

Working together to reduce re-offending

Regional Offender Manager
East of England

Statement of Performance
2007-2008



Ministry of
JUSTICE

**ANNUAL STATEMENT OF PERFORMANCE
FOR THE EAST OF ENGLAND REGION
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 2007 TO MARCH 2008**

CONTENTS

1. Executive summary
2. Introduction
3. Overview of performance
4. Probation performance by individual area
5. Custodial performance – Eastern Area public sector prisons
6. Custodial performance at Peterborough Prison
7. Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plan
8. ROM key activities
9. ROM resource commitment
10. General themes emerging from the year

Annex A – HMP Peterborough financial summary

Annex B – National level reducing re-offending targets/definitions

Annex C – Glossary of terms used in this review

1. Executive summary

The key themes to emerge from this review are:

- Performance levels amongst providers covered by SLA or contract arrangements this year have been generally impressive. The custodial providers have performed admirably in the face of constant pressure to manage the increasing prison population whilst maintaining order and control. For probation the community environment has been equally challenging with rising caseloads and the need to further embed offender management.
- Our increasing awareness of, and ability to interpret, regional offender need has allowed us to direct scarce resources more intelligently so that we gain maximum return on our investment. Commissioning decisions are increasingly evidence based and this has led to some significant changes to the service mix being provided going forward.
- Experience of regional commissioning initiatives have provided evidence of how we can develop real partnerships between the public, private and 3rd sector organisations that reduce re-offending rates across the region and improve public protection.
- We have begun to engage in greater consultation with stakeholders this year, building on last years successful events with sentencers. Our priority for the coming year will be to further embed this process and to take greater account of service user feedback.
- All parties have worked hard to model appropriate relationships between providers and the commissioner this year. Wider developments within the MOJ nationally offer further opportunities going forward and we are already working regionally to make these an operational reality.

2. Introduction

This is the third ROM Annual Statement of Performance and, as in previous years, the purpose of the review is to provide:

1. a summary of achievement against requirements by our providers over the last financial year
2. a basis for benchmarking performance for coming years
3. to review lessons learnt over the last year so as to inform future provider and partnership relationships, and achieve more effective commissioning.

The review covers the performance of the six Probation Service Areas in the East of England, Kalyx performance at Peterborough prison as well as that of the public sector Prison Service Eastern Area. We also outline some of the work the ROM team itself has done over the last year.

A glossary of abbreviations used in the report is provided at Annex C.

3. OVERVIEW OF PERFORMANCE

For the purposes of this review the assessments of performance is based on centrally validated data returns, feedback from discussions at quarterly review meetings, and where appropriate independent feedback from relevant Inspectorates and other external bodies. An explanation of the targets is provided as Annex B.

For the six probation areas, after last year's significant improvements in performance against SLA targets (up from 51% achieved in 05/06 to 90% in 06/07) the last year has been focussed on improving practice, embedding data collection methods and reinforcing performance management cultures. A number of new targets were introduced as well as a new national Integrated Probation Performance Framework (IPPF) to help assess overall provider delivery. Significant effort was also put into implementing further stages of the Offender Management Model (OMM) and responding to the continuing increases in the custodial population. As a result there has been a slight fall in the number of targets achieved (82%) but overall the region continued to perform well in comparison to other regions in relation to both targets achieved and overall IPPF standings.

We remain impressed with the overall delivery picture across the region and confident that effective performance management cultures now exist across probation providers. We expect to see the coming year translate this into further performance consolidation.

Although not a source of complacency (or in any way to undermine the need for continuous improvement) it is notable that the majority of targets where we have struggled regionally have not been isolated to the East of England in terms of difficulty. Disappointing performance against both the shared CJS end-to-end enforcement targets and the percentage of orders/licences successfully completed were repeated across the entire country, and in many cases our regional position compared favourably to that seen elsewhere.

It was of concern to note that some areas struggled on their accommodation targets as we know that successfully addressing housing needs (alongside gaining employment) can have a significant effect on reducing re-offending. With the benefit of hindsight, it is clear that we agreed some overly ambitious targets with some providers. We have learnt from this however and used it as a spur to generate more detailed and accurate needs analysis work across the region so that future commissioning priorities are better able to be reflected in challenging but realistic target volumes for providers.

We have seen some excellent region wide probation performance this year that merits highlighting:

- 1357 offenders were able to find and keep employment whilst under supervision
- over 95% of court reports were delivered within the timescales agreed with the courts themselves

- over 90% of breach procedures were initiated within the required timescales
- over 95% of risk assessments on PPO and Tier 4 offenders were done within required timescales leading to robust public protection
- 1268 general offending behaviour programmes completed, plus a further 215 domestic violence and 144 sex offender treatment programmes on top of that
- 1204 DTTO/DRR orders were commenced by offenders to help them address their drug use

Custodial providers have also delivered some excellent outcomes, including:

- a reduction in the level of serious assaults from the previous year
- commendable levels of performance against measures to tackle drug abuse amongst prisoners
- 676 offending behaviour programmes completed, plus a further 94 specialist sex offender treatment programmes on top of that
- high levels of prisoners discharged to employment and accommodation

In addition, we have overseen the development of the Bail Accommodation Support Scheme regionally this year. This is providing a valuable option for diversion from custody for courts for suitably risk assessed individuals and is covered in more detail in section 8 of this review.

Performance of non-directly commissioned services via the RRDP mechanisms has continued over the last 12 months. This is built on effective joint-agency working and has delivered a more coordinated and targeted response to service provision for offenders that aids both public protection and reduced re-offending. This sort of aligned commissioning of services reduces duplication of delivery and offers the public better value for money; it is also a central methodology by which we will target services in the future.

4. PROBATION PERFORMANCE BY AREA

BEDFORDSHIRE

The area achieved the following performance against targets:

Interventions SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% Unpaid work days lost to stand down	5%	2.6%
Unpaid work completions	542	565
Sex offender programme completions	20	20
Domestic violence programme completions	10	10
Accredited programme completions (others)	135	136
Offenders retained on DRR/DDTO for 12 weeks	75%	87%
DRR/DDTO commencements	110	131
Offenders sustaining employment for 4 weeks	120	154

Offender Management SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% PSR completed on time	90%	100%
Ave. working days to resolve unacceptable absence	35	46
% Offenders breaches resolved within 25 days	60%	58%
% Breaches initiated within 10 days	90%	98%
% Orders/licences successfully completed	70%	73%
% Appointments attended by offenders	85%	94%
% Cases reaching 6 months without breach	70%	75%
% Offenders in settled and suitable accommodation at end of order or licence	75%	77%
% Tier 4 OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	97%
% Tier 1, 2 or 3 OASYS assessments done within 15 days	90%	74%
% PPO OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	98%
LSC referrals	478	598
Victim contact within 8 weeks	85%	97%

Additional National Measures	Target	Actual Delivery
Ave. staff sickness days lost	9	11.9
% Race ethnic monitoring data returned on time	95%	98%

This has been a strong year for performance in Bedfordshire with just three SLA targets failing to be achieved. Two of the failed targets, the measures on average working days to resolve a breach are shared CJS targets and have proved difficult across the whole country. Indeed Bedfordshire performance is closer to target than the national average, and has demonstrated considerable improvement in-year where the time taken has decreased from nearly 60 to less than 40 days by the end of the year. Bedfordshire also narrowly failed to achieve the related target on resolution within 25 days despite sustained effort over the second half of the year. Indeed if this target were viewed on a rolling quarter basis, then it would have been achieved.

The only other missed target was in relation to OASYS assessments for Tier 1, 2 and 3 offenders being completed within 15 days (a new target introduced during the year). Although overall performance was below target there is

evidence that increasingly effective systems were being embedded as the year went on.

It is worth highlighting some excellent figures within Bedfordshire's performance levels. The targets for offenders sustaining employment, the retention levels for DTTO/DRR orders, referrals to the LSC, OASYS risk assessments for PPO and Tier 4 cases, and PSRs completed within the court agreed timescales were all significantly exceeded. This helped Bedfordshire to achieve excellent ratings in the IPPF assessment system throughout the year.

In common with all probation areas Bedfordshire was encouraged to increase the level of offender services provided in partnership with other providers (both voluntary sector and privately operated) on a subcontracted basis over the course of the year. From a position of 3.9% of their budget being spent in this way at the start of the year, by the end of the year this had increased to 6.9%. Plans are in place to take this forward further in the future subject to Best Value assessments.

