

**CABINET RESPONSE TO : MEMBER LED REVIEW – INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT (IOM)**

*To:* **Cabinet**

*Date:* **8 February**

*From:* **Mike Davey,  
Director, Community Engagement**

*Electoral division(s):* **All**

*Forward Plan ref:* **Not applicable**                      *Key decision:* **No**

*Purpose:* **To consider the Member led review on IOM**

*Recommendation:*

- i) To thank Scrutiny for producing a valuable and detailed report.**
- ii) To approve the proposed response to the Member Led Review on Integrated Offender Management (IOM)**

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>	<b><i>Member contact:</i></b>
Name: Mike Davey	Name: Councillor Sir Peter Brown
Post: Service Director, Community Engagement	Portfolio: Cabinet Member for Communities
Email: <a href="mailto:Mike.Davey@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Mike.Davey@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email: <a href="mailto:Peter.Brown@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Peter.Brown@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel: 01354 622 502	Tel: 01223 699173

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Member-led Review by Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Committee into Integrated Offender Management has produced a report which contained over thirty recommendations for consideration by Cabinet.
- 1.2 Cabinet would like to thank Scrutiny for producing the report and seeking the views of officers and members during the study.
- 1.3 The report is comprehensive and detailed, and is welcomed by Cabinet and officers.

## 2. RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The proposed Cabinet responses to the recommendations of the Member Led Review are set out below. Dates for the commencement and completion of activities are shown. As there are a substantial number of acronyms the glossary has been added here for Members information.

### Glossary

CAB	Citizen Advice Bureau
CCC	Cambridgeshire County Council
CSP	Community Safety Partnership
DIP	Drug Intervention Programme
IOM	Integrated Offender Management
JCP	Jobcentre Plus
MAPPA	Multi-agency public protection arrangements
PPO	Prolific and other priority offender (scheme)

- 2.2 Recommendations and responses:

**1.i – The cohort for IOM should be wider than the current cohort for PPO.**

**1.ii – Specifically, it should include the more prolific of those offenders currently receiving no interventions because they served less than 12 months, and those who need lower-intensity interventions following intensive, ‘PPO-style’ work.**

**Response:** agree. The new IOM delivery structure is currently identifying the cohort which will extend beyond PPO to include offenders who have served less than a 12 month sentence. However, it is essential that those selected are managed effectively, so not all those leaving prison before 12 months would be “in scope”.

**2.i – Agencies should consider IOM, including non-statutory clients, as part of their core business.**

**Response:** agree. The IOM Project Manager is currently leading work streams which include identifying and supporting additional partners to participate in IOM

**2.ii – Agencies should ensure this perception cascades throughout their organisations.**

**Response:** agree. As IOM develops, it is anticipated that this will become more “widespread” as many “IOM” clients will be accessing a range of services and it is important that these services work together to meet the needs of the client, rather than in separate silos. All partners under the new structure will be asked to commit to delivery with an agreement of roles and responsibilities and expectations of organisations’ participation

**2.iii – The review group welcomes Probation’s commitment to taking on the cohorts of offenders outlined in Recommendation 1.**

**2.iv – Probation and other agencies should ensure that resources are aligned to give due priority to these cohorts. They should ensure that this attitude is embedded within their working practices. This should include altering performance management arrangements as necessary to make certain that staff are held to account for their work with non-statutory offenders as they are with statutory offenders.**

These ought not to be controversial in Cambridgeshire, given the comments from the various agencies involved.

**Response:** agree. A performance management framework is currently being developed, led by CCC Research Group, all partners will commit to participate in this. However, it will be important to maintain current performance management at the same time to ensure any differences are noted.

**3.i – New IOM clients should not be treated as new cohort of ‘IOMs’ alongside cohorts of ‘PPOs’, ‘DIPs’ and ‘MAPPAs’. Rather, once MAPPAs and DIPs have been separated out, IOM should treat all its remaining clients (that is, those formerly classed as ‘PPOs’, plus those new clients IOM expands its cohort to include) as one continuous cohort. There should be a sliding scale of interventions available, to be individually tailored to an offender’s needs.**

**Response:** agree. The IOM Project Manager is currently leading a work stream to determine the IOM cohorts and the interventions and processes to be used.

