
VISITING EXPERTS' PAPERS

THE EFFECTIVE RESETTLEMENT OF OFFENDERS BY STRENGTHENING 'COMMUNITY REINTEGRATION FACTORS'

PART ONE

*Steve Pitts**



I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Importance of Effective Resettlement

The effective resettlement of offenders is a critical matter – one that affects not only offenders, but their victims, families and, directly and indirectly, communities and society as a whole.

Successful resettlement means fewer offences, fewer victims, more settled communities and the potential for ex-offenders to contribute more beneficially to society. The benefits are not only personal and social: financially, in the United Kingdom, we have estimated the cost of offending by prisoners to be about £11 billion per year. We also estimate that offending, and the response to offending, by one individual can be as much as £1 million over a lifetime.

And yet we also know that it is possible to improve resettlement and reduce reoffending. Our most recent research shows that we can reduce reoffending by between 10 and 30%, against a predicted rate, according to the approach we take. We also know that what works best are approaches that:

- (i) improve offenders' basic skills;
- (ii) improve employability (but note that improved employability must in turn lead to real jobs, and be sustained); or that
- (iii) help offenders to think and see the world and their place in it more constructively and with hope.

Of course, in order to sustain employment people also need somewhere secure and stable to live.

By addressing effective resettlement through community reintegration, we are therefore addressing the key issues. The number of prisoners with '*criminogenic*' employment and accommodation needs in England and Wales – that is, needs which research indicates are relevant to reoffending – are about 65% and 43% respectively. But most offenders are socially disadvantaged and have multiple barriers to employment. This is an important issue for correctional services. But it is clearly also an important issue for others: criminal justice agencies cannot solve employment and accommodation problems alone. We need to work with partners – public, private and third sector. I want to talk about all three.

But first a personal note: I believe strongly in the power of partnership. I also extend that belief to international partnership. I observe that we appear to be witnessing an increase in the pace of development of work in justice – and much of that increase is led by sharing experience and learning across international borders. We all want to improve the effectiveness of resettlement: this course was an excellent opportunity to achieve this goal through sharing our approaches and our learning mutually.

B. Paper Overview

A word about the structure of my paper:

- (i) I would like to begin with an overview of my organization, the National Offender Management

* Head of International Relations and External Programmes, National Offender Management Service, Ministry of Justice, England and Wales, United Kingdom.

Service, or NOMS – its aims and structure;

- (ii) I will follow this with a brief introduction to our partnerships in order to make the link between partnerships and structure;
- (iii) Third, I will speak about the sentencing frameworks. Naturally these play a significant part in shaping the work that NOMS delivers;
- (iv) Next, the Reducing Re-offending Framework, which embraces the assessment of offender risks and needs, case management and interventions;
- (v) All the foregoing provides the background and support for work on reintegration, social inclusion and resettlement. We have invested a great deal of effort and energy in this direction. I would like to expand on this area in the paper, speaking in some detail about developments I feel sure will be of value and interest, including our 'pathway' approach to tackling offender reintegration and reoffending, and approaches to motivating change;
- (vi) Following a look at this broad picture I am going to focus on the crucial areas of employment and accommodation;
- (vii) Next, I describe our partnerships in detail. I think you will be interested in our range of partners: public, private and voluntary. I plan to discuss both strategy and policy and a good number of case examples illustrating different, challenging and I hope useful approaches;
- (viii) Finally, I will conclude with a brief look at some of our very latest developments. These are intended to take us a significant step further in engaging and supporting communities in working together – to reduce reoffending and to increase reintegration. My last points will look at some trends in evaluation. I suggest it will become increasingly important in most of our countries, as we compete internally for limited funds, to demonstrate our impact and our value for money.

The overall approach in this paper is therefore to start with the larger picture and then to move progressively to case examples and the detail.

II. THE NATIONAL OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SERVICE

A. What is NOMS?

The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) is new. It was created in April 2008 as an executive agency of the Ministry of Justice with the goal of helping prison and probation services work together effectively and efficiently to manage offenders throughout their sentences.

The Director General of NOMS is responsible to the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice and sits on the Board of the Ministry, chaired by the Permanent Secretary. The responsibility of the NOMS Agency, on behalf of the Secretary of State, is to deliver the sentences and orders of the courts of England and Wales by:

- commissioning adult offender services in custody and the community from public, private and third sector organizations;
- providing the public prison service; and
- overseeing the Boards and Trusts which provide the public probation services.