Bedfordshire has continued to be at the forefront of regional and multi-agency working during the year, in particular driving forward the 'Path2Work' employment pathfinder project. This has been achieved within a context of some not insignificant changes within the makeup of the senior management team. It is pleasing to note that these changes have not been allowed to distract the Area from its core business nor from establishing some robust evidence of how it is preparing for its goal of achieving Trust status.

Bedfordshire has also been acting as a pilot area for the implementation of a regional population management strategy. Their current custodial caseload has been used to assess the feasibility of returning certain categories of offenders back to the region so they are closer to their respective offender managers and to determine what impact this has on the effectiveness of sentence plan delivery. The outcomes of this pilot will be known later in 2008.

Finally, Bedfordshire has worked hard to ensure that effective offender management structures have been put in place and continues to take appropriate steps to further embed these – as evidenced by a generally positive OM Audit report provided by NOMS Audit and Assurance Unit during the second half of last year and Bedfordshire's robust and active participation in the regional OM Implementation Group over the last year.

We are pleased to note such positive achievements from Bedfordshire over the last twelve months which are to the credit of staff, management and the Board. The Area has a positive attitude towards the wider NOMS agenda and has taken steps to strategically align their operations with our own strategic priorities. As such we are confident that they will continue to embrace change as we move forward into the next phase of the organisations development.

CAMBRIDGESHIRE

The area achieved the following performance against targets:

Interventions SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% Unpaid work days lost to stand down	3.8%	3.9%
Unpaid work completions	675	770
Sex offender programme completions	20	24
Domestic violence programme completions	32	39
Accredited programme completions (others)	134	152
Offenders retained on DRR/DDTO for 12 weeks	75%	87%
DRR/DDTO commencements	170	157
Offenders sustaining employment for 4 weeks	135	268

Offender Management SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% PSR completed on time	90%	100%
Ave. working days to resolve unacceptable absence	35	42
% Offenders breaches resolved within 25 days	60%	59%
% Breaches initiated within 10 days	90%	93%
% Orders/licences successfully completed	70%	67%
% Appointments attended by offenders	85%	86%
% Cases reaching 6 months without breach	70%	67%
% Offenders in settled and suitable accommodation at end of order or licence	72%	75%
% Tier 4 OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	96%
% Tier 1, 2 or 3 OASYS assessments done within 15 days	90%	75%
% PPO OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	96%
LSC referrals	536	554
Victim contact within 8 weeks	85%	100%

Additional National Measures	Target	Actual Delivery
Ave. staff sickness days lost	9	16.3
% Race ethnic monitoring data returned on time	95%	98%

The last twelve months have been difficult for Cambridgeshire. Performance against SLA targets has been mixed; the Area has been subject to NPD directed improvement mechanisms; they have received a critical HMIP re-Inspection Report on Offender Management; and they have experienced a change of Chief Officer.

There has been some good performance - the Area met all its Offending Behaviour Programme targets; exceeded expectations in relation to providing PSR reports to courts within agreed timescales (although we note some courts felt requests to agree to the extension of deadlines were too frequent); helped many more offenders sustain employment than their target; and also had very creditable performance in regard to timeliness of breach action. These are positives for the Area to draw on going forward.

Cambridgeshire did however fail to achieve seven of their SLA targets. Both of the joint CJS court timeliness targets were missed. The 35 day target was missed by a considerable margin and this was particularly disappointing as at

the start of Quarter 2 there were signs that it may well be achieved, however performance from then on slipped each month. Cambridgeshire continue to work closely with partner agencies to address this issue and as the backlog of resolution of outstanding warrants reduces (a backlog not of the Area's making) this should make significant inroads into the figure. The 25 day target was a more marginal failure and although there was significant progress achieved in-year this was not sufficient to recover the annual position.

Performance on the orders and licences successfully completed measure was patchy across the year and although some improvement in Q2 and Q3 was noted this was not sustained. Likewise in relation to orders reaching 6 months with breach action being taken an extremely slow start to the year resulted in it being impossible for the Area to recover sufficiently despite a strong upward trend and that the target was exceeded over the last five months of the performance year.

The DTTO/DRR starts target also proved too challenging and ultimately it was narrowly missed although there was some significant effort made in-year to recover the position (on a positive note the target for offenders retained in treatment was comfortably exceeded though). Another narrow miss was in relation to unpaid work days lost due to stand down – where the target was redefined in-year and only a fraction above the required level. Finally, the target on OASYS assessments for Tier 1, 2 and 3 offenders being completed within 15 days (a new target introduced during the year) was also missed and further work will be needed to address this issue over the coming months.

This year Cambridgeshire was encouraged to increase the level of offender services they provide in partnership with other providers (both voluntary sector and privately operated) on a subcontracted basis. Cambridgeshire began the year with 1.58% of their budget being spent in this way, and by the end of the year this figure remained the same. Plans are however in place to take this forward though via a local commissioning strategy that the new Chief Officer has introduced linked to Best Value assessments.

The most significant challenge that Cambridgeshire faces over the coming months however is how it responds to the OMI re-inspection report. The original report had levelled a number of serious criticisms at the Area and unfortunately the Inspectorate was again unimpressed with what they found, noting “negligible improvement over the original results...once again we found risk of harm assessments of insufficient quality and inadequate management of risk of harm on an on-going basis”. They went on to add “it was apparent there remained significant shortcomings in the Area's general work” and HMIP were “of the opinion that the staffing structures and internal organisation of the Area promoted neither good end-to-end offender management nor dissemination of high quality risk of harm work across the organisation”.

It is clear that fundamental and deep rooted change will be necessary over the coming months to address such direct and repeated criticism. The Inspectorate findings were consistent with a review of offender management

processes undertaken in the autumn by NOMS Audit and Assurance Unit who found significant weaknesses in the control mechanisms in place.

This work, along with continued efforts to address issues raised under the NPD performance improvement measures will result in a very challenging introduction for the newly appointed Chief Officer who took up post towards the end of this reporting period. Cambridgeshire will continue to be subject to close scrutiny by the ROM team over the coming months as we seek clear evidence of embedded improvement being delivered. We share HMIP's optimism however that Cambridgeshire are "keen to improve and...leaders are open to the possibility of making fundamental organisational changes in order to remove the current inhibitors".

ESSEX

The area achieved the following performance against targets:

Interventions SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% Unpaid work days lost to stand down	5%	2.6%
Unpaid work completions	1400	1504
Sex offender programme completions	35	29
Domestic violence programme completions	66	72
Accredited programme completions (others)	367	400
Offenders retained on DRR/DDTO for 12 weeks	75%	91%
DRR/DDTO commencements	320	346
Offenders sustaining employment for 4 weeks	350	394

Offender Management SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% PSR completed on time	90%	98%
Ave. working days to resolve unacceptable absence	35	47
% Offenders breaches resolved within 25 days	60%	52%
% Breaches initiated within 10 days	90%	86%
% Orders/licences successfully completed	70%	68%
% Appointments attended by offenders	85%	91%
% Cases reaching 6 months without breach	70%	73%
% Offenders in settled and suitable accommodation at end of order or licence	85%	76%
% Tier 4 OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	95%
% Tier 1, 2 or 3 OASYS assessments done within 15 days	90%	65%
% PPO OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	96%
LSC referrals	1127	1246
Victim contact within 8 weeks	85%	79%

Additional National Measures	Target	Actual Delivery
Ave. staff sickness days lost	9	12.8
% Race ethnic monitoring data returned on time	95%	95%

Last year (2006/07) was a particularly strong year for Essex in relation to performance against SLA targets which saw them end the year with just one target missed, it is therefore disappointing to find that at the end of this year there are eight targets not achieved. Such a headline figure however does

not tell the whole story and it remains the case that Essex is effectively led by an appropriately performance focussed Board and Chief Officer.

On the positive side Essex did deliver excellent performance in relation to OASYS assessments on Tier 4 and PPO cases (both showing improvement on the previous year); and DTTO/DRR commencements and the number of those on such orders who were retained in treatment for at least twelve weeks. The volume targets related to both general offending behaviour programmes and domestic violence were also exceeded.

Of the targets missed three deserve consideration within context. Although both of the joint CJS court timeliness targets were missed this was subject to an audit by OCJR during the year and this identified that failures were largely outside of the direct control of Essex themselves. Essex also suffered disproportionately compared to some other areas in the region with the effects of warrant backlogs within London. There were signs of improvement as we came towards the end of the year that give rise for optimism that this will not be a problem going forward.