**Recommendation 3.ii – Cambridgeshire’s IOM should use a single governance structure. This structure, however, should be flexible enough to allow districts to pursue local priorities within IOM.**

**Response:** Partially agree, due to differences in delivery between Peterborough and the rest of Cambridgeshire. It will be necessary to continue to have subsections of “IOM clients”, in order to fully understand the cohort. However this needs to be as transparent as possible.

The new delivery model includes a governance structure (see attached). This includes one strategic lead/ group across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. However, given current funding arrangements, this will need to report to the relevant Executive Boards to ensure continuation of funding streams.

***Recommendation 3.iii – It is neither likely to be appropriate that a fixed, equivalent number of IOM clients are found in each district, regardless of the severity of that district’s problems, nor that exactly the same thresholds for selection are used in each district, even if that leaves some almost entirely unserved by IOM. The review group recommends that a balance be struck between allocating IOM resources to the most prolific offenders in the county and ensuring all districts are served.***

**Response:** agree with this recommendation and that flexibility will be key in the delivery of IOM across Cambridgeshire. The CSPs are part of the strategic and working groups which will inform how and what is delivered and will provide local knowledge, expectations and expertise on this.

***4 – Agencies, including but not limited to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) should recognise the potential benefits of an IOM approach.***

**Response:** agree. All 5 Cambridgeshire CSPs have demonstrated commitment to IOM and have also identified reducing reoffending as a priority to deliver upon in 2011/12

***5 – IOM should feature regular case management meetings to discuss offenders. These should bring together the agencies involved in providing services for those offenders. Meetings should be organised, as far as possible, to ensure agencies can attend those cases relevant to them without spending unnecessary time in discussions about other cases.***

**Response:** agree. Currently with both DIP and PPO there are regular multi-agency case management meetings and this will continue with IOM.

***6 – The governance structure described in Recommendation 3.ii should act as a forum for strategic discussion of offender management services and interaction between agencies. It should be publicised to relevant agencies.***

**Response:** agree. It is anticipated that this will be the case once agreement on governance structure has been agreed.

***7 – The review group commends the current creation of a directory of interventions as a priority. The group looks forward to its publication, and urges all agencies to proactively cooperate to ensure they are included.***

**Response:** agree and noted that there is a risk of this becoming out of date as soon as produced. Therefore a web linked directory may be appropriate.

***8.i – Recognising the importance of the joint working of statutory bodies too, the review group recommends that the involvement of non-statutory and third sector organisations should be seen as a priority.***

**Response:** agree. The working group is currently developing a structure of extended partners to be involved including voluntary, private and community sector.

**8.ii – The review group notes that, in the course of this review, it has come across many third sector organisations with great energy and drive, and with a well-evidenced approach. The group anticipates that, with a small amount of effort and accommodation on the part of offender management services, more bodies like this can be found to valuably complement the options currently available.**

**Response:** Partially agree, dependant on resources in voluntary and community sector.

**9 – The review group believes that there are very considerable benefits to be gained by the co-location of services, including, but not limited to, police, probation, mental health and drugs services. Partnership without co-location will not bring the same benefits.**

**Response:** Partially agree that co-location is vital, and there are current DIP/PPO premises that could be used for much of this. However, Probation does not appear to be keen to co-locate staff. The new delivery structure includes co location and also a hub and spokes model of delivery out into local areas

**10.i – Prisoners should be able to begin the process for claiming Job Seekers' Allowance while they are in prison, so that the first benefit payment arrives at the end of the first week after release.**

**Response:** agree. JCP are being invited to be part of the strategic groups and can work on any way to make changes to this which are possible at delivery level. However, Cambridgeshire IOM scheme is not in a position to be able to change national practice.

**10.ii - Prisoners should similarly be able to apply for Employment Support Allowance in advance of their release. They should be able to get medical problems certified by the prison doctor rather than waiting for release. The Home Office and Ministry of Justice are working closely with Department of work and pensions to improve release support.**

**11.i – The Prison Service should be centrally involved in IOM**

**Response:** agree. Peterborough Prison will be key for the delivery of IOM and are part of the IOM Strategic Group. The IOM project manager is in contact with other local prisons (Littlehey and Whitemoor) to gain commitment and participation in developing the new model. Although it should be noted that prisoners do not come directly from Whitemoor to the community. In addition, the IOM project manager is looking at the possibility of funding of a benefits advisor via Citizens Advice Bureau to enable more efficient benefits advice for those on the scheme.

