, 48% of women found guilty of drug offences were carrying drugs to support their partner's drug use. There was also evidence that women forced into other crimes such as sexual exploitation, may go on to offend and commit other offences as a cry for help or to get some sort of justice;
- iv. **type of offence** – women typically committed low level offences; theft, handling and shoplifting. For non-violent offences 81% of women received a custodial sentence compared to 71% of men. Women imprisoned for first time offences were also higher than for men;
- v. **victim history** – the correlation between women offenders also being victims was high: 53% of women reported violent or sexual abuse as a child, continuing into adulthood; for men this is about 27% and often ceases upon reaching adulthood. The link with women being a victim of domestic abuse is also higher;
- vi. **mental health** – there are high rates of self harm amongst women in prison, with high incidence of self inflicted deaths amongst women prisoners; 94 between 1990 - 2012. Women made up 28% of all self inflicted harm in prison, yet make up only 5% of the total prison population.

The Tri-Borough Triage pilot running in Kensington & Chelsea, Hammersmith & Fulham and Westminster started in December 2014 and aimed to empower women to put a stop to their offending. The pilot covers a population of about 575,000 and involves training 2,000 officers.

Women who live in the area are eligible and referred if given a community resolution, caution or charge. Women can also 'self-refer'. Advance Minerva provides a safe, women only space to work with the women. Funding comes from probation services for the IOM, Barrow Cadbury for young women aged 18-25 and the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime for short sentenced prisoners. An holistic, 1-2-1 service is provided, tailored to the women's specific needs including advocacy, empowerment, support, group work on offending behaviour, diversionary activities, and access to specialist support such as counselling, housing advice, debt/benefit advice, legal advice and drug and alcohol services.

Minerva already delivers reductions in reoffending, in their last quarter year report, only 4 of the 46 women on Community Orders had reoffended. In terms of wider outcomes, 53% had reported an improvement in accommodation, and 72% an improvement in mental health.

Mary concluded by saying that triage offered women the ability to access the right services in a safe environment whilst challenging offending behaviour. It provided an alternative to prison with the use of a community disposal and delivered cost savings to the criminal justice system. It reduced reoffending by breaking the revolving door, kept families together and dealt with the root causes of problems rather than just the symptoms.

Day Two – Thursday 26 February 2015

Key note address – Mary Calam, Director General, Crime and Policing Group, Home Office

Mary Calam said that the theme of the conference “meeting the future challenges” was exactly the right focus at this time.



Crime was continuing to fall, with lots of theories about why. The long term reduction in heroin and crack use could account for between a quarter and a third of the fall in acquisitive crime, and other factors - effective police tactics, better local management of the night time economy, and the management of prolific offenders - all played a key part.

Effective collaborative working across agencies was at the heart of IOM. Effective sharing of information and intelligence through IOM was important to understand the crime and reoffending threats facing local communities.

Mary spoke of three particular challenges:

- **financial:** the collaborative approach of IOM, working across both the public and voluntary sectors and delivered without additional resources, was particularly important in the current financial climate. The focus going forward should be on taking demand out of the system by preventing people from becoming drawn into crime in the first place or preventing escalation of offending behaviour.

- **changing nature of crime:** IOM needed to be aware of, and sensitive to, changes in

the nature of crime, whether on-line, tackling domestic violence or contributing to efforts to address child sexual exploitation. Some areas were considering whether to manage these types of offenders under local IOM arrangements. The issue was how best to contribute to the collective local response: tackling child sexual exploitation was a shared effort and IOM could have a role to play in helping to spot the signs that offenders may be involved in such crimes or at risk of becoming involved. There would also be value in looking at whether more could be achieved by bringing the various local multi-agency arrangements closer together.

- **changing partnership landscape:** Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) had brought strong leadership across police force areas, and were investing in innovation and change, driving out waste and inefficient use of resources. PCCs had a strong interest in IOM not just in the contribution that police were making to local arrangements but also in how IOM was helping to deliver their priorities on crime and policing. IOM also presented clear benefits and opportunities to the new probation providers, given the wider partnership approach that IOM brings to crime and reoffending. Mary also mentioned the important role of the voluntary sector within IOM.

