

STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Agenda Item No. 5
21 JULY 2010	Public Report

Report of the Executive Director of Operations

Contact Officer(s) – Detective Chief Inspector Gary Goose: Safer Peterborough Strategy Manager
Contact Details – 01733 863780

THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT (IOM) “Addressing causes not symptoms”

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise the Committee of the progress, development and impact of the Integrated Offender Management programme.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To scrutinise the development and impact of the Integrated Offender Management programme and to comment on areas where improvement or alternative approaches may prove effective.

3. LINKS TO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT

- 3.1 The report is linked to the Sustainable Community Strategy priority of Creating Strong and Supportive Communities.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 This short document is intended to stimulate discussion around the development of an integrated approach to offender management in Peterborough at the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting of 21st July 2010. This provides my personal view of the development of IOM and its impact.

This report is subsequent to the update provided by DCI Donna Wass and I to the committee during 2009.

5. KEY ISSUES

- 5.1
- Where offender management has come from; i.e. offender management in context
 - Where the partnership is now
 - Where we are going

5.2 Putting integrated offender management into the context of Peterborough

About 10 years ago I was working in my home town of Peterborough as Detective Inspector. My role at the time was to tackle drug dealing, organised criminality, burglary, robbery, assaults, sexual offences and with the odd murder thrown in as well. The motives for almost all of those crimes were in some way linked back to sex, drugs, money or some form of mental health issue.

My teams and I were working really hard. Lots of people were caught and lots of people were

sent to prison; these were the same people (or children of the same people) that I had dealt with in my preceding police career. Apparently I was doing a good job then because the police were hitting their detection targets.

But there was a frustration amongst a number of my colleagues and I that nothing was making a difference. We would lock up burglars and car thieves and they would come and do it again; we would take a drug dealing ring out but someone would fill the void. We all knew that 'some kids never stood a chance' but it wasn't thought to be the police's job to solve those problems. The work was exciting but our 'results' felt hollow; everything was short term. We were hooked in to looking at the symptoms (the crime) and not the causes.

At that same time, there was an organisation called Probation whose staff were also working really hard, with some of the same people, but the police didn't really know what they were doing – they certainly didn't talk to each other.

Solicitors were thought to be there to 'get people off' what they had done; it was nothing about truth, it was all about win and lose.

Health and social care were working hard with some of these people, trying to fix them or their circumstances and they were probably interested more in the individual and not too much about the wider community, and they also very rarely spoke with the police or anyone else for that matter because they had their job to do.

Oh, and anti-social behaviour, from police perspective 'that's just minor stuff we are not bothered about that'.

I went on to a couple of other specific investigations for a few years and then began working again with the relatively newly formed Prolific and Priority Offenders (PPO) and Drug Intervention Programmes (DIP) about 4 years ago, and guess what – it was exactly the same people offending and re-offending or children of the same people. And still everyone was working really hard and trying to make a difference but nothing was joining up. There had to be a better way to address causes and not symptoms.

I then became aware of some startling figures about offending rates and offenders themselves as they entered prison:

Only 0.5% of offenders are responsible for up to 10% of our volume crime

10% of offenders are responsible for up to 50% of our volume crime

33% had been in care at some point

90% had been excluded from school at some point

54% had an educational level of an 11 year old

50% were long term unemployed

40% a hard drug issue of more than £100 a day

70% of their closest friendship groups had multiple convictions

10% had a formally diagnosed mental illness

and 76% of those serving less than 12 months would be back in prison within 2 years.

But, given the way we had historically worked it wasn't a surprise to see Peterborough with disproportionately high crime rates and high levels of re-offending. In actual fact, if we wanted to create a system to promote offending, we probably had a pretty good model at that time, and

yet everyone was working hard to try and reduce it.

