

**TO SAVE BUDGET
HOME OFFICE PROJECTS
PRO FORMA FOR ROUND X FORMAL BIDS**

BID NO.....(from your invitation to bid letter)

Summary details

<i>Project title</i>	OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR PROGRAMMES FOR SHORT-TERM PRISONERS			
<i>Parties to project (lead partner in bold)</i>	H M Prison Service Probation Service Voluntary Sector (likely to be NACRO, SOVA) Employment Service Benefits Agency			
<i>Objectives of project</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce re-offending by short-term offenders completing the programme by 10-15%. • To promote effective resettlement for short-term prisoners. • To promote co-operation between the Prison Service, Probation Service, the Voluntary Sector and Central and Local Government departments. 			
<i>Description of project</i>	This project seeks to offer 2 Short-Term Offender Programmes (STOP) aimed at problems associated with imprisonment – homelessness, unemployment, financial difficulties, drug and alcohol abuse. There will be one programme for prisoners serving up to 7 and a second for prisoners serving up to 12 months.			
<i>Round 3 theme (secretariat use only)</i>	<i>Policy category (secretariat use only)</i>			
<i>ISB funding sought</i>	<u>£000's</u>	<u>01/02</u>	<u>02/03</u>	<u>03/04</u>
	Current	1,153	1,078	0
	Capital	58	0	0
	Total	1,211	1,078	0

INVEST TO SAVE

HM PRISON SERVICE

OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR PROGRAMMES UNIT

BID TO DEVELOP PROGRAMMES FOR SHORT-TERM PRISONERS

Bid X

Executive Summary

- 1. There are currently 60,000 offenders per year being sentenced to less than 12 months in prison. 45,000 are adult males of whom at least 60% will re-offend within 2 years.**
- 2. Because they are in prison for such a short time, they are not eligible for current programmes which address offending behaviour and the causes of offending nor are they eligible for the structured support offered by the Probation Service, on licence.**
- 3. This group of offenders faces multiple problems associated with imprisonment – homelessness, unemployment, financial difficulties, drug and alcohol abuse - without the means, the skills or the support to tackle them.**
- 4. This project seeks to offer 2 Short-Term Offender Programmes (STOP) aimed at addressing all these issues. For prisoners serving up to 7 months there would be a motivational programme (MORE) to kick-start change and offer alternative strategies for dealing with problems. For prisoners serving up to 12 months there would be a cognitive /behavioural**

programme, ETS, aimed at addressing the faulty thinking proven to be the main cause of offending.

5. Both programmes would have a resettlement package delivered prior to release, addressing the social factors associated with offending, and every participant in the programme would have a mentor in the community who would offer support and practical assistance both pre- and post-release.
6. Both programmes would have the same rigorous staff selection and training, supervision, audit, monitoring and evaluation currently provided by the Offending Behaviour Programmes Unit.
7. The objective of the 2 programmes would be to reduce re-offending by 10-15%.

Introduction

1.1 Prisoners serving less than 12 months represent nearly 70% of all prisoners received into custody and make up 71% of adult males. Reconviction rates for short-term prisoners are high: 61% of males released in 1995 were re-convicted within 2 years.

1.2 Reasons for re-offending are many and varied, with cognitive deficits being at the top of the list; however there are other factors that influence likelihood of re-offending. Homeless prisoners are twice as likely to re-offend as those who have stable accommodation and ‘the single most effective factor in reducing re-offending rates, with a positive effect of 37%, is employment’ (Lipsey1992).

1.3 At present there are no accredited programmes for this group of offenders, when clearly there is a need for interventions which would have an impact on these criminogenic factors and contribute to the reduction of offending. (Appendix A)

1.4 This project would provide two programmes designed specifically for this group of offenders: one for prisoners serving up to 7 months and a longer and more in-depth one for the 7-12 month group. Each programme tackles social exclusion at its roots by addressing the attitudinal problems and faulty thinking of offenders as well as the barriers to reintegration of unemployment, lack of accommodation, drugs and alcohol etc. It would also offer a mentor in the community to support the prisoner on release, because this group of relatively high risk offenders are the only group of released prisoners not subject to any form of supervision on release.

1.5 The MORE programme has 4 blocks each consisting of a minimum of 1 session, with the exception of block one which is two sessions, making a total of 5

sessions. Depending on need, each block can be extended to up to 4 sessions. These 5 sessions would be delivered over a week, with a resettlement block of 10 sessions delivered over the following week. The resettlement block would have modules on topics such as accommodation, benefits, employment, drugs and alcohol. There would need to be inputs from other agencies e.g. employment and benefits agencies, housing providers as well as people with expertise in the drugs and alcohol fields.