**11.ii – IOM should be an opportunity for all agencies, including prisons to receive feedback on their clients and interventions from other agencies.**

**Response:** agree. The IOM Project Manager is currently working to encourage more participation from local prisons into the IOM process

**11.iii – Prisons should routinely calculate expected dates of release as early as**

***possible, and communicate them to prisoners' needs assessment meetings. Subsequent changes to this date should be avoided, and, in any event, should be communicated to IOM.***

**Response:** agree. As 11.ii

***11.iv – Unexpected release on a Friday should only take place where it is genuinely unavoidable.***

**Response:** Partially agree, although there are issues with the Human Rights Act regarding keeping people in Prison for any longer than their sentence, resulting in their subsequent release on Fridays. The IOM Project Manager is working closely with prison services locally and service providers to identify solutions for this.

***12 – Link workers are a valuable tool for all agencies because they give a named individual responsibility for keeping up links with a particular sector. The review group recognises that some bodies which provide services to offenders will not be part of every IOM meeting.***

***Where this is the case, the group recommends IOM itself give a named IOM worker particular responsibility for liaising with that organisation/group of organisations. For example, if not all education providers attend IOM meetings regularly, there should be an IOM worker with particular responsibility for liaising with education providers.***

**Response:** agree. All partners committing to IOM will be asked to carry out responsibilities including ensuring all of their organisation are aware and can participate fully.

***13 – The review group does not presume to determine who should be the case managers in IOM. Rather, it suggests that this should be discussed directly and openly between all interested bodies.***

**Response:** agree

***14 – All agencies involved in IOM, while continuing to focus on engagement with other organisations, should remember the importance of engaging internally and getting staff not specifically assigned to IOM on board with its work.***

**Response:** agree and will be addressed through the IOM Communication Strategy being developed by the IOM Co-ordinator

***15 – All budget-holding agencies should produce clear frameworks for deciding what services are provided to whom and in what quantity. Such frameworks should be evidence-based and robustly linked to outcomes.***

**Response:** agree

***16.i – Agencies providing interventions should regularly and routinely evaluate their programmes, including their value for money. Agencies***

***funding interventions should expect this level of evidence-based evaluation and provide advice necessary to achieve it.***

**Response:** Partially agree as many small providers do not have the capacity to do this, especially for low cost interventions. There is currently work ongoing with the IOM Project Manager and CCC Research team on how best all work can be evaluated without causing additional workload on the smaller providers.

***16.ii – While some existing projects might struggle to fulfill R16.i in the short term, it should be considered a medium-term priority, and all new projects should provide the evaluations R16.i describes.***

Evaluation will be carried out to demonstrate value for money and clear outcomes.

***17.i – The review group commends the evidence-based approach of organisations like the One Service and the Dawn Project.***

Noted

***17.ii – The review group notes that the Dawn Project's Ministry of Justice (Home Office) funding is set to run out in March 2011; it recommends that commissioners do not allow the county to go without good provision for female offenders.***

**Response:** agree. The CCC Research group have carried out evaluation on a number of projects funded by CSPs to assess their impact on reducing reoffending. They are also involved in developing the performance framework.

***18 – De-selection criteria should be a priority interest in the creation of the IOM scheme. They should emphasise passing on resource when it could be better used elsewhere, even where practitioners are not certain that the offender currently receiving that resource would no longer benefit from it at all.***

**Response:** agree. IOM has to make the most of resources and use them to the greatest benefit. Once an individual has stopped committing crime, or is at lower risk, where possible they should be transferred to relevant agencies in the community, in order that the IOM case managers can focus on those posing the greatest risk.

***19 – There should be a sliding scale of strengths of intervention available through IOM, based on the likely benefit gained from resources. This is likely to generally correlate with lighter interventions targeted towards less prolific/less serious offenders. The appropriate level of intervention should be regularly re-appraised, and should be expected to change over the course of an offender's time on the scheme.***

**Response:** agree. As part of developing the new delivery model this will be addressed.

***20 – The Review Group requests that the County Council writes to the Secretary of State asking for a review of the Broad Market Rental Area limit as it affects higher market rent areas such as Cambridge.***

**Response:** agree. This can be carried out as and when directed by portfolio holder

**21 – The review group does not presume to determine what the ‘right’ sort of housing provision is. It should be ensured, however, that the type of housing intervention used is appropriate to the client in question, and that housing projects are regularly evaluated, including value-for-money assessments which take into account their success rates (coupled, of course, with a recognition that different projects deal with different client groups).**

**Response:** agree. Currently the PPO scheme has a housing support officer funded by Supporting People, and the DIP is funding a housing support officer for those offenders using Class A Drugs. Supporting People are currently engaging to see how offenders’ housing needs can be supported through dedicated link workers for IOM clients.

