



Breaking the Cycle,  
Ministry of Justice,  
10.08, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor,  
102 Petty France,  
London SW1H 9AJ

3rd March, 2011

To whom it may concern

**Re: Breaking the cycle: effective punishment, rehabilitation and sentencing of offenders**

Make Justice Work (MJW) warmly welcomes the progressive proposals set out in the Green Paper, and particularly the emphasis on the value of effective community sentences and restorative justice, as well as the need to take seriously the needs of victims.

MJW was launched in the summer of 2009. It is an independent campaign aimed at highlighting the cost and ineffectiveness of short-term prison sentences and improving public confidence in community sentences. MJW is a Community Interest Company and receives no public funding.

We provide:

- an authoritative and credible voice in the public debate, harnessing the power of experts and opinion-formers from both within and outside the sector, including representation from victims
- evidence that robust and demanding alternatives to custody for less serious offences can be highly effective at reducing criminal behaviour and lessening fear of crime as well as offering big savings to tax-payers

MJW's campaign is open-minded and rests on rational, evidence-based research some of which we have directly commissioned<sup>1</sup>, and on other independent sources which are listed in Annexes A and J.

We have undertaken a National Commission of Enquiry, entitled "*Community or Custody – which works best?*", which is designed to explore the value and effectiveness of intensive community sentences. Chaired by the Daily Telegraph journalist, Peter Osborne, the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Matrix Knowledge Group (2009) 'Are short term prison sentences an efficient and effective use of public resources?' <http://makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2009/06/are-short-term-prison-sentences-an-efficient-and-effective-use-of-public-resources.pdf>

National Enquiry Panel also includes Lord Blair and Dame Anne Owers (see Annex B for full details). The Panel has so far examined two such schemes: the Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC) programme in Manchester and the Together Women Programme (TWP) in Bradford.

MJW acknowledges the altered economic landscape, the imperative to explore alternative economic models and the increasing significance of Social Return on Investment in making criminal policy decisions. We broadly support progressive innovation, and keenly await the evaluation of Social Impact Bonds and Payment by Results.

Whilst acknowledging the economic challenges that we are facing, we have set out a small number of recommendations which we believe are absolutely essential (see *Annex C*) in order to reduce the numbers of lower level offenders going to prison. At the heart of these is our belief that policy should henceforth be based on a presumption *against* the use of short-term prison sentences.

An interim report on the IAC in Manchester and the TWP in Bradford will be submitted to Ministers later in March.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Roma C.A. Hooper". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

**Roma Hooper | Director**  
Make Justice Work  
Third Floor  
26a Ganton Street  
London  
W1F 7QZ

**Q28: *Is there a case for taking a tailored approach with any specific type of offender?***

Emphatically yes. Community sentences work best if they target the individual needs of the offender in a fully integrated way, rather than following a crude one-size-fits-all approach. The effectiveness of such an integrated approach is acknowledged in a report<sup>2</sup>, ‘Order of the Courts’ from the Centre for Social Justice. Good examples are the IAC in Manchester and the Together Women Programme in Bradford, (Annexes B and C) both of which have been closely examined by MJW.

**Q37: *How can we make community sentencing most effective in preventing persistent offending?’***

The evidence MJW has gathered is unequivocal: to ensure community sentencing is effective in preventing persistent offending it is essential that the sentence is tailored to meet the offender’s individual needs for both punishment and rehabilitation. The range of interventions which MJW have identified as critical is attached in Annex C.

**Q41: *How might we target community sentences better so that we can help rehabilitate offenders before they reach custody?***

MJW, through its Enquiry process, and other key areas of work with magistrates, probation and the voluntary sector, has identified a number of ways in which the effectiveness of community sentences in rehabilitating offenders can be greatly improved. These are outlined in the attached Annex.

---

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Social Justice (2009) ‘Order of the Courts’  
<http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/client/downloads/CSJ%20courts%20WEB.pdf>

## **ANNEX A**

### **MJW - Evidence**

There is a growing body of evidence that reconviction rates following community sentences are consistently lower than following short custodial sentences.<sup>3</sup>

The Matrix Knowledge Group (2008)<sup>4</sup> has also provided evidence that alternatives to custody can be more effective at reducing re-offending, and better value for money, than basic prison sentences. For example, adult community-based interventions such as residential drug treatment and surveillance with drug treatment have been shown to be more effective at reducing re-offending than prison. In the case of women, in 2008 just 31% of women on community sentences were reconvicted within a year compared to 64% on short custodial sentences.<sup>5</sup>

Subsequent research by Matrix (2009)<sup>6</sup> - commissioned by MJW - examined the impact of the wider costs to the criminal justice system of responding to a crime, the healthcare costs of treating the victim of a crime, the victim's financial cost of a crime, and the pain and suffering experienced by the victim of a crime. For example, residential drug treatment and intensive supervision with drug treatment produce significant cost savings to society when compared with custody. Specifically:

- Diverting one offender from custody to residential drug treatment would save society approximately £200,000 over the lifetime of the offender
- Diverting one offender from custody to intensive supervision with drug treatment would save society approximately £60,000 over the lifetime of the offender

Even more recent research conducted by the Statistical Methods and Development Department of the Ministry of Justice has compared short custodial sentences with community orders/suspended sentences using a fresh dataset from the Police National Computer<sup>7</sup>. It has found that *'short periods in custody are somewhat less effective at cutting re-offending compared with supervised probation'*.