Likewise although the accommodation target was not achieved there were mitigating factors to consider. Essex agreed at the start of the year the second highest target in the region (which also represented the second highest national target level with only Hertfordshire higher) based on a definition of the target that was then revised by NOMS HQ, it became apparent in-year that the revised definition made achievement more difficult and this proved to be the case by the end of the reporting period. With hindsight both parties would now accept that the original target was probably unrealistic and important lessons have been learnt in relation to target setting for the future.

It is however more disappointing to note the failure to achieve the targets related to timeliness of breach initiation, orders/licences successfully completed, victim contact and sex offender programme completions. Timeliness of breach was particularly volatile throughout the year with monthly performance ranging from 50% to 100% and Essex have not been able to identify the precise reasons for this; they are however taking steps to focus attention on the issues and to strengthen procedures going forward. Fewer than the required 70% of orders and licences were successfully completed, and the monthly target was only met twice.

The requirement to achieve 35 sex offender treatment programme completions was not met as a result of a combination of scheduling and technical issues (including a new requirement to include post-course write ups being completed prior to an accreditation being able to be formally counted) and higher than anticipated attrition – however the final year end position of 20% fewer completions than the target was disappointing. The target level agreed with Essex was also stretching though as it was the highest in the region (although the volume of community orders with this requirement included suggested there was sufficient demand to justify this level).

The failure to achieve the victim contact target is also unfortunate and, recognising the importance, Essex have urgently addressed the issues that led to this so that they are able to quickly return to a position whereby it is a strong aspect of performance as in previous years. We are reassured that they share our view that it is simply not acceptable that any victim of crime who requests contact and support is denied it (although it should be noted that the failure here only relates to a handful of cases and that all of these people received the support they requested but outside the required timescales).

The target on OASYS assessments for Tier 1, 2 and 3 offenders being completed within 15 days (a new target introduced during the year) was also missed and further work will be needed to address this issue over the coming months.

In common with all probation areas Essex was encouraged to increase the level of offender services they provide in partnership with other providers (both voluntary sector and privately operated) on a subcontracted basis over the course of the year. Essex began the year with 3% of their budget being spent in this way, and by the end of the year there had been a modest increase to 3.8%. Plans are in place that could increase this further in the coming year (including greater use of sub-regional collaboration) and any decisions taken will continue to be subject to a Best Value assessment.

Essex has been working hard for some time to ensure that effective offender management structures are in place and continues to take appropriate steps to further embed these; however some work still remains to be done. This was evidenced during the second half of the year when an Offender Management Audit report was provided by NOMS Audit and Assurance Unit outlining that procedures were “less than adequately controlled”. An action plan from that audit is in place and Essex remains appropriately focused on addressing the necessary developments. The area also continues to be a key player in the Regional OM Quality Focus Group.

HERTFORDSHIRE

The area achieved the following performance against targets:

Interventions SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% Unpaid work days lost to stand down	10%	3.5%
Unpaid work completions	700	841
Sex offender programme completions	20	22
Domestic violence programme completions	25	27
Accredited programme completions (others)	200	218
Offenders retained on DRR/DDTO for 12 weeks	75%	86%
DRR/DDTO commencements	180	183
Offenders sustaining employment for 4 weeks	200	209

Offender Management SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% PSR completed on time	90%	100%
Ave. working days to resolve unacceptable absence	35	50
% Offenders breaches resolved within 25 days	60%	50%
% Breaches initiated within 10 days	90%	97%
% Orders/licences successfully completed	70%	74%
% Appointments attended by offenders	85%	88%
% Cases reaching 6 months without breach	70%	73%
% Offenders in settled and suitable accommodation at end of order or licence	88%	79%
% Tier 4 OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	99%
% Tier 1, 2 or 3 OASYS assessments done within 15 days	90%	60%
% PPO OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	95%
LSC referrals	700	722
Victim contact within 8 weeks	85%	98%

Additional National Measures	Target	Actual Delivery
Ave. staff sickness days lost	9	9.4
% Race ethnic monitoring data returned on time	95%	100%

It is pleasing to note that the significant performance improvements in Hertfordshire witnessed during 2006/07 have been consolidated over the last 12 months. At the end of this year Hertfordshire met all but four of its SLA targets. Of those targets that were not achieved the failures generally reflected issues where the probation service nationally has struggled to achieve success.

We note with pleasure the excellent achievements in relation to some critical targets. All three targets related to offending behaviour programmes were exceeded; as were the two targets linked to OASYS assessments of Tier 4 and PPO cases – areas in which historically the Area has not always performed well. Court reports were produced within the timescales required by the courts themselves and breach action was also undertaken in a timely fashion reflecting an appropriate emphasis on public protection.

Hertfordshire however did fail to meet either of the joint CJS court enforcement timeliness targets. The 35 day target saw performance vary significantly during the year with a range of between 61 days in May to 43 days in December – this volatility is indicative of changing priorities and emphasis on enforcement across the Area and the effect this had on the behaviours of partner organisations; much of this impact was outside of Hertfordshire's direct control. In relation to the 25 day target, which is generally seen as being more directly influenced by an Areas own actions, it was disappointing that although the target was achieved in Q1 slippage throughout the rest of the year resulted in it being missed by some margin.

The accommodation target was also not achieved when national performance data was considered. It must be noted however that the Area target was the highest in the region and negotiated on the basis of a different interpretation

of the target than was ultimately used centrally. Hertfordshire performance on the final measure compared well against other area's actual outturn even if it did not appear to be that close to the target requirement.

Finally, the target on OASYS assessments for Tier 1, 2 and 3 offenders being completed within 15 days (a new target introduced during the year) was also missed and further work will be needed to address this issue over the coming months and embedded new practices.

Although the target levels of LSC referrals and employment being sustained were both met, in both cases this was as the result of data cleansing undertaken in Q4 that revealed significant numbers of "missed" cases during the year that had not been reported. Whilst Hertfordshire are to be congratulated on achieving the outcomes required greater attention must be paid to embedding reporting procedures in both instances in future to ensure accurate and timely reporting in the coming year.

Hertfordshire have been seeking to increase the amount of services they provide in partnership with other providers (both voluntary sector and privately operated) on a subcontracted basis over the course of the year. They began the year with 6.5% of their budget being spent in this way, and by the end of the year this had increased to 7.8%. Plans are in place that could increase this further in the coming year and any decisions taken will also be subject to a Best Value assessment.

The Choices and Consequences Project (an intensive alternative to custody initiative) has continued to embed over the year. This project which aims to rehabilitate the county's most prolific offenders is supported by a wide range of Criminal Justice System partners. Probation staff assess offenders recommended by the Police to see if they are suitable for a scheme whereby the Courts can defer a sentence for up to six months whilst the person undertakes an extensive rehabilitation regime that may include drug treatment, life skills training, education and employment. Hertfordshire remain at the centre of this ground-breaking piece of work which is having a significant impact on both offenders themselves and the wider community in which they live.

Hertfordshire also continued to work hard to implement effective structures to support offender management over the last year. Significant reorganisation has taken place to deliver the model in response to last year's Offender Management Inspection Report by HMIP and the requirements of subsequent phases. The Area recognises that some further work is still needed to fully embed this but it is clear that a very solid and effective basis is now in place to deliver this work and that is a credit to all concerned locally.

The Board, Chief Officer, managers and staff in Hertfordshire are once again to be congratulated for the sustained improvement in delivery and the success they have had in meeting the majority of SLA performance targets. The days of Hertfordshire sitting adrift from the bottom of the Probation Weighted

Scorecard seem long ago and it is of enormous credit to all concerned that this is the case.

