

A joint thematic inspection of Integrated Offender Management

An inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation and
HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services

February 2020



Her Majesty's
Inspectorate of
Probation



Promoting improvements
in policing and fire & rescue
services to make everyone safer

Acknowledgements

This inspection was led by HM Inspector Stuart Tasker, supported by a team of inspectors and colleagues from across the Inspectorate. Andrew Reed, Inspection Officer from HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, led the inspection of police work. The manager responsible for this inspection programme is Helen Davies, Head of Thematic & Joint Inspections at HM Inspectorate of Probation. We would like to thank all those who participated in any way in this inspection. Without their help and cooperation, the inspection would not have been possible. Please note that throughout the report the names in the practice examples have been changed to protect the individual's identity.

© Crown copyright 2020

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available for download at:

www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation

Published by:

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
1st Floor Civil Justice Centre
1 Bridge Street West
Manchester
M3 3FX

Follow us on Twitter [@hmiprobation](https://twitter.com/hmiprobation)

Contents

Foreword	4
Contextual facts	6
Executive summary	7
Recommendations	10
1. Introduction	11
1.1. Why this thematic?	11
1.2. Background	11
1.3. Aims and objectives	14
1.4. Report outline	14
2. Policy, strategy and leadership	15
2.1. National policy and strategy	15
2.2. Leadership	16
2.3. Support for staff working in IOM	20
2.4. Conclusions and implications	21
3. Working in partnership	22
3.1. Cross-agency involvement with IOM	22
3.2. Availability of services	23
3.3. Conclusions and implications	25
4. The quality of case work	26
4.1. The quality of case work to support desistance	26
4.2. The quality of work to keep people safe	32
4.3. Conclusions and implications	36
5. Understanding the impact of IOM	37
5.1. Evaluation of IOM	37
5.2. IOM performance monitoring	38
5.3. Findings from the 2018/2019 core probation inspection programme	39
5.4. Conclusions and implications	41
References	42
Annex 1: Glossary	44
Annex 2: Methodology	46

Foreword

We last inspected Integrated Offender Management (IOM) in 2014, before the *Transforming Rehabilitation* probation change programme had completed. At that time, IOM was a significant element of the Home Office and Ministry of Justice (MoJ) strategy to prevent crime and reduce reoffending. This is less explicit now.

Our findings in 2014 were promising, although, in the six areas inspected, we found differing degrees of commitment to the approach among relevant agencies. We commented that IOM is a common-sense approach that feels right, but that it was hindered by the absence of clear evidence of its effectiveness. It is, therefore, concerning that there has been no response to our recommendation for an evaluation of the costs and benefits of IOM at a national level. While there is some monitoring of performance in individual areas, there is no reporting mechanism for this information to be fed back to the relevant government departments, or for learning and best practice to be disseminated more widely. Regrettably, the system for measuring the impact of IOM, provided by the Home Office to police forces, has not been fully implemented, and is still only in place in 14 police force areas. A comprehensive evaluation would therefore provide much-needed direction both nationally and within local areas.

Overall, our findings in this 2019 inspection are disappointing. There has been scant development of IOM since 2015. In many areas, IOM has lost its way and has a much lower profile than previously. The broadening of the scope of many schemes to cover high risk of harm as well as prolific offender cases has reduced the clarity of focus and has not been accompanied by the necessary upskilling of staff to deal with the different challenges presented by this type of offender. Only two out of the forty-four probation staff interviewed had received any specific IOM training, and no formal training was provided to police IOM staff. Little more than half of IOM probation staff felt that their workload was manageable.

The delivery of services to the IOM cohort was also patchy. In only a third of the IOM cases reviewed did plans set out exactly what was required of the service user as a result of their inclusion in the IOM scheme. Less than half of this cohort were getting the drug or alcohol misuse services they needed.

Full co-location of police, probation and support services appears to have become a thing of the past, with only one out of the seven sites we visited having this in place. As a result, we found that delivery is rarely integrated. In some areas, the roles of police and probation had blurred, and the police were more actively engaged in the delivery of rehabilitation work than the probation service. The separation of probation under *Transforming Rehabilitation*, reductions in police numbers and funding cuts to most services has hindered delivery. Work to protect the public, in particular, needs to be improved.

This is not to say that our findings during this inspection were all negative. There remain some encouraging signs about the potential for IOM to provide good-quality interventions to those individuals who most need it, and we found some effective practice continuing at some of the sites we visited. There are indications that IOM can be effective in providing close monitoring and supervision and in achieving swift enforcement. An analysis of 268 IOM cases assessed during our routine local probation inspections over the course of

2018/2019 found that they were 10 percentage points more likely to have been adequately supervised on our key standards relating to assessment, planning, delivery and review. This further supports the case for decisions to be made about who might benefit most from this multi-agency approach.

Significant changes to probation are pending, and the new model brings opportunities to develop IOM. An increase in police numbers may also create the potential for a higher profile for IOM and an increased level of cross-agency collaboration to deal with the greater numbers of offenders likely to find their way into the system. We have made a number of recommendations to assist in preparing for these systemic changes.



Justin Russell

HM Chief Inspector of Probation



Wendy Williams

HM Inspector of Constabulary

Contextual facts

August 2008

The government provided funding to five 'pioneer areas' to pilot the IOM approach.¹

125

The current number of IOM schemes across England and Wales.

Not known

The current number of cases managed in IOM across England and Wales.

81%

The percentage of IOM service users that were deemed to have drug misuse as a criminogenic factor in our 2018/2019 inspection programme.²

40%

The percentage of IOM service users that were deemed to have accommodation as a criminogenic factor in our 2018/2019 inspection programme.³

75%

The percentage of IOM service users that were subject to post-release supervision in our 2018/2019 inspection programme.⁴

37%

The percentage of the offending population in 2018 that had had a long criminal career (15 or more previous convictions). This is an increase of **10** percentage points since 2008.⁵

42%

The percentage of serving prisoners on 31 March 2019 that were prolific offenders.⁶

£18.1 billion per year

The estimated total economic and social cost of reoffending in England and Wales.⁷

100%

The percentage of IOM schemes that involved the police and the local Community Rehabilitation Company.

96%

The percentage of IOM schemes that involved the National Probation Service.⁸

80%

The percentage of IOM schemes that included statutory substance misuse services.⁹

1 Senior, P. et al. (2011). *Process evaluation of five integrated offender management pioneer areas. Project Report*. London: Ministry of Justice, Home Office. Available at: http://shura.shu.ac.uk/7046/1/Senior_process_Evaluation_of_five.pdf.

2 HMI Probation. (2019). *2018/2019 inspections of probation services aggregated data*. (Unpublished).

3 HMI Probation. (2019). *2018/2019 inspections of probation services aggregated data*. (Unpublished).

4 HMI Probation. (2019). *2018/2019 inspections of probation services aggregated data*. (Unpublished).

5 Ministry of Justice. (2019). *Criminal Justice System statistics quarterly: December 2018*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/criminal-justice-system-statistics-quarterly-december-2018> Accessed: 7 August 2019.

6 Ministry of Justice. (2019). *Prolific Offenders Criminal Pathway: Prison Events and Offender Needs*. NB: 'A prolific offender is someone who has committed a disproportionately large number of offences relative to their age group (more than four offences for juvenile prolific offenders; more than eight offences for young adult prolific offenders; more than 16 offences for adult prolific offenders)'.

7 Ministry of Justice. (2019). *Economic and social costs of reoffending: Analytical report*.

8 HMI Probation. (2019). *IOM Survey of Police and Crime Commissioners*. (Unpublished).

9 HMI Probation. (2019). *IOM Survey of Police and Crime Commissioners*. (Unpublished).

Executive summary

Context

IOM was originally established in 2009 and aimed to bring a cross-agency response to the threat of crime and reoffending faced by local communities. The most persistent and problematic offenders were to be identified and managed jointly by partner agencies working together. IOM aims to help improve the quality of life in communities by:

- reducing the negative impact of crime and reoffending
- reducing the number of people who become victims of crime
- helping to improve the public's confidence in the criminal justice system.

In June 2014, as part of the government's *Transforming Rehabilitation* programme, 35 probation trusts were replaced by a new public sector National Probation Service (NPS) and 21 Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs), owned by eight organisations,¹⁰ each different in constitution and outlook.

Subsequently, the MoJ and Home Office relaunched their approach to IOM in 2015 and refreshed the key principles. Broadly, these led to the diversification of IOM and enabled individual areas to bring in a wider range of offender cohorts and offence types. All offenders are now potentially within the scope of IOM. Where previously the approach was used to support and manage those with the most complex needs who posed a high likelihood of reoffending, IOM now focuses more on serious harm. Of the cases reviewed in this inspection, just under half involved violence and almost 40 per cent were assessed as posing a high or very high risk of serious harm. Over half involved current concerns about domestic abuse.

This inspection aimed to examine how IOM has been operating since the implementation of *Transforming Rehabilitation* and in a climate of reduced police numbers. In doing so, HMI Probation and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) visited seven different IOM schemes in England and Wales, selected to provide a cross-section of urban and rural locations. At each site, we interviewed managers, frontline staff and other agencies. We also looked in detail at 60 cases across the seven sites, reviewed relevant research and interviewed key national strategic leads for IOM in the police, HMPPS and MoJ. A survey of all Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) was also conducted, to which 39 responded.

Policy, strategy and leadership

After the 2015 relaunch, IOM received less attention from the MoJ and Home Office. There is no centralised national leadership of IOM, and strategy and leadership are now driven at a local level, with Local Criminal Justice Boards (LCJBs) and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) providing strategic oversight and setting priorities. PCCs are supporting IOM in most areas and have led work to help re-define the approach. However, *Transforming Rehabilitation* had a negative impact on partnership working, and the consequences for the integration of services at a local level were not considered or sufficiently planned for. Only 26 of the 44 probation responsible officers we spoke to said that their IOM referral and inclusion criteria were well understood. It has taken considerable energy and commitment for partnerships to navigate their way through the challenges of the probation changes and make sense of the differing priorities and delivery models of providers, while maintaining the involvement of both the NPS and CRCs.

¹⁰ This number reduced to seven in February 2019 when the CRCs owned by Working Links transferred to the Kent, Surrey and Sussex CRC.

The passion and commitment of managers and staff working within IOM was evident throughout this inspection. However, workloads and resourcing issues in all agencies have impacted on the quality of services at times, with only just over half of the probation staff interviewed saying that their workload was manageable. Although there are exceptions, investment in training and development for IOM teams has been lacking, and this has impacted on the quality of practice, particularly in relation to keeping people safe. Only two of the forty-four probation staff interviewed reported having any specific IOM-related training and no formal training in the role was provided to the police.

Working in partnership

Good partnership working is essential for IOM to be effective. Although we saw strong relationships between agencies at a strategic level, with the right agencies involved in the range of strategic meetings, this was not always replicated operationally. Significant funding cuts to the majority of services meant that some schemes lacked involvement from key partners to deliver rehabilitative interventions and, in the areas inspected, IOM status no longer resulted in priority access to services such as mental health or substance abuse treatment, as it may once have done. We did, however, see some areas where additional funding from PCCs or, in some cases, good relations between agencies had resulted in an array of service provision. Some areas had managed to coordinate resources so that individuals had priority access to some interventions, and this was impressive to see in a climate of reduced funding.

Full co-location and integration of the core IOM agencies (CRC, NPS and police) appears to be a thing of the past, and we only saw evidence of this in one of the seven areas we visited, although partial co-location was happening in some others. Although co-location is generally viewed as best practice and the desired approach, competing organisational priorities and resourcing issues were impacting on the ability of some partners to commit to this way of working.