Finally, Mary spoke about the opportunities being presented by new technologies, including the use of GPS tracking for IOM offenders on a voluntary basis, and the use of the IDIOM system which supported local delivery through the tracking of offenders, and which also allowed areas to monitor their impact on crime and reoffending.

Mary concluded by thanking everyone involved in IOM for all their work.

Session 6: “Joining up to the neighbourhood”

Presentation by **Marie Snelling**, Director of IOM, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime

i. Marie Snelling – Director of IOM, Programmes and Neighbourhoods, Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)



Marie Snelling spoke about the critical importance of IOM in cutting crime: there had been a 21% reduction in crime in London in the last 7 years, but adult reoffending was up by 1.4%. With the number of first time entrants into the criminal justice system falling, reoffenders were committing a larger share of crime: 77% of adult offenders in London were reoffenders. Analysis showed that they had 12,311 previous convictions or cautions between them. This represented a sizeable number of prolific offenders and why it was important to focus on them.

IOM works and London had robust evidence from a North West London IOM pilot which targeted 418 high risk offenders and resulted in 25% fewer offences by the cohort in the first year.

London recognised that what was required was a whole system approach. To date, IOM had been a community based approach with mixed levels of partnership engagement. There was a need to bring in wider partners including health and HM Courts and Tribunals Service. Analysis showed that the more court appearances an offender had, the slower they moved through the system. The challenge was to ensure swift justice without undermining the independent role of the Judiciary.

Examination of the cost highlighted the fiscal challenge. Analysis of around 2,000 London IOM offenders on IDIOM showed that they were responsible for around 53,000 offences over a 3 year period, at a cost to society of £163 million.

Further analysis of offenders through their OGRS (Offender Group Reconviction Scale) scores identified 3,818 high demand offenders (scores 75+) in London. These were mapped and 92% were managed by the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) and the remaining 8% by the National Probation Service (NPS).

Tackling this cohort was key to reducing crime even further in London, and MOPAC are moving towards a whole system approach through:

- collective action based on **risk and demand**: strengthening arrangements, ensuring neighbourhood policing teams focus on the offender, use of technology such as GPS tagging, enhanced prosecution strategies, driving court hearings, strengthening the quality of pre-sentence reports, adopting problem solving approaches and strengthening ‘Through the Gate’ services;
- use of **IDIOM**: further enhancements of the system to develop a case management function would enable real time tracking of offenders and allow all agencies to have a single view of the offender;
- **co-commissioning and shared delivery** of pathways out of crime. MOPAC were exploring with health how high risk offenders could ensure priority access to health services; and
- **shared performance framework**: use of adult reoffending dashboards and shared accountability.

Session 7: “Future challenges – prison and beyond”

Two presentations, from:

- i. **A Prison perspective: Gary Monaghan**, Governing Governor, HM Prison Wormwood Scrubs
- ii. **A National Probation Service perspective: Tony Kirk**, Head of Stakeholder Engagement, National Probation Service and **Emma Wools**, National Probation Service – Wales Division

i. Gary Monaghan, Governing Governor, HM Prison Wormwood Scrubs



During his presentation, **Gary Monaghan** spoke to the challenge: what can prisons do to support IOM and make it more effective? He noted that, while there were some examples of good practice, all too often prisons would not know that prisoners in custody were part of an IOM caseload. Establishments did not currently generally have access to IDIOM, which would help the situation.

Gary explained that prisons operated a system of basic and enhanced regimes. This provided the opportunity to prioritise and incentivise IOM offenders to engage with rehabilitation services whilst in custody by giving them access to the full regime if they complied and engaged, provided that the establishment knew who the offenders were. This would also enable the prison to give the community IOM teams access to the establishment, ensure swift engagement from offender supervisors in prison and assist in setting up prison visits.

Gary went on to highlight work underway within London. The size of London presented enormous challenges, but there

was a strong push to get IDIOM firmly established in prisons. The Deputy Director of Custody was establishing a whole region approach for London with high level input into the London Reducing Reoffending Board. The Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime was also pushing IOM in London. London data showed that 30% of IOM offenders were in custody at any given time, and so this presented a huge opportunity to work with them whilst they were in prison.