NORFOLK

The area achieved the following performance against targets:

Interventions SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% Unpaid work days lost to stand down	8%	5.1%
Unpaid work completions	880	948
Sex offender programme completions	29	29
Domestic violence programme completions	40	40
Accredited programme completions (others)	165	204
Offenders retained on DRR/DDTO for 12 weeks	75%	76%
DRR/DDTO commencements	156	198
Offenders sustaining employment for 4 weeks	168	204

Offender Management SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% PSR completed on time	90%	99%
Ave. working days to resolve unacceptable absence	35	43
% Offenders breaches resolved within 25 days	60%	61%
% Breaches initiated within 10 days	90%	98%
% Orders/licences successfully completed	70%	63%
% Appointments attended by offenders	85%	91%
% Cases reaching 6 months without breach	70%	72%
% Offenders in settled and suitable accommodation at end of order or licence	80%	64%
% Tier 4 OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	97%
% Tier 1, 2 or 3 OASYS assessments done within 15 days	90%	71%
% PPO OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	99%
LSC referrals	710	1158
Victim contact within 8 weeks	85%	100%

Additional National Measures	Target	Actual Delivery
Ave. staff sickness days lost	9	13.3
% Race ethnic monitoring data returned on time	95%	99%

This has been an excellent performance year for Norfolk building on the improvements noted last year and further embedding effective delivery. Norfolk failed to meet just four of its SLA targets and two of those failures were issues where the probation service nationally has struggled to achieve success.

Performance highlights included 99% of court reports being completed within the timescales the court themselves agreed; and in addition Norfolk have significantly increased the number of fast delivery court reports available to sentencers – an outcome that speeds up the timely delivery of justice, reduces administration costs and offers better value for money to the public without compromising the interests of justice.

When breach action proved necessary Norfolk were able to carry out the process in a timely fashion. The targets for Tier 4 and PPO OASYS assessments were both comfortably exceeded giving reassurance that public protection is high on the agenda, and in addition levels of victim contact were exemplary throughout the year. Norfolk referred over 60% more offenders to LSC provision than expected, and the level of Unpaid Work stand downs was also significantly below the target level.

Finally, although the target for DTTO/DRR commencements was significantly exceeded this year there was a worrying decline in the proportion of offenders remaining in treatment for 12 weeks (where performance slumped from 91% in December to just 53% in March). This is believed to be partly the result of increasing the numbers of people entering treatment placing a strain on provision, and also linked to the lack of support staff in some parts of the county which is now being addressed.

The joint CJS court enforcement timeliness target for resolution within 35 days saw performance improve significantly during the year from 59 days in Q1 just 43 days by the end of Q4 as a result of close partnership working across the CJS. In relation to the 25 day target Norfolk performance has been an example to others this year – although the target was being missed in Q1 improvements in systems and liaison with the courts resulted in sustained improvement and the target was then comfortably met for the rest of the reporting period.

The accommodation target was not achieved (however NOMS centrally changed the definition of this target after it was negotiated regionally which resulted in the target levels being much more challenging). Norfolk missed their target by a significant margin and on reflection it was clear to both parties that the originally negotiated target level was unrealistic; Norfolk has been nationally recognised as an area with significant needs in relation to the availability of suitable accommodation (due in part to the large amount of poor quality B&B type accommodation in coastal areas). This issue is taken very seriously by the Area and both a more realistic target and sensible plans to begin to address the problems are in place for the coming year. Towards the end of Q4 we started to see encouraging signs that these plans were having a positive impact.

Norfolk was also unable to achieve the 70% target on orders and licences successfully completed with performance throughout the year remaining stubbornly below the requirement at around 65%. Efforts were made to address this in year (including assistance from the NPD Performance Improvement Unit) but without success. Further work will be undertaken over the coming twelve months and it is clear Norfolk is not complacent over this. The target on OASYS assessments for Tier 1, 2 and 3 offenders being completed within 15 days (a new target introduced during the year) was also missed. There will need to be sustained improvement in procedures and reporting to embed good practice on this measure over the coming year.

In common with all probation areas Norfolk was encouraged to increase the level of offender services they provide in partnership with other providers (both voluntary sector and privately operated) on a subcontracted basis over the course of the year. Norfolk began the year with 3.8% of their budget being spent in this way, and by the end of the year there had been a modest increase to 4.3%. Plans are in place that could increase this further in the coming year (including greater use of sub-regional collaboration) and any decisions taken will also be subject to a Best Value assessment.

Norfolk has also continued to work hard to embed the National Offender Management Model over the last 12 months. An action plan to address issues raised by the HMIP Offender Management Inspection has been implemented and some solid foundations are in place upon which to move forward. Norfolk remains an active member of the Regional OM implementation group.

As we entered the 2007/08 performance year Norfolk were still subject to NPD performance improvement requirements. A robust managerial approach was however already delivering significant improvement and as a result of this Norfolk was removed from the special measures in June 2007. This is to the credit of the management and staff and this improvement has been sustained to a very pleasing level. We are now confident that Norfolk has effective management and governance systems in place to go forward confidently into the future.

SUFFOLK

The area achieved the following performance against targets:

Interventions SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% Unpaid work days lost to stand down	7%	1.3%
Unpaid work completions	633	674
Sex offender programme completions	21	20
Domestic violence programme completions	25	27
Accredited programme completions (others)	140	158
Offenders retained on DRR/DDTO for 12 weeks	75%	86%
DRR/DDTO commencements	105	104
Offenders sustaining employment for 4 weeks	135	150

Offender Management SLA Measure	Target	Actual Delivery
% PSR completed on time	90%	100%
Ave. working days to resolve unacceptable absence	35	31
% Offenders breaches resolved within 25 days	60%	67%
% Breaches initiated within 10 days	90%	98%
% Orders/licences successfully completed	70%	67%
% Appointments attended by offenders	85%	86%
% Cases reaching 6 months without breach	70%	78%
% Offenders in settled and suitable accommodation at end of order or licence	75%	71%
% Tier 4 OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	94%
% Tier 1, 2 or 3 OASYS assessments done		

within 15 days	90%	66%
% PPO OASYS assessments done within 5 days	90%	92%
LSC referrals	500	586
Victim contact within 8 weeks	85%	100%

Additional National Measures	Target	Actual Delivery
Ave. staff sickness days lost	9	11.7
% Race ethnic monitoring data returned on time	95%	96%

Last year (2006/07) was an exceptionally strong one for Suffolk in relation to the achievement of SLA targets, with only one target being missed. This year has seen a more challenging operating environment and as a result a total of five targets have failed to be achieved. This should not mask some very strong performance in relation to other measures however, and overall Suffolk remains a well performing Area.

It is worth highlighting some excellent performance by Suffolk against individual SLA metrics. Across the whole year all court reports were produced within the timescale required by the courts themselves; both the joint CJS court enforcement timeliness targets were comfortably exceeded (no other probation area in the region achieved this and the county now has Beacon Status in relation to this work); over 98% of breaches were conducted in a timely manner and well above the expected number of orders and licences reached the 6 month point without breach being required; there were less than half of the anticipated number of unpaid work days lost to stand downs than was expected; the volume targets for IDAP and general programmes were exceeded; and over 10% more offenders retained employment whilst under supervision than expected.

The target on orders and licences successfully completed was not achieved however, showing considerable volatility across the year. Monthly performance varied from 75% down to as low as 59% which is in part the result of the way the sample size that determines the measure is extracted. Work has been undertaken locally to address issues through a compliance improvement plan and performance should improve going forward.

The sex offender treatment programme target was missed by a single completion which was disappointing although this was the result of an appropriate management decision to breach an offender on a course late in the year and there was then no time left to recover the position. DTTO/DRR commencements also ended the year a single outcome (less than 1%) short of the target although the measure relating to retaining offenders on these orders in treatment was comfortably exceeded.

The target on OASYS assessments for Tier 1, 2 and 3 offenders being completed within 15 days was a new target introduced during the year. Suffolk conscientiously set up systems to deliver this requirement however these proved insufficient to deliver the required performance levels. There are grounds for optimism going forward though that these will embed and that as a result better performance will result.

The other target not achieved was in relation to accommodation where required levels were narrowly missed (although there were issues with the method of data collection and the ability of local systems to replicate national data extraction methods).

Suffolk has worked hard throughout the year to implement the findings and action plan from the HMIP Offender Management Inspection and the benefits of this are now beginning to become embedded in effective practice. Suffolk has made considerable strides in addressing a number of the originally identified OM areas for improvement (including risk of harm screening for unpaid work orders and sentence planning). There is further work to do in sentence planning for tiers 1, 2 and 3 cases and we wait to see the effects of risk of harm training on the quality of risk of harm assessments.

The appointment of internal quality auditors in-year should assist this process even further going forward. There is also evidence that solid systems are in place from the findings of a NOMS Audit and Assurance Unit review of offender management that took place in Q3 and which also found there to be adequate control mechanisms in place.