In some areas, the police appeared to have taken over some of the rehabilitation work traditionally carried out by probation services, for example helping individuals to complete benefit applications or taking them to appointments.

Some schemes were routinely gathering and analysing the profiles and needs of those subject to IOM, which is vital to ensure that services are suitably responsive and personalised. CRCs tended to be more able to provide data to commissioners to help inform funding decisions. On a national level, the police and NPS strategic groups operate in isolation. There is an opportunity for these groups to work better together to share ideas and jointly promote IOM in their respective agencies.

The quality of case work

Practical help given to promote compliance with interventions was impressive, and we saw some good examples of both police and probation going the extra mile to ensure that individuals received relevant support for complex problems. Multi-agency contributions to post-release licence conditions to reduce the likelihood of reoffending were also strong in some areas. More joint pre-release visits between police and probation and joint induction meetings to explain the ramifications and requirements of IOM would improve engagement further.

Work to reduce reoffending was generally better than practice to protect the public. This is concerning, given the changing profile of IOM cases, with a number of schemes now prioritising 'threat, harm and risk' offender groups. In particular, training for the IOM police in working with domestic abuse perpetrators, safeguarding children and the protection of vulnerable adults needs to be prioritised. Discussions within monthly IOM case review meetings tended to focus on the needs of the offender, rather than actions to protect the victims.

In only around a third of cases in our sample did plans set out exactly what was required of service users as a result of their inclusion in the IOM scheme. Delivery of services was patchy, with less than half of service users getting sufficient delivery of drug or alcohol misuse services in the cases

we looked at and even fewer getting sufficient help with thinking and behaviour or relationships deficits.

We found case recording practice of both police and probation, including the reasons for inclusion in the IOM cohort and of activity to keep people safe, to be lacking at times. Service users were only properly informed about their inclusion in the scheme in half the cases inspected. Both issues require attention.

Understanding the impact of IOM

Although there are indications that IOM can have a positive impact on the quality of work delivered to service users, there remains an absence of any comprehensive evaluation to evidence that IOM is effective. IOM is now being used with so many different cohorts and offence types that measuring its impact or level of success has become more difficult. Of the 58 cases we reviewed,¹¹ 38 individuals were not convicted or cautioned again during their most recent period of supervision – though almost half were recalled to custody. Service user involvement in reviews of progress was poor and there was a lack of exit strategies for those who did finish supervision successfully.

There has been limited commitment to developing evaluation and establishing a performance framework at a national level. The Intelligence Driven Integrated Offender Management (IDIOM) system, approved by the Home Office for measuring the impact of IOM and available since at least 2013, has only been implemented in 14 police force areas. Although most schemes have systems in place to monitor and measure outcomes, there are a range of different approaches in use and no agreed methodology for measuring IOM performance. The MoJ and Home Office should take a more collaborative approach to this agenda and support the development of a national performance framework.

As part of this inspection, we analysed the quality of supervision of 268 IOM cases which were assessed as part of our routine local probation inspections in 2018/2019. Comparing these IOM cases to other inspected cases, we found that, across a range of measures relating to assessment, planning, delivery and review, they were, on average, 10 percentage points more likely to have been adequately supervised.

Effective Practice

Areas of practice we identified as enhancing the quality of IOM delivery:

- clearly defined governance and leadership arrangements provide clarity of purpose and direction for staff, managers and partners
- regular monitoring and analysis of service users' profiles, characteristics and needs help to determine the services required to support desistance and keep people safe
- co-location and integration of both core (CRC, NPS and police) and wider IOM partners (for example, substance misuse and housing) in one building enable better communication, information-sharing and accessibility of services for those supervised by IOM
- the involvement of all IOM agencies in case review meetings/panels that have a clear purpose and structure improves the ability of the IOM team to respond to the risks and needs of service users
- the allocation of cases to suitably trained, specialist IOM staff and teams enhances confidence, relationships between agencies and the quality of case supervision.

Our Effective Practice guide can be found at:
www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/effective-practice/

¹¹ Although we inspected 60 cases, not all inspection questions were applied to every case.

Recommendations

The Ministry of Justice should, in collaboration with the Home Office:

1. commission an independent, authoritative and structured evaluation of the cost and benefits of IOM, in terms of crime reduction; reduced frequency and/or seriousness of reoffending; and eventual desistance from crime. In doing this, they should identify which cohorts of offenders benefit most from the IOM approach
2. refresh the joint IOM strategy and provide clear leadership and support for the delivery of IOM and sharing of best practice. The strategy should be clear about who should provide leadership and governance for IOM within local areas.

The Home Office should, in collaboration with the Ministry of Justice:

3. provide support to local areas on the use of IDIOM, or an equivalent suitable alternative, to ensure that there is one performance framework that can help measure the impact of IOM on the cost of crime and the rehabilitation of service users.

Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service should:

4. provide information on service user profiles, characteristics and needs to local police and probation services, to support the development of IOM and commissioning of services at a local level.

The Probation Reform Programme should:

5. ensure that there is a workstream dedicated to IOM development and that probation delivery partners at a local level provide interventions that address the needs of individuals subject to IOM.

Police and Crime Commissioners should:

6. assure themselves that all relevant partners and services are involved in the delivery of IOM, as a major contribution to reducing reoffending and community safety.

Chief Constables, National Probation Service Divisional Directors and Community Rehabilitation Company Chief Executive Officers should:

7. define their IOM operating model and produce practice guidance that sets out clearly what is required by each agency at every stage of the IOM supervision process
8. improve the quality and accuracy of recording in IOM cases, in particular, the activity relating to public protection
9. analyse training needs and ensure that all staff receive sufficient training to enable them to fulfil their duties. Training in public protection, safeguarding children and working with vulnerable adults should be prioritised
10. ensure that service users are kept informed, as much as possible, about the benefits of inclusion in IOM, the support available and the monitoring and information-sharing ramifications of IOM supervision.

The National Police Chiefs Council lead for IOM and the National Probation Service IOM Strategic lead should:

11. establish a joint national oversight group to drive forward improvements to IOM and make sure that progress is sustained.

1. Introduction

1.1. Why this thematic?

This inspection was agreed by the Criminal Justice Chief Inspectors' Group and forms part of their Joint Inspection Business Plan for 2019/2020.

In 2015, in response to our thematic inspection, the MoJ and Home Office refreshed their key principles for IOM, originally defined in 2010. The refreshed principles intended to define the essence of IOM but acknowledged that local delivery models will vary depending on local circumstances and priorities, as determined by local crime and needs profiles.

Since then, the core partners delivering IOM have been through significant organisational changes. The police have had to redefine priorities as a result of reduced staffing numbers, and probation services have had to cope with the changes brought about by *Transforming Rehabilitation*.

In May 2019, the government announced its plan to reform the delivery of probation services and some of the changes brought about by *Transforming Rehabilitation*. From 2021 onwards, the NPS will be responsible for managing all offenders on a community order or licence following release from prison. Before making the announcement, in its consultation paper *Strengthening probation, building confidence* (2018), the MoJ had acknowledged the positive work of IOM and encouraged further cross-agency collaboration to help probation and the police deal with the most persistent offenders.

On 05 September 2019, a national campaign to recruit 20,000 new police officers was launched. The Chancellor announced funding to support the recruitment of a first wave of up to 6,000 officers, who will be shared among 43 forces in England and Wales. The remaining 14,000 will be recruited over the following two years.

We decided upon a joint thematic inspection to examine how IOM has been operating since *Transforming Rehabilitation* and in a climate of reduced police numbers. Given the impending changes to police and probation, we also examine the opportunities for further development of IOM.

1.2. Background

The IOM approach aims to provide an enhanced level of surveillance and control to a range of different types of offender, while also providing rehabilitation for those who are willing to accept help.

The UK Government describes IOM as a cross-agency response to the threat of crime and reoffending faced by local communities. The most persistent and problematic offenders are identified and managed jointly by partner agencies working together. IOM aims to improve the quality of life within communities by:

- reducing the impact of crime and reoffending
- reducing the number of victims of crime
- improving public confidence in the criminal justice system (MoJ and Home Office, 2015).

History

The development of IOM can be traced back some 20 years. The Social Exclusion Unit (2002) estimated that reoffending accounts for 18 per cent of recorded crime. Home Office research carried out in 2001 (cited in Home Office, 2007) estimated that, of the total offending population of around one million, approximately 100,000 (10 per cent) were responsible for half of all the crime committed in England and Wales.

One of the responses by the government to this high level of reoffending by an especially active minority was the Prolific and Other Priority Offender (PPO) programme introduced in 2004. This was originally announced in 2002 as part of the Narrowing the Justice Gap programme. The aim was to target resources from each Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (now CSPs) at offenders in the community with six or more convictions over the previous 12 months. Around 5,000 offenders were targeted in the first year for a variety of interventions focused on each stage of the criminal career – badged as Prevent and Deter, Catch and Convict and Rehabilitate and Resettle. PPOs were tracked on a joint police and probation database (JTRACK) that allowed for the evaluation of outcomes.

In 2009, the Home Office sought to embed the PPO programme in the new IOM approach. The UK Government argued that PPO needed a 'refresh' to ensure that local priorities were correct and that the right offenders were being targeted. IOM was partially envisaged as a less intensive regime than the PPO programme and would provide a 'cushion' for those deselected from the PPO scheme.

The UK Government at the time urged local IOM schemes to provide a 'strategic umbrella', bringing together all activities that targeted, managed and supported those offending at the highest levels within communities. IOM 'pioneer' areas were established in six police divisions in 2008/2009 and the approach was rolled out to all areas shortly afterwards (Home Office, 2009).

The 2009 *Policy Statement* (Ministry of Justice, 2009) reaffirmed the goals of IOM to reduce crime and reoffending and improve local coordination and resource allocation in tackling the most problematic offenders in communities. IOM would complement other statutory multi-agency arrangements, such as Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), and build on PPO and the Drug Intervention Programme, targeting those on court orders or licences and those currently outside the criminal justice system but where intelligence suggested a significant level of offending. The statement emphasised that all offenders who present a high risk of harm and reoffending are within the scope of IOM but the most dangerous should be managed through MAPPA. The most prolific offenders should be intensively managed through PPO-style arrangements (MoJ, 2009).

The case for IOM

The IOM concept is compatible with the well-regarded Risk-Need-Responsivity principles of effective correctional practice (Bonta and Andrews, 2017). The risk principle – that intensity of service should increase with the level of assessed risk – is reflected in IOM targeting processes (which should be undertaken with structured assessment tools). The need principle – that primarily criminogenic needs should be targeted for intervention – was reflected in a Home Office survey of community safety partnerships (184 out of 292 responded), which showed that the emphasis of most IOM schemes was on targeting drug-misusing offenders (62 per cent) and other priority offender types (Home Office, 2013). The responsivity principle – that is, to deploy skills building and learning strategies with offenders – is an essential part of the 'carrot and stick' motivational approach of IOM.

Best et al (2010) provide some support for IOM-style partnership working in their study of a high-intensity multi-agency programme for drug-using offenders. In this study, 116 offenders with a drug misuse problem were randomly allocated to either treatment-as-usual or the 'quasi-coercive' High Crime Causing Users partnership between the police and drug misuse service. Outcomes for the experimental group were significantly more positive, with lower reoffending rates and greater retention in treatment.

Dominey (2018), in her study *The Use of Community Hubs to Deliver Probation Supervision*, makes a case for the sharing of premises and pooling of resources by agencies to offer a holistic service to those under statutory supervision. Although the study did not focus on IOM, it highlighted the benefits of having a range of agencies located in one place to address problems such as housing, drugs, alcohol and unemployment. The study found that service users attending these places developed professional relationships with probation staff and clearly valued their interaction with them at the hubs. The model increased service users' awareness of the work of other agencies and

consolidated, and sometimes did away with the need for, referral processes. In addition, staff working at the hubs explained that they knew more about the work of other agencies and benefited from opportunities for informal discussion.