**22.i – Specialised housing provision should be available for those offenders facing the most problems, including mental health problems.**

**Response:** agree. A mental health rep is now part of the strategic group and is providing guidance on how best to meet the needs of clients who suffer with mental health issues. However, any involvement is likely to be subject to additional funding from NHS Cambridgeshire.

**22.ii – There should, in general, be greater housing availability.**

**Response:** agree that appropriate accommodation for ex offenders does not meet need.

**23 – Districts should form agreements with other districts elsewhere in the country, whereby a number of offenders who wish to leave their current area are ‘swapped’ each year and management responsibilities handed over, to help offenders make a fresh start in a new environment.**

**Response;** Partially agree. Information sharing agreements are being developed for providers and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) lead for IOM is working with all Police forces and Local Authorities in the country to share good practice from the pathfinder IOM pilots and to establish better ways of working. To work effectively would mean all Local Authorities in the country would need to sign up, however there is scope to trial this with clusters of Local Authorities.

**24 – Mental health should be seen as central to the management of offenders; offenders should be seen as a key constituency for mental health care. Mental health representation must be at the heart of IOM just as, for example, the police are. This should extend to co-located workers and representation at IOM meetings.**

**Response:** agree. Cambridgeshire Mental Health Trust now has a representative on the IOM Executive group and is working closely with the Project Manager on addressing all mental health issues within offender management.



**25.i – There should be clear pathways for the mental health care of offenders, which do not rely on GP referral.**

**Response (and for 24 – 29) :** agree., however resources are currently inadequate. The Bradley forum are addressing mental health issues and report into the IOM Executive Group.

**25.ii – The mental health representation on IOM called for in Recommendation 24 above should be used to help with decisions regarding referral.**

**Response:** See response under item 24.i

**25.iii – In the absence of this representation, there should be direct referral pathways from IOM workers into mental health.**

**Response:** see above

**26 – The link worker model works, and should be extended. The review group welcomes the prospect of funding for a Probation-mental health link worker in Cambridgeshire and in Peterborough.**

**Response:** see above

**27 – There should be a thorough review of practices to ensure mental health access and provision at the point of arrest. This should not be considered an optional extra, but a key part of at-arrest procedures.**

**Response:** see above

**28 – The commissioning of mental health services for offenders, particularly of forensic mental health teams, should be joined-up. Cambridgeshire County Council & NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Unitary Authority & NHS Peterborough should liaise to ensure social care and health care provision matches up.**

**Response:** see above

**29 – There is a lack of forensic mental health cover where it is most needed (Peterborough and Wisbech). This should not be the case.**

**Response:** see above

**30.i – Long waits for the start of a Foundation Education programme can lead offenders to give up on the system. Foundation Education providers (such as Cherry Hinton Hall, the YMCA etc) should coordinate with one another to stagger the starts of their programmes to ensure there is always a programme starting soon.**

**Response:** agree. The working group are identifying solutions to providing good education, employment and training opportunities to offenders within IOM

**30.ii – Education providers should ensure there is some quick-access ‘drop-in’ education available to buffer before the start of a fixed-term programme.**

**Response and 31:** Partially agree, there is not clear evidence as yet that drop ins lead to further take up, however would be worth piloting locally if resources allow. The IOM Project Manager is currently working with wider partners, e.g. adult learning services to extend the interventions available.

**31 – Adult learning and learning disability education should coordinate their eligibility criteria to ensure any given offender is eligible for, and suitable for, one programme or another.**

**Response:** As above

**32 – There is a lack of services to help offenders with financial issues (paying bills, claiming benefits, budgeting etc) which merits further scrutiny.**

**Response:** agree. The voluntary sector agencies can provide a contribution to this, e.g. CAB and can be negotiated by the project manager. This will require funding to be sought via the CAB in order to provide a benefits advisor for IOM.

<b>Source Documents</b>	<b>Location</b>
IOM Business plan Pathfinder, good practice IOM documents	CCC Community Safety office