Suffolk was encouraged to seek to increase the amount of services they provide in partnership with other providers (both voluntary sector and privately operated) on a subcontracted basis over the course of the year. They began the year with 2.9% of their budget being spent in this way, and by the end of the year there had been a regrettable slight decrease to 2.5%. Plans are in place that could reverse this trend in the coming year (including greater use of sub-regional collaboration) and any decisions taken will also be subject to a Best Value assessment.

We remain confident that Suffolk is a highly performance focussed area with a solid delivery culture that is a credit to its staff and management.

5. CUSTODIAL PERFORMANCE – EASTERN AREA PUBLIC PRISONS

The public sector Prison Service achieved the following regional performance against the targets set out in its Service Level Agreement:

SDT	Target	Actual Delivery
To ensure that there are fewer than x absconds from across all establishments in the Area	26	20
To ensure that the rate of escapes from establishments and from escorts, expressed as a percentage of the average prison population, is nationally lower than 0.05%	0	0
To ensure there are no Cat A escapes	0	0
To reduce year on year the number of those testing positive under Mandatory Drug Testing as a percentage of the population	9.4%	7.5%
To ensure that X% of ROTLs successfully comply with the terms of their licence	95%	99.3%

SDT	Target	Actual Delivery
% of serious assaults per overall prison population not to exceed X%	1.5%	1.05%
X% prisoners will have settled accommodation to go to on release	65%	85.5%
To ensure that X% of prisoners in Local Prisons have a housing needs assessment undertaken within 4 days of reception	90%	95%
To complete X full CARAT substance misuse triage assessments	4413	4421
To ensure that X prisoners enter a detoxification programme	2000	2071
To have X prisoners enter a formal drug rehabilitation programme	1122	1063
To have X prisoners complete a formal drug rehabilitation programme	720	747
X accredited offending behaviour programmes completed by prisoners (excluding SOTP)	544	601
To ensure that there are X completions of Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (SOTP)	94	94
X% of eligible OASys reviews to be conducted to the appropriate timescale	90%	No data available
To achieve X Key Work Skills awards (excluding LSC provision)	4612	7435
To ensure that X% prisoners enter education or training on release	8%	10.6%
To ensure that X% prisoners enter employment on release	27%	33.3%
The percentage of prisoners held in accommodation units intended for fewer prisoners does not exceed X% of the average population in prisons	27.6%	19.6%
To ensure that prisoners spend an average of X hours per week in purposeful activity	25.5	25.5
Rate of self-inflicted deaths (SIDs) in prison not to exceed X per 100,000 prison population	Target measured at national level	N/A
To ensure that the average daily hours unlocked is at least X hours per day per prisoner	10.8	10.7
To ensure that at least X% of planned attendees attend education	80%	84.4%
To ensure that X% of prisoners are ready for discharge for court appearances in compliance with escort contract	90%	98%

The operating environment for the prison system over the last twelve months nationally has been very difficult, and this has been reflected within the region where managing the increasing prison population has taxed staff at all levels. The proportion of prisoners in the region from outside our geographical borders has again increased with a knock-on effect that prisoners from within the region are being held further from their homes and also their Offender Managers. Despite this order and control has been maintained well within public sector prisons in the region with no significant problems reported.

Additional accommodation has been brought on stream across a number of prisons. This has taken the form of reclaiming cells in some prisons, building new accommodation units at others, and at HMP Norwich a wing scheduled for closure and demolition was temporarily retained in use. In addition limited use across the region was made of court and police cells to hold prisoners under Operation Safeguard.

This then forms a very challenging operational environment for the public sector Prison Service, and it is therefore with great pleasure we can report that overall performance against SLA targets has been exceptional. In total only 2 out of 23 SLA targets have been missed at Area level.

Overall security performance was commendably strong. There were no escapes from public sector prisons throughout the year, and although there were 20 absconds from open conditions this was still 25% fewer than anticipated (and achieved at a time of greater occupancy levels). In addition overall levels of drug use detected by MDT stood at 7.5% compared to a target of 9.4% and all but one prison achieved their respective target levels. Order and control were also demonstrated by levels of serious assaults significantly below the target rates – only two individual prisons failed to achieve their targets.

Efforts to reduce re-offending also resulted in some significant achievements. Over 85% of prisoners had accommodation to go to on release, a third were discharged into employment and above target levels entered education or training on release; all of these are outcomes proven to have a positive effect on reducing the likelihood of a person re-offending.

In relation to tackling substance abuse the targets for CARATS assessments, detoxification and drug treatment programme completions were all exceeded. The committed levels of drug treatment programme starts was not achieved however, and audits of the programme quality at three establishments found significant failings in relation to quality of delivery that HMPS will need to address over the coming months. However general offending behaviour programme completions did exceed the required levels, and the area also achieved the sex offender treatment programme requirement.

Targets linked to the decent treatment of prisoners showed that the overall level of purposeful activity across the area was slightly above target, however the average time unlocked in which this took place was slightly below that required.

Finally, we were deeply saddened to note that there were ten self-inflicted deaths in public sector prisons this year – our sympathies go out to the families and friends of the deceased. Of these, six were at HMP Chelmsford where the public sector Prison Service has taken appropriate steps to learn from investigations into these deaths and implement robust procedures to prevent such tragedies occurring again.

We were pleased to note further strengthening of relationships this year between the public sector Prison Service and both the private prison at Peterborough and also the six probation areas regionally in relation to the delivery of effective offender management. Work has been on-going through the reporting period on embedding Phase 2 of Offender Management and Phase 3 commenced in January 2008 for IPP prisoners. The ROM team visited a number of establishments throughout the year to monitor progress made and were generally impressed with what they found as staff were clearly committed to making the model a success. Throughout the process there was a commitment to joint learning with the ROM and openness about the state of progress and the public sector Prison Service continues to be a key representative on the Regional Offender implementation group.

We are very pleased to be able to report such solid performance and remain assured that public sector prisons in the region have a strong performance culture supporting decent and humane treatment of offenders.

6. CUSTODIAL PERFORMANCE AT PETERBOROUGH PRISON

In this second year of full operation the prison (operated by Kalyx) has experienced the same challenging operating environment as the public sector and has continued to play its part in responding to national prison population pressures by further increasing the operational capacity of the prison to 1008 (384 females and 624 males housed within two discrete sites within the same prison). It is to the credit of staff and management that this increase has been achieved without serious incident.

In relation to performance against contractual targets it has been a mixed year, with 29 targets being met across the establishment and 10 missed. It should be noted that as a private establishment, and because separate targets are set for the male and female parts of the prison, Peterborough has a higher number of targets overall than public sector establishments.

This level of delivery represents a slight decline from the previous year when 31 of the then targets were achieved and 8 missed. However as the prison has been required to change in order to accommodate female young offenders and become a main lifer centre, as well as the overall context of population pressures under which it has had to operate as well as the still relative immaturity of the contract itself, this still represents an acceptable overall picture of delivery.

The prison delivered some very good performance against some challenging targets. The MDT targets for both male and female prisoners were met this year and overall levels of drugs detected were significantly down on the previous year reflecting a maturing strategy to combat drug abuse. Serious assault targets were also achieved in both the male and female prisons, and there were no serious assaults recorded at all amongst the female population. The establishment has established a deserved reputation for delivery high volumes and high quality ETS course completions and it also succeeded in getting over 99% of prisoners to court on time.

The most disappointing failure of the year was the escape from custody which occurred at the end of October when a prisoner being escorted to a local hospital escaped from his escort whilst an in-patient. Kalyx and their staff however cooperated fully with the subsequent investigation into the matter, appropriate managerial action was implemented and procedures have been strengthened for the future. The prisoner was recaptured within 48 hours and no further offences were committed whilst he was at large.

The new accommodation target was not achieved (this was particularly so for the male prison where the target was missed by a significant margin). That required levels of drug treatment starts and completions were also not met was regrettable (although this was down to a delay in starting the new drug rehabilitation programme which was not entirely within local control), especially when the significant exceeding of detoxification and CARATS targets indicates that drug abuse is a major issue amongst the offender population.

The other serious concern was the continued poor performance in relation to the amount of purposeful activity prisoners undertake each week. Despite close managerial attention throughout the year the target was not met and although there were minor improvements in-year there remains a significant challenge to ensure there are sufficient activity places for the expanded population. This must be set against the fact that the prison did exceed its targets for skills for life and key work skills.