Previous inspections

Our joint thematic inspection of IOM in 2014 was conducted before the implementation of *Transforming Rehabilitation*. The report was cautiously optimistic about the IOM schemes in six areas. The right offenders were targeted for inclusion, some information-sharing was excellent and good rehabilitation work was being undertaken. We found inconsistencies between areas in identifying offenders for the IOM programme and two areas that had not moved beyond the PPO approach; they had not fully exploited the potential of IOM. We reported that police officers in IOM schemes had rarely received training in the principles of rehabilitation. Probation staff were trying to fill the skills gap through informal mentoring, but a more structured approach was needed. Of particular concern was that some probation officers did not understand the importance of offender motivation and identifying obstacles to change.

We found that IOM cohort offenders had complex and resource-intensive needs – drug misuse, unstable accommodation and homelessness and unemployment were all common. IOM staff needed to be highly skilled, and strong partnerships were needed to tackle such a high level of need.

IOM cohort offenders, when asked, were mostly positive about the scheme and the help and encouragement they had received. Many mentioned the importance of a credible and committed case manager, regardless of whether the person was from police or probation; simply having a positive and consistent relationship was highly valued.

The report ended by noting the difficulties in evaluating performance for IOM cohorts. These offenders have multiple and complex problems with drug misuse, accommodation, lifestyle and associates, and entrenched negative and anti-social beliefs and attitudes. Nevertheless, a third to a half of the cases inspected had made progress against their priority risk factors, which supported the evidence-based approach to IOM that most areas were taking. Reoffending results were poor for the IOM cohorts; however, the frequency of reoffending had not been monitored and needed to be in order to evaluate the programmes. This was a significant omission. Our report recommended that the Home Office and MoJ commission an independent, authoritative and structured evaluation of the costs and benefits of IOM in terms of reducing crime, considering reduced frequency and/or seriousness of reoffending and eventual desistance from crime (HMI Probation and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, 2014). This evaluation has never taken place.

In our thematic inspection *Post-release supervision for short-term prisoners* (HMI Probation, 2019c), one in four of the cases were managed by IOM. Acceptance onto an IOM scheme varied hugely and was determined by the local policing strategy, with a move away from acquisitive crime to managing high risk of harm cases. Although the inspection found a slight improvement in the availability of services to address reoffending where IOM applied, attention to the safety of other people was weaker in comparison to the overall inspection sample.

1.3. Aims and objectives

This inspection was undertaken to examine how IOM is operating in 2019, post *Transforming Rehabilitation*, and to identify opportunities for future development. Specifically, we wanted to know the following:

1. Does the leadership support and promote the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all service users supervised by IOM?
2. Are staff working within IOM empowered to deliver a high-quality, personalised and responsive service to those supervised by the scheme?
3. Is there a comprehensive range of high-quality services in place, supporting a tailored and responsive service for all those supervised by IOM?
4. Are timely and relevant information available and appropriate facilities in place to support a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all those subject to IOM?
5. How well does IOM support desistance from offending behaviour?
6. How effective is IOM at keeping people safe?

1.4. Report outline

Chapter	Content
2. Policy, strategy and leadership	How strategic leadership supports the delivery of IOM both nationally and within local areas. How staff and managers are empowered to deliver a good-quality service to those supervised by IOM.
3. Working in partnership	The effectiveness of partnership working. The availability of services and whether they support a tailored and responsive service.
4. The quality of case work	How the work of IOM supports those being supervised to desist from offending. The quality of assessment, planning, delivery of interventions and reviewing practice to reduce reoffending and keep people safe.
5. Understanding the impact of IOM	Evaluation and performance monitoring of IOM. Findings from the core probation inspection programme 2018/2019 on the impact of IOM status on the quality of case supervision.

2. Policy, strategy and leadership

In this chapter, we report on current IOM policy and the strategic approach at both a national and local level. We comment on whether IOM operating models are defined and understood and whether staff working within IOM are empowered to deliver a high-quality, personalised and responsive service.

2.1. National policy and strategy

The key principles of IOM were published in 2015 (Ministry of Justice and Home Office, 2015) and are set out below:

- **all partners manage offenders together:** a broad partnership base for IOM, with co-located teams wherever possible, helps to ensure that the local approach is underpinned by comprehensive evidence and intelligence and that a wide range of rehabilitative interventions are available to support offenders' pathways out of crime;
- **to deliver a local response to local problems:** the local IOM model reflects local circumstances and priorities, responding to the crime and reoffending risks faced by the local community;
- **with all offenders potentially in scope:** IOM brings a wider partnership approach to the management of offenders identified as being of most concern locally, whether subject to statutory supervision by the NPS or CRC, or managed on a voluntary basis where not subject to these formal arrangements;
- **facing up to their responsibility or facing the consequences:** the IOM carrot and stick approach brings a multi-agency partnership offer of rehabilitative support for those who engage, with the promise of swift justice for those who continue to offend;
- **with best use made of existing programmes and governance arrangements:** IOM provides a 'strategic umbrella' that ensures coherence in the response to local crime and reoffending threats, providing a clear framework to make best use of local resources in tackling the most persistent or problematic offenders, identified by local agencies working collaboratively together;
- **to achieve long-term desistance from crime:** IOM ensures that offenders of concern remain on the radar of local agencies, even if not subject to statutory supervision, or where a period of statutory supervision has come to an end, with the opportunity to provide sequenced rehabilitative interventions to provide the individual with pathways out of crime.

In addition to the key principles, the MoJ and Home Office published supplementary guidance in 2015 to provide further detail and advice to local areas. This guidance takes account of the significant changes within the criminal justice system since IOM was originally launched, including the first PCC elections in November 2012 and the creation of the NPS and 21 CRCs in 2014. The intention was to help local areas adapt their arrangements to the reformed landscape while also urging the development of a broadened approach and the opening up of IOM to new cohorts of offenders (MoJ and Home Office, 2015).

The 2015 key principles ended the requirement to retain PPO identification on case management systems, and IOM became the predominant catch-all label for local approaches to tackling the most persistent and chaotic offenders.

In 2015, Her Majesty's Prisons and Probation Service (HMPPS) also issued guidance on IOM practice. The document provided broad guidelines for NPS divisions and CRCs about their interface and involvement with IOM.

National Standards for the Management of Offenders for England and Wales (MoJ and National Offender Management Service, 2015) referred briefly to IOM and stated that:

- staff should have a joint input into the process of identifying and selecting offenders suitable for IOM, to ensure that the process takes account of the maximum available intelligence
- providers should have mechanisms in place for identifying offenders who meet the local criteria for IOM, available to all staff
- partners should meet regularly to review and refresh their list of offenders and to discuss the inclusion of new offenders and the removal of those no longer considered to be at high risk of reoffending
- officers/practitioners will utilise professional judgement and flexibility in the case management of offenders subject to IOM, while ensuring that all decisions take appropriate heed of the level of risk posed by the individual offender.

Performance

There are currently no HMPPS performance measures relating to IOM for either the NPS or CRCs, although a new framework is being developed by the NPS IOM Strategic Divisional Leads group. Similarly, there are no specific IOM performance measures for the police. The IDIOM reporting system enables some performance monitoring by the police at a national and local level, and we provide further commentary on this in chapter five.

CRC contract management

Those bidding for CRC contracts in 2014 had to explain during the *Transforming Rehabilitation* procurement process how they would contribute to IOM, and detail of this was incorporated into schedule eight of each CRC contract. However, IOM does not feature in active contract monitoring arrangements for CRCs.

2.2. Leadership

Until recently, there was no IOM policy lead within the MoJ, and there is currently no lead within the Home Office. Leadership and governance of IOM are now provided by LCJBs and CSPs, although local arrangements vary between areas. The 2015 key principles made clear that partners should work collaboratively to ensure a common understanding of the crime and reoffending threats facing the local community to inform the priorities to be addressed through local IOM arrangements. Individual areas have been left to their own devices to construct a model that reflects local need. As a consequence, models vary significantly across areas. We did, however, see some commonality, with schemes moving away from approaches that address acquisitive crime to new priorities that focus on threat, harm and risk.

To support this thematic inspection, we conducted a survey of IOM schemes in England and Wales via PCCs, given their role in coordinating criminal justice partnership work. There was an excellent response rate, and 39 out of 43 areas replied, as highlighted in Annex two.¹²


We asked in the survey how many offenders were covered by IOM schemes to gain an insight into the scale of their operations. Most commonly, IOM schemes delivered services to 201–500 offenders. Caseloads depended on the size of the area, the case mix of the area, the eligibility

¹² In this survey, 36 responses were at the police force area level, five encompassed a number of local IOM schemes and nine were from individual London boroughs. Annex two provides more detail and outlines our methodology in full.

criteria and the resources available to the scheme. Figure 2.1 gives an overview of the size of IOM scheme caseloads from the information provided in the survey responses.

Figure 2.1: The number of individuals supervised by IOM at any one time, as reported by PCC areas

Approximately how many offenders are covered by your IOM scheme(s) at any one time?



IOM cohorts and criteria now cover a broad spectrum of offence types, with increased inclusion of domestic abuse perpetrators, those involved in serious organised crime and, in some areas, individuals convicted of sexual offences. In preparing for inspection, trying to obtain a clear picture from the Home Office and MoJ about the number, profile and characteristics of IOM cases nationally was problematic and we were unsuccessful in our attempts to do so. Figure 2.2 shows a summary of the offences committed by individuals subject to IOM from the cases inspected during the HMI Probation core inspection programme (2018/2019). This shows the broad range of offence categories and that violence against the person was the most common conviction, followed by theft and handling stolen goods.

Figure 2.2: Offences committed by those supervised by IOM from the HMI Probation core inspection programme 2018/2019

Original principal offence	IOM	
	Number	Percentage
Violence against the person	76	29
Breach of restraining or non-molestation order	17	6
Sexual offence	3	1
Burglary	57	21
Robbery	8	3
Theft and handling stolen goods	70	26
Fraud and forgery	3	1
Criminal damage	3	1
Drug offences	12	5
Motoring offences	10	4
Other offences not listed above	7	3
Total	266 ¹³	

The identification of IOM nominals¹⁴ and referral processes vary. Some schemes use a referral matrix, constructed to reflect local priorities; others use approaches based on professional judgement, with the facility for practitioners across agencies to refer individuals who require additional support. Some areas use a combination of both approaches.

At an individual agency level, a deputy chief constable in Gloucestershire has lead responsibility for IOM for the police and chairs the quarterly National IOM Working Group. This group aims to provide a forum for representatives from all police forces to come together and share ideas, experience and best practice. However, the portfolio lead has limited power and influence over resourcing or objective-setting within individual forces, which work to the priorities set by PCCs and chief constables.

The NPS IOM Strategic Divisional Leads group also meets quarterly. It is led by a divisional director who has strategic responsibility for IOM within the NPS across England and Wales. Its work has included: issuing an IOM case-recording instruction; interpreting the IOM key principles into an accessible guide for staff that sets out the NPS's vision and strategy (*Eleven Key Messages for IOM Managers and Practitioners*); and developing an IOM performance framework. Although it is commendable that the NPS and police groups exist, there are no links between them, nor is there a comparable forum for leads within the CRCs. We believe that these two groups can work better together by forming a joint oversight group.

LCJBs and CSPs are providing strategic oversight, and PCCs are supporting IOM in some areas. A number of PCCs have led work to help develop the IOM approach, review governance arrangements and revise cohorts so that schemes reflect local crime plans. This is not consistent, however.

