



Home Office



Ministry of
JUSTICE

**INTEGRATED OFFENDER
MANAGEMENT**
GOVERNMENT POLICY
STATEMENT

June 2009

Contents

Purpose of the document	3
The case for working together	4
IOM: Supporting local partners to succeed	6
The principles of IOM	8
Taking IOM forward in your area	11
Taking IOM forward across England and Wales	15
Contact for enquiries	17

Purpose of the document

This document provides all agencies engaged in local criminal justice partnerships – Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships/Community Safety Partnerships (CDRPs/CSPs) and Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) – with direction and support in bringing together the management of repeat offenders into a more coherent structure – known as Integrated Offender Management (IOM).

Young offenders (those under 18) are already managed using an IOM approach through multi-agency integrated Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) and the Deter Young Offender Management Framework. Nonetheless, there are clear operational benefits for both adult and youth systems to exploit in the development of IOM.

The aim of IOM is to help local partners jointly to:

- reduce crime, reduce re-offending, improve public confidence in the criminal justice system, tackle the social exclusion of offenders and their families and drive organisational performance delivery improvement – recognising that all these aims are, of course, interconnected;
- address potential overlaps between existing approaches and programmes to manage offenders and address gaps – recognising that some high-priority/highly damaging offenders may fall between the gaps in current arrangements;
- align the work of local criminal justice agencies and their partners more effectively, expanding or improving on partnerships that already exist at the local, area and regional level with wider social agencies, e.g. local authorities, the National Treatment Agency and health, education and employment services, etc., to work with targeted groups of offenders;
- simplify and strengthen governance, to provide greater clarity around respective roles and responsibilities – including leadership, operational decision-making and allocation of resources.

The case for working together

Since 1997 the criminal justice system has made good progress in catching, punishing and rehabilitating those individuals committing crime in our communities.

There has been real success in recent years – based on the 2006 cohort of offenders, the frequency rate of adult re-offending over a one-year period fell 13% from the previous year (to 146.1 re-offences per 100 offenders).

Managing offenders, reducing crime

- More than 202,000 people accessed **drug treatment services** in 2007/08, well in excess of the Government's commitment to double the numbers in drug treatment by 2008.
- Every year over 55,000 criminals are subject to **Community Payback**, carrying out over 6 million hours of physical, unpaid work. Since December 2008 all adult offenders on Community Payback have been required to wear branded, high-visibility jackets.
- **Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA)** support the assessment and management of the most serious sexual and violent offenders.
- Every locality has a **Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) scheme**, targeting the offenders causing the most amount of crime in their communities.

At the core of the Government's efforts has been a move towards better working between criminal justice agencies, government departments, the NHS, local authorities and partners in the private and third sector. The creation of CDRPs/CSPs and LCJBs has driven improvements in community safety, crime reduction and efficiency and, at a local delivery level, the operational partnerships involved in the PPO programme, Drug Interventions Programme (DIP), YOTs, MAPPA and other programmes have been associated with a period of sustained reductions in crime.

At the same time there has been a growing need to look at how resources can be most efficiently spent within the justice system. One of the drivers for IOM has been to look at how to build the case for more investment in community-based approaches for offenders, as an alternative to the revolving door of short-term custody.

More integrated working can be especially valuable in preventing the most serious and violent crimes from occurring and in identifying and gripping those prolific offenders, mostly involved in serious acquisitive crimes such as burglary and street robbery, who disproportionately damage our communities.

Case study

West Yorkshire has implemented its IOM approach across the whole county. West Yorkshire's intelligence hub, which includes agencies involved with adult and young offenders, tasks local neighbourhood policing teams to assist in ensuring that offenders are kept under constant supervision as well as providing access to services through the five rehabilitation and resettlement hubs.

In the drive to continue to reduce crime, the Government recognises that local delivery partners need to be better supported by having a clearer and more consistent framework for the management of offenders in the community. IOM provides a comprehensive and coordinated response, recognising that more coherent joint working can help partners to make the best use of their resources.

Pioneer case study

There are six London Diamond Districts, identified as those areas most needing support. In all six districts, in two days of action in April 2009, the Diamond teams worked to clear all outstanding court warrants for breaches of community sentences in their districts, informing each of these offenders of the Diamond offer of support via home visits.

IOM: Supporting local partners to succeed

IOM is the strategic umbrella or overarching framework that brings together agencies across government to prioritise intervention with offenders who cause crime in their locality.

It builds on and expands current offender-focused programmes, such as PPO, MAPPA and DIP, recognising that an offender of concern to everyone may end up being no one's responsibility. It manages a selected and locally defined cohort of offenders who are in the community, regardless of whether they are under statutory supervision or not. In targeting those offenders of most concern, IOM aims to manage them consistently, using pooled local resources to turn them away from crime, punishing and reforming them as appropriate.

