INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT
KEY PRINCIPLES

March 2010

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This document provides an overview of Integrated Offender Management (IOM) and sets out questions for partnerships about key elements of joint working to enable effective development and delivery of IOM, following on from the Government's IOM policy statement published in June 2009[1].

OVERVIEW OF INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT (IOM)

IOM is an overarching framework for bringing together agencies in local areas to prioritise interventions with offenders who cause crime in their locality. Local IOM arrangements will work best if they are not restricted to statutory or local criminal justice agencies, but involve a wide range of social agencies, including the voluntary sector, who have a role to play in tackling risk factors associated with crime and offending.

IOM provides areas with the opportunity to target those offenders of most concern in a more structured and co-ordinated way. Building on an analysis of the crime and offending problems in an area, IOM will help to ensure coherent joint working across partnership agencies to make the best use of local resources, to ensure that targeted offenders do not fall through the gaps between existing programmes and approaches, and that identified problems are addressed. The IOM policy statement recognised the significant contribution that both the Prolific and other Priority Offender (PPO) and Drug Interventions Programmes (DIP) will make to local IOM arrangements, and these successful approaches should be firmly embedded within local IOM arrangements.

---

1   www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/iom

IOM places a strong focus on four key actions:

- Reduce crime, reduce re-offending and improve public confidence in the criminal justice system.

- Address potential overlaps between existing approaches and programmes to manage offenders and address gaps.

- Align the work of local criminal justice agencies, expanding and improving on partnerships that already exist at the local, area and regional level with wider social agendas.

- Simplify and strengthen governance, to provide greater clarity around respective roles and responsibilities - including leadership, operational decision making and allocation of resources.

PRINCIPLES OF IOM

The IOM policy statement set out five key principles which should underpin local IOM arrangements. These are:

- **All partners tackling offenders together** - local partners, both criminal justice and non- criminal justice agencies, encourage the development of a multi-agency problem-solving approach by focussing on offenders, not offences.

- **Delivering a local response to local problems** - all relevant local partners are involved in strategic planning, decision-making and funding choices.

- **Offenders facing their responsibility or facing the consequences** - offenders are provided with a clear understanding of what is expected of them.

- **Making better use of existing programmes and governance** - this involves gaining further benefits from programmes such as the PPO programme, DIP and Community Justice to increase the benefits for communities. This will also enable partners to provide greater clarity around roles and responsibilities.

- **All offenders at high risk of causing serious harm and/or re-offending are 'in scope'** - intensity of management relates directly to severity of risk, irrespective of position within the criminal justice system or whether statutory or non-statutory.

The questions set out later in this document build outwards from these overarching principles. They are for partnerships to work through, to help provide an understanding of the strength of local arrangements and areas for further development. The underlying objective is to ensure that local IOM arrangements across England and Wales are as robust as they can be.

PPO REFRESH AND 'TRAFFIC LIGHT' ASSESSMENTS

In June 2009, the PPO refresh guidance, *"PPO 5 years on: maximising the impact"* was published. This recognised the impact that the PPO programme continues to have on the crime and re-offending of a group of damaging offenders, and set out a number of challenges for local areas to address, to ensure that their local PPO schemes are having the maximum impact on local crime rates.[2]

Both the PPO refresh guidance, and the IOM policy statement, recognised the important contribution that PPO schemes would continue to make as part of broader IOM arrangements, with the IOM strategic umbrella providing the framework for reviewing and refreshing local PPO arrangements.

The questions set out in this document are intended to complement the existing PPO traffic light assessment tool, which is used in partnership with Government Offices to assess key elements of local PPO schemes. The PPO criteria were revised in 2008 to reflect the Community Safety Partnerships Hallmarks of Effective Partnership working. The criteria describe the three broadest enablers of effective performance management: people & relationships, data & analysis and structures & processes.

The PPO traffic light assessment tool remains valid, as a tool for ensuring that PPO schemes make maximum impact on crime and re-offending as part of local IOM arrangements.

DIP REVIEW

The findings of the review of the DIP Delivery Model were published in May 2009. The review recognised the significant improvements in capability and services that the Programme has brought about and included recommendations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of DIP. A programme was put in place to implement the findings of the review and achieve a step-change improvement in delivery effectiveness. In February 2010 the *DIP Operational Handbook* was published which, supported by a new DIP funding model, set out a new framework defined through three core functions:

- the successful **IDENTIFICATION** of specified Class A drug misusing offenders;

- a comprehensive and standard **ASSESSMENT** of their treatment and other support needs;

---

2   www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/ppo/ppominisite095years.pdf

- effective, consistent **CASE MANAGEMENT** to help break the cycle of drugs and offending.

The DIP Operational Handbook will be implemented from April 2010.

The DIP review also identified IOM as the local infrastructure for sustaining DIP in the long-term, and implementing the elements within the DIP Operational Handbook will be taken forward under the IOM strategic umbrella, to ensure that DIP continues to operate as a key component of local IOM arrangements.

HALLMARKS OF EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP WORKING

The principles of IOM focus on desired outcomes for integrated offender management. There is a much greater chance that these outcomes can be achieved when partnerships embed the six hallmarks of effective partnership working, set out below, which underpin effective delivery of all outcomes.