More strategic join-up was needed and Transforming Rehabilitation presented opportunities to do this through Community Rehabilitation Companies and properly joined-up criminal justice infrastructures

Gary concluded by saying that to fully integrate IOM within prisons required strong leadership. It was the right approach, but the real benefits of doing this had yet to be realised. Areas needed to think about the proportion of their IOM offenders who could be in custody – it could be up to a third – and IOM arrangements were missing an opportunity if they failed to engage prisons fully. Geography remained an issue but Gary emphasised that Community Rehabilitation Companies brought great opportunities to deliver dramatic changes and really transform the rate of reoffending.

ii. Tony Kirk, Head of Stakeholder Engagement, and Emma Wools, IOM Cymru Development Manager, National Probation Service (Wales)

Tony Kirk said that the National Probation Service (NPS) was developing a consistent national approach to IOM. A national IOM

Working Group has been established, which is taking forward work with representatives from each of the seven NPS divisions.



The group has undertaken an audit of the NPS's investment in IOM arrangements across England and Wales which had looked at governance, case management, co-location, profile of IOM offenders and information sharing.

This had showed that the NPS were managing more IOM cases than had initially been anticipated.

The NPS were also working with the National Offender Management Service and a number of partner agencies, including the Ministry of Justice, College of Policing, representatives from Community Rehabilitation Companies, prisons and the Home Office to develop a Probation and Prison Service instruction for managing offenders who are part of local IOM arrangements.

The new instruction presents a unique opportunity to draw together a set of minimum standards for work with IOM offenders which would apply to prisons and probation providers. The draft instruction was being consulted on.

Emma Wools gave an overview on IOM Cymru which had been launched in 2011. It provided a pan-Wales approach to IOM, working across all four police forces and Police and Crime Commissioners.

Governance sat with a pan Wales Strategic Partnership, led by NOMS in Wales and ACPO Cymru and supported by the Welsh Government. The governance structure brings all the key partners together with a

collective focus on the agenda and a clear strategic vision.

IOM Cymru recognised the need to co-ordinate strategic and operational activity of both criminal and social justice partners which included testing new technologies (such as GPS tagging), drug and alcohol services, the children and families agenda through early intervention, high risk of harm and women offenders.



IOM Cymru also provided an opportunity to align existing programmes and initiatives aimed at reducing reoffending. This is driven by the Wales Reducing Reoffending Strategy which had been launched in March 2014. The IOM approach forms an integral part of the strategy which has identified priority offender groups – females, veterans, 16-25s, high risk of harm, high volume crime and serious acquisitive crime. The Strategy also focuses on developing reducing reoffending pathways and the need to engage wider community services to achieve long term sustainable outcomes.

In terms of impact, there had been significant reductions in serious acquisitive crime, a strengthening of the case for further investment and the women offender pathfinder had already started to demonstrate promising results in reducing reoffending.

Emma concluded by setting out the challenges facing IOM Cymru:

- **information sharing**: an ongoing challenge but being addressed through information sharing agreements and protocols;
- involvement of wider **social justice and voluntary services**: this was a priority going forward, working with Clinks and the Welsh Third Sector;
- **evidencing outcomes**: IOM Cymru had set up an integrated research analytics and performance working group. They were also using IDIOM to provide areas with real time performance information. The continued development of the system was vital; and
- maintaining and developing **consistent approaches** to IOM delivery: this was extremely complex and difficult but IOM Cymru were addressing this through their IOM Delivery Manual and Strategic Framework.

Workshop sessions

Conference delegates had the opportunity to participate in different workshops exploring different aspects of IOM practice, innovation or wider areas linked to the delivery of IOM. The workshops were:

Workshop 1: Refreshed IOM Key Principles – what’s changed

Facilitator: Bernard Lane, Home Office

Brief overview: This workshop provided the opportunity to explore how the refreshed IOM Key Principles can help local areas to adapt their IOM arrangements to the reformed delivery landscape (for example, with the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners and the creation of the National Probation Service and 21 Community Rehabilitation Companies), maintain the impact that IOM is having on crime and reoffending and go further by developing IOM in new directions.