1.6 ETS is a cognitive/behavioural programme which addresses the faulty thinking of offenders, in particular their poor problem solving and social skills, their rigidity, egocentricity, impulsivity and their narrow, concrete thinking. Moral reasoning and social perspective taking are also covered. The programme is 20 sessions and would be delivered over 4 weeks. The resettlement block would be delivered during the third and fourth weeks.

Objectives of the project

2.1 The main objective of the project would be to reduce re-offending by short-term offenders completing the programme by 10-15%. ‘What Works’ literature shows that well designed and well implemented programmes can reduce re-offending by between 10 and 30%. Given that short-termers are a high risk group a reduction of between 10 and 15% is a realistic target.

2.2 This project will contribute to Home Office Aim 4, particularly the crime reduction strategy, by developing and piloting programmes with a view to extending the range of accredited programmes.

2.3 To promote effective resettlement for short-term prisoners.

2.4 To promote co-operation between the Prison Service, Probation Service, the Voluntary Sector and Central and Local Government departments e.g. DfEE, Benefits Agency and local housing providers.

2.5 Sub-objectives would be to select 7 pilot sites, each delivering between 80 and 100 completions per year, to produce a Resettlement Manual for delivery alongside the two cognitive/motivational programmes, and to recruit and train the staff to deliver the programmes.

Funding requirements for the project

£k	2001-2002	2002-2003
ISB funding	1,211	1,078
Of which: current	1,153	1,078
capital	58	0
Bidder's own funding		
Prison Service	565	462
Of which: current	507	462
capital	58	
Totals	1,776	1,540

3.1 Costs fall predominately into two categories, staff costs and training. Many of the establishments which have asked to be considered to be pilot sites for this project are putting up some funding to assist the provision of programmes for this needy group of offenders. The selection of pilot sites depends on a variety of issues including: location; anticipated effectiveness of delivery based on what programmes that establishment is currently delivering for longer term prisoners; and what would make sense in terms of prisoner population management. In any event, the bid would remain substantially the same.

3.2 Establishments themselves are absorbing much of the capital expenditure. The bid includes capital costs for the construction of classroom accomodation only where it is not possible to obtain resources from any other source. Clearly it is not appropriate to request funding for the provision of classroom accommodation in Prison Service establishments from the private sector

3.3 The project could proceed with fewer sites and smaller numbers. The purpose of the project is to pilot the two programmes to test effectiveness in terms of reducing re-offending, with a view to national rollout if it works. A reduction in sample size would seriously undermine the credibility and reliability of the data. For the same reason, at this stage, we would not seek to include women's nor young offenders' establishments because there would not be a sufficiently large sample size to validate the data collected.

Innovation

- 4.1** Along with the 6 joint Prison – Probation Resettlement Pathfinders funded by the Crime Reduction Strategy, this project will be one of the first specifically to seek the reduction of re-offending in short-term prisoners.
- 4.2** This project is the first to include a cognitive-behavioural element with a specific, structured resettlement package and with the support structures and accountability mechanisms to ensure consistent, effective delivery through processes which are already tried, tested and proven.
- 4.3** Short-term prisoners are at the highest risk of re-offending and yet have no supervision and only very limited access to support and assistance on release. This project would make up for this.
- 4.4** In the case of the MORE programme, whilst current thinking indicates that ‘dose’ (the number of hours of input to a programme recipient) should be a minimum of 40 hours to be effective, this programme seeks to demonstrate that if what is provided is focussed in the right direction, i.e. a systematic programme of resettlement, ‘dose’ is not as crucial. In the case of ETS + we are also seeking to provide a different kind of programme, one which uses the skills learned directly to resolve the offender’s own problems in the resettlement block.
- 4.5** It will offer a significant contribution to Ministers’ commitment to a seamless sentence by ensuring that prisoners are prepared effectively for release into the community.

Benefits to users

- 5.1** Short-term offenders are most at risk in terms of re-offending and unless something is provided to help break the cycle of offending, they will keep reoffending and returning to prison. This project provides them with that opportunity and offers them a real chance of becoming offence-free and able to lead constructive lives.
- 5.2** This project provides access to an alternative way of behaving which is already available to longer-term prisoners through programmes and the statutory supervision of the Probation Service.
- 5.3** The main beneficiaries of this project will be the public, in terms of the likely reductions in the number of offences committed by the target group. The main objective of the Police, Prison and Probation Services is to protect the public. If the project is successful in reducing re-offending by 10-15% there will be a reduction in the number of recorded offences of around 1050 over 4 years. (700 participants per year for two years, 15% of whom would not re-offend in the 2 years following release, giving a total of 210 who would not re-offend. For each reconviction there is evidence to suggest there are 5 offences recorded by

the police, giving a total of 1050 recorded offences saved). That means 1050 fewer victims of crime (but see 6.1). If the project were successful, the intention would be to roll out the programme nationally, subject to funding being made available, with the consequent greater impact on the crime figures.