The Agency is responsible for ensuring the number of proven offences committed by adult reoffenders is reduced by 10% between 2005 and 2011. By delivering this it will contribute to the wider Ministry of Justice Departmental Strategic Objectives which outline what the Ministry of Justice will deliver to the public by 2011.

In operating through providers and partners in the public, private and third sectors, NOMS endeavours to manage offenders in an integrated way. What work needs to be done – and who does the work - is based on evidence and driven by ensuring value for money for the public.

NOMS manages offenders throughout both their custodial and community sentences, working with around 260,000 offenders a year. We carry out prison sentences in England and Wales: there are 135 prisons, of which 124 are run by the public sector and 11 by private contractors. We also manage offenders on community sentences, and provide services to offenders, victims, witnesses and the courts. There are

42 probation areas – areas which have recently become Trusts – a change designed to provide an increased level of independence and clear accountability for delivery, whether by the Trust or through its partners.

NOMS aims to help offenders change their lives in order to reduce their chances of reoffending. NOMS met or exceeded 27 of 28 national performance targets and the number of reoffences committed fell 11.1% between 2005 and 2007. The number of reoffences classified as serious fell by 9.8% over the same period. Like most government departments around the world we are required to make efficiency savings. We met our £81 million efficiency savings target for 2008/09 with an even larger savings target of £171 million for 2009–2010.

B. Delivering to the Public

NOMS is an Agency of the Ministry of Justice. As such we are responsible for one of the four Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSOs): DSO 3 – to protect the public and reduce reoffending. DSOs are in turn reflected in NOMS' responsibility to deliver two Public Service Agreements or PSAs:

The first is PSA 23 – Making Communities Safer. PSA 23 involves cross governmental priority action of reducing reoffending through the improved management of offenders and involves a reoffending reduction target of 10% by 2011.

The second is PSA 16. PSA 16 is to increase the proportion of socially excluded adults in settled accommodation and employment, education or training. Significantly, this PSA is led by the Cabinet Office. Note that both PSAs involve NOMS working together with other Government departments and are drivers for collaboration. This collaborative approach is reflected in partnerships with other sectors which I will turn to later.

NOMS manages the achievement of PSAs through delivering to annual targets for the employment of offenders under supervision, at termination of order or licence, and upon release. Targets are both numeric and based on a percentage of orders: for example, last year we were required to ensure that 14,430 offenders under supervision in the community found, and sustained, employment. This target was exceeded by more than 2,000 people into work - the number being 16,982. We were also required to ensure that 40% of offenders were in employment at termination of their order or licence. The figure achieved was 45%. A lower figure of 26% was applied to prisoners at the point of release, a figure met precisely.

In relation to accommodation, targets include the percentage of offenders in settled or suitable accommodation at the end of their order or licence and upon release. The targets are 70% and 80%, with an achievement of 78% and 86% respectively. Whilst we can take some satisfaction in achieving these results, the real value of sharing them is that they provide an excellent example of partnership – between government departments and with private and third sector organizations. These partnerships simply could not have been achieved working on our own.

Much more will be said about these partnerships later. Our work to deliver targets also leads directly to the next part of the paper on organizational structure.

C. Organizational Structure

The NOMS organizational structure is new. NOMS, like the Ministry of Justice of which it is an agency, has been established following a major programme of structural change. Change is intended to create, amongst other things, increased clarity and accountability between the Government's national strategies for community safety and reducing reoffending and the responsibility of NOMS to deliver 'on the ground'. Delivery is organized through ten Directors of Offender Management, or DOMS, nine for each of the English regions and one for Wales. DOMS have the task of achieving results and value for money through commissioning public, private and third sector stakeholders and delivery partners. This work includes requiring operational prison and probation services to deliver regional reducing reoffending strategies.

Regional strategies are therefore a cascaded version of national strategies which are agreed inter-departmentally by a range of Government departments responsible for areas such as education, employment, housing and health, as well as justice. The *national* cross-Government Reducing Re-offending Board is the

most senior level example of a partnership to reduce reoffending.

Just as strategies are cascaded, so are budgets devolved to DOMS so that they can use them to meet regional need – work which is delivered in collaboration with other government services and other sectors at the regional or Welsh level. *Regional* partnerships involve private or third sector services working alongside the public services to resettle offenders. The 135 prisons and 42 Probation Trusts are in turn able to form *local* partnerships to address locally identified needs.