During the time that partnership working on crime and community safety issues has been in place, we, and our delivery partners, have learnt what characterises effective partnerships by appraising the way in which high-performing partnerships conduct their business. It is the desire to improve performance across all partnerships to a higher level that lies at the root of the Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships[3].

The Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships are intended to summarise the core elements of effective partnership working and they provide a way for partnerships to check if they are delivering effectively or if there are areas where they should target improvements. The six Hallmarks are:

- Empowered and Effective Leadership;

- Visible and Constructive Accountability;

- Intelligence-led Business Processes;

- Effective and Responsive Delivery Structures;

- Engaged Communities; and

- Appropriate Skills and Knowledge.

---

3   http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/guidance_for_effective_partnerships.pdf

KEY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Principle 1. All partners tackling offenders together - *local partners agree the means to share all relevant information on an offender with each other and ensure that there is a process to clearly assign responsibility for managing an identified offender. At the same time they make sure that all agencies continue to participate and they provide the offender, as far as possible, with a single lead professional. Local partners encourage the development of the multi-agency problem-solving approach by focussing on offenders, not offences.*

1.1 Are all of the relevant agencies fully committed and signed up to effectively delivering the local IOM approach, including Police, Probation, YOTs, Prisons, Court Service, CPS, Local Authority, Primary Care Trusts, drug and alcohol treatment services, third sector (this list is not exhaustive)?

1.2 Is there effective involvement from non criminal justice agencies to support offenders, in line with reducing re-offending pathways, including the third sector and private sector?

1.3 Is there a clear and common strategic vision of IOM that all agencies understand and are signed up to?

1.4 Has an IOM strategy/framework been developed that has commitment from statutory and non-statutory agencies?

1.5 Has a local governance structure been agreed that has clear lines of accountability?

1.6 Is there clear leadership within the IOM arrangements?

1.7 Are statutory and non-statutory agencies clear on their strategic and operational roles and responsibilities?

1.8 Is there agreement between agencies of what constitutes success in the IOM approach?

1.9 Are arrangements in place to assess progress against the agreed success criteria?

1.10 Are information sharing processes and protocols in place, signed up to and applied by all relevant agencies?

2.1 Has a local profile of crime and offending been conducted?

2.2 Are the results of the local profile used to inform the decisions about which offenders will be prioritised for interventions?

2.3 Is IOM being used to assist the delivery of local targets, such as Local Area Agreements?

2.4 Has a profile been conducted in order to align existing resources to ensure the most efficient and effective approach to offender management?

2.5 Has a communication strategy been produced in order to encourage community engagement, share good practice and increase public confidence?

2.6 Has a framework been developed to assess the impact of IOM on communities, victims and offenders?

3.1 Are arrangements in place to ensure that offenders prioritised through IOM get access to timely and appropriate interventions that meet their needs and will contribute towards reducing re-offending?

3.2 Are offenders provided with timely information that indicates what is expected of them and the potential consequences if they do not engage with the interventions?

3.3 Are offenders aware of the interventions that are available to them and their intended impact?

3.4 Are offenders provided with timely information that indicates what they can expect from the agencies they are engaged with?

3.5 Where possible, are offenders who represent risk to the community, receiving appropriate support and access to interventions whilst they are in custody?

Principle 4. Making better use of existing (and proven) programmes and governance *- this involves gaining further benefits from programmes such as PPO, DIP and Community Justice to increase the benefits for communities, as well as taking advantage of the developing roles of bodies such as CSPs in reducing re-offending.*

4.1 Are existing programmes and approaches, particularly PPO and DIP, embedded in the local IOM arrangements?

4.2 Has the PPO cohort been refreshed in accordance with Government guidance to ensure that it is focused on the most prolific and damaging offenders?

4.3 Is DIP effectively identifying specified Class A drug misusing offenders, assessing them and managing their cases, including referring them into treatment and/or other appropriate support?

4.4 Are there processes in place to highlight issues of safeguarding, including adult and young offenders and young victims?

4.5 Are there processes in place to manage effectively the transition of the most at risk (of re-offending) young offenders turning 18 from youth to adult services and interventions?

4.6 Is there alignment between IOM and wider strategies, for example increasing confidence, safer neighbourhoods, social inclusion, family interventions and reintegration?

Principle 5. All offenders at high risk of causing serious harm and/or re-offending are 'in scope' *- intensity of management relates directly to severity of risk, irrespective of position within the criminal justice system or whether statutory or non-statutory. IOM is about bringing together existing arrangements.*

5.1 Are there arrangements in place to identify offenders who pose the greatest risk/cause most damage, for prioritising under IOM?

5.2 Where an offender is assessed as posing a high risk of causing serious harm, has responsibility for multi-agency management arrangements been agreed through MAPPA?

5.3 Does the IOM approach include a flexible and robust system that enables partner agencies to review prioritised offenders and provide the appropriate level of support or control, based on their risk of re-offending?

5.4 Are there interventions in place that specifically target those offenders prioritised under local IOM arrangements, who are not subject to statutory requirements?

5.5 Are there exit strategies in place for those offenders whose risk of re-offending has significantly reduced?