¹³ The number of cases quoted may not match the number of cases in the sample. This is due to the question not being applicable or missing data.


¹⁴ The term 'nominal' is used to reference an individual who has been selected for IOM inclusion and is actively receiving supervision from an IOM scheme.

Good practice example: Leadership and IOM governance in Colwyn Bay/North Wales

There is a clear vision and governance structure in place in Colwyn Bay, and IOM has maintained a high strategic priority in Wales. The IOM Cymru Strategic Framework is embedded and each meeting has a clear purpose, aim and objective. The IOM delivery manual is comprehensive, and we believe that other areas in England could benefit from introducing a similar model.

There is a North Wales IOM performance report that has helped to change the scheme's priorities to threat, harm and risk, and the needs of service users are monitored and analysed on an annual basis.

We also saw the benefits of having an IOM programme manager. They have supported the strategic leads in driving IOM activity, and the integrity of the IOM Cymru brand has been maintained. The diagram below provides an overview of the IOM governance structure in Wales.



Good practice example: Review of IOM in Greater Manchester

The Greater Manchester Combined Authority supported a substantial programme of work during 2018 to redefine IOM across the 10 local authority areas in Greater Manchester. The CRC, NPS and police, as part of the IOM Futures Board, worked collaboratively over a number of months to review the Greater Manchester IOM scheme, otherwise known as Spotlight. They developed a new set of expectations, identified new selection criteria and launched new operating guidelines that included minimum delivery standards. The aim of this work was to provide a greater level of consistency and help IOM teams measure and understand their effectiveness.

Although some areas do have a well-defined IOM vision, strategy and governance framework, these are not always communicated effectively to staff, partners or other stakeholders. Staff managing IOM cases in a number of schemes found it difficult to articulate their local delivery model or describe the added value that IOM brought to the supervision of offenders. Of those responsible officers interviewed, 29 out of 43 stated that the vision and strategy for IOM in their areas were clear. Only 26 out of 43 said that their IOM referral and inclusion criteria were well defined and understood across their area. In too many instances, both frontline staff and middle managers were confused about the local strategy and delivery model for IOM.

The separation of probation during *Transforming Rehabilitation* has complicated IOM leadership and delivery. The different priorities and delivery models of probation service providers have created challenges for individual areas in defining an IOM structure that meets local needs while

maintaining equal buy-in and involvement from the CRC and NPS. In some areas, IOM has lost its way and has a much lower profile than it once did.

2.3. Support for staff working in IOM

Without exception, staff and managers from the three core agencies were committed to IOM and enthusiastic about working collaboratively with partners. However, we know from our core probation inspection programme that there are significant workload pressures on both NPS and CRC staff across England and Wales. Similarly, police numbers have reduced in recent years. These conditions have impacted on IOM delivery, not least the extent to which an enhanced service can be provided to IOM nominals: those individuals within local areas who often require the most intensive support and monitoring to help them stop offending.

Just over half (25 out of 44) of those responsible officers interviewed felt that their workload was manageable and enabled them to deliver a quality service to those subject to IOM. In a number of the areas inspected, IOM police officers were at times redeployed to other operations to support workload pressures elsewhere in their organisation. We did see an exception to these high workloads in one area, illustrated by this good practice example:

Good practice example: IOM workload in Sheffield

We last inspected South Yorkshire CRC in December 2018. Since then, the CRC has notably increased the number of staff working on IOM in Sheffield. Responsible officers from the CRC had on average 30 to 35 cases. These staff told us that this was a manageable number and enabled them to provide the additional support and monitoring required by the IOM cohort. This increased staffing and reduced workload was enhanced further by CRC staff being co-located with police colleagues and substance misuse services in the centre of Sheffield, enabling good cross-agency communication and quick access to information and support for IOM nominals. The CRC's commitment to training and development of staff working in IOM was also impressive. Staff new to the CRC underwent a period of induction and received 12 weeks of basic training in case management and shadowing of colleagues before being allocated IOM cases.

These conditions were resulting in good-quality case supervision.

Research on probation skills indicates that significant reduced reoffending in service users is associated with staff who have been trained in the use of effective supervision practices (Raynor, 2019). Effective supervision involves: (i) the appropriate use of authority, (ii) modelling and reinforcement of appropriate behaviour, (iii) skill-building and problem-solving, (iv) effective use of community assets and (v) quality staff-offender relationships characterised by staff displaying warmth and commitment to the work. Having the resources to train staff in such effective supervision practices and having the time to deploy and develop their skills is as important to IOM as it is to all work with offenders.

We found that no formal training was provided to the police on the role of an IOM officer, with a reliance on shadowing existing officers within the unit. Although joint training opportunities were sometimes offered by partners, these were rarely taken up. There was also limited training in safeguarding and vulnerability provided to officers, despite the increased number of high-risk domestic abuse nominals being supervised within a number of areas. In the Surrey and Cumbria forces, officers had received MOSOVO (management of sexual or violent offenders) and ViSOR (violent and sex offender register) training to deal with higher risk offenders, which is positive.

On the whole, specific training and continual professional development for IOM staff, outside of standard single agency training, is a significant gap. Despite the scope of IOM schemes broadening to include higher risk service users, this change has not been sufficiently supported by a training strategy. Out of those probation responsible officers interviewed, only two (out of forty-four) reported having received any specific IOM-related training to support them in their work. Only eight said that they had received any joint training with IOM colleagues.

Staff and managers in those areas with an IOM coordinator (London), IOM programme manager (North Wales) or IOM scheme manager (Warwickshire) spoke positively about the additional guidance and support offered by these roles. In particular, they were perceived to be vital in helping to remove obstacles to service provision and in ensuring that the various IOM meetings took place and had purpose.

2.4. Conclusions and implications

There is no centralised leadership for IOM nationally, and the approach has diversified since our 2014 thematic inspection. Although the national policy position is for local determination and leadership for IOM, significant organisational changes at a national level, such as *Transforming Rehabilitation* and the police shift in priorities to threat, harm and risk, have made IOM delivery more complex.

Although there is some national support for individual organisations via the police and NPS portfolio leads, their approach has not been collaborative or applied across all agencies. Furthermore, due to the diverse range of CRC providers and delivery models, there is no comparable forum for collaboration or sharing of best practice between IOM leads in those organisations.

The broadening of IOM, with 'all offenders potentially in scope', has diluted the approach. IOM certainly has a lower profile in most areas than it used to, and the increased inclusion of individuals posing a high risk of serious harm has diverted attention away from offering intensive support to repeat offenders and those with complex needs.

3. Working in partnership

In this chapter, we report on the quality of partnership working and outline the extent to which those involved in IOM delivery are working in an integrated way. We also examine whether there is a sufficient range of services in place to support a tailored and responsive service for all those supervised by IOM.

3.1. Cross-agency involvement with IOM

Working in partnership is a fundamental requirement for IOM to operate effectively. The IOM key principles acknowledge that rehabilitating the most difficult and entrenched offenders requires effective partnership working to bring together the range of support and interventions required to reduce the risk of reoffending. The principles endorse using local IOM arrangements to provide that approach, bringing together all the agencies and organisations with a contribution to make, and working on a cross-agency basis to address the agreed priorities and work with identified nominals (MoJ and Home Office, 2015).

In all seven areas visited for this inspection, the core IOM agencies were the CRC, police and NPS. Generally, the police had a dedicated team of staff and a sergeant leading the day-to-day management of IOM. CRCs and NPS divisions deployed a variety of models. Some had dedicated IOM teams and others allocated cases across the workforce, depending on divisional or organisational resourcing issues. These differing approaches had implications for the quality of partnership working and cross-agency communication.

In our PCC survey, 35 respondents (70 per cent) reported that police and probation staff were co-located and 23 (46 per cent) schemes involved co-location of substance misuse, housing, mental health services and other partners. Co-location, with IOM staff from different agencies sharing a single building, was viewed as desirable by the majority of respondents. This practice is seen as a means of building trust, facilitating joint work and sharing intelligence on a timely basis. Eleven areas identified co-location as the most important change they would make to IOM.

Although co-location was also considered best practice in the areas we inspected, we only saw full co-location of the three core partners in one area (Warwickshire). In the remaining areas, although there was some co-located delivery, either the CRC or NPS were absent from these arrangements, because of significant staffing issues or because area priorities and the cohorts had changed. These changes had resulted in some CRCs and NPS divisions having very few cases registered in IOM. Co-location was therefore deemed to be of little benefit for the individual organisations and not considered an efficient use of their resources. The increased use of mobile technology by all three agencies has provided greater opportunities for flexible working. In those areas without full co-location, some staff could make use of their mobile phones and laptops and base themselves with partners when needed.


Despite there being limited co-location, all schemes held a case review meeting at least monthly and the three core agencies were involved in some way. Although these meetings varied in name and structure, in all areas there was some attempt to bring the three core agencies together to discuss individuals' progress, agree required actions, decide on new registrations and identify those who no longer required IOM involvement. We saw a mixed level of engagement and preparation for these meetings, however.

In locations where staff had predominantly IOM caseloads, those attending the case review meetings were well prepared and confident in contributing to the team discussions. Relationships with colleagues from the other agencies were also more developed. Where IOM cases had been dispersed across a larger team, or individuals attending the meeting only had one or two cases, relationships were less developed and not as productive, with relevant information not always shared.

The wider the agency base for the local IOM arrangements, including agencies from the public, private and voluntary sectors, the more comprehensive those arrangements are likely to be (MoJ and Home Office, 2015). Figure 3.1 illustrates the extent of wider partner involvement in IOM delivery at a national level, from our pre-fieldwork survey of PCCs. Housing aid and advice services (67 per cent) and substance misuse services (58 per cent) emerge as the most commonly engaged. Over half had involvement from registered social landlords (58 per cent), and less than half of schemes involved peer mentoring services (44 per cent).

Figure 3.1: Wider partner involvement in IOM from our survey of PCCs

Which non-statutory agencies are involved?



In the areas visited for this thematic inspection, despite there being relevant partner buy-in and contribution to IOM at the strategic level via the various strategic governance meetings, wider partner involvement was not always replicated at an operational level, outside of the three core agencies. In some areas, rehabilitative services (for example housing support, substance misuse provision and mental health treatment) were not readily available, and even in areas where there was a broad range of services on offer, these agencies rarely attended or provided information to the monthly case review meetings to help monitor and review the progress of those being supervised.

3.2. Availability of services

In order for IOM schemes to provide the required range of services and interventions to respond to priorities and offender needs, regular monitoring and analysis of service users' profiles, characteristics and needs are required. However, there is no systematic national monitoring or analysis of the profiles or needs of IOM nominals.

At a local level, there is patchy tracking and analysis of service users' needs and some areas are doing this more effectively than others. CRCs are much more agile in their ability to gather and analyse service users' profiles and data on their needs. Although work is underway to develop this in the NPS, there have been significant constraints for NPS leaders in providing IOM data locally and this is a risk for the unified probation model going forward.

Since our previous thematic inspection, there have been significant cuts to most services in local areas, and we saw a mixed picture regarding the availability of services and interventions for IOM. IOM status rarely results in priority access to services, as PPO status sometimes did, and in some schemes, there is an overreliance on the three core agencies (CRC, NPS and police) to deliver rehabilitative work outside mainstream provision. There are some exceptions to this, however.

Good practice examples: Priority access to interventions for IOM

Surrey: As a direct result of the data that the Kent, Surrey and Sussex CRC provided on the accommodation needs of the IOM cohort, combined with service user and staff feedback, the Surrey PCC has match-funded the Seetec charity 'Your Ambition' to provide eight supported bed-spaces with Transform Housing and Support, a supported accommodation provider. A new shared house with floating support opened in May 2019 and prioritises access to referrals from IOM.