The point I wish to emphasize is that partnerships are at the centre of every aspect of delivery, at every level – central, regional and local – and with every sector, whether public, private, or the third or voluntary sector.

D. Statutory Partnerships

I would like to take a moment next to describe some of the statutory or public partnerships before turning later to private and voluntary sector partnerships.

Community Safety Partnerships, or CSRs, are a new arrangement in place only since April 2010. They bring together police, local authorities (including their responsibility for housing), fire and rescue, health and probation, together with suggestions for working with prisons, other parts of the criminal justice system including Youth Offending Services, and the voluntary sector, to reduce reoffending. Budgets devolved from central government departments are then combined by agencies closer to the ground, working in partnership to meet identified patterns of need. CSRs are a good example of this model in operation:

CSR member organizations work together to deliver work according to the *ASPIRE* model, first developed by the probation service. *ASPIRE* provides partners with a relatively simple model for co-operation. The five co-operative *ASPIRE* steps are:

- Assess profile of reoffending in the area *including social exclusion data*;
- Strategically *Plan* for action;
- Implement the plan, drawing on case managed intervention, mainstream and commissioned services;
- Review performance;
- Evaluate success to review outcomes and value for money.

CSPs place a statutory duty on organizations to co-operate. This duty is set out in Section 108 of the Policing and Crime Act 2009. I would like to quote the argument put forward in support of this approach: “Success in reducing reoffending can only be achieved by local partners working beyond traditional organizational boundaries. More effective partnership working as a result of these changes will help to reduce crime and reoffending, protect the public and improve public confidence in the criminal justice system, the police and in other local partners, in a way that allows people to see and feel the difference in their local communities”.

The CSP Executive Summary continues: “Adults and young people convicted of offences are often some of the most socially excluded within society. The majority of offenders have complex and often deep-rooted health and social problems, such as substance misuse, mental health problems, homelessness, high levels of unemployment and possibly debt and financial problems. Tackling these problems is important for addressing the offender’s problems and providing ‘pathways out of offending’, and to break the inter-generational cycle of offending and associated family breakdown”. CSPs therefore give local expression to the national aim of reducing reoffending through reducing exclusion.

Because CSPs are so new, it is not yet possible to provide examples of completed projects. But I can provide examples of work delivered as a result of the preceding Crime and Disorder Act of 1998. The 1998 Act created Crime and Disorder Partnerships (CDRPs). A national dissemination programme, known as the Beacon Scheme, has subsequently celebrated and promoted some of the most successful and innovative partnerships. Four of the areas selected for Beacon status focussed on creating safer communities through reducing reoffending. All have had to demonstrate six ‘hallmarks’ of excellence:

- Empowered and Effective Leadership;

145TH INTERNATIONAL TRAINING COURSE
VISITING EXPERTS' PAPERS

- Visible and Constructive Accountability;
- Intelligence-led Business Processes;
- Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures;
- Engaged Communities;
- Appropriate Skills and Knowledge.

Examples of partnership practice, facilitated by the multi-agency community approach, include:

- (i) The Safer Sunderland Partnership: Sunderland is the largest city in the north-east of England. The Sunderland project aimed to improve the rate of young offenders engaged in education, employment or training. Sixty local businesses were approached, many of them corporate victims of crime. Offenders were then placed with them to provide unpaid work and gain work experience, so contributing to restorative justice. As well as the skills specific to the employment sector, the offenders learnt basic aspects of employment including timekeeping and dress. By 2008 Sunderland achieved 91% of young offenders in education training or employment, exceeding the national average by 20%.
- (ii) A scheme in the City of Leicestershire involves companies in offering two-week mentored support to young offenders in what is often a first step in experiencing employment.
- (iii) Another scheme in Sunderland engaged young offenders in the design and development of projects to reduce reoffending. This provided a positive learning experience as well as producing useful intervention materials including DVDs on the effects of substance misuse and knife crime.
- (iv) The Sunderland partnership also piloted a scheme for the male perpetrators of domestic violence. A development of the multi-agency approach includes a hostel for eight men who are removed from the domestic home and receive interventions to reduce violence, whilst at the same time agencies work with the victims, and the children in the 98% of cases in which children are also involved.
- (v) Tower Hamlets London – Safe Exit Diversion Scheme. This scheme works with women involved in street prostitution through linking criminal justice services, local authorities and third sector organizations. Following an holistic assessment of needs, women can be referred to one of 12 agencies. Well over 50% of women referred completed the scheme and had their cases discontinued.
- (vi) The “Be Safe Bolton” scheme demonstrated the benefits of information and intelligence gathering and was able to ensure police and reintegration resources were targeted at offenders with the highest risk of harm or conviction. Local agencies have identified “Single Points of Contact” for prisoners approaching release. The intelligence focuses improvement work on localities with high crime rates, and helps identify the most successful approaches. It was one of the first to involve residents in deciding the focus of community service work by offenders. Known as “Community Payback”, more than 50% of community service work is targeted following “Community Walks” on which residents decide on priorities to improve local safety. “Alley-gaters” to prevent run-throughs by groups of young people were one of the first developments.
- (vii) Other schemes addressing offender employment include “Community Hubs” in Tower Hamlets, London which links employers and employment support. Prisoners are, where possible, met at the prison gate. Ex-offenders are engaged in the meeting service and in delivering the employment programme, a model which also develops their own skills and helps them make life changes. The scheme employs male and female ex-offender mentors, and also tries to address specific faiths. Other schemes map the offenders’ experience in gaining work and then involve partnership agencies in working together to improve the process.

CSPs are only one example of agencies working together at the local level. Other statutory partnerships work with specific groups of offenders, including MAPPA partnerships to co-ordinate work with those offenders that present a higher risk of harm, and PPO partnerships working with Prolific and other Priority Offenders. Others target drug mis-users or deliver intensive case management with recently released prisoners who have served short sentences.

“Intensive Alternative to Custody” projects work closely with courts. They may combine community service work, electronic monitoring, group work programmes, and police surveillance, the aim being to divert offenders from custodial sentences.

E. NOMS: Some Facts and Figures

About 50% of NOMS' total budget is spent on public prisons, about 5% on private prisons (another example of work with the private sector), and 23% on probation services. The probation caseload is about 250,000, and the prison population, about 83,000 in 2009, has just passed 85,000. Both these population figures need to be seen in the context of a 'flow' through the system: during 2008, there were 134,000 first receptions into custody and 205,000 started Probation Service supervision.

About 5% of prisoners are female and 14% are foreign nationals. The majority of prisoners are sentenced for offences involving violence, sexual offences, robbery or burglary. The largest number are serving sentences of more than four years, although short-term prisoners, serving less than 12 months, account for a large proportion of receptions and discharges – about 60,000 per year, in spite of the relatively small proportion in prison at any one time. The majority of short-term prisoners spend six weeks or fewer in prison, a length which poses difficulty in arranging purposeful activity.

It is clear that many countries face similar problems in relation to reducing their prison population. These include 're-balancing' custodial sentences in favour of sentences served partly or wholly in the community, reducing reoffending, and demonstrating value for money. There is also an increasingly global set of guidance and regulations, and of course more movement of people. These issues in common reinforce the value of international sharing and learning.

But has the 'science' of transfer kept up with the *pace* of transfer? Working closely with the European Union and international networks such as the European Probation Organisation (the CEP), we have begun, through pilot projects and research, to explore what contributes to successful transfer. This is a topic in its own right, but it will of interest to know that some of the emerging evidence points to the importance of adaptation, to culture as well as legal framework, of learning from failure as well as success, and of transferring ideas rather than detailed methods. We have also seen that *how* a method is delivered can be as important, even more important, than the method itself – and that the vital ingredient of motivated staff and leaders needs to be backed up by opinion formers – the judiciary, media and politicians. It may also be beneficial to resist too fast an implementation of a promising practice. 'What works' may become 'What works and who works, where and how?'

III. THE SENTENCING FRAMEWORK

A. The Sentencing Framework

The England and Wales sentencing framework, like the effective practice and resettlement frameworks which follow, has a relatively recent genesis. The framework was designed with support of resettlement as one of its aims.

1. The Purposes of Sentencing

The 2003 Criminal Justice Act sets out the five purposes of sentencing:

- the punishment of offenders;
- the reduction of crime (including its reduction by deterrence);
- the reform and rehabilitation of offenders;
- the protection of the public; and
- making reparation by offenders to persons affected by their offences.

