



## **Effective Community Sentences**

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

21<sup>st</sup> June 2012

### To Consultation Co-ordinator,

Make Justice Work (MJW) welcomes the community sentence review and particularly the emphasis on the value of effective community sentences, restorative justice and the best use of electronic monitoring.

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 and on other independent sources, which are listed in the appendices.

Community sentences need to be demanding, while simultaneously working effectively to reduce the likelihood of re-offending and the level of crime in society. The most impressive aspect of effective community sentences is their ability to rehabilitate offenders and turn them away from a lifestyle of law-breaking, thereby reducing the number of victims. Not only can they reduce reoffending more effectively than imprisonment, but they do so at a small fraction of the cost (see attached Executive Summary). Extending the availability of effective community sentences has the potential to deliver substantial savings to the public purse in the longer-term.

A National Enquiry, commissioned by Make Justice Work, found that community sentences must attract the confidence of victims of crime and local communities. Victims and the wider public must be confident that community sentences are both demanding and punitive, but critically such sentences should also confront the drivers of the offender's criminal behaviour. This means that during community sentences time should be spent addressing the causes of lower-level crime in order to help offenders move towards a more stable, productive and crime-free life.

Community sentences must also provide a platform for the voluntary, private and independent sectors to work collaboratively and develop innovative programmes that are tailored to the individual needs of offenders. Every programme should function as a 'one-stop-shop' and host representatives from a range of providers and public agencies such as housing organisations, local authorities and health services.

Effective community sentences should also see the judiciary being informed about the progress offenders are making. Magistrates must be fully informed about the various options for community sentences in their area and the public must be engaged also, to help improve their understanding of the role such sentences can play in making local communities safer. Those responsible for running each programme must also ensure the local judiciary is well informed about its outcomes and effectiveness.

However, we are concerned about the risk of up-tariffing, whereby offenders who previously might have received a fine for an offence, would be subject to community sentences instead. The extension of community sentences as an alternative to less demanding sanctions, could lead to an increase in the number of breaches and in turn to more people being sent to prison. We fear this would be counter-productive and undermine the objective of ensuring community sentences are a more effective alternative to custody.

Key stakeholders and opinion formers must have the confidence to counterbalance negativity in the media and subsequently the wider public. As the following articles demonstrate, there is evidence both on mainland Europe and from the Right On Crime campaign in the USA about the opportunities which exist to challenge misguided orthodoxies on the inappropriate use of custody.

- [Economist 'Smart on Crime: Why reforming criminal justice is now a Conservative issue'](#)
- [Criminal Justice Alliance 'Reducing the use of imprisonment. What can we learn from Europe'?](#)
- [Right on Crime The Economist 'Custody v Community Sentences: Smart on Crime'](#)
- [Huffington Post 'Prison Overcrowding: States Make Move to Reduce Inmate Population'](#)
- [Economist 'The challenges of realignment'](#)
- [Commonwealth Foundation 'Pennsylvania's Blueprint for Better Public Safety'](#)

Ministers need to challenge the hollow rhetoric of 'soft' versus 'tough' sentences by actively promoting public understanding of the facts about lower-level crime and the rehabilitation of offenders. They must encourage much wider use of community sentences that are not just intrinsically punitive – such sentences must be rehabilitative as they can then be much more effective at reducing crime than short-term imprisonment and are considerably less expensive. (See link to our full report in Appendix 13). Strong leadership will be required to face down ill-informed opposition, but the example of the Right on Crime campaign in the USA should be an encouragement.

Yours sincerely



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

**Q1: What should the core elements of Intensive Community Punishment be?**

Confronting the underlying causes of crime must be the priority. During community sentences time should be spent addressing the key drivers of lower-level crime in order to direct and guide offenders towards a stable, productive and crime-free life. Tailored, personalised community sentences are essential. One-size-fits all interventions will not work.

Our National Commission of Enquiry (Appendix 1) identified the core elements which underpin such a community sentence (Appendix 2).