Estimated savings

6.1 Recent research has estimated the average cost per crime committed at £1,033. From this it is possible to estimate the total benefit the scheme will provide. Assuming that there will be a reduction in re-offending of 15% and that there are 21 actual offences per re-conviction (5 recorded per conviction, and 4.2 actual crimes per recorded crime), then we can estimate the total benefit of the two year scheme to be around £20.5m. The benefits would be spread over a total of four years.

6.2 This saving is based on estimates of the total impact of crime on society. This includes several elements:

- **Costs in the anticipation of crime – including the expenditure on personal security alarms or the cost of risk-averse behaviour, for example using a taxi instead of walking at night**
- **Costs as a consequence of crime – including the cost of physical and emotional impact and health service costs**
- **Costs in response to crime – the costs to the criminal justice system of dealing with a crime, including court services and sentences**

6.3 This estimate is based on assumptions made during the Spending Review 2000 negotiations. As a result this calculation is subject to numerous caveats and the estimates should be treated with some caution. However, it does allow some indication of the benefits likely to result.

(The Prison Service is indebted to the Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate for providing this information)

Additionality test

7.1 At the present time there are no other avenues of funding available for this project. Whilst the various prisons are able to put some resources into it, they are not nearly sufficient to fund the extensive input required to deliver the programmes nor the community support, nor the evaluation and monitoring essential to effectiveness.

Accountability and audit

8.1 HM Prison Service's Offending Behaviour Programmes Unit will assume accountability for the project. They have extensive experience in managing, developing and supervising the implementation of programmes within prisons. (See Appendix B for a summary of the existing ETS audit document which would be modified to take into account the resettlement block and the different features of the MORE programme.) OBPU currently manage programme delivery in over 100 sites to the demanding standards set by the Joint Accreditation Panel (an international panel of experts in the fields of criminology and programmes, who accredit programmes in this country)

8.2 Governors who work for OBPU currently carry out audits annually with additional site visits. Mandatory national meetings are held to support local managers and ensure consistency of approach. A similar system would be set up for this project.

8.3 The Probation Service also has considerable experience of managing offenders in the transition between prison and the community, as do the voluntary sector agencies likely to be involved – Society of Voluntary Associates (SOVA) and the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO).

8.4 All staff involved in the delivery of the programmes would be selected, trained and supervised in line with current OBPU standards and criteria (Appendix B – the current audit baselines).

8.5 Evaluation would additionally involve the psychometric testing of offenders before and after the programme to measure changes in offenders' attitudes. There would be follow-up to analyze re-conviction within 2 years of release.

Project cycle management

9.1 Economic Appraisal – See Appendix C

9.2 Each programme will be monitored as per the requirements in the audit document (summary attached at Appendix B). Essentially, that means each local manager, trained by OBPU, will supervise the assessment and selection of prisoners, the delivery of the programme and the pre- and post-course testing of the programme participants. There will be a random sample check of parts of each programme delivery by OBPU.

9.3 OBPU's long-term evaluation unit will carry out follow-up research on re-conviction data.

9.4 There will be a management board, made up of senior managers from OBPU, Probation Service and chaired by the head of the ‘What Works in Prison Unit.

RUNNING COGNITIVE SKILLS PROGRAMMES IN PRISON

Linda Blud, Principal Psychologist, Offending Behaviour Programmes Unit

Research on Cognitive Skills Programmes:

The prevailing view in the 1970s was that ‘nothing worked’ with offenders. This conclusion was put forward by several researchers, most notably Martinson (1974), who reviewed published studies of offender treatment programmes and their outcomes and concluded that overall, rehabilitation was a waste of time. Most offenders did not respond to attempts to rehabilitate them.

Over the past few decades, a considerable amount of research has looked at whether rehabilitation programmes for offenders can have any real impact. We are now in a better position than we were twenty five years ago to draw clearer conclusions about the characteristics of programmes which can effectively reduce re-offending. This is largely due to the development of meta-analytic research. Meta-analysis is a statistical technique which integrates the research findings from a number of studies, allowing a better judgment of the practical benefits of interventions [see Losel (1995) for a review of studies].