The significant difference between short custodial sentences and community-based alternatives can be ascribed to the lack of time and resources available in prison to focus on behaviour, attitudes, employment, education, family relationships and community ties.

---

<sup>3</sup> Rethinking Crime and Punishment (2004) 'Crime, Courts and Confidence - Report of an independent inquiry into alternatives to prison'. <http://www.rethinking.org.uk/PDFs/Coulsfieldreport.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> The Matrix Knowledge Group (2008) *'The economic case for and against prison- Update'* <http://www.matrixknowledge.com/wp-content/uploads/matrix-prison-report-dec-08-web.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> Nef (London, 2008), 'Unlocking Value: how we all benefit from investing in alternatives to prison for women offenders'. <http://www.neweconomics.org/publications?keys=unlocking+value&tid=All>

<sup>6</sup> The Matrix Knowledge Group (2009) 'Are short term prison sentences an efficient and effective use of public resources?' <http://makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2009/06/are-short-term-prison-sentences-an-efficient-and-effective-use-of-public-resources.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Ministry of Justice (2010) Compendium of Reoffending statistics and analysis <http://www.justice.gov.uk/compendium-of-reoffending-statistics-and-analysis.pdf>

## **ANNEX B**

### **National Commission of Enquiry**

MJW has appointed a panel of experts who are investigating the effectiveness of community alternatives in comparison to short-term prison sentences.

The Enquiry began its work in the summer of 2010 and plans to hold four in-depth investigatory meetings around the country where experts and the public are given the opportunity to give evidence and opinions to the panel about relevant local practices, and answer questions from the panel.

The first session of the National Enquiry was held in Manchester in July and the second in Bradford in 2010. The remaining two will focus on the Leicester Drug and Alcohol Programme (Criminal Justice Drugs Team) on 5 April and a mental health programme in London on 11 July.

Its terms of reference are:

***“To enquire into the efficacy and cost of robust community based alternatives in comparison to short-term (under 12 months) prison sentences for lower level, non- violent offenders”***

The panel is chaired by **Peter Osborne**, author, broadcaster and commentator for the Daily Telegraph and consists of:

- **Lord Blair, former Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police**
- **Roma Hooper, Director of Make Justice Work**
- **Paul McDowell, Chief Executive of Nacro**
- **Dame Anne Owers, former Chief Inspector of Prisons**
- **John Thornhill, Chair of the Magistrates’ Association**
- **Javed Khan, Chief Executive of Victim Support**

Once the four Enquiry sessions are finished we will produce a full report outlining the enquiry findings. The report will be published and launched at a major London event in the summer of 2011 which will be attended by policy makers, stakeholders, and the media. We expect the conclusions to gain widespread coverage and make a significant contribution to the policy decisions of the coalition government.

## ANNEX C

### Recommendations

- MJW recommends that a *presumption against the use of short-term prison sentences* should be built into the new sentencing guidelines.
- The *Intensive Alternative to Custody* model must be more widely adopted so that it is available to sentencers throughout England and Wales.
- The one-stop-one model pioneered by the *Together Women Programme* (TWP) in Bradford must also be more widely adopted, and applied not just to women, but to other groups of offenders (as with the *Foundation Training Company* in London).
- MJW recognises the inevitability of spending cuts, but strongly urges that the core ingredients of these programmes be protected - otherwise their effectiveness will be compromised. In due course it may be possible to fund such schemes in whole or in part on a 'payment by results' basis. But this will not be possible in the short term.
- MJW is concerned that most of those involved in delivering the new schemes are public-sector employees who have little experience of raising funds or attracting investment from alternative sources. They will have great difficulty in responding effectively to calls for the development of new funding models (including those based on the principle of 'payment by results').
- The success of the proposed 'rehabilitation revolution' will therefore depend on making *training and advice* available to practitioners throughout the UK, particularly those working in small voluntary sector organizations. Charitable trusts and foundations may be willing to help the Government deliver such support, but it is unlikely that they will be prepared to do so on their own: some public money will also need to be committed.
- MJW recommends the development of Magistrates' Training. Magistrates are not always well informed about the effects of the sentences they hand out, and many are sceptical about the value of community sentences.
- MJW is exploring, with the Magistrates Association, how best to address this challenge and would be happy to share its findings with Ministers. MJW recommends that magistrates and judges be made fully aware not only of the direct financial and administrative costs of a sentence, but also of the broader costs and benefits for offenders, their families and the wider community.
- MJW urgently recommends that the Government launches a marketing campaign to promote greater public confidence in reforms designed to reduce our present excessive reliance on the use of prison.
- As part of this process, MJW urges the Government to commission from an independent creative agency "*An Easy Guide to Community Sentencing*" - written in layman's language with case studies and victim and offender stories. Such a guide should be made available to all criminal justice agencies, including magistrates, courts probation service and police, as well as victims, offenders, their families, volunteers, and the wider community.
- MJW is also encouraged by the prominence given in the Green Paper to Community Resolution, to Restorative Justice, and Community Justice Panels. It urgently recommends that Restorative Justice be used as part of an out of court disposal developed within the police framework and embedded in the CJS in a professional, transparent and appropriate way. MJW endorses RJ being embedded in the pre-sentence structure.