*“When it came to sentencing, I could have gone to prison. I was sentenced to an Intensive Alternative to Custody Order (IAC) for 12 months. This meant I would be attending at least 5 appointments every week at Together Women and that I would have some discipline to avoid returning to custody. The fact that I had appointments I had to comply with worked better for me than prison as I was kept busy.” Julie, Together Women Project client.*

**Q2: Which offenders would Intensive Community Punishment be suitable for?**

Thorough screening and in-depth assessment (particularly focussing on mental health, self-harm, drug and alcohol issues) must be put in place, and included in pre-sentence reports presented to the courts. The choice must still remain with the offender as to whether he/she can opt for a short custodial sentence. Appendix 3 provides a guide to which offenders could be suitable. The Government’s commitment to target 120,000 ‘problem families’ recognises the importance of tailored programmes which address the underlying problems of criminality. Effective and robust ICPs should be considered as appropriate for some members of these families, as an alternative to custody.

*“I thought driving without a licence was a victimless crime, but I can understand now that it wasn’t. A prison sentence would not have changed my behaviour. If I was given two months, I would have emerged from prison exactly the same. On the IAC there is the time for rehabilitation.” Edward, Manchester IAC.*

**Q3: Do you agree that every offender who receives a community order should be subject to a sanction which is aimed primarily at the punishment of the offender (‘a punitive element’)**

No - There is no evidence that increasing punishment will lead to a reduction in re-offending. (Appendix 4). It is also important to recognise that by definition, an ICP is in itself punitive – considerably more so than a short custodial sentence – and will lead to a significant loss of liberty and impose a number of demanding and restrictive obligations on the offenders concerned. This is essential if an offender is to address the triggers of their criminal behavior.

*“A number of the offenders at this Manchester course told us that it would have been much easier to have gone to prison for three months, and that some people did indeed make the decision to drop out and go to jail. But for those who did fully participate in the very intrusive and challenging twelve month alternative programme the rewards were huge.” Peter Osborne, Political Commentator, The Daily Telegraph – Chair of the Community or Custody Enquiry.*

#### **Q4: Which requirements of the community order do you regard as punitive?**

For an offender whose life is often chaotic, lacking in structure and unstable, all of the requirements could be considered as punitive. Each of the requirements available under the sanction of a community sentence has a 'punitive aspect'.

Critically, for many offenders, a tough and demanding community sentence is regarded as harder and more challenging than a short prison sentence. (Appendix 5)

*"Prison for me was a place to rest, to watch TV, get well and fit, then I would be back into the same circles when I came out. But in this project it was different; I had to open up, to engage with strangers, to talk to people about issues that I had kept buried for years.*

*I had to keep appointments, have courses, and understand the impact of my crimes on victims. I was bored in prison, it was so much easier".* Kieran Simmonds, Leicester Criminal Justice Drug and Alcohol Team Peer Mentor.

*"It's just a punishment coming in 4 times a week. Once a week would be better ....it can get in the way of things."* 23 year old on the IAC in Manchester.

#### **Q5. Are there some classes of offenders for whom (or particular circumstances in which) a punitive element of a sentence would not be suitable?**

Few lower level offenders would benefit from a purely punitive element being incorporated into their sentence (Appendix 6). Consideration should be given to create sanctions for breach which do not involve custody.

*"The problem of women specific crime and solutions is related to the question of community or custody in Nicola Stell's opinion. 'Women, because of their (generally) more numerous or more severe personal problems, frequently have greater difficulty than men in complying with community orders'. This meant, she argued, that making a Community Order more onerous when breached will tend to push women more rapidly towards the custody threshold."* [Community or Custody Bradford Report 2011](#).

#### **Q6. How should such offenders be sentenced?**

An individually tailored sentence should always be the priority with a strong focus on dealing with the issues triggering the offender's criminal behavior. This can only be achieved through local partnerships and integrated services. Intelligent assessment via Probation and other service deliverers is crucial through the pre-sentence reports, to ensure the courts are appropriately informed to enable them to provide the most reasoned sentence which will increase the likelihood of reduced re-offending. (Appendix 7).