The meta-analytic reviews that have been published to date assess a range of different interventions with offenders, but have not been able to identify any single approach which could be taken as a guarantee of success. In general, the research assesses a range of outcomes, including re-offending, and overall the results indicate a success rate (i.e a reduction in recidivism) of around 10 to 12% (Andrews et al, 1990, Lipsey, 1992). Some approaches are more successful than others, and the better approaches may reduce recidivism by over 30%.

Skills-based, cognitive behavioural approaches are amongst the most successful interventions identified (McGuire, 1995). These interventions are based on a range of methods and typically involve the use of behavioural and social learning principles of interpersonal influence, skill enhancement, and cognitive change.

The most widely run interventions currently running in prisons in England and Wales are two cognitive skills programmes based on this model.

1. **The Reasoning and Rehabilitation Programme (R&R)**, which was developed in Canada (Ross and Fabiano, 1985).
2. **Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS)** – a programme modelled on the R&R but developed by psychologists in Britain.

Both programmes are based on the premise that the main target for intervention for a large number of offenders should be cognitive deficits.

Research conducted in the development of these two cognitive skills programmes has indicated that offenders do differ significantly in the number and range of cognitive deficits they exhibit (Ross and Fabiano, 1985, Clark 1993).

The six main areas identified are these:

Self-control

Many offenders tend to be action-oriented and impulsive.

Cognitive style

Uncomfortable with abstract concepts – notions like social harmony and justice – many offenders are constrained by their thinking which is rigid, inflexible, dogmatic, intolerant of ambiguity.

Interpersonal problem solving

Unable to appreciate the subtleties and complexities of social interaction, some offenders don't recognise that they have social handicaps. Often they lack ability to properly recognise what their problems are, are unable to see range of alternatives available, rarely think through the consequences of their behaviour, do not see a relationship between means and ends.

Social perspective taking

Most of our problems involve other people. Many offenders don't recognise this. They remain egocentric. Not only do they fail to see why they should consider others, but they lack the ability to see things from someone else's point of view. So they misinterpret social expectations and the intentions and actions of people – so they are often seen as selfish and callous.

Values

Many would say that offenders are amoral. However, it is probably more correct to say that they lack moral reasoning skills – they do not see the inconsistency between their values – what they stand for and believe and their actions.

Critical reasoning

Many offenders display thinking which is illogical and irrational. They do not reflect on their behaviour and engage in any self-analysis. They can justify their actions, but tend to externalise blame: nothing is ever their fault.

Not all offenders, of course, have all of these deficits. But research has demonstrated that many persistent offenders do. Cognitive Skills Programmes comprise a series of structured exercises designed to address the main areas of cognitive deficit which have been identified. Enhancement of cognitive and interpersonal skills is achieved through systematic modelling, reinforcement, roleplaying and social and problem solving skills practice.

How good is the evidence that programmes like these have a real impact on re-offending?

There is convincing evidence available relating to the R&R programme, which has produced the most comprehensive reconviction study conducted so far (Robinson 1995). Data is available on over 2,000 offenders who have completed the programme in Canada, which demonstrates a 20% reduction in the number of new reconvictions for the treatment group, compared with a matched control group, a year following release from prison.

The main conclusions were:

- A 20% reduction in new reconvictions a year following release specified. It is not enough for a prison to run an accredited programme: in addition they have to demonstrate that they are running it to maximum effect.

Both the R&R and the ETS programmes outlined above have been assessed as meeting the accreditation criteria.

Multidisciplinary teams within prisons run programmes with a wide range of offenders, including women and young offenders. Psychometric evidence indicates that the changes seen for juveniles (15-17 year olds) and young offenders (18-21) show a similar pattern of improvement in areas (problem solving, impulsivity, understanding of consequences) targeted by the programme. Reconviction data for cognitive skills programmes run in England and Wales is also now available, and demonstrates that the programme is effective in significantly reducing reconvictions for all offenders. The impact on younger offenders is encouraging —for those under 18, 44% of the treatment group had been reconvicted within a year following release, compared to 57% of the comparison group. The sample size is fairly small, and more data should be available before the end of the year.

Cognitive Skills programmes are now running in around 100 prisons around England and Wales, and represent an important and revolutionary new rehabilitative approach to prison regimes.

Appendix B

Assessing Cognitive Skills Sites for Accreditation (Audit Document)

The following is a summary of the first and last sections of the OBPU audit document and an explanation of how the audit impacts on programmes. For reasons of length it has not been possible to include the whole document, however section 2 is attached to give a flavour of the standards and baselines that OBPU demands and works to.