IOM is a recognition that different partners are involved in the lives of offenders at different points and for different purposes – for example, the police will want to know when a prisoner is about to be released because they will want to know his or her whereabouts; health services will want to continue an offender's mental health, alcohol or substance misuse treatment; and accommodation providers may be asked to help provide housing.

Success criteria for IOM

IOM brings together agencies involved in tackling the crimes of concern to their communities. By looking at existing programmes and approaches, recognising where work can be simplified and also where there are gaps in the current provision, we believe that IOM:

Outcomes

- contributes towards achieving national and Local Area Agreement (LAA) targets to reduce re-offending, cut crime, tackle social exclusion and raise confidence in the criminal justice system;

Outputs and processes

- assists in improving the compliance of targeted offenders on statutory supervision;
- offers targeted ex-offenders assistance to keep away from crime;
- helps criminal justice agencies to execute the sentences of the court more effectively;
- strengthens the ability of the criminal justice system to communicate outcomes to victims and the public;
- improves the level of information exchange between agencies about offenders and about their risks and needs.

Pioneer case study

The Lancashire area currently manages PPOs, statutory offenders and non-statutory offenders identified as committing volume offences of serious acquisitive crime and began a domestic violence pilot last year which links into offenders under the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) and MAPP. Lancashire has recently responded to the needs of vulnerable offenders and has co-located mental health outreach workers with the IOM team.

The principles of IOM

At its most ambitious, IOM should operate on the following principles:

All partners tackling offenders together – Local partners agree the means to share all relevant information on an offender with each other and ensure that there is a process to clearly assign responsibility for managing an identified offender. At the same time they make sure that all agencies continue to participate and they provide the offender, as far as is possible, with a single lead professional. Local partners encourage the development of the multi-agency problem-solving approach by focusing on offenders, not offences.

Delivering a local response to local problems – All relevant local partners from the public, private and voluntary sectors are involved in planning, decision-making and funding choices. They jointly discuss and agree the offender groups that local agencies want to target and prioritise and ensure that existing local methods of engaging with communities are used.

Offenders facing their responsibility or facing the consequences – Local partners provide offenders with a clear understanding of what is expected of them and balance efforts to motivate offenders to change with the appropriate intensity of punishment and intervention necessary to disrupt their criminal lifestyles.

Pioneer case study

Avon and Somerset operates a place-based approach, concentrating on offenders in Bristol. Offenders are identified through a multi-agency process. The central IOM team coordinates and shares information on identified offenders and serves as a co-located hub for rehabilitative and resettlement services.

Making better use of existing (and proven) programmes and governance – This involves squeezing more benefits from programmes such as PPO, DIP and Community Justice to increase the benefits for communities,

as well as taking advantage of the developing roles of bodies such as CDRPs in reducing re-offending.

Evidence base for IOM

While there has so far been no specific impact evaluation of IOM, it builds on what we already know about reducing re-offending:

- The recent evaluations of the **PPO programme and DIP¹** suggest that they may impact on re-offending among targeted offenders.
- A review of **mentoring of adult offenders²** found that the evidence of the effectiveness of such programmes in reducing re-offending is promising.
- There is **strong evidence around the role played by drug treatment³** in reducing re-offending.
- It is widely agreed that **multi-modal approaches, which tackle a number of these issues, are likely to be more effective than focusing on a single issue in isolation.⁴**

All offenders at high risk of harm and re-offending are “in scope” – Intensity of management relates directly to severity of risk, irrespective of position within the criminal justice system or whether statutory or non-statutory. IOM is about bringing together existing arrangements. Many of these existing arrangements for managing offenders should remain in place, in particular:

- The most **dangerous offenders** should continue to be managed under MAPPA.
- The most **damaging/prolific offenders** continue to receive the most intensive (PPO) management, but **only while risk of re-offending remains critical.**

Pioneer case study

West Midlands’ initial pilot areas of Walsall and Wolverhampton are developing approaches to early interventions in the life of potential offenders and diversion of low-level offenders from custody, delivered by multi-agency neighbourhood diversion teams that include police and probation.

¹ Home Office (2007) *An impact assessment of the Prolific and other Priority Offender programme*. Home Office Online Report 08/07. www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ppo/rdsolr0807.pdf, accessed 25 May 2009.

² Joliffe, D. and Farrington, D. (2007) *A rapid evidence assessment of the impact of mentoring on re-offending: a summary*. Home Office Online Report 11/07. London: Home Office.