#### **Q7. How can we best ensure that sentences in the community achieve a balance between all five purposes of sentencing?**

Punishment is only ONE of the five purposes. The other elements are in fact the key drivers that can reduce crime and help to rehabilitate offenders. (Appendix 8). At present there is a lack of appropriate accountability mechanisms in place to ensure community sentences are held to

account in terms of the quality of outcomes and delivery. There is a role for multi-agency working including people such as Magistrates, the Police and the newly elected Police & Crime Commissioners to devise appropriate mechanisms locally to improve such accountability. This would help to ensure that sentences in the community achieve a balance between all five purposes of sentencing.

*“Many evidence-givers and panel members responded that for most victims the primary concern was not to be a victim again, and that no one else should be a victim. If reoffending rates following short-term sentences were much higher than those following community alternatives, victims would favour the latter.” [Community or Custody Manchester Report](#).*

**Q8. Should we, if new technologies were available and affordable, encourage the use of electronically monitored technology to monitor compliance with community order requirements (in addition to curfew requirement)**

As has been shown by the IAC in Manchester, careful and intelligent use of new technology can result in a positive response from the offender. However it is important to avoid the use of electronically monitored technology in relation to up-tariffing and net-widening for minor offences, where fines would previously have been regarded as appropriate. (Appendix 9)

However, there is a risk that women subject to controlling behaviour and domestic abuse may be placed in unsafe situations as a result of curfews.

**Q10. Are there other ways we could use electronically monitored curfews more imaginatively?**

Critically, careful assessment of an offender’s habits and vulnerability must be taken into account, such as when they are used in conjunction with sobriety orders for example. (Appendix 10)

The use of electronically monitored curfews will help to reduce reoffending only when it is linked to clear recovery and rehabilitative programmes; simply limiting someone's ability to offend does not provide them with an alternative to offending as it only "reduces the window of opportunity". Community orders which restrict offenders activities must also offer a meaningful alternative which can lead to sustainable change after the short term controls have been lifted. Linking restriction requirements and electronically monitored curfews to programmes based upon desistance and recovery can overcome some of these issues if it is done in a joined up and creative way. Ideally each offender placed upon such an order should be linked in with a peer/recovery mentor who can guide them through the process and introduce them to alternatives to substance misuse and offending

**Q11. Would tracking certain offenders (as part of a non-custodial sentence) be effective at preventing future offending?**

No – however, done appropriately, it could impact on **compliance** as well as reducing the likelihood of offending during the order. It cannot prevent future offending as once the order is complete the offender is just as likely to continue offending, unless effective support and rehabilitation has been put in place during the order and offered **after** the order is completed.

**Q19. How can compliance with community sentences be improved?**

Offenders will comply if they believe they are being dealt fairly, and treated humanely. Sentences which motivate and engage with the offender, coupled with appropriate monitoring and control of behaviour, rather than just punish, will result in greater compliance and reduced levels of re-offending. (Appendix 11).

*“The encouragement I was given from the judge at my court reviews, motivated me as it felt like he understood that prison would have made things worse, in fact I know I wouldn’t be here now.”*  
Together Women Project Client.

**Q36. How else could our proposals on community sentences help the particular needs of women offenders?**

Women do better on community sentences than men but *women are less likely than their male counterparts to receive a community sentence. In 2010, just 10% of women received a community sentence compared to 16% of men.* (Appendix 12)

More must be done to educate sentencers about the effectiveness of community sentences for women and more effort must be made to ensure that where there is scope for gender specific community provision to be included in a sentencing package courts are fully informed through detailed proposals in pre-sentence reports. Probation trusts should ensure that they commission appropriate services for women.

Early intervention and preventative services for women that aim to divert them away from criminal justice sanctions and into appropriate treatment and care should be prioritised. Liaison and diversion services must be made gender-specific. Equally, Alcohol Treatment Requirements for women must offer appropriate gender-specific needs assessment and treatment options.

Women serving community payback orders should do these in women’s centres with all supervision delivered within these centres.

## **Q1: What should the core elements of Intensive Community Punishment be?**

### **Appendix 1**

#### National Commission of Enquiry: Community or Custody?

MJW appointed a panel of experts to investigate the effectiveness of community alternatives in comparison to short-term prison sentences.