Section 1 of the audit document sets out the requirement for a letter of commitment from the Governor of any establishment delivering a programme. It requires that there is a management structure in place with specific people on the management team to ensure that there is authority to deliver all the other requirements. It is very specific about the amount of time tutors must be allocated to prepare for the programme, deliver it, debrief and write reports. It sets out what classroom provision there must be and what training must be in place for other prison staff to ensure they understand and support the programme.

Section 2 is attached.

Section 3 covers the provision of follow-up for prisoners after they have completed the programme, even if they leave the establishment, and specifies the nature and frequency of contact the programme team must have with the prisoners' Probation Officer. This section would need to be adapted significantly to set standards and baselines for the provision of the resettlement block and mentoring

Each item on the audit document is scored and an overall percentage figure worked out based on those scores. If the score is less than 100%, then the number of prisoners put through the programme who count towards the KPI is reduced proportionately e.g. for a score of 90%, only 9 out of ten completions would count towards the KPI target. In this way it is in a governor's interest to ensure that the highest standards are maintained.

A similar document would be devised for the short-term offender programmes.

2. TREATMENT MANAGEMENT

CRITERIA	METHOD OF CHECKING	SCORING GUIDE	COMMENT	SCORE
<p>2.1 Tutors should be properly selected. No staff should attend cognitive skills tutor training who have not been through the selection procedure as laid down in the Managers' Manual including attendance at an assessment centre (Skills training).</p>	<p>Treatment Managers ensure guidelines for selection of tutors are followed and to provide a report on the selection procedure used, with scores for each selected tutor, to OBPU as a condition of booking them onto the tutor training.</p>	<p>4 = National selection procedure, or equivalent, followed. 3 = SOTP selection procedures followed, but no additional procedures included. 2 = Some deviations from above 1 = Major deviations from above 0 = No selection procedure followed.</p>		
<p>2.2 Staff must be properly trained. All tutors must have attended the 2-week national training course and any other compulsory courses (e.g. update training and booster training). Selected tutors are required to complete a three-day skills training package prior to selection for the 2 week course.</p>	<p>OBPU to maintain database of all tutors trained.</p> <p>OBPU to co-ordinate skills training in response to demand.</p> <p>OBPU to identify common problems in programme delivery through videotape monitoring and develop training accordingly.</p> <p>OBPU to provide feedback to Treatment Managers through video monitoring on training support which can be provided during supervision.</p>	<p>MANDATORY</p> <p>4 = Attendance at national assessment centre, and 2 week national training completed for all tutors. Tutors who have completed required treatment hours have attended or are booked to attend Booster training. 3 = All main tutor requirements met, but some eligible tutors not attended or booked on Booster training. 0 = Criterion not complied with.</p>		

CRITERIA	METHOD OF CHECKING	SCORING GUIDE	COMMENT	SCORE
<p>2.3 Newly trained tutors should be paired with more experienced tutors when running their first course.</p>	<p>OBPU to check via pre-treatment returns and tutor database.</p>	<p>4 = Newly trained tutors always paired with experienced (i.e.. booster-trained) tutors. 3 = Newly trained tutors paired with experienced in most cases but some experienced tutors not yet booster-trained. 2 = Occasional attempts to pair new tutors with experienced. 1 = Rarely pair new tutors with experienced. 0 = Never pair new tutors with experienced. <i>(The Panel accepts that this may not be possible in new establishments with no experienced tutors and in these cases this item is not scored).</i></p>		
<p>2.4. All sessions to be videoed.</p>	<p>Treatment Managers to be responsible for ensuring all sessions are videoed. OBPU to check that all videos are received.</p>	<p>MANDATORY 4= All sessions videoed 0= Not all sessions videoed. <i>(If there is a reasonable explanation for missing sessions - e.g.. Camera breakdown - this will not be scored down).</i></p>		
<p>2.5 Treatment Managers should study at least one videotape for every 5 sessions in preparation for each supervision session.</p>	<p>Treatment Managers to maintain video monitoring record for each tape viewed in the supervision log (video monitoring should be fed back during supervision). OBPU to check supervision logs during visits.</p>	<p>4 = Criterion complied with. 3 = Most videos watched for all courses or required number of videos watched for most courses. 0 = 50% or less of required videos watched.</p>		