Details of the complete performance against targets achieved are set out below:

SDT	Target Male	Actual Delivery Male	Target Female	Actual Delivery Female
To ensure that there are fewer than x absconds from across all establishments in the Area	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
To ensure that the rate of escapes from establishments and from escorts, expressed as a percentage of the average prison population, is nationally lower than 0.05%	0	1	0	0
To ensure there are no Cat A escapes	0	0	0	0
To reduce year on year the number of those testing positive under Mandatory Drug Testing as a percentage of the population	15%	15%	10%	6%
To ensure that X% of ROTLs successfully comply with the terms of their licence	95%	98%	95%	100%
% of serious assaults per overall prison population not to exceed X%	2%	2%	1.5%	0%
X% prisoners will have settled accommodation to go to on release	65%	39%	65%	60%

SDT	Target Male	Actual Delivery Male	Target Female	Actual Delivery Female
To ensure that X% of prisoners in Local Prisons have a housing needs assessment undertaken within 4 days of reception	90%	82%	90%	90%
To complete X full CARAT substance misuse triage assessments	550	559	450	464
To ensure that X prisoners enter a detoxification programme	700	1110	650	1208
To have X prisoners enter a formal drug rehabilitation programme	120*	59*	120*	59*
To have X prisoners complete a formal drug rehabilitation programme	71*	53*	71*	53*
X accredited offending behaviour programmes completed by prisoners (excluding SOTP)	48*	75*	48*	75*
To ensure that there are X completions of Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (SOTP)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
X% of eligible OASys reviews to be conducted to the appropriate timescale	90%	128%	90%	131%
To achieve X Key Work Skills awards (excluding LSC provision)	750	852	700	781
To ensure that X% prisoners enter education or training on release	8.5%	15%	8%	15%
To ensure that X% prisoners enter employment on release	17.5%	17.5%	12.5%	8.9%
The percentage of prisoners held in accommodation units intended for fewer prisoners does not exceed X% of the average population in prisons	30%	20%	6%	0%
To ensure that prisoners spend an average of X hours per week in purposeful activity	30	23	30	23
Rate of self-inflicted deaths (SIDs) in prison not to exceed X per 100,000 prison population	Target measured at national level	N/A	Target measured at national level	N/A
To ensure that the average daily hours unlocked is at least X hours per day per prisoner	12	12	12	12
To ensure that at least X% of planned attendees attend education	80%	90%	80%	75%
To ensure that X% of prisoners are ready for discharge for court appearances in compliance with escort contract	95%	98.7%	95%	99.3%

Notes: * These targets are spread across the whole establishment

The Offender Management Unit has continued to function well and the prison has embraced the next phase of offender management embedding these procedures across the establishment to a high standard. Completion of OASys assessments continue to be done to a level and quality that compare favourably with other prisons across the country.

External validation of the establishment has taken place this year in the form of a return visit by Standards Audit Unit (SAU). Standard 59 (where the internal audit system is verified) was the focus of this year's audit, and an agreed action plan has been put in place to address the identified shortcomings.

The prison continues to address the findings of the HMCIP report, and has taken positive action for the most significant of these - the provision of healthcare. The last twelve months has seen developments including the TUPE transfer of staff from the PCT to Kalyx (completed February 2008); the appointment of an Operational Healthcare Manager; changes to operational procedures leading to improvements to the service patients receive; the introduction of a "First Night Centre" in the female prison; improvements to the pharmacy provision including an on-site Pharmacist and Pharmacy Technician; and finally more robust and active Health Promotion. Much work still remains to be done but those who have visited the healthcare centres in the prison generally comment favourably on the standard of service now in place in comparison to what was there previously. It is noticeable that there is a greater sense of ownership, confidence and optimism amongst the staff now which offers encouragement that further necessary improvement will also be delivered.

The second key HMCIP issue was a concern over insufficient differentiation between policies and practices for men and women. The prevailing ethos and procedures in key areas, such as bullying, security and resettlement were seen as those of a male prison leading to women experiencing a poorer quality of service. These criticisms have been addressed by the appointment of a new Deputy Director, responsible for the female prison. In addition there are now two Violence Reduction Coordinators, one for the male and one for the female prisons in post.

With deep regret we note that there were two deaths at Peterborough this year – our sympathies once again go out to the families and friends of both the deceased. Every death in custody is a tragedy and Peterborough has taken full and appropriate steps to learn from the investigations into these deaths and implement robust procedures to prevent similar such happenings in the future. Any learning will be reviewed in light of the outcome of the respective inquests which remain outstanding.

There have been some significant changes in the working practices as a result of the Offender Management Act which came into force in July 2007 which removed historical inconsistencies between the way private and public sector prisons operate. Adjudications are now being completed by the Director and his managers, as are the duties of administering licence signing

and HDC/ROTL decisions. These new working practices were brought into force in November and have worked well throughout the remainder of the performance year.

The stable foundations laid the previous year have led to ongoing improvements during the last twelve months at a time of great operational pressures, and whilst there remains a need to improve performance and delivery in relation to some of the issues highlighted above we remain confident that the overall direction in which the prison is heading is positive.

A financial cost summary for HMP Peterborough for 2007/08 is included as Annex A to this document.

7. Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plan (RRDP)

The ROM chairs the regional RRDP Strategic Partnership Board (SPB) which has continued to oversee the delivery of the seven pathways identified in the RRDP. The reporting framework has been developed by the supporting regional performance group which has met four times during the year. YJB has established a transitions pathway group, to look at the transfer of young offenders into the adult system. Work has begun to update both the strategy (in the light of a new national plan to be published in June 2008) and supporting metrics (in the light of the Local Area Agreement National Indicator set).

Accommodation: Providing access to suitable and settled accommodation for offenders. The pathway has continued to be led by Anglia Care Trust. Work has continued to focus on facilitating information exchange and implementing the NOMS housing and support framework. The Norfolk Offender Accommodation Forum remains the model for developing effective interagency working. To ensure adult offenders can access floating support in their home communities through Supporting People and strengthen the robustness of existing Housing Protocols between Prisons and Probation Areas with Local Authority Housing Departments.

Skills and Employment: Ensuring that offenders have the skills, education and training necessary to help them settle into sustained employment. In the light of a successful bid to become a test bed for reducing re-offending through employment and skills the pathway group has become the Test Bed Board – chaired by the LSC. During the year community based interventions were developed using additional European funding. The ROM team (working closely with BiTC) has been instrumental in establishing a regional employer engagement leadership group, which has membership from private, public and voluntary sector employers covering the range of employment sectors. A number of initiatives have been started in prisons and the community which will be taken forward under the test bed umbrella.

Mental and Physical Health: Securing effective access to primary care and other health services for offenders in custody and the community.

The pathway is led by CSIP. The group has struggled to achieve consistent membership over the year but has now done so. A more strategic regional Health and Social Care in Criminal Justice Forum (chaired by SHA) has now been established. A regional consultation event was held for the National Offender Health Strategy. The pathway will be prioritising improving offender health provision 'through the gate' with a particular focus on mental health provision including where appropriate the diversion of mentally disordered offenders out of criminal justice and in to health provision.

Drugs and Alcohol: Encouraging offenders into treatment and providing support and through care to help them build effective lives.

The pathway has continued to be led by NTA. Focus has primarily been on getting better connection between CARATS and DIP. Recent data suggest that approximately 68% of drug treatment appointments made following release are kept (a significant improvement on previous performance which was approximately 20-30%). IDTS has been progressed by a separate management group with four out of six prisons given 'live' status by the end of March 2008.

Finance Benefit and Debt: Tackling the financial problems faces by many offenders:

The pathway is led by CAB. There was an attempt to develop cross regional working given organisation changes in CAB. Bids were prepared but unfortunately were not successful. More recent work has focused on obtaining bank accounts for prisoners.

Children and Families of Offenders: Providing support to offenders and their families to protect the interests of children offenders to develop and sustain family ties.

The pathway is led by the Ormiston Trust. Work has focused on developing Quality Standards for contact between a prisoner and their family; devising a planning checklist to support children's centres developing services for families of offenders revised; and work to support foreign national prisoners (at HMP Bullwood Hall).

Attitudes, Thinking and Behaviour: Programmes and support to address specific offending behaviour problems or motivation:

The pathway is led by Norfolk Probation Service. The group has focused on looking at opportunities to develop "through the gate" provision. A Prison Service motivational programme which was piloted at HMP Littlehey is now being piloted by the Probation Service with residents in Approved Premises in Norwich and Bedford. There has been useful cross pathway connection.