The Enquiry was completed in July 2011. Over a twelve-month period it held four in-depth investigatory meetings around the country where experts and the public were given the opportunity to give evidence and opinions to the panel about relevant local practices, and answer questions from the panel. The panel visited the Intensive Alternative to Custody Programme in Manchester, the Together Women Project in West Yorkshire, the Leicester Criminal Justice Drugs Team and the Together Mental Health Diversion scheme at Camberwell Green Magistrates Court.

***“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”***

**Peter Osborne**, author, broadcaster and commentator for the Daily Telegraph chaired the panel and consisted of:

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

The full report is available online: <http://www.makejusticework.org.uk/our-projects/national-commission-enquiry-final-report/>

### **Appendix 2**

From the Community or Custody Report, September 2011

#### **Confronting the causes of crime**

During community sentences time should be spent addressing the key drivers of low-level crime in order to help offenders move towards a stable, productive and crime free life.

- The focus of all community based programmes must be the underlying causes of criminal activity, with each programme being tailored to the individuals own behavior, needs and circumstances
- Further funding needs to be made available to widen the availability of mental health liaison services operating at the earliest possible stage in the criminal justice process.
- All offenders should be screened and assessed for low-level mental health needs that may not qualify for serious psychiatric intervention but if properly addressed would reduce the likelihood of reoffending.
- Alcohol and drug misuse must be awarded equal status and alcohol rehabilitation provision must be increased.
- Every programme should provide wider family and community support to help offenders resolve problems in their lives and break away from bad influences.
- Providers of community sentences must work to reduce the barriers to a productive, crime-free lifestyle, such as lack of stable accommodation, low educational attainment and limited employment opportunities.

## **Giving victims confidence in the punishment**

Community sentences must not be a soft option.

- Whilst rehabilitation is integral, victims and the wider public must be confident that community sentences are tough and effective.
- Reparation must be a central part of an intensive community sentence. Offenders should understand the impact of their crimes on their communities and victims and work to restore damage caused.
- Victim- awareness activities should be included in all community orders and the option of Restorative Justice conferencing should be available to all courts.
- Offenders who breach the conditions of their order must face a firm and swift response, but this must be balanced by finding better ways to achieve compliance. Offenders (and the wider public) need to understand that an alternative to custody is not a soft-option and that it makes tough demands.

### **Examples of a tailored approach:**

#### **Manchester**

The IAC Order in Manchester involves an intensive curriculum of activity offering rehabilitation, punishment and reparation through new partnerships between Greater Manchester Probation Trust, 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

#### **Bradford**

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

**Q2: Which offenders would Intensive Community Punishment be suitable for?**

**Appendix 3**

- Those who are at low risk of self-harm
- Those who are assessed as having significant employment, lifestyle and behaviour needs (likely to include a range of other offender related needs such as alcohol, attitudes, relationships and accommodation)
- Women who are at risk of custody
- Young adults at risk of custody and who, in the view of the court, would respond best to such an intensive community sentence
- Those who express a certain level of maturity
- NB: the danger can be that courts will see this type of sentence as a viable option for those who are even lower level offenders, so up-tariffing/net-widening must be avoided at all costs.

**Q3: Do you agree that every offender who receives a community order should be subject to a sanction which is aimed primarily at the punishment of the offender ('a punitive element')?**

**Appendix 4**

- intensive community punishment is intrinsically punitive - additional sanctions designed purely to be punitive will be unnecessary and in some cases, harmful.
- A personalised risk assessment should be made through the pre-sentence report system to avoid unnecessary expense on ineffective punitive measures.
- Excessive/unnecessary punishment may lead to increased likelihood of breach.
- Victims, as evidence confirms, are most concerned that the offender does not go on to commit further crimes. Whilst at first their natural reaction is to want punishment, when more engaged with the process, their attitudes change<sup>1</sup>.

**Q4: Which requirements of the community order do you regard as punitive?**

**Appendix 5**

A community order should include a package of measures to tackle the triggers of criminal behaviour, including ones which may not be deemed as highly punitive, but are crucial to reduce levels of re-offending.