A number of important principles underpin the sentencing framework. These include the need to ensure that sentences are fair and proportional to the offence, and that sentences of imprisonment are delivered in a seamless fashion from prison to the community as a 'whole sentence'. Purposes of sentencing should be addressed in both the *custodial* and *aftercare* stages of the sentence. This principle directly supports the resettlement framework.

2. The Question of Offence Seriousness

Whilst courts are obliged to have regard to these principles, sentence will generally be determined according to *seriousness* of the offence. Seriousness is made up of:

- *harm* caused by the offence; and

- *culpability* of the offender in committing it.

There is also a presumption that recent and relevant previous convictions make an offence more serious.

Thresholds of penalty are based on seriousness:

- offences that are so serious that only custody will represent a sufficient response;
- offences that are serious enough to warrant a community sentence.

In cases where neither of these thresholds is reached then a fine or a discharge will be appropriate.

3. Prison Sentences

The structure of prison sentence depends on sentence length. Implementation is progressive:

- (a) Sentences under 12 months (currently no supervised licence). The intention is:
 - A custodial period of 2-13 weeks; a licence period of 6-9 months;
 - Court sets licence conditions;
 - Includes executive recall.
- (b) Sentence of 12 months' imprisonment or longer:
 - Are served half in custody and half in community;
 - A Case Manager agrees an intervention plan and conditions;
 - Includes executive recall.
- (c) Intermittent and Suspended (court handles breach) options;
- (d) In the case of a life sentence, or indeterminate and extended sentences for serious and public protection cases, the Parole Board decides the release date.

The intention of the Act is that many of the options applicable to community sentences are also available on post-release licence.

4. Community Sentences

Since the implementation of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, there has been a single community order for offenders aged 18 or over that can comprise up to 12 requirements depending on the offence and the offender. These are:

- unpaid work (formerly community service/community punishment) – a requirement to complete between 40 and 300 hours' unpaid work;
- activity – for example to attend basic skills classes;
- programme – there are several designed to reduce the prospects of reoffending;
- prohibited activity – requirement not do so something that is likely to lead to further offences or nuisance;
- curfew – electronically monitored;
- exclusion – not much used as no reliable electronic monitoring yet available;
- residence – requirement to reside only where approved by a probation officer;
- mental health treatment (requires offender's consent);
- drug rehabilitation (requires offender's consent);
- alcohol treatment (requires offender's consent);
- supervision – meetings with probation officer to address needs/offending behaviour;
- attendance centre – three hours of activity, usually on Saturday afternoons, for between a minimum total of 12 hours and a maximum of 36 in total.

Typically, the more serious the offence and the more extensive the offender's needs, the more requirements there will be. Most orders will comprise one or two requirements but there are packages of several available where required. The court tailors the order as appropriate and is guided by the probation service through a pre-sentence report.

IV. THE EFFECTIVE PRACTICE, OR ‘WHAT WORKS’, FRAMEWORK

NOMS has introduced three systems to reduce reoffending:

- An Offender Assessment System (OASys) – designed to assess risk and needs and to inform case management;
- The *National Offender Management Model* – intended to manage offenders safely and effectively, including managing prisoners consistently from prison to the community;
- *Interventions* - including unpaid work, employability programmes, and accredited programmes to address a wide range of offending-related or ‘criminogenic’ needs including ‘thinking skills’, domestic violence, sex offending, and drug or alcohol misuse.

The effective practice framework flows naturally from the sentencing framework. Although they may at first appear only indirectly related to resettlement, closer examination shows a direct relationship.

A. The OASys Assessment System

OASys has been developed jointly by the prison and probation services. It is an IT-based system which assesses offending-related need and risk of reconviction and serious harm. There is on-going validation of accuracy against actual reconviction. The OASys tool also guides individual sentence planning, measures change, and provides management information. Data is aggregated centrally, regionally and locally to support analysis and service planning – of NOMS and stakeholders.

OASys measures a wide range of factors statistically shown to be relevant to offending. These include education, training and employability, accommodation, financial management and income, relationships, lifestyle and associates, drug and alcohol mis-use, emotional well-being, and thinking skills and attitudes.

The risk assessment element measures harm to the public, children, staff, prisoners, offenders themselves, and to adults known to the offender, indicating whether risk is low, medium, high or very high. Action to manage risk is then triggered including through MAPPA arrangements described later.