8. ROM KEY ACTIVITIES

Visits to providers

The ROM has always placed emphasis on the benefits for a commissioner being able to observe provider delivery first hand. This enables us to meet directly with both service users themselves and also with practitioners on the

front line of service delivery. We have undertaken a variety of scheduled visits to prisons and probation areas during the course of the year in the process observing issues as diverse as offender management units in operation, alcohol treatment provision in prisons and the community, “through the gate” service provision, plus a full and varied programme of visits to each of the prisons in the region. All visits were focussed on progress towards delivery of SLA targets, identified priorities and SLA service progress plan objectives. Providers received feedback on findings and this in turn was incorporated into future commissioning priorities.

Bail Accommodation Support Service (BASS)

A new bail accommodation and support service (BASS) was introduced in June 2007 to enable the courts and prisons to make greater use of bail and early release on Home Detention Curfew (HDC). The scheme is a response to sentencers’ requests for additional bail accommodation for defendants who could otherwise be bailed if alternative accommodation was made available or who require additional support and the target group is medium to low risk, male or female adults. The scheme is nationally commissioned and regionally managed by ROMs who oversee delivery from ClearSprings Management Limited. A part time BASS Operational Lead was appointed by the ROM in August 2007 this was increased to full time in November 2007 when the scheme was officially launched.

Currently housing provision is mainly in the north of the region and there are 13 houses available providing 43 beds. In the summer of 2008 this will be expanded to 18 houses and 58 beds at which point availability will more closely align to identified need across the whole region.

The scheme has developed gradually in the region since the introduction of ring fenced staff, improvements to publicity and better training which have resulted in greater sentencer and provider confidence in the scheme. In late 2007 additional resources were provided linked to agreed 2nd bail appearance referral targets.

By January 2008 there were 6 newly appointed staff to work on bail referrals in all local prisons across the region. A series of regional training events commenced in December 2007 specifically for Bail and HDC operational staff working on the Scheme. In order to promote the Scheme every establishment has been offered a BASS focus training event aimed at the SMT, HDC Boards and all operational staff who are involved in bail and HDC processes. These events have made a significant difference and many establishments have taken the opportunity to review and streamline their bail and HDC processes to automatically include referrals to Clearsprings as a matter of course. So far over 100 staff have attended these events with an average of 20 per establishment.

By the end of the reporting year 73 have been placed by the scheme (65 males, 8 females). Two service users have been given support within their

own homes on a 'support only' package by Clearsprings tailored to individual service user needs.

The performance in the region of referrals made to Clearsprings was above target for 10 successive weeks from 28 January – 31 March 2008. The regions success is due to the innovative approach to involving staff and encouraging them to make good quality referrals aiming for success building the credibility of the scheme. Throughout the period Clearsprings have achieved 100% move on rate for service users against their target of 80%. This record illustrates the commitment Clearsprings have made to provide a good quality service to all users of the scheme. This also contributes to a reduced likelihood of re-offending as users are positively encouraged to make use of the opportunities of support given to them.

A pilot 1st bail scheme will be introduced in 2008 and will build on this success and people with identified levels of risk that show they do not need to be in prison can be bailed without having to be remanded in custody for short periods. Defendants who are not remanded in custody at all maintain continuity of any benefits and will be less likely to lose employment or to have family life disrupted. Having a dedicated court resource will also enable probation to support in person the positive resolution of second appearance cases referred by prisons.

Regional Pathfinder – offender employment

The pathfinder that began in 2007 became fully operational during the year. An interim review was completed by Deloitte in March 2008 which concluded that the project (known as Path2work) had taken a while to bed down, and in particular has not received the number of referrals from offender managers that were envisaged, but was now operating at a level equal to or greater than similar projects. Further work is in hand to develop other ways of engaging with offenders (such as visiting unpaid work parties on site), and further develop the work with employers.

Regional Employment and Skills 'Test Bed'

The East of England was selected as one of two regional test beds for reducing re-offending through employment and skills. The test beds run for 18 months starting from September 2007. The ROM office hosts the small test bed team that has been established to drive developments, and leads the regional delivery group. Funding is from DIUS, and the test bed is a partnership between OLASS (Offender Learning and Skills Service), prison, probation, Job Centre Plus, and the range of providers. Key activity has focused on getting consistency of Information Advice and Guidance, with better connection between providers; better use of IT, greater involvement of employers in helping define training and skills opportunities (to ensure that offenders will gain skills that will enhance their employability and potential employers are prepared to give them a chance). There is also a focus on motivating offenders, with projects planned to test out 'employability

compacts' and look at the potential of unpaid work in connecting offenders into training and work skills opportunities.

Events/consultation exercises

Over the last 12 months (building on successful experience from previous years) the ROM team hosted a variety of events for existing and future providers and stakeholders.

This was mainly aligned to the development of the Regional Commissioning Plan and throughout the autumn we carried out 10 consultation events; five with probation areas, one with the Prison Service, one with GO EAST, two sentencer events and also a specific diversity and equality consultation in partnership with Peterborough Race Equality Council. All these events were well attended and generated good ideas and suggestions that were then used to inform and further develop our regional commissioning priorities that were included in the final version of the plan itself.

Work on the Offender Management Act

The ROM office has, on behalf of NOMS HQ, been leading on providing policy advice, drafting support and representation in relation to clauses relating to private prisons within the Offender Management Bill which received Royal Assent on the 26th July 2007. The legislation creates a consistent operating framework between the public and private sectors. This involved a significant time commitment from within a small team throughout the first half of the year as after the Act was passed there was still much work to be done to make the introduction of the new powers an operational reality across all the private prisons.

Publications

In January 2008 (following extensive consultation) we published the latest version of the East of England Regional Commissioning Plan, developed from the NOMS Commissioning Framework, which outlines the arrangements for commissioning offender services, both in custody and the community. The final plan reflects feedback from partners, stakeholders and providers and was the basis for the SLA agreements signed with each of the six probation boards and HMPS Eastern Region (as well as informing a contract renegotiation process at the privately operated Peterborough prison). The plan has been subject of an Equality Impact Assessment.

9. ROM RESOURCE COMMITMENT

The combined 2007/8 expenditure for prisons and probation in the region amounted to £247.19M. Of this, the ROM team operating budget for the year was £0.85M (equivalent to 0.34% of total resource commitment). In addition to direct commissioning of prison and probation services the ROM also allocated funding to two project budgets totalling a further £0.68M. These

were BASS (Bail Accommodation Support Services) and C2 (Choices and Consequences Project in Hertfordshire).

The ROM staff complement includes the Peterborough prison Controllers team in addition to the staff employed at our office in Peterborough. The staffing complement remained within our authorised headcount at all times throughout the year.

The following table summarises 07/08 expenditure by category:

		Total £M
Prisons	12 Public and 1 private	177.23
Probation	6 Probation Areas	68.43
ROM office	Project funds (BASS, C2, & other)	0.68
	Commissioning, project and prison support (including Controller office)	0.85
TOTAL		247.19

Note: Public prisons costs are prison operating budgets only and do not include Area Office overheads

10. GENERAL THEMES EMERGING FROM THE YEAR

Throughout 2007/08 our key regional strategic priorities were to deliver improvement in relation to offender access to employment and accommodation as we believe that people need both a job and a stable home in order to be able to effectively reduce their likelihood to re-offend. Looking back over the last twelve months I consider we have been very successful in these two fields.

Not only have our SLA providers, both in custody and the community, delivered excellent results in relation to targets linked to these priorities, but we have also seen real progress in the development of the regional employment pathfinder, the employment and skills test bed and the RRDP strategy. Our ability to align commissioning priorities and decisions with partner organisations has delivered real benefit to individual offenders as well as the wider public at large through reductions in crime and offending.

We continue to drive these priorities going forward with real grounds for optimism as the East of England remains one of the safest and most crime free places in the UK to live and work. We cannot afford to become complacent as more still can and must be done and the coming twelve months will see us linking more closely with local area agreements to influence local objectives at local level.

Overall, this has been a rewarding year throughout which we have seen consistently good performance against a range of demanding targets for probation areas. After significant performance improvement in 2006/07 we

commissioned targets at much more stretching levels over the last year and yet providers have once again risen to the challenge to deliver. It is especially pleasing to note that two probation areas, Norfolk and Hertfordshire, improved to such a degree that they were successfully removed from the NPD special improvement measures regime during the year. Likewise for custodial providers targets were raised this year yet performance has remained very high.