CRITERIA	METHOD OF CHECKING	SCORING GUIDE	COMMENT	SCORE
<p>2.6 Tutor teams should receive at least 2 hours supervision each week (or for every 5/6 sessions). Supervision should comply with guidance in the Managers' manual, and should be done with whole tutor teams rather than individually, although new tutors may need extra individual supervision.</p>	<p>Treatment Managers to maintain supervision log.</p> <p>OBPU to check supervision log during visits. Notes should be available at audit to indicate videos watched for each supervision session.</p>	<p>4 = Criterion complied with - 2 hours every 5/6 sessions with tutor teams. 3 = Criterion complied with generally (i.e. most weeks/some individual supervision only). 2 = Criterion sometimes complied with. 1 = Criterion rarely complied with. 0 = Criterion never complied with.</p>		
<p>2.7 All relevant documentation should be completed to an acceptable standard and sent promptly to OBPU at the start and end of each programme. This documentation includes Pre-programme treatment returns, (at the start), pre-course assessment questionnaires, post-programme treatment returns, post-programme assessment questionnaires, Cognitive Skills Referral Summaries (at the end of the programme); Post-Programme reports (PPRs to be sent within 2 months of the end of the course), Case conference reports (4- 8-weeks) and follow-up assessment questionnaires (within 2-3 months).</p>	<p>Treatment Managers to ensure all documentation is completed and sent to OBPU.</p> <p>OBPU to check receipt of post-programme documentation with notified dates on pre-treatment returns.</p>	<p>4 = All documentation received in time, and properly completed. 3 = Occasional lapses in timeliness of despatch or standard of completion. 2 = Poorly completed documentation, or late receipt of documentation. 1 = Poorly completed documentation and late receipt. 0 = Documentation not received.</p>		
<p>2.8 At the end of each course, Treatment Managers should send all videotapes, correctly labelled, to OBPU for sampling.</p>	<p>Treatment Managers to ensure videotapes are correctly labelled, including tutors' names, and passed to OBPU.</p> <p>OBPU to sample tapes and return for recycling.</p>	<p>4 = Correctly labelled tapes received promptly. 3 = Occasional lapses in labelling (i.e. tutors names not shown), or late despatch. 2 = Poor labelling and/or despatch; missing tapes. 1 = Tapes for one or more courses not received. 0 = No tapes received.</p>		

APPENDIX B

CRITERIA	METHOD OF CHECKING	SCORING GUIDE	COMMENT	SCORE
<p>2.9 All Treatment Managers to have attended national tutor training.</p>	<p>OBPU to maintain details of training on tutor database.</p>	<p>MANDATORY 4 = Criterion complied with. 0 = Criterion not complied with.</p>		
<p>2.10 Treatment Managers must have sufficient professional competence and experience to manage the programme, as outlined in the competency criteria document.</p>	<p>OBPU to provide support training and details of Treatment Managers competency.</p>	<p>MANDATORY 4 = Fully meets criteria. 3 = Criteria not met but evidence of system in place to comply with criteria. 0 = Criteria not met.</p>		
<p>2.11 All Treatment Managers to attend additional Treatment Manager training courses provided by OBPU.</p>	<p>OBPU to develop Treatment Manager training and maintain details on database.</p>	<p>4 = Treatment Manager training attended. 3 = Not yet attended, but booked on course. 0 = Not attended and no definite plans to attend.</p>		
<p>2.12 All Treatment Managers to attend additional Booster training courses provided by OBPU.</p>	<p>OBPU to develop Booster training and maintain details on database.</p>	<p>4 = Booster training attended. 3 = Not yet attended, but booked on course. 0 = Not attended and no definite plans to attend.</p>		
<p>2.13 All Treatment Managers should deliver at least two programmes as tutors after receiving the national training (i.e. 80 hours of ETS, 140 hours of R&R).</p>	<p>OBPU to check via Treatment returns.</p>	<p>4 = TM has delivered at least 2 programmes. 3 = Not yet delivered required programmes but clear evidence of planned intention to do so. 0 = Not yet delivered required programmes no clear plans to achieve this.</p>		

CRITERIA	METHOD OF CHECKING	SCORING GUIDE	COMMENT	SCORE
<p>2.14 Each establishment to follow national guidelines for selection of offenders for cognitive skills programmes as laid out in the Managers' Manual.</p>	<p>Treatment Managers to ensure correct completion of Cognitive Skills Referral Summary (1st stage referral - risk) and Interview Schedules (second stage referral - need) for each offender.</p> <p>Completed Cognitive Skills Referral Summaries to be forwarded to OBPU.</p> <p>OBPU to check interview schedules during site visits.</p> <p>OBPU to set up a database to record information from Cognitive Skills Referral Summary Documents.</p>	<p>4 = Risk and Need properly assessed (CSRS & Interviews, including appropriate ratings, completed in all cases)</p> <p>3 = One area (risk or need) properly assessed, but the second area not adequately assessed.</p> <p>2 / 1 = Some mis-selection evident in both areas.</p> <p>0 = Selection procedures not followed.</p>		
<p>2.15 All participants to complete national assessment questionnaires prior to and following completion of the programme and after a period of between 4 and 8 weeks.</p>	<p>Treatment Managers to ensure questionnaires are correctly administered and completed and despatched to OBPU, correctly labelled.</p> <p>OBPU to monitor % missing and incomplete.</p>	<p>4 = Pre-, Post-course and 8-week assessments routinely completed (or 8 week arrangements in place)</p> <p>3 = Pre- and Post-course assessments routinely completed.</p> <p>2/1 = Inadequate arrangements for completion of questionnaires (i.e. pre- or post- missing, or not properly completed)</p> <p>0 = Criterion not complied with.</p>		
<p>2.16 Grids and session evaluation sheets should be completed to a high standard.</p>	<p>OBPU to check standard of completion and submit samples to Panel.</p>	<p>4 = Grids and session evaluation sheets completed to a high standard.</p> <p>3 = One area not completed satisfactorily.</p> <p>2 = Poor completion of grids/ evaluation sheets.</p> <p>0 = No grids or evaluation sheets completed.</p>		