Workshop 2: Demonstrating the local area process for understanding violence and vulnerability through effective information collection and sharing (referred to on the programme as the “County lines and gangs” workshop)

Facilitator: Mick McNally, Home Office

Brief overview: This workshop focused on cross border crime and explained the use of data tracking and bespoke intelligence requirements to identify vulnerable areas and people. It explored how vulnerable and violent people are identified at a local level using known data sources and qualitative interviewing with key stakeholders.

Workshop 3: Addressing the needs of women offenders – Avert Project

Facilitators: Sarah Swindley, Chief Executive Officer of Lancashire Women’s Centres and Johanne Key, Lancashire Constabulary

Brief overview: ‘AVERT’ is a partnership project developed by Lancashire Constabulary and Lancashire Women’s Centres. It aims to divert women from the criminal justice system at the earliest opportunity into services that reduce the risk of reoffending by addressing underlying needs. The project pilot has been independently evaluated and this workshop will share the findings and learning from that evaluation. The workshop allowed delegates to explore the project development process, next steps and consider the opportunities about how this might be replicated in other force areas.

Workshop 4: Expanding the cohort – the IRiS Project

Facilitators: Roger Doxsey and Andrew Newman, IRiS Team, Bristol

Brief overview: IRiS is a team of professionals who manage people that pose the highest risk of serious harm to the public. They work together to make positive changes for offenders and robustly enforce any risk related behaviours and non-compliance. The workshop showed the benefits of the successful pilot project and highlighted areas of learning and development.

Workshop 5: Satellite tracking

Facilitators: **Steve Norman** and **Sabir Mechbal**, West Yorkshire Police

Brief overview: This workshop aimed to demonstrate the way in which West Yorkshire are using satellite tracking to assist and manage offenders within their IOM cohort and explore the ways in which the technology can be used to further enhance offender management.

Workshop 6: IDIOM

Facilitators: **Kosar Shah**, Home Office Technology and **Neil Pitman**, College of Policing

Brief overview: The workshop demonstrated how the IDIOM national IT system uses Police National Computer data to produce performance reports for areas to evidence the success of local IOM arrangements and approaches. IDIOM uses the Home Office cost of crime figures and the Ministry of Justice proven reoffending definitions and metrics to deliver a standardised approach for performance reporting. The workshop also set out the future developments, vision and ambition for the system.

Workshop 7: Impact of parental offending and imprisonment on children and young people

Facilitators: **Toby Stewart**, Barnardo's

Brief overview: The workshop focused on the impact of parental offending and imprisonment on children and young people, including on health, education, social and economic outcomes and intergenerational offending. The workshop also explored the specific impact that criminal justice agency involvement has on children's outcomes and welfare from arrest, sentencing through to pre-release and return to the community. The workshop also highlighted the benefits of multi-agency working and the important role that families play in encouraging desistance and reducing reoffending.

Workshop 8: New guidance on the end to end management of IOM offenders in custody and the community under Transforming Rehabilitation and Through the Gate

Facilitators: **Fiona Bauermeister**, London Community Rehabilitation Company, **Emma Wools**, Wales National Probation Service and **Stanley Jacobs**, National Offender Management Service

Brief overview: Transforming Rehabilitation introduces significant changes to the management of offenders in custody and the community. The National Offender Management Service is currently developing policy guidance to support prisons, National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Companies in managing offenders identified as falling within IOM cohorts. This workshop formed part of the consultation with key stakeholders and will be used to help inform a new Probation and Prison Service Instruction and guidance on best practice. The workshop also discussed the implications of working with the police and other agencies in managing IOM offenders in custody and the community within the new environment.

Workshop 9: Domestic Violence Persistent Perpetrator Panel (DVPPP)

Facilitators: Simon Vallance, IOM Focus Manager, London Borough of Islington

Brief overview: This panel was set up specifically to tackle the increase in domestic violence within Islington and to use the current IOM structures to manage those offenders. It is now one of 5 specific programmes/panels under the IOM banner managing offenders in Islington. These are the FOCUS programme (acquisitive offenders and the biggest programme), 18-24s Gangs and Serious Youth Violence, DVPPP, Alcohol IOM and the complex needs women's programme. The workshop explained the rationale behind setting up the panel, the practicalities of the panel in a zero resource environment, how this fitted within existing IOM structures, the use of enhanced enforcement to manage the perpetrators and the successes and failures.