Then came IOM and finally there was an acknowledgement that the whole is better than any individual component part and that a difference could be made by just doing something that meant common sense:

- It makes sense with those figures to identify youngsters at risk and concentrate on diverting them away from offending;
- It makes sense to concentrate on those youngsters excluded or at risk of being excluded from school;
- It makes sense to concentrate efforts on those causing the most problems (0.5% of offenders responsible for 10% of crime were picked up by PPO but what about the next 10% responsible for 50% of our volume?);
- It makes sense to concentrate on dealing with someone's drug addiction, or mental health or housing issues or unemployment;
- It makes sense for agencies to work together so people got the same message – "we can help but play your part too".
- And, it makes sense to try and get our communities involved in developing solutions and making offending and anti-social behaviour actually feel wrong for those who indulge.

And so we began to develop IOM in Peterborough.

5.3 Where are we now?

Aware of the clear Home Office (HO) guidance about not developing IOM until Drug Intervention Programme (DIP) and Prolific and Priority Offenders (PPO) was as fit for purpose as it could be – we benefited from a PPO review and realigned DIP. The police led an anti-burglary campaign known as Operation Alert. Targeting 60 known burglar's, being proactively 'in their faces', and ensuring that they all knew burglary was the police priority. And then we began to look a wider co-hort of offenders and introduced The Key's Project – those who fall just below PPO status but who on any given week could be offending more than a PPO and catering for some female offenders recognising the complexity of female heroin addicted shop lifting sex workers, 'pimped' by their boyfriends, we joined up with the Dawn Project, funded by the Ministry of Justice and run by the Women's Centre.

AND ITS WORKED but there's lots more to do (return to this in a moment)

We found some blockages (some of which still need some work)

Short –termism

Organisational arrogance and ego

Conflicting targets

Human nature

Politics

But, perhaps galvanised and motivated by the Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) red flag, and with some forward thinking and influential management we began to draw things together to where we are today.

We:

- re-focussed and strengthened police activity and investigation techniques,
- amalgamated the community safety teams to provide support,
- strengthened Neighbourhood Policing Teams,
- maintained a full safer schools commitment,
- introduced partnership tasking,
- reviewed and redefined our way of looking at anti-social behaviour,
- remodelled DIP and began to look at our substance misuse delivery and began to look more closely at alcohol as an influencer,
- reviewed, refreshed our PPO scheme to target more closely those committing serious acquisitive crime
- collapsed the PPO strategic group, re-drew its focus as an IOM strategic group and brought in DIP/Operation Alert and latterly The Keys Project.

It's worked because serious acquisitive crime is down, burglary has halved and the air in Peterborough has not changed! **So there comes a point where you have to say the way of working has made a difference and that is now.**

5.4 Where are we going?

There is a lot more to do in Peterborough and some specific challenges ahead.

- The Social impact bond is an exciting development: It is, and must continue to be embraced, it is now engaged at a strategic level and we must ensure that the benefits it can bring are developed at a tactical level. We must ensure there is not wasted and duplicated energy. We must flag up some concerns around the simplistic measure of success proposed and agreed.
- The funding crisis means we must be clear that government and our communities want us to reduce crime first and not be slavish to old fashioned detection rates. Detection rates should be an indicator of one area of overall performance not an end in themselves. Government will need to work with Constabularies to change their culture.
- We must get cross agency agreement as to who is to lead as we develop a one team approach to offender management.
- That one team approach has to reach further into the voluntary sector and continue to develop a consistent case management approach based upon the pathways to reduce reoffending.
- We need clarity around the A10 states issue – a real acute problem in the City
- We need to ensure that language around initiatives to offer incentives to offenders is not something that alienates the public but rather galvanises public support and confidence. We must not allow ourselves to get into the 'deserving and undeserving debate' around funding.

I believe we have moved IOM forward in the City, I do not believe we are anywhere near the finished article but I do believe that what we have already done is making a significant difference to the City's safety.

6. NEXT STEPS

- 6.1 Following the discussion at the meeting the Scrutiny Committee may make recommendations and request further scrutiny at a future meeting.