Stockport: The Community Safety Partnership has provided specific funding for IOM in Stockport, and a £1,000 monthly resettlement fund is available to those in the cohort. The money is available to those who need emergency support across the range of rehabilitation pathways. In addition to the resettlement fund, there is dedicated substance misuse treatment provision for the IOM cohort.

Warwickshire: The PCC has funded a number of initiatives for IOM, and a broad range of services are available to the cohort. These include the use of GPS tags to monitor whereabouts, access to counselling, priority access to substance misuse services, employment support provided by Ixion housing support through P3 and mentoring and post-release support through Futures Unlocked.

IOM staff in some areas were frustrated at the lack of support provided by substance misuse services, and there were particular gaps in mental health and housing provision in most areas. The following typified what we heard:

"IOM nominals can access the same services as everyone else but they used to get priority access and they don't anymore. Lots of agencies have lost funding, especially in the areas of drug misuse and mental health".

"There is no priority access – IOM carries no weight at all to access provision. IOM is about police and probation – that is where the agency commitment is".

Despite a lack of additional PCC funding for IOM in Sheffield, a lot is being achieved as a result of strong partner relationships and co-location of the police, CRC and substance misuse services. The CRC has also dedicated a lot of its mainstream intervention provision to IOM, recognising the potential impact in directing resources to those most likely to offend. Responsible officers said:

"Engagement is the issue, but if those subject to IOM are willing to engage, the services are there".

"Addaction offer a number of services: acupuncture, an allotment and a breakfast club which provides a relaxed environment to meet service users. In addition, we get support from NACRO to help find housing; a MIND worker for counselling those with mental health problems; and Forging Ahead links people up with employers and charities to obtain appropriate clothing for interviews".

Similarly, there was a mixed picture from respondents to our PCC survey regarding priority access for IOM cases to rehabilitative services. Although 42 respondents (84 per cent) replied that their IOM caseload did receive priority from some services, eight others cited 'austerity cuts' and increased pressures on services as resulting in a lack of access. When we asked respondents about the most significant gaps in provision, some (n=14) referred to accessing housing for their IOM cohort as their most serious gap. IOM offenders often do not qualify as a priority for social housing and private rental accommodation is often unaffordable. Some respondents reported a general lack of suitable and affordable accommodation in their area. One area described problems with the benefits system as it affects employment and housing; working over 16 hours drastically reduces Housing Benefit, making employment (a key prosocial support) unfeasible.

The next most common problem reported was access to mental health services (n=10). One respondent described mental health provision as 'desperately needed', but explained that there is no funding for a dedicated worker or keyworkers to be available for everyday support. Another area cited the sheer complexity of mental health commissioning as a barrier to accessing services for

their cohort. Dual diagnosis (substance misuse and mental health problems) was reported by one area as creating a significant obstacle to intervention.

3.3. Conclusions and implications

IOM relies on effective partnership working, and relationships were generally strong between the core agencies at a strategic level in the seven areas inspected. However, there is limited involvement of other agencies at an operational level in some areas, which restricts the range of provision available to support the rehabilitation of service users, in particular accommodation and mental health.

Having the right services in place to support individuals to rehabilitate relies on monitoring and analysing service users' profiles and needs. Although we found CRCs to be able and willing to provide this information, the NPS is more restricted. This will need some attention as the changes to the probation delivery model are implemented.

Integration of services via co-location was not as established as we expected and full co-location was only achieved in one area visited. With the shift in IOM priorities, high caseloads and limited resources, some partners were unable to commit to co-location. This impacted on the quality of cross-agency relationships, information-sharing and the standard of case work.

4. The quality of case work

In this chapter, we report our findings on the quality of case work delivered to those in our sample of 60 cases. In particular, we examine the quality of work to support desistance from offending and to keep people safe. Where it is possible to do so, we provide comparative data from our larger sample of IOM cases reviewed as part of our core probation inspection programme 2018/2019.


4.1. The quality of case work to support desistance

Selection and allocation of IOM nominals

The published IOM key principles (2015) state that, where possible: *'local partners should ensure that there is a process to assign responsibility for managing prioritised offenders, utilising a single lead professional approach'*. The aim of the lead professional approach is to help ensure that the individual remains engaged with the support on offer and that interventions are sequenced appropriately.

The allocation of a lead professional was achieved in all cases included in this inspection. All but one were subject to statutory supervision and therefore managed by either a CRC or NPS responsible officer. One service user was being offered support from IOM on a non-statutory basis and had a lead professional allocated from the police. Figure 4.1 shows the split of cases by lead agency.

Figure 4.1: IOM cases by lead organisation



The recording of the reasons for IOM selection was generally poor. It was often difficult for inspectors to determine exactly why and how some individuals had been included in IOM or the intelligence that had been shared to inform the selection decision. A variety of processes were in place to identify IOM nominals, and a clear selection matrix was used in some areas but not in all. Although all areas had some form of multi-agency meeting to discuss IOM referrals and adopt or reject taking them onto the scheme, recording of these decisions was inconsistent.


In one case, for example, there was a discrepancy between police and probation records on the date and purpose of IOM registration. Probation records showed that the service user had been registered in February 2019 due to their sexual offending, yet police systems referred to the individual as a prolific and priority offender registered in IOM in January 2019.

Despite some poor recording on both police and probation ICT systems, responsible officers knew the reasons for IOM registration in 43 out of 59 relevant cases.

Keeping the service user informed

Informing a service user about their inclusion in IOM is an important part of engaging with them effectively to assess their needs and plan and deliver interventions that will help them to stop offending. Figure 4.2 below highlights that this was done effectively in fewer than half of the cases inspected. Both probation and police recording systems were vague about this and few schemes had an agreed protocol for formally notifying a service user of their inclusion in IOM.

Figure 4.2: Were the reasons for IOM registration explained to the service user at the time and were their views taken into account?



An exception to this poor practice was found by one of our inspectors in relation to a case managed in Sheffield:

Good practice example: Communication of IOM status in Sheffield

A local offender management panel meeting took place to register the service user in IOM three months prior to his release, which gave an opportunity for pre-release contact. The service user then received three pre-release visits before coming out of prison and two of them were joint with the police. IOM registration was explained to the service user during these meetings, as were his licence conditions.

Assessment and planning

Notwithstanding that IOM registration was not explained to all service users, assessments had focused sufficiently on engaging them in 72 per cent of cases at the seven fieldwork sites. This was slightly lower than the proportion in the IOM cases inspected as part of our core programme, which was 78 per cent.

An IOM approach should bring all relevant agencies together to respond to the risks and needs of the service users selected for inclusion in the scheme. At the individual level, this requires an assessment of needs and a plan that targets the factors most linked to offending. Figure 4.3 provides a breakdown of the offending-related needs in the cases we inspected, alongside the respective data from IOM cases in our core programme inspections in 2018/2019. It shows good alignment for most, but with higher levels of need in the core programme sample for lifestyle and associates, and drug misuse.


Figure 4.3: The factors most linked to the service user's offending

	Thematic IOM sample		Core programme IOM cases	
Attitudes to offending	26	44%	156	58%
Family and relationships	25	42%	120	45%
Thinking and behaviour	49	83%	214	80%
Lifestyle and associates	34	58%	202	75%
Drug misuse	39	66%	218	81%
Alcohol misuse	24	41%	84	31%
Education, training and employment	4	7%	47	18%
Accommodation	27	46%	106	40%

In our thematic sample, all but one case had an assessment completed by the probation responsible officer. The only case that did not was the individual supervised on a non-statutory basis, and this was because of his refusal to comply. Of the 59 cases that did have an assessment, 50 (86 per cent) were judged to focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending. This is similar to our finding of 79 per cent for the IOM cases inspected as part of our core programme. Both measures are significantly higher than the average score (68 per cent) for the same inspection question in HMI Probation's aggregated inspection data from 2018/2019, for those cases not supervised by IOM. This suggests that IOM inclusion has a beneficial impact on the quality of assessment of an individual's offending-related needs.

Figure 4.4 below highlights that just over half of assessments sufficiently incorporated information obtained from IOM partners. The agency that contributed most often to assessment was the police, through the provision of intelligence on behaviour and offending. Assessments rarely included information obtained from partners delivering substance misuse and housing provision.


Figure 4.4: Does assessment sufficiently incorporate information obtained from IOM partners?



Planning had focused sufficiently on engaging the service user in 69 per cent of cases, which is about the same as our finding of 72 per cent for IOM cases inspected as part of our core programme.

Three-quarters of cases had a plan in place that focused sufficiently on reducing reoffending, as highlighted in figure 4.5 below. This was around the same as our larger sample of core programme IOM data (78 per cent) shown in figure 5.2. Although we saw a few examples where the police had contributed to planning, generally it was the lead professional from probation who constructed the plan, in isolation from IOM partners. In some instances, pre-release visits and initial appointments at the start of a sentence or release from custody involved the police and probation discussing future plans with service users, but this did not happen consistently. There was no evidence of planning at all in the one case supervised on a non-statutory basis. In only 21 of the 59 cases did plans set out exactly what was required of the service user as a result of their IOM registration. In less than half of cases were the roles and responsibilities of the other IOM agencies made clear in the planning process.

Figure 4.5: Does the plan focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending?



Implementation and delivery of rehabilitative interventions

While lead professionals had oversight of the implementation of the sentence plan in most cases, figure 4.6 shows the extent to which services were delivered to address offending-related needs. Also shown is the respective data from the IOM cases in our core programme inspections during 2018/2019. It shows good alignment for most, although the very low numbers for ETE preclude such comparison here.

Figure 4.6: Were sufficient services delivered to address relevant offending-related factors?

	Thematic IOM sample		Core programme IOM cases	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
a) Attitudes to offending				
Yes	10	38%	54	35%
No	16	62%	99	65%
b) Family and relationships				
Yes	8	32%	44	37%
No	17	68%	76	63%
c) Thinking and behaviour				
Yes	19	39%	84	40%
No	30	61%	127	60%
d) Lifestyle, including friends and associates				
Yes	13	38%	78	39%
No	21	62%	121	61%
e) Drug misuse				
Yes	17	44%	129	60%
No	22	56%	87	40%
f) Alcohol misuse				
Yes	11	46%	43	53%
No	13	54%	38	47%
g) Education, training and employment				
Yes	3	75%	20	43%
No	1	25%	26	57%
h) Accommodation				
Yes	19	70%	70	67%
No	8	30%	35	33%

In our thematic sample, the most common explanation for the lack of delivery to address these needs was the service user's poor motivation and erratic compliance. As we found in our previous thematic inspection, IOM nominals tend to have significant complex needs, anti-social beliefs and poor motivation, which in part explains the lack of progress against the objectives in their sentence plan.

Despite the intensive nature of the work and the difficulties in engaging with and motivating IOM nominals, we met some excellent practitioners in both probation and the police who went out of their way to support people. In more than three-quarters of cases, the service user was supported to engage and comply with interventions when they were available. This support often involved practical help to get to appointments and at times the pursuit of other agencies to provide the interventions that were needed.

Good practice example: Case work in Waltham Forest

Joshua is subject to a suspended sentence order with 15 Rehabilitation Activity Requirement (RAR) days, an Alcohol Treatment Requirement (ATR) and a requirement to attend the Building Better Relationships (BBR) programme. The sentence was imposed for an offence of common assault committed against his ex-partner, with whom Joshua has two children. He has 20 previous convictions for a total of 39 offences. The past convictions include domestic abuse against the same victim.