We should not underestimate how impressive these achievements are because all of this has been delivered within an exceptionally challenging delivery environment for all providers. The prison population has continued to rise and likewise the caseload volume of community providers has also expanded significantly. Providers have faced real planning and delivery challenges as a result and some significant improvements have been made in the value for money of services delivered as performance was maintained within tight financial constraints.

The last twelve months have also seen increasing evidence of the advantages that NOMS was set up to deliver in relation to greater “through the gate” delivery and greater joining up of service delivery between the various aspects of the criminal justice system. We have commissioned services from providers against demonstrable offender need, and have done so alongside other statutory organisations as part of a process of aligned commissioning. We have also been able to encourage and enable more effective joint working between the regional prison and probation providers. In the process we have been able to increasingly hold providers to account for their actions that impact on other providers ability to achieve targets – such as ensuring prisons make enough professional visits slots available to offender managers to enable them to complete reports on prisoners within required timescales, or tackling the causes of delays in the community that mean prisons cannot complete parole dossiers on time because external probation reports have been held up.

We have worked collaboratively with the LSC to jointly inform our respective target setting processes, and have had similar discussions with colleagues in the fields of health and drugs. Such an approach has the combined benefit of improving services to offenders, increasing the likelihood of reducing re-offending and also offering greater value for money by reducing duplication of effort. As we go forward into a world where LAA’s are increasingly the vehicle by which service improvement will be delivered locally such an approach based on joint working will be increasingly important.

The coming year will be full of challenges as well. There are significant changes underway within NOMS nationally and regionally which will require new ways of working collaboratively together between ourselves and the public sector Prison Service at regional level, and there will also be changes to the relationship with have with probation areas as the ROM takes on a stronger line management role for probation.

For probation we will see the impact of both a Best Value regime as well as the next steps in the move towards Trust status. There will also be challenges as probation takes steps to strengthen confidence in community sentences using the additional resources provided for this SLA year. For prisons challenges include workforce reform, restructuring prisoner regimes and managing the expansion in regional custodial capacity. All of this will take place in an environment where resources remain tight and the pressure on population and caseloads show no signs of relenting.

Regionally we will continue to prioritise work to address education, training and employment of offenders, work in the community to focus attention on preventing re-offending by PPO and High Risk of Harm offenders, and increasing the focus on interventions linked to alcohol abuse. In 2008/09 we will ensure that probation providers make alcohol treatment services increasingly available to courts across the whole of the region in line with the expectations of sentencers.

I look forward to the challenges ahead and the opportunity to work with a group of highly committed and talented individuals and teams across the region who all share my commitment to improving public services, building safer communities and strengthening social cohesion through improved public protection and reduced re-offending.

Trevor Williams
Regional Offender Manager
East of England
June 2008

Annex A

CONTRACTED PRISONS 2007/08 AVERAGE COST PER PLACE AND AVERAGE COST PER PRISONER

Pre-audited financial information

Establishment	Management & Financing Arrangements	Main Category	Certified Normal Accommodation in use	Average Population	Expenditure 2007/08	Average Cost per Place p.a.	Average Cost per Prisoner p.a.
	Note 1	Note 2	Note 3				
					£	£	£
Peterborough	DCMF	Male/Female Local	1008	954	28 628 887	28 402	30 009

NOTES

- 1 Expenditure figures have different cost elements included reflecting different management and financing arrangements.
For Manage Only establishments the expenditure figures include
 Payments to contractors
 Controller Team related to the establishment
Design, Construct, Manage and Finance expenditure figures include
 As above and an adjustment for the capital repayment element in contractual payments
Service Level Agreement figures are extracted from the HMPS Annual Report and Accounts 2007/08
- 2 Establishments are categorised by their main role only.
- 3 The figure shown for Certified Normal Accommodation may vary from contractual figure.

Annex B

National level reducing re-offending target definitions and volumes

Probation Targets
Reducing Re-Offending
At least 90% of OASys assessments must be completed or updated within appropriate timescales (5 days following sentence or release on licence for all PPO cases)
Protecting the Public
At least 90% of OASys assessments (assessment, screening & full risk of harm analysis and sentence plan) must be completed or updated within 5 days following sentence or release on licence for all Tier 4 risk of harm cases (excluding PPOs).
Offender Management
At least 90% of OASys assessments (assessment, screening &, if appropriate, full risk of harm analysis and sentence plan) must be completed or updated within 15 days following sentence or release on licence for all Tier 1, 2 & 3 cases (excluding PPOs)
Delivery of Justice
Achieve an average of 35 working days from the relevant unacceptable failure to comply to resolution of the case; and to resolve 60% of breaches of community penalties within 25 working days of the relevant unacceptable failure to comply (CJS measure).
70% of orders and licences successfully completed
46,300 Completions of unpaid work requirements
Rehabilitation & Support
13,200 offenders under supervision achieve & sustain employment for 4 weeks
13,940 accredited offending behaviour programmes completed by offenders
1,300 accredited sex offender treatment programmes completed by offenders
2,079 accredited programmes for domestic violence completed by offenders
75% of offenders are retained in DRR/DTTO for 12 weeks
Reassurance & Confidence
85% of victims to be contacted within eight weeks of an offender receiving 12 months or more for a serious sexual or violent offence
Supporting the courts
90% of Pre Sentence Reports (PSR's) are completed to agreed timescales

Resource Use Strategy
Days lost due to sickness (Probation) not to exceed 9 days per annum
95% of race and ethnic monitoring data on staff and offenders returned on time using correct classification (Probation)

Prison Targets
Public Protection
No escapes of Category A prisoners
Rate of escapes from prison and prison escorts to be lower than 0.05% of the average prison population
Fewer than 1 in 20,000 escapes from contracted escorts
Safety Decency & Respect
Rate of self-inflicted deaths (SIDs) in prison not to exceed 112.8 per 100,000 prison population.
1.81% of serious assaults per overall prison population
The % of prisoners held in accommodation units intended for fewer prisoners does not exceed 24% of the average population in public prisons
The % of prisoners held in accommodation units intended for fewer prisoners does not exceed 34.5% of the average population in private prisons **
Delivery of Justice
The rate of drug-misuse in prison is less than 10% - as measured by the random Mandatory Drug Testing (rMDT) programme (reported 1 month in arrears)
Rehabilitation & Support
6655 accredited offending behaviour programmes completed by prisoners (exclusive of SOTP)
1,105 accredited sex offender treatment programmes completed by prisoners
At least 75% of offenders move to settled accommodation on release
26% of discharged prisoners entering employment on release
To ensure that 7185 prisoners complete a drug rehabilitation programme or Therapeutic Community annually
Supporting the courts
At least 85% of prisoners from prison or police cells are delivered to court before the agreed time
Resource Use Strategy
Days lost due to sickness (Prison System) not to exceed 11 days per annum
At least 6.3% of the workforce in public prisons to be from ethnic minority groups (Prison System)

Annex C

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

BiTC – Business in the community

CAB – Citizens Advice Bureau

CARATS – Counselling, assessment, referral and through care services

CJS – Criminal Justice System

CSIP – Care Services Improvement Partnership

DIP – Drug Intervention Programme

DIUS – Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills

DRRO – Drug Rehabilitation Requirement Order

DTTO – Drug Treatment and Testing Order

ETS – Enhanced Thinking Skills

HDC – Home Detention Curfew

HMCIP – Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Prisons

HMiP – Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation

IDAP – Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme

IDTS – Integrated Drug Treatment Service

IPP – Indeterminate Public Protection

IPPF – Integrated Probation Performance Framework

LAA – Local Authority Agreements

LSC – Learning Skills Council

MAPPA – Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements

MDT – Mandatory Drug Test

MOJ – Ministry of Justice

NOMS – National Offender Management Service

NPD – National Probation Directorate

NTA – National Treatment Agency

OAsys – Offender Assessment System

OCJR – Office of Criminal Justice Reform

OMI – Offender Management Inspection

OMM – Offender Management Model

PCT – Primary Care Trust

PPO – Prolific and other Priority Offenders

PSR – Pre-Sentence Report

ROM – Regional Offender Manager

ROMS – Regional Offender Management Service

ROTL – Release on Temporary Licence

RRDP – Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plan

SHA – Strategic Health Authority

SLA – Service Level Agreement

YJB – Youth Justice Board