CRITERIA	METHOD OF CHECKING	SCORING GUIDE	COMMENT	SCORE
<p>2.17 Post-programme reports should be completed, including ratings of progress made. Ratings should be decided using pre-course interview scores and grids to guide post-course assessments/ratings. PPRs should also include objectives (which should be agreed/modified during the course review). Objectives need to be specific, achievable, relevant, measurable time-bound and related to areas covered in the programme.</p>	<p>Treatment Managers to ensure Post Programme Reports (PPRs) are completed correctly, with objectives specified, and forwarded to OBPU.</p> <p>OBPU to check standard of completion and submit samples to the Panel.</p>	<p>4 = PPRs correctly completed, including ratings and objectives to a high standard. 3 = PPRs completed with ratings and objectives but quality could be improved. 2 = PPRs completed but ratings or objectives missing. 1 = PPRs completed but ratings and objectives missing. 0 = No PPRs completed.</p>		

Economic Appraisal

The Options

1. Do Minimum
2. Preferred Option
3. Decrease the number of pilot sites
4. Only implement programme for prisoners serving up to 12 months
5. Only implement programme for prisoners serving up to 7 months

Option 1 – Do Minimum

Benefits

None

Disadvantages

There will be no provision for short-term offenders, who will continue to re-offend with the resultant costs to the public sector agencies e.g. police, CPS, courts etc.

Cost Benefit Analysis

	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05
1. Costs (£k)	0	0	0	0
2. Benefits (£k)	0	0	0	0
3. Net Benefits (1-2)	0	0	0	0
4. Discount Factor	1	0.94	0.89	0.84
5. Net Present Value (£k) (3 x 4)	0	0	0	0
6. Cumulative NPV (£k)	0	0	0	0

Option 2 - Preferred Option (As per bid)

Benefits

- A potential reduction in offending in short-term prisoners of 10-15%.
- Credible and reliable data which supports that the programmes are effective in reducing offending in this high risk group of offenders.
- A proven and supportable programme that is suitable for national rollout.
- A very good case for arguing for more centrally funded resources to fund rollout.
- Fewer crimes committed and therefore fewer victims.
- More and better co-operation between agencies, both public and voluntary sector.

Disadvantages

- The costs of the project.

Cost Benefit Analysis

	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05
1. Costs (£k)	1,776	1,540		
2. Benefits (£k)	0	6,248	12,495	12,495
3. Net Benefits (1-2)	(1,776)	4,708	12,495	12,495
4. Discount Factor	1	0.94	0.89	0.84
5. Net Present Value (£k) (3 x 4)	(1,776)	4,425	11,121	10,496
6. Cumulative NPV (£k)	(1,776)	2,649	13,770	24266

Risks and Uncertainty

There is a possibility that the programmes will not be as effective as anticipated, although it is highly unlikely that it would have no positive effect. The methods and theory have been well tested and the ongoing monitoring would be able to check early deficiencies and rectify them.

There is also the possibility of start up delays but with relevant experience in chosen sites these should be kept to a minimum.

Option 3 - Decrease the number of pilot sitesBenefits

- The costs would not be as high as the preferred option.
- A potential reduction in offending in short-term prisoners of 10-15%.
- Fewer crimes committed and therefore fewer victims.
- More and better co-operation between agencies, both public and voluntary sector.