Joshua has poor anger management skills, is alcohol dependent, impulsive and regularly self-harms. A comprehensive sentence plan and risk management plan had been put in place by the responsible officer. Despite Joshua's sporadic compliance, the responsible officer has been relentless in her pursuit of support to assist Joshua with both his alcohol addiction and self-harm. She has referred Joshua to two substance misuse services as well as counselling. She also monitors closely the risks Joshua poses to his ex-partner and children, relaying information to and from the police and children's social care while maintaining a positive relationship with him. The responsible officer has convened numerous professionals' meetings and has been in contact with Joshua's general practitioner throughout the supervision process to ensure that Joshua has the interventions needed to reduce the risk he poses to himself and others.

Good practice example: Case work in Cumbria

Khalil is serving a custodial sentence for offences against a child and is assessed as posing a high risk of serious harm. He has an extensive history of offending, with convictions for robbery and burglary, as well as domestic abuse offences. Khalil grew up in care and suffers from a learning disability and mental health problems. He has no family support or social network and has long-standing issues with substance misuse.

Khalil was selected for inclusion in IOM due to his complex needs and the likelihood that he would need extensive support in the community to help him rehabilitate. There was excellent communication with Khalil by both the police and probation before his release. He went initially into a probation hostel and then to supported housing. Khalil was also referred for treatment with substance misuse services and was regularly taken to medical and housing appointments by the police. Communication with drug services by the police and probation was strong, and Khalil is also supported by his housing key worker. Although he still requires crisis intervention by the community mental health team at times, Khalil is much more stable than he has been in the past, and the support and coordination of the work by professionals has been excellent.

As illustrated above, it is sometimes appropriate for the police to support rehabilitation work. However, in some areas, the roles of police and probation had blurred and the police were engaged more actively in the delivery of rehabilitation work than probation. We found this in our previous thematic inspection too and commented that, while police officers working in IOM should have some knowledge of the theories and practices associated with assisting individuals to achieve desistance, their principal role should be gathering and disseminating intelligence and enforcement.

The use of licence conditions and enforcement

Overall, we noted good information exchange between police and probation when licence conditions to reduce reoffending were added. An experienced probation officer in Sheffield reflected a commonly expressed view:

"I've worked in probation for twenty years and I've always struggled to make sure we have the right licence conditions for people that aren't managed in MAPPA. Working with the police and drug services every day makes this so much easier".

Just under half of the service users from our inspection sample (29 out of 60) were judged to have complied with their sentence, and 23 out of the 47 who were on licence were recalled to custody during their most recent period of supervision. Such poor compliance is not unusual for those supervised by IOM, and we generally saw good communication and decision-making when it came to enforcement.

Reviewing

Despite IOM multi-agency case review meetings taking place in all areas inspected, the discussions from these forums were rarely reflected in case records, and this was an issue for both police and probation practice. There was a sufficient level of review and adjustments made to plans in only 33 of the applicable 55 cases.

Service user involvement in reviews was poor and we saw evidence of this in only 16 of an applicable 59 cases.

The IOM key principles highlight the benefits of IOM for putting 'exit strategies' in place for individuals who come to the end of formal supervision, to ensure that they remain prioritised for interventions while they pose a risk of reoffending. Although we inspected seven cases that were de-selected from IOM, there was only evidence of an exit strategy and an offer of on-going support in one of them.


4.2. The quality of work to keep people safe

Since we last inspected IOM, there has been a move away from the traditional focus on acquisitive crime to an agenda that prioritises threat, harm and risk. Greater numbers of domestic abuse perpetrators, sexual offenders and those convicted of serious violence are now managed by IOM. Figure 4.7 illustrates the offences committed by those in our case sample and figure 4.8 shows the risk classification.

Figure 4.7: Index offences committed by those in case sample

	Number	Percentage
Violence against the person	27	46%
Breach of restraining order or breach of non-molestation order	4	7%
Sexual offence	2	3%
Burglary	11	19%
Robbery	2	3%
Theft and handling stolen goods	6	10%
Drug offences	2	3%
Motoring offences	3	5%
Other offences not listed above	2	3%

Figure 4.8: What was the risk of serious harm classification at the start of the most recent sentence/period of supervision?



All but two cases included in this inspection posed some risk of causing serious harm, with only two assessed as low risk. In 33 of the 60 cases, there were current concerns about the individual being a perpetrator of domestic abuse. It is therefore disappointing that practice to keep people safe tended to be of a lower quality than that delivered to reduce reoffending, as highlighted by figure 4.9, below.

Figure 4.9: The quality of practice to keep victims and other people safe.



Poor practice example

Damien is subject to a 12-month community order with a 25-day RAR imposed for an offence of assault. He also has a history of domestic abuse offending and a long-standing addiction to crack cocaine.

The initial assessment was completed by the responsible officer without any input from or liaison with IOM partners. Although there is good early engagement with the service user, there was minimal communication with drug services to check whether Damien was complying with the intervention.

At the start of the order, Damien was still living with his partner, the victim in previous violent convictions. There was no action taken to assess her safety or that of her children by either police or probation. Following a further assault on his partner three months into the order, the police completed a DASH risk assessment and made a Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference referral but this was not recorded on probation systems or incorporated into a review of the risk assessment. The IOM police were also unaware of the outcome of this referral or what safeguarding measures had been put in place for the victim or her children.

The shift in strategy to including higher risk of harm cases has not been supported by appropriate training or development for some IOM teams, and this was evident in the quality of case work at times. We found that victims were not given sufficient priority, with an expectation by IOM police that other departments, such as public protection and safeguarding teams, would take the necessary action. There was then a lack of communication with these other departments to verify that the tasks had been completed and whether safeguarding needs were met for both the victim and, where applicable, children within the household.

We observed a number of IOM case review meetings, during which cases were discussed between IOM partners. Too often, there was insufficient focus on risk of harm, safeguarding and identifying actions to protect victims. Discussions tended to focus primarily on the needs of the offender without the use of professional curiosity to develop a fuller picture of the potential for harm. Where safeguarding actions had been identified to protect vulnerable people and children, there was sometimes limited follow-up and outcomes were not routinely recorded. The Warwickshire and Surrey schemes were two exceptions, and their review meetings were victim-orientated and suitably reflected their area priorities of threat, harm and risk.

Good practice example: Surrey IOM panel

Over the course of the last 12 months, Surrey has redefined its IOM priorities in line with the police force's shift in focus towards threat, harm and risk. To deal with the significant increase in work for the ViSOR unit, the IOM and ViSOR teams were merged to create the High Harm Perpetrator Unit. It was expected that all staff would work with the full range of offending types. This was supported by a training strategy, and all IOM police officers received the accredited training for working with violent and sexual offenders. Although these changes are still bedding in, we observed some encouraging practice with regard to public protection. The work recorded on police systems and observation of two IOM case review meetings (in Guildford and Redhill) showed an appropriate focus on victims and the prevention of harm. All minutes and agreed actions were recorded on both police and probation case records and then followed up, in the majority of cases.

Although there were some exceptions, the recording of decision-making and activity to keep people safe was at times poor. For this inspection, we had access to both police and probation ICT systems and interviewed the lead professionals from the CRC and NPS in the majority of cases. We were therefore able to gain a full picture and chronology of the events relating to each case. In too many instances, it was evident that individual agencies had made assumptions about the recording practices or tasks carried out by others. As a consequence, they did not record or attempt to verify

that key actions had been carried out. When it came to safeguarding and protecting vulnerable people, agencies had left themselves open to criticism.

Poor practice example

John was sentenced to three and a half years in custody for conspiracy to supply class A drugs. Following release, he was being investigated in relation to potential involvement in serious offences that had caused significant harm to the public. While in custody, John was linked to drug-related activity and assaulted others on numerous occasions. He is linked to the use of firearms, is assessed as posing a high risk of harm and is vulnerable to targeting by organised crime groups.

This case requires close multi-agency management, yet police systems were surprisingly sparse. The lead professional from probation had not shared the risk management plan, and it was not clear whether each agency knew the expectations and actions being taken by the others to manage the risks posed. There was very little evidence of discussions taking place between police and probation to manage this individual or to protect him from others.

We did see a small number of cases where practice to manage the risk of harm was of a good quality, as shown in the below example from North Wales:

Good practice example: The use of innovation and restrictive measures to manage the risk of harm in Colwyn Bay

Gareth has a history of mental health problems and other complex needs and was sentenced to custody for offences of assault against his ex-partner. He was assessed as a high risk of causing serious harm and posed an on-going risk to his victim, who was residing in a refuge. There had been previous breaches of a licence condition forbidding contact with his ex-partner and he had been recalled.

On his most recent release, he was residing in a probation hostel and received daily support for his mental health issues, was seen three times a week by his responsible officer and the IOM police and had an exclusion zone and a no contact condition relating to his ex-partner. In addition, a GPS tag was used to monitor his whereabouts.

In addition to the intensive support provided to help Gareth engage with interventions, there was very effective co-working to identify changes in his mood and appearance in the probation hostel. Suspicions of contact with the victim led to prompt and effective action by the IOM team, and use of the GPS tag to confirm Gareth's proximity to the victim led to his arrest and protected her from further harm.

The IOM key principles state that IOM is about bringing together existing arrangements, with partners working smarter, to avoid duplication and ensure that the best use is made of all available resources. The principles go further and point out that IOM arrangements should add value to, but not duplicate, existing arrangements to tackle crime, reoffending and victimisation, including MAPPA. We were impressed with the Warwickshire model, as outlined below.

Good practice example: Warwickshire

In this area, the link between MAPPA and IOM was clear and widely understood, with IOM used to enhance the level of day-to-day intervention and monitoring provided to a small number of cases managed under the MAPPA framework.

All MAPPA level two and three cases are adopted automatically onto the IOM cohort and have access to the interventions available. A representative from IOM then attends the MAPPA meetings to ensure that relevant information is shared. MAPPA level one cases are not automatically adopted onto the cohort, but each case is referred for consideration on whether the tracking of intelligence could benefit the management of the case.

4.3. Conclusions and implications

The allocation of IOM nominals to a lead professional was working well but the reasons for selection and involvement in IOM were often unclear. Although formal multi-agency IOM meetings were operating in all areas, recording of registration decisions was inconsistent.

Work to reduce reoffending was generally better than practice to protect the public, and practical support to promote compliance with interventions was often impressive. We saw some good examples of both police and probation going the extra mile to galvanise support for a range of complex problems. However, in some areas, traditional police and probation roles have blurred and need re-defining.

Appropriate licence conditions were in place and enforcement action taken where necessary. However, practice to keep people safe requires development, especially given the threat, harm and risk priorities of most schemes. Training for the IOM police in working with domestic abuse perpetrators, safeguarding children and the protection of vulnerable adults needs to be prioritised.

Originally, IOM focused on the provision of intensive support and monitoring for prolific and priority offenders and it seems that this is where staff are most confident and skilled. The move to include more dangerous offenders has diluted the approach and there is a risk now that neither cohort is being best served.

5. Understanding the impact of IOM

This chapter assesses the extent to which the impact of IOM is understood. We examine the work taking place at both a national and local level to monitor and report on the performance of IOM schemes. Aggregated data from our 2018/2019 adult inspection programme is used to explore the impact that IOM can have on the quality of supervision.

5.1. Evaluation of IOM

There has been very little research into or evaluation of IOM. Despite a common belief among criminal justice professionals that it works and supports a reduction in reoffending, there has been no comprehensive evaluation at a national level to establish whether IOM achieves its aims. The potential for evaluating IOM is complicated further by the fact that the approach has diversified and is now being used to address a broad spectrum of cohorts and offence types.