Examples of measures to include in a community order would be:

- Curfew/tagging – restriction of movement.
- Attending 30 plus hours a week at a centre.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Victims Perspectives on community alternatives to custody', Make Justice Work and Victim Support [http://www.makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Evidence-review-report\\_FINAL1.pdf](http://www.makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Evidence-review-report_FINAL1.pdf)

- Victim awareness and restorative justice - facing up to the impact of their crime
- Community payback – undertaking reparation
- Attendance Centre which can involve weekend work
- Prohibited activity
- Drug and alcohol treatment which includes abstinence
- Mental health treatment
- Family work – dealing with complex relationship issues
- Education, training and employment – e.g. dealing with literacy issues

**Q5. Are there some classes of offenders for whom (or particular circumstances in which) a punitive element of a sentence would not be suitable?**

#### **Appendix 6**

- Some first time offenders
- Functioning alcoholics
- Those whose circumstances suggest the likelihood of breach due to their chaotic lifestyles
- Those with certain degrees of drug, alcohol or mental health issues who have committed nonviolent offences
- Vulnerable women and those who have full time caring responsibilities but are at low risk of breaching
- Women where financial penalties for breach of orders may result in further debt and money problems for those already living in poverty and are unlikely to be a solution that reduces the risks of reoffending. Orders and licence conditions should fit women's particular circumstances and should be flexible in the way they respond to women's needs
- For some who are in employment and where a punitive measure could disrupt their ability to continue working
- For some offenders who have communication difficulties, for example those with learning disabilities, or do not speak English.

**Q6. How should such offenders be sentenced?**

#### **Appendix 7**

- Critical to the success of such non-punitive sentences is the option of diversion from the criminal justice system, to appropriate robust services in the community such as drug, alcohol and mental health services.
- Problem solving courts are shown to be an effective tool, particularly for those where reward/motivation rather than punishment has shown to be a motivator for compliance. Check research.
- Residential drug treatment programmes as evidenced in our Matrix Report<sup>2</sup>.
- Common sense and informed sentencing should ensure that punishment is not used in a heavy handed way which, for some offenders will result in failure to comply and increase their likelihood of reoffending
- Gender-specific sentences which allow women to undertake orders in a safe and appropriate environment

**Q7. How can we best ensure that sentences in the community achieve a balance between all five purposes of sentencing?**

#### **Appendix 8**

The five purposes of sentencing:

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Are short term prison sentences an efficient and effective use of public resources', Make Justice Work and Matrix Evidence <http://cebp.indiana.edu/Portals/418/Chris/are-short-term-prison-sentences-an-efficient-and-effective-use-of-public-resources.pdf>

The punishment of offenders

The reduction of crime (including its reduction by deterrence)

The reform and rehabilitation of offenders

The protection of the public

The making of reparation by offenders to persons affected by their offence

- Well trained and informed magistrates and judges who have a mandatory responsibility to visit the community sentences they are sentencing offenders to
- Well trained and informed probation officers who can establish relationships of mutual trust with offenders accept.
- Well trained and informed voluntary and private sector staff ditto
- As is the case at the moment, high level risk assessments but improved pre-sentence reports to identify appropriate sentencing via Probation Trusts
- Carefully targeted use of tagging/curfews/electronic monitoring in conjunction with rehabilitative requirements
- Multidisciplinary partnership working (through Integrated Offender Management and the commissioning process)
- Victim input, including Restorative Justice. RJ offers opportunity to give victims of crime a voice and have a greater stake in resolution of offences.
- Service User Council – continuous engagement with offenders and ex-offenders regarding the success/failure of any given community sentence will increase the likely of achieving the most appropriate balance
- Local community engagement, via Police and Crime Commissioners, PCTs, Employment, Education, and Training providers, housing agencies and voluntary sector agencies

From the Community or Custody Enquiry Report 2011

### **Holding community sentences to account**

- Magistrates must be fully informed about intensive community sentences in their area and the public must be helped to understand the role such sentences can play in combating crime.
- A statutory requirement and framework for magistrates and judges to familiarise themselves with all community sentences available in their area by visiting on a regular basis.
- Judicial oversight during the sentence must be maintained and where appropriate offenders should attend court for regular progress reviews.
- Those in charge of each programme must ensure that the local judiciary is informed about its outcomes and effectiveness.
- All programmes must develop initiatives such as the 'Local Crime: Community Sentence' to educate and inform the wider community about the work they do to punish and rehabilitate offenders.