## **ANNEX D**

### **Intensive Alternative to Custody programme in Manchester for 18 to 25 year old young men**

#### **Introduction to Intensive Alternatives to Custody**

The Intensive Alternatives to Custody (IAC) programme is funded by the Ministry of Justice to run for three years through to March 2011 to test the use of intensive community orders to divert offenders from short-term (under 12 months) custody. The rationale behind the development of intensive community orders was to see whether they would be more effective at reducing reoffending than short-term imprisonment.

Using the Criminal Justice Act 2003, IAC pilots provide courts with enhanced community sentencing options by combining intensive probation supervision with a mix of demanding requirements and interventions delivered by partner agencies. Seven areas were chosen to pilot IAC orders: Derbyshire, West Yorkshire, South Wales, Dyfed-Powys, Greater Manchester, Merseyside and Humberside.

#### **IAC in Greater Manchester**

Launched on 1 April 2009, the Greater Manchester IAC is a two-year pilot programme. The pilot targets 18-25 year old male offenders who have tended to be the hardest to engage with and rehabilitate. Its catchment area is Salford and Manchester which contain neighborhoods with some of the highest levels of crime and deprivation in the UK.

The pilot caters for those who are perhaps facing the risk of custody for the first time, as well as 'revolving door' cases that are frequently before the courts and in and out of prison. The idea is that IAC offers a better hope of achieving rehabilitation and lasting change as well as being more cost effective.

#### **Who runs/manages it?**

Whilst Greater Manchester Probation Trust (GMPT) is the lead agency with the IAC pilot it has commissioned services from a variety of other providers to form a multi-agency partnership. The IAC involves intensive Employment, Training, Education mentoring provided by a not-for-profit organization called Work Solution and Probation itself.

The team also includes a Family Support service from a voluntary sector organization called Partners of Prisoners (POPs) which works with offender's parents and significant others (i.e. others in the family, partners) to get them encouraging compliance and supporting rehabilitation. The pilot is finding that if those close to offenders understand the expectations of IAC and what it is trying to achieve they are better able to offer the right sort of support or ask for help themselves if needed. IAC's Family Support service has recently formed a link with a Young Father's project which promotes responsible parenting with the young men on the pilot who have children of their own.

Group 4 Securicor (G4S) provide a Community Outreach service, which coupled with enhanced Electronic Monitoring arrangements for curfew, controls behaviour to a greater degree than generic community supervision. The outreach service can respond immediately to non-attendance and violations, placing additional checks on behaviour, often taking action in the evening and at weekend when the risk of reoffending can be highest. It also provides transport to intensive interventions and activities, keeping service users busy and helping maintain good compliance.

IAC is delivered in partnership with Greater Manchester Police and includes a seconded Police Officer who is involved in running Restorative Justice interventions as part of an offender's supervision. Restorative Justice involves contact with victims, on occasions including fact-to-face meeting so the offender can hear about the impact of their behaviour as well as explain what they

are done to turn their life around and make amends. The police officer also provides intelligence to help select candidates for the pilot, input into the design IAC Orders and direct involvement in delivering an integrated approach to monitoring behaviour and dealing with any re-offending once Orders are imposed.

## **Annex E**

### **The Together Women Programme – Yorkshire and Humberside (Leeds, Doncaster and Bradford)**

#### **Introduction to the Together Women Programme**

In March 2005 the Home Secretary announced £9.15 million funding to establish the Together Women Programme (TWP) which would adopt a more effective community-based response to women offenders and women at risk of offending. In Yorkshire and Humberside a consortium of organisations led by Foundation Housing secured funding to open centres in Leeds, Doncaster, Bradford and an outreach centre in Keighley and another based at New Hall Prison. Another Together Women Programme was established in the North West run by a different consortium of organisations with centres in Liverpool and Salford.