OASys data may be analysed in many ways: data demonstrates the offending-related needs of a national probation sample by type of need and by gender. The data might also, for example, be analysed by prison or probation caseload or by region or city. Our OASys data shows that the most common needs of offenders, *related to their offending*, include education, employment, with a wide range of other needs including ‘thinking skills’ (such as problem solving), accommodation and drug problems not far behind. This complexity of need makes our work more difficult. This point will be returned to later.

B. The National Offender Management Model

The National Offender Management Model is underpinned by a number of principles intended to support resettlement. These include:

- One Offender Manager, an individual probation officer, who manages the case throughout the sentence (including time in prison) to provide continuity;
- The Offender Manager is community based – even for prisoners;
- One sentence plan is developed for the entire sentence;
- A system of resource “Tiers” allocates resources according to risk and needs;
- The concept of the “Offender Management Team” – all responsible agencies operate to common agreed goals.

The model provides the means by which NOMS ensures the right services are harnessed from within the service and from partners, and delivered to each offender according to risks and needs assessed through OASys assessment.

C. Interventions – The “What Works Core Curriculum”

The third system is referred to as the “Core Curriculum”. This is the suite of interventions most closely associated with ‘what works’ – interventions based on tested independent research evidence of effectiveness.

NOMS 'what works' interventions are based on a process of accreditation. Accreditation is carried out by an independent group of international experts – the "Accreditation Panel". The panel has developed Interventions Criteria against which new approaches are assessed. Key criteria are:

- a clear model of change;
- specified offender selection criteria;
- targeting of offending risk factors;
- employing effective methods;
- skills orientated;
- appropriate sequencing, duration and intensity of intervention;
- motivation and engagement;
- continuity of services;
- maintenance of integrity;
- evaluation and monitoring.

The core curriculum contains more than 20 programmes, and is continuing to expand. The creation of NOMS provides an opportunity to rationalize programmes historically developed separately by the prison and probation services and to build continuity of programme design and delivery. For example, sex offender treatment begun in prison can be reinforced post-release.

The programme range includes cognitive skills, substance misuse, sex offender treatment, violence and emotional management, women offenders, drink impaired drivers, and resettlement. Most are designed for group delivery. However there are also programmes for delivery to individuals, who might for example live in an isolated area where it would be impractical to deliver to a group.

It is important to note that we know from experience and research that programmes are only effective when delivered as intended by well-trained, managed and supported staff. Delivery quality is so important that NOMS has developed detailed guidance, audit and support to ensure these standards are met in prisons and the community.

D. 'What Works' Evaluation

Evaluation evidence is promising. The 2006 Evaluation Cohort allows comparison with year 2000 results. The frequency of reoffending reduced by an average of 22.9%. For offences classified as most serious, the reduction was a reduction of 11.1%. Over the same period, the *proportion* of offenders reoffending fell by 10.7%.

This translates into significantly fewer victims and reduced costs associated with crime.

V. SOCIAL EXCLUSION, COMMUNITY REINTEGRATION AND RESETTLEMENT

A. Development of the Overall Approach

I now move to social exclusion, community reintegration and resettlement.

Genesis of the resettlement and community reintegration framework has followed a similar timescale to the sentencing and 'what works' frameworks. In 2001 the Government's Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) published a report on prisoner resettlement and social exclusion. The findings were startling and showed, for example, that prisoners were far more likely than the general population to be unemployed (67% of pre-sentence prisoners and 5% of the general public respectively), to have no qualifications, to be homeless, and to suffer from mental disorders.

The NOMS reintegration and resettlement framework is based on the Social Exclusion Unit's work. The report, which was researched and prepared in close collaboration with the Prison and Probation Services, proposed a needs-based 'pathway' approach through which offenders' needs are addressed via cross-government agreement and action.

As noted by Maguire and Raynor (2006), the SEU's location in the office of the Deputy Prime Minister gave the recommendations political weight and allowed development of a cross-departmental approach to social inclusion and reducing reoffending. A national strategy and action plan on reducing reoffending (2004) extended the pathway approach to community sentences.

The resettlement framework comprises seven rehabilitation 'pathways' for men and women. Each pathway addresses areas of work critical to resettlement (and to work with offenders in the community). However, when applied to resettlement, the pathways require prisons and probation areas to work closely together to ensure that pathways are continuous from custody to community. The 'pathways' are:

- Accommodation;
- Education, training and employment;
- Health;
- Drugs and alcohol;
- Finance;
- Families;
- Attitudes, thinking and behaviour.