***Q8. Should we, if new technologies were available and affordable, encourage the use of electronically monitored technology to monitor compliance with community order requirements (in addition to curfew requirement)?***

### **Appendix 9**

- 24/7 satellite tracking and possibly sobriety requirements – critical that they are pitched at the right group such as persistent offenders causing damage or harm and those at risk of short custody. As long as targeting is right it can sit well as part of an intensive disposal. Smart monitoring of behaviour in the community is as important as punishment.
- Again, it is essential that such technologies are not used in isolation – there has to be a rehabilitative focus attached.

**Q10. Are there other ways we could use electronically monitored curfews more imaginatively?**

**Appendix 10**

Northumberland Probation Trust work in partnership with the Cyrenians who run a Recovery Day Centre which is available to all offenders in the city the idea is to give offenders somewhere to go so that they can receive peer support and engage in positive activities during the day so that when restrictions are placed on an offender as part of the order they cannot go into certain areas, e.g. shopping centres, pubs etc. at key times of the day. The centre is open and the offender is able to come to the centre to encourage positive activities and recovery. The Recovery Centre is a peer lead initiative which encourages an abstinence and desistance based approach to recovery from all forms of substance misuse and is built on the principle that if individuals are encouraged to build recovery capital they are more likely to live offence and substance free life styles.

**Q19. How can compliance with community sentences be improved?**

**Appendix 11**

From the Community or Custody Report 2011

**No passing the buck**

- Alternatives to custody depend on effective partnerships between multiple agencies.
- The offender, not the individual agencies delivering a community sentence, must be the focus of all interventions. Agencies must operate together on the basis of an integrated offender management plan, sharing information and pooling budgets wherever possible.
- The government should encourage the voluntary and private sectors to provide innovative approaches to community sentences and give them the freedom to build programmes that are tailored to the individual needs of each offender.
- Providers delivering community sentences must cooperate closely with local police forces and wherever possible a police officer should be seconded to work with the delivery team.
- Every programme should function as a 'one-stop-shop' and host representatives from a range of providers, including housing organisations, and local health services.

And in addition:

- Including a reward mechanism will increase motivation, as has been achieved within the IAC in Manchester regarding tagging.
- Enabling strong and positive relationships is crucial. Improved offender-key worker relationship – the development and maintenance not just of motivation but also of hope are key tasks for criminal justice practitioners
- Focus on the human relationships between offenders and those they care about
- Increased use of peer mentors and community volunteers
- Appropriate enforcement – partnership with police. Hull IAC work closely with the Police and have officers stationed at Humberside Probation which makes information sharing extremely effective. Their role is to visit offenders on home visits with a member of Probation; this partnership means that any non-compliance can be dealt with swiftly.
- Partnership with offender's families – Hull IAC offers a Family Intervention Project<sup>3</sup> where a 'whole family' approach is adopted. Probation work with Minerva Project and offer families the opportunity to take a role in problem solving and the decision-making processes.
- Increase the quality of offender engagement and service deliver.
- Service User councils
- Victim Councils

---

<sup>3</sup> 'Hull Family Intervention Project' managed by Barnado's in Partnership with Hull City Council <http://www.makejusticework.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Hull-FIP.pdf>

- Understanding maturity and applying the most appropriate sanction
- Equally, community sentences are integral to offenders becoming active citizens in the local communities and citizenship, therefore, should be seen as an integral part of the process of rehabilitation. Motivation is key to compliance and this would be added value.

***Q36. How else could our proposals on community sentences help the particular needs of women offenders?***

**Appendix 12**

For women offenders, this means strengthening partnerships with voluntary organisations providing women-specific options such as Cautions and Intensive Alternatives to Custody. A Specified Activity Order can be used to direct women offenders into local women’s community services and in this way a community sentence can be tailor-made so that a bespoke package of gender-responsive interventions can be delivered in a women-only environment with expertise and support geared towards developing protective factors, building resilience and reducing risks.

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.

**Appendix 13**

Make Justice Work commissioned Matrix Evidence to undertake a special piece of research into the cost benefits of alternatives to custody.

The brand new report “An Economic analysis of alternatives to short term custody” is now available on our website.