The Programme has been running since 2006 and its objectives are to reduce:

- Women's offending;
- Women's re-offending;
- The numbers of women remanded in custody;
- The numbers of women sentenced to custody; and
- The associated family breakdown, specifically in relation to children.

#### **Description of work**

The centres are gender specific "one-stop-shops" which support women offenders and women at risk of offending. The centres aim to tackle issues which may trigger offending behaviour, divert women from custody, and prevent family breakdown.

The support model aims to be holistic and needs centred – each woman referred undergoes a detailed needs assessment which tries to identify needs across a range of areas. These include: substance misuse, mental and physical health issues, lack of suitable accommodation, lack of access to education, training and employment, domestic abuse, and money management issues such as unmanageable debt. An individually tailored support plan is created which is designed to tackle the needs highlighted.

In line with the support strategy, women can access the following services from TWP:

- 1:1 key worker support
- Courses and groups run internally by staff and by partner agencies
- Advocacy work on behalf of women with statutory agencies such as Social Services or the courts
- Referrals and supported access to specialist agencies such as drug treatment agencies
- Counselling
- Use of OFSTED registered crèche facilities enabling women with children to access all support and services
- Health trainer sessions
- Shower and washing facilities
- Reimbursement of travel expenses upon production of bus/ train ticket

#### **What type of women does the TWP project work with?**

One quarter of the TWP caseload is with women who are at risk of offending. Numerous factors can lead to the kind of social exclusion that place women at risk of offending such as: deprivation, prostitution, mental health issues, domestic/ sexual violence, substance misuse, and lack of education/ training or appropriate housing. These issues frequently create a barrier for women preventing them from accessing support. To engage with women suffering from these issues TWP has established referral routes with mainstream statutory agencies such as Social Services, the

NHS, Job Centre and Housing Providers and voluntary sector agencies such as those tackling domestic violence, substance misuse and mental health issues. Furthermore, marketing strategies and outreach work facilitate self referrals to TWP.

The rest of the TWP caseload consists of women offenders. TWP works in partnership with the following statutory stakeholders – police, courts, probation and prisons – to ensure women involved with the CJS at any point are able to access the support they need.

### **Partnership working and customer involvement**

Information sharing and partnership working is led by the TWP centres which run a monthly Local Implementation Advisory Group (LIAG). This group is attended by partner agencies, and acts as a forum to discuss service delivery, share best practice, and ensure integrated support is delivered to women.

### **The organisation's main parent agencies are:**

**The Police:** TWP is given the opportunity to engage with women very early on in their involvement with the CJS so women receive early intervention and support. TWP has established a range of referral routes with the Police such as: DIP, Vice, alcohol referrals, public protection and conditional cautions

**Courts:** The project has the chance to encourage sentencers to divert women from custody and for TWP staff to engage with/support women attending court. Each centre has a worker who provides weekly court surgeries in order to feed into PSRs and advocate on women's behalf at court. The worker also tries to establish partnership working and communication with Offender Managers, sentencers, the CPS and defence solicitors.

**Probation:** TWP is given the opportunity to try and support women on the Probation caseload and try and help their compliance with community orders. The aim is to target issues which trigger offending in order to prevent re-offending. TWP has established referral routes with Probation teams. Furthermore, women can serve up to 50% of their national standards appointments at TWP centres, and complete unpaid work/ Intensive Alternative to Custody Order placements. In Bradford and Leeds, two offender managers have been seconded to the centres in order to provide an increase integrated support.

**Prisons:** The TWP New Hall post delivers services directly in the prison, intended to support the accommodation needs of women as they move from custody back into the community.

There are also other local stakeholders who work with women offenders or those at risk of offending, and who the TWP engages with. These include local government and city councils, social services, jobcentre's, and third sector organisations working with women experiencing from domestic violence, drug and alcohol problems and family breakdown.

Each centre also has its own Service User Involvement Group which enables women to put forward their comments and ideas on how to improve the services they receive and to make suggestions for future services required. They may also plan activities and events for themselves and their children. Feedback forms are completed by women after each course or group they attend, and at the end of their engagement with TWP.

## **ANNEX F**

### **Question 28: Is there a case for taking a tailored approach with any specific type of offender?**

The IAC Order in Manchester involves an intensive curriculum of activity offering rehabilitation, punishment and reparation through new partnerships between Greater Manchester Probation Trust (GMPT), statutory, voluntary and private sector organisations. IAC Orders last for 12 months and most will involve up to five requirements out of the twelve available under the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

The partner agencies who assist in delivering the IAC Orders with GMPT are Work Solutions, Partners of Prisoners and Group 4 Securicor.