³ See e.g. Gossop *et al.* (2001) and Prendergast *et al.* (2002).

⁴ Harper, G. and Chitty, C. (2005) *The impact of corrections on re-offending: a review of ‘what works’*. Home Office Research Study 291. www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors291.pdf, accessed 25 May 2009.

Local partners taking forward IOM could, in particular, consider the following as priority groups:

- Targeted offenders (adult and youth) on **statutory supervision** require additional support to hold them in compliance.
- Agency contact can be provided to targeted groups of offenders not being supervised, especially those released from **short-term prison sentences**.
- Offenders who respond to the PPO approach can be “downgraded” to a lower tier of intensity (reserving PPO places for the most prolific offenders).
- **Drug-misusing offenders** managed through DIP and on community sentences with a Drug Rehabilitation Requirement require additional support to hold them in compliance, with the most non-compliant (repeat testers/high crime-causing users) referred into PPO intensive arrangements if necessary.

In taking forward IOM approaches, local partners will want to take into account the needs of particularly **vulnerable offenders**, especially women offenders and offenders who have mental health needs. Local partners, in assessing how they can address the needs of these

offenders, should be aware of Baroness Corston’s review of women in the criminal justice system⁵ and Lord Bradley’s review regarding mental health needs.⁶

Pioneer case study

In Nottingham city centre, offenders are kept under close supervision by police enforcement teams. The teams make random home visits to identified priority offenders to ensure that they comply with their community orders or appointments with resettlement agencies, reminding them when and where their appointments are.

⁵ Home Office (2007) *The Corston Report: a review of women with particular vulnerabilities in the criminal justice system*. www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/corston-report, accessed 11 June 2009.

⁶ Department of Health (2009) *The Bradley Report: Lord Bradley’s review of people with mental health problems or learning disabilities in the criminal justice system*. www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_098694, accessed 11 June 2009.

Taking IOM forward in your area

The Government wants to encourage delivery partners to develop local arrangements to oversee the management of offenders in their communities, working within the context of the outcomes required by LAAs and the Government's National Indicator Set and Public Service Agreements.

Early lessons from IOM pioneer areas

- The core agencies at the heart of IOM are the police and the National Offender Management Service (NOMS). However, IOM cannot solely be a partnership between the two agencies but also depends on local authority and local health provider support, together with assistance from a range of other partners.
- Ensure that all partners involved in taking forward IOM in their area are involved at the appropriate stage, recognising that some will be key to operations and others will offer support at a more strategic level. The relationship between CDRPs/CSPs and LCJBs in particular is crucial.
- Decide the scope of the IOM project with your local partners. Most pioneers have tested out their approach in one or more test sites before rolling it out/force/area wide.
- Secure local agreement across agencies, including using community engagement feedback, to decide on the local priority groups for your area.

We suggest that:

- **All partners** taking forward IOM should establish clear governance arrangements with the support of the relevant Government Office (Home Office Regional Deputy Director) and the Director of Offender Management, the relevant LCJB and the relevant CDRPs/CSPs around the more coordinated management of offenders.
- **CDRPs**, given their new responsibilities to reduce re-offending, should:
 - ensure that their PPO schemes are reviewed and refreshed, as appropriate, in the light of updated government guidance on delivering the programme, to ensure that the right offenders are subject to the intensity of this programme, to maximise its outcomes for the community;
 - bring together all partners, including, where appropriate, voluntary and private providers, to target a locally agreed cohort of offenders⁷ alongside the PPO scheme, drawing on existing resources to hold offenders in compliance and working with them to stop their offending, with a particular focus on reducing serious acquisitive crime in the local area and providing management of those who pose a risk to their communities who are currently unsupervised, noting in particular that: CDRPs/CSPs may choose to work together with neighbouring CDRPs/CSPs where appropriate and, for those CDRPs/CSPs that are already knife crime, burglary and serious acquisitive crime areas, bringing together these projects could help constitute their priority groups;
- ensure that the systems and processes are in place to ensure that CDRP/CSP partners have a consistent oversight of all offender management programmes in their area;
- establish a clear process to move offenders out of the targeted cohorts once they have desisted in their offending.
- **LCJBs** should:
 - identify how courts and the Crown Prosecution Service can contribute to IOM. In particular if the area is an engaging communities Pathfinder Area, working with community justice teams and Community Prosecutors to channel IOM cases through the Community Justice court, and link this to feeding back on homes to the local community;
 - ensure that all partners are performing their role in ensuring that where offenders fail to comply

⁷ This cohort can include both adult and youth offenders, where appropriate, and should not just include current PPOs.

with their sentence, swift action is taken to bring them to justice;

- communicate with the public to increase public confidence in the arrangements for identifying/ tackling priority offenders, including through local case studies that demonstrate positive outcomes for the community as well as offenders.