A national evaluation of the PPO scheme, which preceded IOM, revealed a 43 per cent reduction in reoffending for the PPO cohort (Dawson and Cuppleditch, 2007). The researchers had hoped to produce a counterfactual matched sample from the Police National Computer; however, this proved unfeasible, as PPO selection relied on discretionary factors, often using soft intelligence, which could not be statistically replicated. As such, it was not possible to attribute the reduction entirely to the PPO programme. Nevertheless, the reduction in offending was impressive and interviews with offenders showed that most were aware of the additional surveillance and restrictions placed on them and appreciated the support and rehabilitative opportunities that the PPO programme made available.

Wong et al (2012) evaluated the voluntary sector's contribution to IOM schemes. They noted several barriers to voluntary sector involvement, while reporting that relationships between the voluntary sector and the statutory partners were strengthened by IOM. Problems identified by this qualitative research included:

- getting buy-in from frontline practitioners to refer IOM cases to voluntary sector interventions
- some lack of awareness among voluntary sector workers of the aims and methods of IOM
- limited understanding of risk management among voluntary sector agencies, which were often new to working with offenders.

Annisson et al (2015) found in their study of the Thames Valley IOM scheme that the roles of probation officers were largely unchanged by IOM. In contrast, police officers working in the IOM team found themselves undertaking traditional probation tasks (such as assessments, appointments and home visits) for non-statutory cases, which was often not something they were trained to do or the best use of their time compared to intelligence work. The additional service provision that IOM cases should have benefited from, such as access to substance misuse, employment services and other support, was no better than for other service users. Indeed, the additional rehabilitative services were 'sporadic and extremely limited' (p.393). As one police officer in a focus group put it, **"... in terms of carrots, we haven't got anything more than the mouldy carrots that we had five years ago"**. The main benefits of IOM were sharing intelligence and smoother case management processes. Nevertheless, the practitioners interviewed were very loyal to the 'brand' of IOM and its potential for better partnership working, despite the limited resources they had to make a real difference to the IOM service users.

In *Transforming Rehabilitation: a summary of evidence on reducing reoffending*, the MoJ found that integrated case management and multi-agency working can play an important part in addressing the complex needs of offenders and reducing reoffending (MoJ, 2013). There were indications of potential benefits from joint working at a local level through adopting a case management approach to addressing individual circumstances. There was some useful evidence that supported the approach, involving, for example, the police, probation, voluntary sector, health services, local

authorities and other partners at a local level. Examples included evaluations of IOM (Senior, 2011), the Drug Interventions Programme (Skodbo, 2007), and the prison-based MoJ Payment by Results pilots (Disley, 2015).

More recently, King et al (2018) reported that IOM has not achieved all of its desired aims. For example, they found that the reoffending rates for the IOM schemes in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire were not significantly different from those for other offenders. The authors conducted interviews and observations of IOM staff and leaders and argued that one barrier to success is the conflict of police and probation organisational cultures, both at the leadership level and the practitioner level.

5.2. IOM performance monitoring

In our 2014 thematic inspection, we acknowledged the difficulties in creating a performance framework to measure the effectiveness of IOM due to the multiple aims of the approach. There was some attempt at that time by the areas inspected to produce outcome data related to reoffending. We reported that reoffending rates were still high among the inspection sample, although changes in the frequency and/or seriousness of reoffending were not assessed.

In this 2019 thematic inspection, although we only inspected a relatively small sample of cases, 38 out of 58 individuals were not convicted or cautioned again during their most recent period of supervision. Of those that did reoffend, our inspectors judged the frequency and seriousness of the proven offending to have reduced in just one case, as outlined below.

Figure 5.1: Is there evidence that the service user has been convicted, cautioned, or had another out-of-court disposal for an offence committed since the start of sentence/release on licence?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	20	34%
No	38	66%
In the opinion of the inspector, does the frequency of proven offending appear to have...		
Reduced	1	5%
Stayed the same	13	65%
Increased	6	30%
Not applicable	0	-
In the opinion of the inspector, does the seriousness of proven offending appear to have...		
Reduced	1	5%
Stayed the same	15	75%
Increased	4	20%

IDIDM (Intelligence Driven Integrated Offender Management) is the Home Office approved ICT system for monitoring the impact of IOM in local areas. It is a web-based system that can be used by police forces and shared with partners and allows for the monitoring of both IOM nominals and other, locally identified, offender cohorts.

The system receives automated, daily downloads of data from the Police National Computer on the arrests, charges, disposals, remand details, court outcomes, including convictions data, and prison releases for all flagged offenders. It is a national system that works across police force boundaries, providing users with national and local data. IDIDM is restricted to police officers/staff. Each IOM scheme should have an Information Sharing Agreement with partner agencies working within IOM.

Although the system is promising, at present it is not being used consistently by police forces. At the time of writing, IDIOM is only being used by 14 police force areas, despite having been available when we last inspected IOM. The first governance meeting for IDIOM was held by the Home Office in October 2019, and was attended by representatives from most police force areas with a view to supporting wider roll-out.

A number of the schemes inspected were using a variety of techniques to analyse the impact that IOM was having on reconviction rates, by comparing data before and after IOM registration. Cumbria and Waltham Forest are two of the schemes where results appeared favourable with regard to the direct impact that IOM was having on stopping people from offending. However, each area was using different methods to measure its outcomes.

Analysing reconviction rates is not always the best way to understand the impact of intervention on those receiving supervision. In our Academic Insight, *'If reoffending is not the only outcome, what are the alternatives?'* (Wong, 2019), we acknowledged the limitations of using reconviction data and suggested some fairer alternatives to measuring the effectiveness of probation supervision, such as:

- monitoring service user engagement with provision
- analysing changes in the needs (criminogenic and non-criminogenic) that the provision is directly helping the user with
- identifying changes in wellbeing, and relationships – using standardised measurement tools.

It is widely acknowledged that individuals subject to IOM are complex and reoffend more often than those subject to standard supervision. Using reconviction data alone to understand the impact of IOM would therefore only provide limited insight.

We saw some encouraging work taking place to quantify the impact of IOM in some areas. Sheffield, for example, are using a range of methods, and the South Yorkshire IOM performance report is produced by a data analyst, co-funded by the CRC and police. Produced monthly, the report provides a summary of outcomes to senior leaders from across the reducing reoffending partnership on a number of measures. In addition to reoffending rates, these measures include: the numbers and throughput of cases made subject to IOM each month; the compliance rate of those supervised by the scheme; an overview of the enforcement activity undertaken with service users; and progress against criminogenic needs for those who receive IOM intervention.

Similarly, Surrey are in the process of agreeing a performance framework using a model similar to the one used by the IOM scheme in Kent and which reports to the Kent and Medway Reducing Reoffending Board. The Kent IOM performance framework is produced quarterly and reports on a number of measures, including the impact of IOM on reducing reoffending and a breakdown of cohort profiles and criminogenic needs, among other things.

In our survey of PCCs, we asked respondents how they monitored and evaluated the effectiveness and outcomes of IOM schemes. Almost all (n=49) of our respondents replied. Most respondents were using police data on arrests and convictions to monitor individual and scheme outcomes. Several respondents described using a variety of tools (nDelius, IDIOM and custom) to monitor provision of services such as housing and substance misuse.

5.3. Findings from the 2018/2019 core probation inspection programme

The current adult probation inspection programme was launched in April 2018. During the first year, we inspected every NPS division and all 21 CRCs. We examined the quality of case supervision on 3,308 cases in total. Inspectors recorded the IOM status for 3,247. Of these, 268 (8.3 per cent) were recorded as being 'subject to Integrated Offender Management'. We inspected 173 CRC cases subject to IOM and 95 NPS cases. Analysis of the case assessments show that there are statistically significant and beneficial differences in cases that are subject to IOM.

On average, IOM cases were more likely to be judged positively by inspectors, with scores 10 percentage points higher on the sufficiency of assessment, planning, delivery and reviewing. The quality of case work was judged positively in 62 per cent of cases for those not receiving supervision from IOM, whereas work delivered to those included in IOM was judged positively in 72 per cent of cases. These differences were statistically significant for all summary questions except for one – *Delivery: Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the service user's desistance?*

Two questions from the responsible officer survey concerning multi-agency work were also analysed. As we would hope for IOM cases, these showed significantly better evidence of effective relationships with other agencies. Figure 5.2 below shows our detailed findings.

Figure 5.2: Summary of inspection findings from HMI Probation core inspection programme 2018/2019

	Non-IOM cases		IOM cases	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Assessment: Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?	71%	2,976	78%	268
Assessment: Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?	68%	2,978	79%	268
Assessment: Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	60%	2,974	69%	268
Planning: Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?	66%	2,967	72%	267
Planning: Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting the service user's desistance?	66%	2,968	78%	268
Planning: In relevant cases, does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	52%	2,401	67%	235
Delivery: Is the sentence/post-custody period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the service user?	74%	2,971	81%	268
Delivery: Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the service user's desistance?	55%	2,962	60%	266
Delivery: In relevant cases, does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?	48%	2,408	63%	235
Reviewing: In relevant cases, does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's compliance and engagement?	69%	2,439	79%	234
Reviewing: In relevant cases, does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's desistance?	64%	2,186	74%	202

	Non-IOM cases		IOM cases	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Reviewing: In relevant cases, does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	49%	1,658	61%	166
RO survey: In this case, were there effective relationships with other agencies to support desistance through access to mainstream services both during and after the sentence?	82%	1,385	88%	163
RO survey: In this case, were there effective relationships with other agencies to manage the risk of harm to others?	79%	1,346	89%	160

We also tested whether IOM status had an independent effect when interacting with other key variables (type of case, risk of serious harm level, likelihood of reoffending and provider). A logistic regression analysis (a form of multivariate predictive analysis) was undertaken. In 8 of the 12 questions, IOM status was an independent factor in influencing the better results for IOM cases. As such, we can conclude that IOM status did enhance the service provided for these key areas of probation work, **shaded green** in the above table.

For the responsible officer survey questions, only one of the two showed IOM status as operating independently of the other case, risk and provider variables. This was: *In this case, were there effective relationships with other agencies to manage the risk of harm to others?*

5.4. Conclusions and implications

Although there are clear indications from HMI Probation inspection data that IOM can have a positive impact on the quality of work delivered to service users, there remains an absence of any comprehensive evaluation to evidence that IOM is effective in achieving other outcomes. IOM is now being used with so many different cohorts and offence types that measuring its impact or level of success has been complicated further.

There has been limited commitment at a national level to develop work to understand the impact of IOM. Our recommendation to the MoJ and Home Office in 2014 to commission an independent, authoritative and structured evaluation of the cost and benefits of IOM has never been progressed. Moreover, IDIOM, the Home Office approved system for measuring the impact of IOM, has not been fully implemented. We commend the work being undertaken in individual areas to measure IOM performance but the methods being used are all different. We urge the MoJ and Home Office to take a more collaborative and proactive approach to this agenda going forward.

In 2014 we highlighted that some of the areas we visited had made significant attempts to evaluate their work. However, the absence of an agreed methodology or independent academic research to assess outcomes meant that the quality of the evaluations and the weight that could be placed on them was limited. This conclusion is applicable and relevant to our findings in 2019.

