

Plymouth Community Safety Partnership briefing paper September 2014

Priority – Reducing Offending/Reoffending

Reducing reoffending is fundamental to reducing crime and as of April 2010 this became a statutory responsibility of community safety partnerships.

There is a wealth of research that shows that adults and young people that offend are amongst the most socially excluded in society and the majority often have complex and deep-rooted health and social problems, such as substance misuse, mental health, homelessness, debt and financial problems.

Tackling these issues in a holistic and co-ordinated way is important to provide “pathways out of offending” and to break the inter-generational cycle of offending and associated family breakdown.

- **What is in place to help Safer Plymouth Partnerships deliver against the Reducing offending/reoffending priority**

I am uncertain whether this is a single overarching strategy in place to reduce reoffending in Plymouth or even at a Peninsula level and whether there is a Reducing reoffending sub group of the CSP. Any current strategy would need to take into account the uncertainty around service delivery prompted by the implementation of the Transforming Rehabilitation agenda and the introduction of the New Dorset, Devon and Cornwall Community Rehabilitation Company.

In addition to the wider Plymouth Partnership plan, there will be a number of strategies contributing to this agenda including strategies from adult drug and alcohol treatment agencies, Youth justice plan and Troubled families agenda. Integrated Offender Management (IOM) as a single framework for the management of repeat offenders contributes greatly to the achievement of this priority. Within Plymouth, IOM is delivered within a peninsula-wide framework under the name Turnaround, with local governance and accountability for Plymouth sitting with Safer Plymouth.

- **What is in place to help Safer Plymouth Partnerships deliver against the reducing reoffending performance measures.**

I am aware that given the many factors that contribute to an increased risk in an individual committing an offence, there are equally as many agencies working with individuals to address pathways in both direct and non direct means of intervention. I have therefore sought to capture some of the key agencies that contribute to performance measures.

IOM – I am aware that there is a National “refresh” of IOM. For the meantime, there remains a committed multi-agency team managing a cohort of prolific and other priority offenders. Performance data is collated and should inform the CSP data set.

CRC/NPS – Since the 1st June as part of the governments TR programme, the probation service has split into the National probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Company. The CRC is preparing for share sale which will also bring with it through the gate services, utilising tier 3 providers within the voluntary sector to provide rehabilitation services to those offenders who are in their last 3 months of custody. The new Rehabilitation Bill will also address the under 12 month sentencing introducing a period of supervision to all those sentenced to 1 or more days in custody. This will provide vital support for short term prisoners in an effort to drive down reoffending rates amongst this offender profile.

The national probation Service holds those offenders who pose the greatest serious harm to our communities, but not necessarily the prolific nature of repeat offending. The NPS still hold MAPPA cases as part of the Turnaround scheme and is committed to joint working within an IOM multi agency forum.

With regard to data performance, there has been difficulties in getting accurate and up to date data as part of the transition. This is being addressed at both local and national levels although I am not clear when this segmented data reflecting the two separate organisations will be available.

Families with a Future – Recent changes to the FWaF cohort has introduced greater links to those families in which adults sentenced to custody or probation supervision parental responsibilities. There is work currently being undertaken to cross reference the FWaF cohort with that of the NPS and CRC to identify those who meet the eligibility criteria. I am not sure of what performance data is contributed by FWaF

Youth Offending Service – The YOS have an established multi-agency approach to addressing offending and reoffending and provide performance data to the CSP.

Restorative Justice – I am aware that there is a range of organisations currently providing RJ services including the Police. As this is an emerging agenda from the PCC I anticipate that the newly formed RJ forums will provide performance data that will inform and assure CSP board members of RJ's effectiveness as an intervention supporting victims and addressing reoffending rates.

I am aware that I have not fully captured what is in place to assist Plymouth CSP deliver against the reoffending priority and propose that a gap analysis is undertaking through the reducing reoffending sub group.

- **What are the gaps in terms of activities, information, resources and/or interventions that may hinder Safer Plymouth Partnership deliver against the reducing reoffending priority and/or performance measure.**

Potential focus for the forthcoming year would be to develop a local reducing reoffending strategy to be clear how we are going to do more and better for less in times of austerity. This requires the highest quality data to inform local assessment and evaluation of performance. Local monitoring and information sharing about performance and outcomes which would inform the reducing reoffending strategy underpinning a reducing reoffending sub group to the CSP at which agencies would be held to account against the priority objectives.

Gap Analysis – via the RR sub group, a gap analysis would map any training needs deficits which may act as barriers to the effective identification, referral and engagement into specialist services. Gaps in provision would also need to be identified for offenders which would inform any commissioning arrangements.

Mapping of performance measures - ensuring that they are SMART and demonstrate clear outcomes in relation to reducing reoffending. Propose that the RR sub group is the forum to monitor this performance data which feeds into the Plymouth CSP. The sub group can undertake an analysis of missing data and assess the impact on how this missing or historic data impacts upon the ability to implement a proactive response to reoffending spikes.

The above briefing serves as a single agency perspective on the key points raised and is not representative of all CSP agencies. It is hoped that it begins to capture some issues relating to the current climate in relation to the TR agenda and highlights gaps in my understanding of the full range of agencies contributing to this key priority.

Georgia Webb
National probation Service
Head of Plymouth, Cornwall & IoS