Two additional 'pathways' have recently been added for work with women. The 'pathways' are underpinned by four cross-cutting themes:

- Assessment and Case Management;
- Diversity;
- Public Protection;
- Partnerships.

One of the most far-reaching recommendations of the SEU report encouraged prisons to think in terms of '*mainstream permeability*', the idea that prison walls should not be barriers to prisoner access to mainstream services. Government departments have responsibility for developing policy on offender access to mainstream services. This recommendation has speeded up the introduction of mainstream staff working closely in prisons, often through a system of '*in-reach*' staff co-located with prison staff in resettlement units.

The pathway approach has enabled us to gain a national, regional and local picture of resettlement need and to involve other departments and partnerships based on this accurate picture. When OASys needs are placed within the pathway structure we see that education, employment, thinking skills, relationships (including family), substance misuse, and accommodation are at the top of the list. This provides us with clear and impartial evidence on which to base priorities in strategy, policy and practice.

B. Lessons in Resettlement

In parallel to the work of the SEU, a number of evaluated development projects including the Resettlement Pathfinders (1999- 2003) demonstrated some vital characteristics of effective resettlement.

But firstly, what do we mean by resettlement? In 2001 the UK Association of Chief Officers of Probation defined it thus:

"A systematic and evidenced-based process by which actions are taken to work with the offender in custody and on release, so that communities are better protected from harm and reoffending is significantly reduced. It encompasses the totality of work with prisoners, their families and significant others in partnership with statutory and voluntary organizations."

The pathfinders found resettlement was more effective when:

- The sentence plan is based on sound assessment of risks and needs;
- Intervention begins as soon as possible after sentence;
- Intervention includes attention to attitudes and thinking;
- Attention is given to practical needs, with links to mainstream provision and community facilities;
- Case management is delivered 'through the prison gate' and includes work on motivation.

The echoes of the effective practice framework described earlier will be evident. The Social Exclusion Unit report and resettlement pathfinders were followed by the National Reducing Re-offending Strategy and action plan. These have since shaped resettlement at the central, regional and local levels.

C. The Importance of Personal and Social Factors in Inclusion, Reducing Reoffending and Resettlement

I want to conclude this first paper by describing some new and exciting developments in inclusion, reducing reoffending and resettlement. These focus on the interaction of personal and social factors in supporting change and integration.

1. Desistance

First I would like to draw attention to the rise in understanding of what helps offenders to desist from reoffending. Desistance theory emphasizes long term change over short term control, and the collective interest of the community in integration of offenders. The focus is on supporting offenders to see themselves in a new and more positive light with hope for the future. Desistance theory may argue that individuals need a combination of *motivation, human capital and social capital* in order to succeed. Human capital includes the capacity of the individual to make changes and achieve goals. Social capital includes factors such as employment and supportive family or other relationships.

Successful resettlement therefore depends on helping offenders in all three areas, recognizing that progress in all is unlikely to be direct or continuous. It is said that 90% of offenders remain ambiguous about their future until and even beyond apparently stable reintegration.

2. Motivation

(i) F.O.R. a Change

F.O.R. a Change is a resettlement programme which draws on desistance theory, motivational theory, the proven effectiveness of cognitive behavioural work, and practical support to engage offenders in planning a new future. The aim is to create both confidence and commitment to change. The programme builds on the motivational cycle of change to move individuals through five stages of accepting the need for change, recognizing problems, defining how to overcome problems, developing their own plan for change, and controlling of risks of relapse.

The programme involves 12 two-hour sessions, delivered in groups and individual sessions, with support post-release offered by the probation service or by the voluntary sector. One of the most successful and innovative features of the programmes is the "Community Market Place". This innovative approach involves inviting representatives of public agencies and voluntary organizations into the prison where they set up "Market Stalls" displaying the services they offer. Prisoners are able to walk around the 'market place' and to approach organizations that would be helpful to them, making appointments to follow up these contacts once they are released. Prisoners therefore become active rather than dependent participants in their own resettlement and feel the rewards of their own positive action. This in effect is building social capital, and taken as a whole, the programme aims to improve motivation, confidence and community opportunities.

The F.O.R. a Change programme has been run in several male and female prisons with good success and has received accreditation by the UK's panel of independent experts.

Consideration of this programme will lead suitably to part two of this paper which will consider employment and accommodation strategy, and the partnerships and projects which deliver the strategy, in detail.