References

- Annisson, H., Bradford, B. and Grant, E. (2015). 'Theorizing the role of 'the brand' in criminal justice: The case of Integrated Offender Management'. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, Vol. 15(4) 387–406.
- Best, D., Walker, D., Aston, E., Pegram, C., and O'Donnell, G. (2010). 'Assessing the impact of a high-intensity partnership between the police and drug treatment service in addressing the offending of problematic drug users'. *Policing and Society*, 20(3), 358–369.
- Bonta, J. and Andrews, D.A. (2017). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. London: Routledge.
- Dawson, P. and Cuppleditch, L. (2007). *An impact assessment of the Prolific and other Priority Offender programme*. London: Home Office.
- Disley, A. et al. (2015). *The payment by results Social Impact Bond pilot at HMP Peterborough: final process evaluation report*. London: Ministry of Justice.
- Dominey, J. (2018). *The Use of Community Hubs to Deliver Probation Supervision*. Available at: <https://www.ccgscj.crim.cam.ac.uk/pdf/community-hubs> Accessed: 31 October 2019.
- Equality and Human Rights Commission. (2018). *Article 7: No punishment without law*. Available at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/human-rights-act/article-7-no-punishment-without-law> Accessed: 27 March 2019.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary. (2014). *A Joint Inspection of the Integrated Offender Management Approach*. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation. (2018). *An Inspection of the Midlands Division of the National Probation Service*. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation. (2019a). *An Inspection of the South Yorkshire Community Rehabilitation Company*. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation. (2019b). *An Inspection of the North West Division of the National Probation Service*.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation. (2019c). *Post-release supervision for short-term prisoners: the work undertaken by Community Rehabilitation Companies*. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation. (2019d). *2018/2019 inspections of probation services aggregated data*. (Unpublished).
- HMPPS. (2016). *All about Integrated Offender Management (IOM)*. Available at: <https://intranet.noms.gsi.gov.uk/news-and-updates/features/features-archive/all-about-integrated-offender-management-iom> Accessed: 27 March 2019.
- HMPPS. (2018). *Eleven Key Messages for IOM Managers and Practitioners* (Unpublished)
- Home Office. (2007). *An impact assessment of the Prolific and other Priority Offender programme*. London.
- Home Office. (2009). *Prolific and other priority offender programme five years on: maximising the impact*. London.
- Home Office. (2013). *Integrated Offender Management: Findings from the 2013 survey*. London: Home Office.
- King, S., Hopkins, M. and Cornish, N. (2018). 'Can models of organizational change help to understand 'success' and 'failure' in community sentences? Applying Kotter's model of organizational change to an Integrated Offender Management case study.' *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, Vol. 18(3) 273–290.

- Ministry of Justice. (2009). *Integrated offender management: Government policy statement*. London.
- Ministry of Justice. (2018). *Strengthening probation, building confidence*. London.
- Ministry of Justice and Home Office. (2015). *Integrated Offender Management Key Principles*. London: Home Office.
- Ministry of Justice and Home Office. (2015). *Integrated Offender Management Key Principles – Supplementary information*. London: Home Office.
- Ministry of Justice and National Offender Management Service. (2015). *Practice Framework: National Standards for the Management of Offenders for England and Wales*. London: Ministry of Justice.
- Raynor, P. (2019). *Supervision Skills for Probation Practitioners*. Academic Insights 2019/05. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- Social Exclusion Unit. (2002). *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Senior, P. et al (2011). *Process evaluation of five integrated offender management pioneer areas. Project Report*. London: Ministry of Justice, Home Office.
- Skodbo, S. et al (2007). *Research Report 2. The Drug Interventions Programme (DIP): addressing drug use and offending through 'Tough Choices'* London: Home Office.
- Wong, K. et al. (2012). *Increasing the voluntary and community sector's involvement in Integrated Offender Management: Research Report 59 Summary*. London: Home Office.
- Wong, K. (2019). *If reoffending is not the only outcome, what are the alternatives?* Academic Insights 2019/07. Manchester: HMI Probation.

Annex 1: Glossary

Alcohol Treatment Requirement (ATR)	A requirement that a court may attach to a community order or a suspended sentence order aimed at tackling alcohol abuse
Allocation	The process by which a decision is made about whether an offender will be supervised by the NPS or a CRC
Building Better Relationships (BBR)	BBR is a nationally accredited groupwork programme designed to reduce reoffending by adult male perpetrators of intimate partner violence
Child protection	Work to make sure that that all reasonable action has been taken to keep to a minimum the risk of a child coming to harm
Community Safety Partnership (CSP)	CSPs are a statutory partnership of organisations who work together to create strategies and practical interventions to reduce crime and disorder in their local area. The police, NPS and CRCs are statutory members of these partnerships.
CRC	Community Rehabilitation Company
ETE	Education, training and employment: work to improve an individual's learning, and to increase their employment prospects
HMPPS	Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS): the single agency responsible for both prisons and probation services. See note below on NOMS
Integrated Offender Management (IOM)	Integrated Offender Management brings a cross-agency response to the crime and reoffending threats faced by local communities. The most persistent and problematic offenders are identified and managed jointly by partner agencies working together
Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB)	LCJBs brings together senior leaders from across the Criminal Justice System. The Board promotes a joined-up collaborative approach driving forward work to address challenges facing the system, as well as maintaining oversight of the criminal justice process. The Board works to set cross-system priorities and ensure these are understood and implemented.
Logistic regression analysis	A statistical methodology that estimates the strength of the relationship between two or more variables
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements: where probation, police, prison and other agencies work together locally to manage offenders who pose a higher risk of harm to others. Level 1 is ordinary agency management, where the risks posed by the offender can be managed by the agency responsible for the supervision or case management of the offender. This compares with levels 2 and 3, which require active multi-agency management
MoJ	Ministry of Justice

nDelius	National Delius: the approved case management system used by the NPS and CRCs in England and Wales
NOMS	National Offender Management Service: until April 2017, the single agency responsible for both prisons and probation services, now known as Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS)
NPS	National Probation Service: a single national service which came into being in June 2014. Its role is to deliver services to courts and to manage specific groups of offenders, including those presenting a high or very high risk of serious harm and those subject to MAPPA
Partners	Partners include statutory and non-statutory organisations, working with the participant/offender through a partnership agreement with the NPS or CRC
Providers	Providers deliver a service or input commissioned by and provided under contract to the NPS or CRC. This includes the staff and services provided under the contract, even when they are integrated or located within the NPS or CRC
Rehabilitation Activity Requirement (RAR)	From February 2015, when the <i>Offender Rehabilitation Act</i> was implemented, courts can specify a number of RAR days within an order; it is for probation services to decide on the precise work to be done during the RAR days awarded
ViSOR	The Dangerous Persons Database is used as a management tool by UK Law Enforcement, HMPPS, and a wide range of other agencies to manage: registered sexual offenders, other sexual offenders, violent offenders, and those subject to management under MAPPA. It allows each agency to share information with relevant partner agencies and contribute to the risk management of offenders

Annex 2: Methodology

Pre-fieldwork

1. A review of national and international research.
2. Identification and analysis of Home Office, MoJ and HMPPS policies and guidance.
3. Context discussions with MoJ and HMPPS leaders.
4. A trawl of previous inspections by HMI Probation and HMICFRS relating to IOM.
5. A survey of PCCs conducted to help gain an initial overview of current IOM delivery, the agencies involved, the make-up of cohorts and the selection and identification processes of each scheme. A total of 39 PCC areas responded from a possible 44, giving a response rate of 89 per cent.
6. A pilot inspection hosted by IOM in Bournemouth. This took place in July 2019.

Inspection fieldwork

The inspection fieldwork included visits to seven areas in September and October 2019, covering a mix of metropolitan, urban, rural and coastal areas. We spent time with staff and managers from the three core IOM agencies in each location, as shown below:

IOM scheme	NPS division	CRC	Police force
Waltham Forest	London	London	Metropolitan
Sheffield	North East	South Yorkshire	South Yorkshire
Stockport	North West	Cheshire & Greater Manchester	Greater Manchester
Colwyn Bay	Wales	Wales	North Wales
Cumbria	North West	Cumbria and Lancashire	Cumbria
Surrey	South East	Kent, Surrey & Sussex	Surrey
Warwickshire	Midlands	Warwickshire and West Mercia	Warwickshire

The fieldwork comprised:

1. Assessment of 60 cases, across the seven areas; in 44 of these, we interviewed the responsible officer. Four of these interviews were conducted in Welsh. The case assessments were completed to develop our understanding of the specific schemes and the collated data should not be viewed as representative of all IOM cases.
2. In each case, we accessed both probation and police records in our examination of IOM practice.
3. In addition to meeting with responsible officers working with those subject to IOM, we also held interviews and focus groups with the following:
 - senior leaders from the CRC, NPS and police
 - middle managers from the CRC, NPS and police
 - probation officers and probation service officers, including those who did not have cases within the sample group
 - police officers

- representatives from offices of the PCC
 - representatives from a range of agencies providing interventions to those supervised by IOM.
4. In most locations, we spoke with a small number of service users receiving supervision from IOM.
 5. We undertook the following observations of practice:
 - five IOM case review meetings/panels
 - activity at a women's centre.

Post-fieldwork

On completion of our fieldwork we interviewed:

- the National Police Chiefs' Council portfolio lead for IOM and Electronic Monitoring
- the NPS Divisional Director with lead responsibility for IOM
- representatives from the NPS IOM Strategic Divisional Leads group
- a probation policy lead from the MoJ
- the project manager for IDIOM.

Inspection case profile

We examined 17 cases where the service user had been sentenced to a community sentence, 42 that were subject to post-release supervision, and one that was not serving any sentence and was supervised on a non-statutory basis. Of the cases we assessed:

- the index offence was related to violence in 27 (46 per cent)
- a burglary offence had been committed by 11 (19 per cent)
- the responsible officer had classified the risk of harm to be medium or high in 56 (95 per cent)
- the service user had more than 21 previous convictions in 32 cases (55 per cent).

The demographics of the service users in 59 of the 60 cases were as follows:¹⁵

- 14 (24 per cent) were aged 18-25 years, 23 (39 per cent) were 26-35 years and 22 (37 per cent) were 36-55 years. There were no service users in our sample aged 55 or over
- 53 (90 per cent) were male; 6 (10 per cent) were female
- 47 (81 per cent) were white.

HMI Probation IOM survey of PCCs

1) Access and methodology

HMI Probation determined that the best route to local IOM arrangements was via Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), as we could not identify a national list of IOM schemes. PCCs have a leading role in coordinating criminal justice partnership activity and we are grateful for their assistance with the survey.

¹⁵ It was not possible to identify the demographics of the service user receiving IOM supervision on a non-statutory basis.

The survey builds on the Home Office's previous IOM survey. In 2013, the Home Office sent questionnaires to Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs); 181 out of 292 CSPs (62 per cent) responded to that survey.

We emailed all PCCs with a request to complete an online survey about their local IOM arrangements. We used the contact details provided on the Home Office website. Where an email failed to deliver, a follow-up email was sent to the details provided on the specific PCC website.

The survey was open from 8 May 2019 to 30 June 2019.

Follow-up emails were also sent to local HMICFRS liaison officers and we are grateful for their help to improve our response.

2) Response

We received responses from 39 out of 43 police force areas (90 per cent), and we are grateful for the time and effort respondents gave to provide a nationally representative survey. Responses have been submitted by a mixture of police lead officers, dedicated IOM managers and PCC strategy and policy managers.

We had a response from PCCs (or their nominated representative) in every English region and from Wales. We had responses from all the major conurbations except for Northumbria and the West Midlands.

The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime for the Greater London Authority (MOPAC) kindly coordinated a response from the London boroughs and gave us an overview of IOM across the capital. We are also grateful to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), which responded on behalf of the Greater Manchester "Spotlight" IOM schemes.

We had responses from 50 IOM strategic representatives. Of these, 36 responses were at the Police Force Area level; five were at a custom IOM strategic level, encompassing a number of local IOM schemes; and nine were from individual London boroughs.

These 50 respondents are the denominator used where we quote survey findings in the report.



Her Majesty's
Inspectorate of
Probation

HM Inspectorate of Probation
1st Floor Civil Justice Centre
1 Bridge Street West
Manchester
M3 3FX
ISBN: 978-1-84099-942-6