- **Directors of Offender**

Management should work with **regional Home Office and National Treatment Agency and offender health leads in the Government Offices** to:

- map existing offender management provision across the criminal justice area and identify and agree the main gaps. This will help to define the criteria for targeting offenders, including those young people who have recently transferred from YOT to adult supervision who may benefit from the continuation of an IOM approach;
- ensure that ongoing work in probation to deliver intensive unpaid work, intensive alternatives to custody and other innovative community sentencing options is adequately reflected in local plans and monitored for impact;
- work to ensure that the police are informed when identified priority offenders, including PPOs and high

risk of harm offenders, are released from custody.

- **YOT managers** should:

- review YOT inter-agency partnership structures in the light of IOM to ensure that they deliver the IOM approach locally;
- review YOT processes in the light of IOM to determine whether IOM principles can add value to work to prevent offending and re-offending by children and young people;
- review Deter Young Offender processes and structures to ensure that they are delivering the IOM approach and, specifically, that information and intelligence-sharing processes between the YOT and the police inform the effective management of young people who offend.

Of course, we are already aware that many of the bodies listed above are already performing some or all of these functions – and in some places are exceeding them – in taking forward IOM in different areas. The important point is that the functions need to be performed even if local circumstances may dictate different arrangements.

Commonly asked questions

- **What is the difference between a good merged PPO scheme/DIP and IOM?**

IOM asks local partners to look at all existing offender-focused programmes and processes and examine how to simplify, join up and streamline them. PPO and DIP remain crucial to the delivery of sustained reductions in re-offending and local partners may decide that, initially, the PPO and DIP cohorts are the starting point for their IOM schemes.

- **What are the additional resource implications of starting up IOM in my area?**

Four of the six pioneer areas have received some national funding. However, the majority of resources that IOM requires are in local partners' hands. IOM is principally about doing core business differently to achieve enhanced outcomes.

Commonly asked questions (continued)

- **Does every area have to have an IOM scheme?**

We encourage local partners to consider the added value an IOM approach would have in their area, drawing on the experience of other schemes already operating in their area. No area would be starting from scratch.

Taking IOM forward across England and Wales

Nationally, the Home Office and Ministry of Justice are:

- supporting **six nationally recognised IOM pioneer areas** to explore how the concept of IOM can be applied in practice. The Home Office and Ministry of Justice are identifying early lessons and good practice in these areas and sharing it with local areas;
- **supporting the spread of IOM** by:
 - helping areas to introduce IOM-style working within actions under Operation Vigilance. This Operation, announced on 13 May 2009, targets a range of interventions in priority areas to prevent emerging problems of serious property-related crimes (e.g. burglary, robbery and car theft) from becoming entrenched. This includes supporting areas with £3 million to intensify the targeting and management of known offenders, which will help police, probation and local authorities to learn from what works and how to use more proactive methods to target and catch offenders;
- providing central assistance to new IOM areas through expert operational support;
- developing a self-assessment tool for local partners;
- developing a core set of tools, performance diagnostics and operational models;
- supporting the **reinvigoration of the PPO programme** by:
 - working with Her Majesty's Courts Service, the Crown Prosecution Service, NOMS and the Police Service in taking forward recommendations from the joint thematic inspection of the PPO Premium Service;
 - looking at better ways of sharing information on PPOs throughout the criminal justice system, including piloting the extension of J-Track

(the PPO database) to NOMS and linking up with Community Justice;

- **evaluating the IOM pioneer areas⁸** by:
 - providing action research to the pioneer areas;
 - conducting a break-even analysis of the IOM approach in each of the pioneer areas (due in November 2009);
 - carrying out a feasibility study to determine whether an impact evaluation could be useful later down the line and recommend any necessary changes in local IOM practices to facilitate such an evaluation (due in November 2009);
 - conduct a process evaluation (due in March 2010).

⁸ The evaluation excludes London which is conducting its own evaluation.

Contact for enquiries

Robin Brennan

Head of Intensive Offender
Management Team
Offender Assessment and
Management Group
Ministry of Justice

Email: robin.brennan@justice.gsi.gov.uk

Tel: 020 7217 5255

Bernard Lane

Programme Director, Prolific and other
Priority Offender programme and IOM
Offender Based Interventions Unit
Home Office

Email: Bernard.Lane@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

Tel: 020 7035 0101



50% recycled
This publication is printed
on 50% recycled paper