The tailored approach is achieved through:

- Intensive supervision
- Enhanced monitoring
- 30 hours per week activity + curfew
- Accredited Programmes
- Unpaid work
- Court review progress
- Drug, alcohol, mental health treatment
- Swift sanction for non-compliance
- Accommodation support
- Mentoring
- Victim awareness

At the Bradford-based Together Women Programme, an individually-tailored support plan is created which is designed to tackle the specific needs of each offender. The support model aims to be holistic and needs-centred – each woman referred undergoes a detailed needs assessment which tries to identify issues across a range of areas. These include: substance misuse, mental and physical health issues, lack of suitable accommodation, lack of access to education, training and employment, domestic abuse, and money management issues such as unmanageable debt.

Probation Supervision appointments are located at the centre which reduces the likelihood of breach because all activities take place under one roof and there is a crèche.

The tailored approach is achieved through:

- One-to-one key worker support
- Courses and groups run internally by staff and by partner agencies
- Advocacy work on behalf of women with statutory agencies such as Social Services or the courts
- Referrals and supported access to specialist agencies such as mental health, domestic violence, alcohol and drug treatment agencies Educating Training and Employment
- Counselling
- Use of OFSTED registered crèche facilities enabling women with children to access all support and services

## **Cost savings – the tailored approach**

Matrix's analysis<sup>8</sup> suggests that the majority of community sentences provide similar or better value for money and effectiveness than short-term prison sentences. For example, residential drug treatment and intensive supervision with drug treatment produce significant cost savings to society when compared with custody. Specifically:

- Diverting one offender from custody to residential drug treatment would save society approximately £200,000 over the lifetime of the offender.
- Diverting one offender from custody to intensive supervision with drug treatment would save society approximately £60,000 over the lifetime of the offender

These cost savings include not only the lower cost of implementing the sentences, but also the costs avoided due to reduced re-offending as a result of these non-custodial sentences. Amongst others, the costs saved by diverting one offender from custody to residential drug treatment include:

- £112,000 avoided by people who would otherwise have been victims of crime, due to both reduced financial costs and reduced pain and suffering.
- £75,000 avoided by the Criminal Justice System due to reduced intervention costs and having to respond to fewer crimes.
- £13,000 avoided by the NHS as a result of having to respond to fewer crimes.

In the case of mentally ill offenders there is a particularly strong case for diverting people who commit minor offences from short prison sentences to community-based rehabilitation. Research by the Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health (2009)<sup>9</sup> shows that for each offender diverted from prison and who receives a quality mental health care within the community, an average of £20,000 can be saved in crime related costs alone.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The Matrix Knowledge Group (2009), 'Are short term prison sentences an efficient and effective use of public resources?' <http://makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2009/06/are-short-term-prison-sentences-an-efficient-and-effective-use-of-public-resources.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health Report (2009) 'A Missed Opportunity: Community Sentences and the Mental Health Treatment Requirement' [http://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/pdfs/Missed\\_Opportunity.pdf](http://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/pdfs/Missed_Opportunity.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health Report (2009) 'A Missed Opportunity: Community Sentences and the Mental Health Treatment Requirement' [http://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/pdfs/Missed\\_Opportunity.pdf](http://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/pdfs/Missed_Opportunity.pdf)

## ANNEX G

### Question 37: How can we make community sentencing most effective in preventing persistent offending?

#### Manchester IAC

**Courts:** There has been very good support from HMCS and sentencers, who appear to understand the order and have visited the pilot. Magistrates and Judges are able to see how orders are progressing (via reviews) so it is beneficial for them too. The IAC is now a well-recognized sentencing option and respected 'brand' in the areas where it is operating.

**Punishment:** A Community Order is for 12 months (or longer) and prohibited activities include for example football matches, pubs, contact with certain individuals, exclusion from certain areas (e.g. crime hot-spot, a particular shop), up to 30 hours of work/activities per week, plus tagging, fast-track breach processes to ensure immediate enforcement action (usually this means imprisonment).

**Curfew:** Group 4 Securicor (G4S) provide a Community Outreach service, which coupled with enhanced Electronic Monitoring arrangements for curfew, controls behaviour to a greater degree than generic community supervision. The outreach service can respond immediately to non-attendance and violations, placing additional checks on behaviour, often taking action in the evening and at weekends when the risk of reoffending can be highest. It also provides transport to intensive interventions and activities, keeping service users busy and helping maintain good compliance.

**Accommodation:** An emergency fund is available for those requiring bed and breakfast accommodation and the IAC has free access to the Stonham Bail Accommodation Service.

**Mentoring:** Work Solutions provides advocates/mentors to work alongside the Offender Manager to encourage motivation and support compliance.

**Employment:** Despite the challenging offender group and difficult economic climate, on average 24% of unemployed IAC offenders have found full time work.