Disadvantages

- Sample size would be reduced which would mean there would be insufficient data to be credible and, with a smaller sample, the data would not be considered to be reliable. There would therefore be nothing to support an argument for national rollout.
- Management overheads will constitute a greater proportion of costs with fewer projects

Cost Benefit Analysis

	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05
1. Costs (£k)	1,024	841		
2. Benefits (£k)	0	3,014	6,027	6,027
3. Net Benefits (1-2)	(1,024)	2,172	6,027	6,027
4. Discount Factor	1	0.94	0.89	0.84
5. Net Present Value (£k) (3 x 4)	(1,024)	2,042	5,364	5,063
6. Cumulative NPV (£k)	(1,024)	1,018	6,382	11,445

Risks and Uncertainty

- There is a possibility that the programmes will not be as effective as anticipated, although it is highly unlikely that they would have no positive effect. The methods and theory have been well tested and the ongoing monitoring would be able to check early deficiencies and rectify them.
- There is also the possibility of start up delays but with relevant experience in chosen sites these should be kept to a minimum.
- If any one of the chosen sites proves ineffective this would have a disproportionate effect on the whole programme.

Option 4 - Only implement programme for prisoners serving from 7 to 12 months

Benefits

- The costs would reduce.
- There would be enough data for analysis in this category.
- A potential reduction in offending in short-term prisoners of 10-15%.
- Credible and reliable data which supports that the programme is effective in reducing offending in this high risk group of offenders.
- A proven and supportable programme that is suitable for national rollout.
- A very good case for arguing for more centrally funded resources to fund rollout.
- Fewer crimes committed and therefore fewer victims.
- More and better co-operation between agencies, both public and voluntary sector.

Disadvantages

- There would still be no provision for offenders in the up to 7 month group who make up a substantial part of the under 12 month group of offenders
- They would continue to re-offend at their current rate, with the resultant costs to the Criminal Justice system and the public. The opportunity to pilot a new and different approach would be lost.
- Management overheads will constitute a greater proportion of costs with fewer projects

Cost Benefit Analysis

	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05
1. Costs (£k)	1,208	1,072		
2. Benefits (£k)	0	3,014	6,027	6,027
3. Net Benefits (1-2)	(1,208)	1,942	6,027	6,027
4. Discount Factor	1	0.94	0.89	0.84
5. Net Present Value (£k) (3 x 4)	(1,208)	1,825	5,364	5,063
6. Cumulative NPV (£k)	(1,208)	617	5,981	14,044

Risks and Uncertainty

- If we were to proceed with the ETS + resettlement option, there is no guarantee that it would be as effective as anticipated, although it is likely to have a positive effect. The methods and theory have been well tested and the ongoing monitoring would be able to check early deficiencies and rectify them.
- There is also the possibility of start up delays but with relevant experience in chosen sites these should be kept to a minimum.

Option 5 - Only implement programme for prisoners serving up to 7 months

Benefits

- The costs would reduce.
- There would be enough data for analysis in this category.
- A potential reduction in offending in short-term prisoners of 10-15%.
- Credible and reliable data which supports that the programme is effective in reducing offending in this high risk group of offenders.
- A proven and supportable programme that is suitable for national rollout.
- A very good case for arguing for more centrally funded resources to fund rollout.
- Fewer crimes committed and therefore fewer victims.
- More and better co-operation between agencies, both public and voluntary sector.

Disadvantages

- There would still be no provision for offenders in the 7-12 month group who would continue to re-offend at their current rate, with the resultant costs to the Criminal Justice system and the public.
- They would continue to re-offend at their current rate, with the resultant costs to the Criminal Justice system and the public. The opportunity to pilot a new and different approach would be lost.
- Management overheads will constitute a greater proportion of costs with fewer projects

Cost Benefit Analysis

	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05
1. Costs (£k)	761	614		
2. Benefits (£k)	0	3,234	6,468	6,468
3. Net Benefits (1-2)	(761)	2,620	6,468	6,468
4. Discount Factor	1	0.94	0.89	0.84
5. Net Present Value (£k) (3 x 4)	(761)	2,463	5,757	5,584
6. Cumulative NPV (£k)	(761)	1,702	7,459	13,043

Risks and Uncertainty

- If we were to proceed with the MORE + resettlement option, there is no guarantee that it would be as effective as anticipated.
- There is also the possibility of start up delays but with relevant experience in chosen sites these should be kept to a minimum.

Evaluation of the Options

The preferred option would give the best opportunity to examine what works in reducing re-offending amongst the short-term offender population. It would enable 2 new initiatives to be piloted and evaluated with a view to the implementation of best practice.

If it were necessary to reduce funding and so have to reduce the project, it would be better to support just one of the programmes rather than reduce both. This would mean that there would be sufficient data in at least one group to give it credibility and reliability. The programme with which we are more confident of success would be ETS + resettlement. However, the MORE + resettlement offers the opportunity to try something completely different with a larger group of offenders.