**Compliance:** Another key indicator is that it is achieving better compliance and engagement with young adult males than alternative supervision, despite the higher expectations placed on them – 78% compliance rate. The evidence that has been gathered throughout the two-year pilot has confirmed that counter to the initial view that there would be a lower level of compliance due to the stringent nature of the order, the reverse has been the case.

#### **Victims &**

**Restorative Justice:** Restorative Justice involves contact with victims, on occasions including a face-to-face meeting so the offender can hear about the impact of their behaviour as well as explain what they are doing to turn their life around and make amends. The police officer provides intelligence to help select candidates for the pilot, helps to design IAC Orders and is directly involved in delivering in monitoring behaviour and dealing with any re-offending once Orders are imposed.

**Cost-effectiveness:** The average cost of an IAC Order in Greater Manchester is £5,500 per year. This is less expensive than the average 3-month custodial sentence in an adult prison. It should be noted however that 66% of IAC cases in

Greater Manchester have been aged 18 -21 years and if they had gone to custody would have been managed under YOI arrangements, at greater cost than adult imprisonment. It is estimated that the cost to the economy of short-term prisoner re-offending currently is between £7 and £10bn per year<sup>11</sup>.

**Case Study:**

Edward said that when he was sentenced to the IAC he was disappointed not to have been given a short sentence instead, given the time it takes to complete the order.

While prison is publicly perceived to be a harsher punishment than a community sentence, some offenders actually regarded a short prison sentence as less demanding. Alternatives to custody involved a restriction of liberty over many months, and intensive employment and behaviour management programmes.

**Bradford**

**Courts:** The IAC Women's Order is proving highly successful with excellent compliance rates which encourage sentencers to divert women from custody. Sentencers also encourage TWP staff to engage with/support women attending court. Each centre has a worker who provides weekly court surgeries in order to feed into Pre Sentence Reports (PSRs) and speak on women's behalf at court. Staff work hard to establish close partnerships and effective communication with Offender Managers, sentencers, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and defence solicitors.

**Punishment:** One of the major contributions to heavily reducing breach rates is the fact the probation officers are housed in the one-stop-shop, thus enabling women to comply more easily with their sentence and reducing the risk of non-attendance.

**Partnership working &**

**service user involvement:** To ensure that information-sharing and partnership working takes place effectively, TWP centres run a monthly Local Implementation Advisory Group (LIAG). This group is attended by partner agencies, and acts as a forum to discuss service delivery, share best practice, and ensure integrated support is delivered to women. Each centre also has its own Service User Involvement Group which enables women to put forward their comments and ideas on how to improve the services they receive and to make suggestions for future services required. They may also plan activities and events for themselves and their children.

**Accommodation:** TWP works closely with Ripon House, the probation bail hostel to support women into accommodation as well as moving women from unsafe to safe accommodation.

**Employment:** Women have gained or improved their employment and training skills, have increased sustainability of employment, improved basic skills including literacy and numeracy (particularly entry level 1) and increased their capacity to work.

---

<sup>11</sup> National Audit Office (2010) Managing Offenders on Short Custodial Sentences  
[http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0910/short\\_custodial\\_sentences.aspx](http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0910/short_custodial_sentences.aspx)

**Compliance:** The compliance rate for the Together Women's project in Bradford is 80%. The re-offending rates for TWP customers are between 5 and 10%, compared to a national average re-offending rate of 55% for women on short-term custodial sentences.

**Cost Effectiveness:** The cost of putting an offender through the Bradford TWP programme depends on the intensity of the scheme. On average the cost is £1000 per woman. However this can fall to £750 for some women, and rise to £1200 for woman on an IAC order.

## ANNEX H

### Q41: How might we target community sentences better so that we can help rehabilitate offenders before they reach custody?

**Sentencers:** There is a need to involve sentencers more closely in the design, implementation and management of community sentences. More careful attention needs to be paid to the targeting of alternatives both in legislation - through criteria for custody – and in everyday practice. Pre-sentence reports, prepared by probation officers, are crucial in ensuring that information about the offender's circumstances and the range of suitable options for meeting them are put before sentencers.

Sentencing for non-violent women must do more to meet their needs. It is essential that sentences are used appropriately and are relevant to individuals' needs. If reliable cost data can be generated, these should be provided to the sentencing authorities. It is essential that those handing down sentences should have access to information not only about the direct cost of a sentence but also what the broader costs and benefits will be for women offenders, their families and their communities.<sup>12</sup>

#### **Case Study:**

*"[As a JP] I first experienced the work of Together Women when a female defendant, supported by a TWP key worker, appeared in court facing a possible custodial sentence. Known to the probation services and having several periods of custody for similar offences the defendant said that 'TWP were the only people to ever listen, help and support her'. Our non-custodial sentence with a recommendation for TWP involvement was, some months later, vindicated by the continuing encouraging progress achieved"*

**Police:** The Manchester IAC is delivered in partnership with the Greater Manchester Police and includes a seconded Police Officer who is involved in running Restorative Justice Interventions as part of an offender's supervision. The victims' focus inherent within the IAC has led to the development and delivery of Restorative Justice as part of a community order for the first time in Greater Manchester and can now contribute to an improved targeting of community sentences.

The Bradford TWP team works closely with the police who also have the opportunity to engage with women very early on in their involvement with the criminal justice system so women receive early intervention and support.

**Probation:** Probation officers support women on the Probation caseload to improve compliance with community orders, and deliver more intensive wrap around support for a wide range of needs and issues. This support helps women to tackle issues which trigger offending. TWP has established effective referral routes with Probation teams. Furthermore, women can serve up to 50% of their national standards appointments at TWP centres, and complete unpaid work/ Intensive Alternative to Custody Order placements.

---

<sup>12</sup> nef, Unlocking Value: how we all benefit from investing in alternatives to prison for women offenders, London 2008)

## **Family and**

**Relationship work:** A report written by Graham Allan MP,<sup>13</sup> suggests that Early Intervention can help to prevent violent behaviour, drug and alcohol misuse and teenage pregnancy. It also shows that intervening later is more costly, and often cannot achieve such good results.

The enquiry in Manchester showed that familial and peer relationships, in particular, were crucial helping to rehabilitate offenders and reduce the likelihood of custody. The IAC team includes a Family Support service from a voluntary sector organisation called Partners of Prisoners (POPs) which works with offenders' parents and significant others (i.e. others in the family, partners) to help them encourage compliance and support rehabilitation. Critically, this work also supports maintaining appropriate accommodation.

The IAC provides participants with a family support officer. This element of IAC is also having a positive 'ripple' effect preventing criminality elsewhere in the family (e.g. with younger siblings). The inclusion of family support as part of a community order has not been attempted before with young adult offenders in the UK.

There is often a need to remove offenders from negative peer relationships and to help them to forge more positive ones. Prison, according to one offender, did the reverse, forming connections and peer relationships with other criminals rather than positive role models.

TWP has established a range of referral routes with the Police such as: Drug Intervention Team, Vice, alcohol referrals, public protection and conditional cautions. The programme provides parenting skills and a range of other activities to support family well-being and support offenders before they reach custody.

To reduce breach and encourage motivation and compliance, the Manchester IAC and the TWP programme both include a strong mentoring element.

## **Victims and**

**Restorative Justice:** It is common for women (and men) to be both the perpetrator and victim of crime. TWP work with female offenders who are also 'victims' of domestic abuse using on-to-one work in victim awareness, a confidence & self-esteem course and a Survivors of Domestic Violence course. Key workers use this work as a means of identifying triggers for their client's offending. As part of a community sentence, the impact of this type of work is far reaching.

In relation to Young Offenders, the research evidence is compelling. Matrix<sup>14</sup> has found that, for all offenders aged 18-24 sentenced in a Magistrate's court for a non-violent offence in a given year:

Diversion from community orders to pre-court Restorative Justice conferencing schemes is likely to produce a lifetime cost saving to society of almost £275 million (£7,050 per offender). The costs of RJ conferencing are likely to be paid back within the first year of implementation. During the course of two parliaments (10 years), implementation of such a scheme would be likely to lead to a total net benefit to society during this period of over £1 billion.

---

<sup>13</sup> Early Intervention Report: Next Steps' (2011) [www.rip.org.uk/my-rip/network.../572-early-intervention-report-jan-2011](http://www.rip.org.uk/my-rip/network.../572-early-intervention-report-jan-2011)

<sup>14</sup> Matrix Knowledge Group (2009) 'Economic Analysis of Interventions for Young Adult Offenders' <http://www.matrixknowledge.com/evidence/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/barrow-cadbury.pdf>

## **ANNEX I**

### **Cost savings of reducing the use of prison for those who would receive less than a 12 month sentence**

Using alternatives could more effectively meet one of the statutory purposes of prison – to reduce re-offending – while also reducing taxpayer costs and, in the case of community-based interventions, alleviate the strain on prison capacity. Matrix<sup>15</sup> predict that by using such alternatives, the cost savings per adult or juvenile offender receiving a community intervention rather than prison range from:

- £20,000 to £88,500 for savings to the taxpayer only
- £38,000 to £203,000 for savings to the taxpayer plus the savings from fewer victim costs.

Subsequent research by Matrix (2009)<sup>16</sup> examined the impact of the wider costs - to the criminal justice system of responding to a crime, the healthcare costs of treating the victim of a crime, the victim's financial cost of a crime, and the pain and suffering experienced by the victim of a crime.

During 2007, the last year for which figures are available, it is estimated that there were a total of 7,873 prisoners given sentences of less than 12 months who were drug users and who could have instead been offered these alternative sentences - 9.2% of all offenders who were given custodial sentences.

Had they been given these alternative sentences, the Matrix analysis suggests this would have resulted in significantly reduced reoffending and intervention costs. It is estimated that society would have saved almost £1 billion had those drug-using offenders sentenced to 12 months or less in 2007 instead been given residential drug treatment. The annual cost savings for the first six years post sentencing would have been £60-100 million.

Such findings are endorsed by research conducted by nef, in 2010<sup>17</sup>, which found that prison is 'costly and fails to reduce crime'. In particular, sending a child to prison now costs £140,000 a year - about five times more than a place at Eton. They estimate £60 million could be saved through a move to more local justice.

For women offenders, research by nef<sup>18</sup> found that for every pound invested in support-focused alternatives to prison, £14 worth of social value is generated to women and their children, victims and society generally over ten years. Even small reductions in re-offending translate into significant savings. If alternatives to prison were to achieve an additional reduction of just 6 per cent in re-offending, the state would recoup the investment required to achieve this in just one year. The long-term value of these benefits is in excess of £100 million over a ten-year period.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Matrix Knowledge Group (2008) *'The economic case for and against prison- Update'*  
<http://www.matrixknowledge.com/wp-content/uploads/matrix-prison-report-dec-08-web.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> The Matrix Knowledge Group (2009) *'Are short term prison sentences an efficient and effective use of public resources?'* <http://makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2009/06/are-short-term-prison-sentences-an-efficient-and-effective-use-of-public-resources.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> The New Economics Foundation (2010) *'Punishing Costs: How locking up children is making Britain less safe'*  
<http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/punishing-costs>

<sup>18</sup> Nef (London, 2004), *'Unlocking Value: how we all benefit from investing in alternatives to prison for women offenders'*. <http://www.neweconomics.org/publications?keys=unlocking+value&tid=All>

## **Annex J**

### **References**

Bottoms, A., Rex, S. and Robinson, G. (eds.) (2004) *Alternatives to Prison: Options for an Insecure Society*, Cullompton: Willan.

Centre for Social Justice (2009) 'Order of the Courts'  
<http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/client/downloads/CSJ%20courts%20WEB.pdf>

Intensive Alternative to Custody: Options Paper November 2010 Greater Manchester Probation Trust) Early Intervention Report: Next Steps' (2011)  
[www.rip.org.uk/my-rip/network.../572-early-intervention-report-jan-2011](http://www.rip.org.uk/my-rip/network.../572-early-intervention-report-jan-2011)

The Matrix Knowledge Group (2008) '*The economic case for and against prison- Update*'  
<http://www.matrixknowledge.com/wp-content/uploads/matrix-prison-report-dec-08-web.pdf>

The Matrix Knowledge Group (2009) 'Are short term prison sentences an efficient and effective use of public resources?' <http://makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2009/06/are-short-term-prison-sentences-an-efficient-and-effective-use-of-public-resources.pdf>

Matrix Knowledge Group (2009) 'Economic Analysis of Interventions for Young Adult Offenders'  
<http://www.matrixknowledge.com/evidence/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/barrow-cadbury.pdf>

Ministry of Justice (2010) 'Compendium of Reoffending statistics and analysis'  
<http://www.justice.gov.uk/compendium-of-reoffending-statistics-and-analysis.pdf>

National Audit Office (2010) *Managing Offenders on Short Custodial Sentences*  
[http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0910/short\\_custodial\\_sentences.aspx](http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0910/short_custodial_sentences.aspx)

Nef (London, 2008), 'Unlocking Value: how we all benefit from investing in alternatives to prison for women offenders'.  
<http://www.neweconomics.org/publications?keys=unlocking+value&tid=All>

The New Economics Foundation (2010) 'Punishing Costs: How locking up children is making Britain less safe' <http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/punishing-costs>

Rethinking Crime and Punishment (2004) 'Crime, Courts and Confidence - Report of an independent inquiry into alternatives to prison'  
<http://www.rethinking.org.uk/PDFs/Coulsfieldreport.pdf>

Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health Report (2009) 'A Missed Opportunity: Community Sentences and the Mental Health Treatment Requirement'  
[http://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/pdfs/Missed\\_Opportunity.pdf](http://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/pdfs/Missed_Opportunity.pdf)

Smart Justice and Victim Support Survey (2006)  
<http://www.smartjustice.org/pr16jan06.html>

Wright, M. (2009) 'Towards a Restorative Society: a problem solving response to harm.'  
<http://makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/Martin-Wright--Towards-a-Restorative-Society.pdf>

**MAKE JUSTICE WORK  
MARCH 2011**