



Thinking about performance frameworks in community justice

**Rob Strachan,
Chief Officer,
Lothian and Borders
Community Justice Authority (CJA)**

Reducing re-offending: Scotland's £3bn challenge at the interface between the justice system and local democracy - are all partners on board? Are we rowing in the same direction?



Where we need to get to... partnership that maximises improvement

- Shared understanding at local level of the problems we are trying to solve? What are priority people, places & themes?
- Evidence base & “what works” informs strategies & practice.
- Effective coordination of services and interventions that support desistance from criminal activity.
- Engagement & leadership – political and officers, across sector.
- System change & improvement planning, information sharing, performance culture & framework, evaluation, service user focus.
- Resources & commissioning brought closer together and a better appreciation of the added value of the third sector.
- Enable risks/needs with intensity & shape of intervention; have the “carrot and stick / enforcement” conversation.

Drivers and connections...why?

1. Performance culture needed across community justice system, especially around key shared priorities;
2. Promote a performance system that is partnership orientated; and
3. Identify key components and systems that are adaptable to the Scottish context.

So what?

- We need credible research that will do 3 things:
 1. Provide options for scrutiny and improvement arrangements in the community justice system in the short term (through CJAs);
 2. Get behind Community Planning system through pinpointing key evidence in support of local performance frameworks and providing an 'options' menu for drawdown;
 3. Provide Scottish Government and justice partners with a strong evidence base around potential performance and information requirements.



Connections and key themes

1. Community safety.
2. Health inequalities.
3. Economic inclusion (see gaps).
4. Resilient communities.
5. Criminal justice.
6. Housing.
7. Families.

.....and with performance frameworks for community justice partners.



Aims of our research

- To identify the components of an effective performance framework by researching those used in other jurisdictions;
- To suggest some elements for an outcome and performance framework for each of the priority areas;
- To identify **indicators** that could assist in demonstrating whether each performance measure has been met;
- To identify which of the outcome measures are appropriate for each of the CJA's statutory partners: police, prosecutors, courts, social work/probation, prisons/corrections, health and victims; In doing so, to improve shared understandings across the CJA; and
- To identify analytical gaps affecting current practice.

(note: focus on women, prolific offenders, violent offenders, families are areas in most need of development – relatively strong on sex

offenders and young people in the justice



Methods

1. Identifying jurisdictions where promising performance frameworks are currently in place.
2. Examining these frameworks against the academic literature on criminal justice outcomes, such as those on the effectiveness of community supervision and on desistance and facilitated change.
3. Identifying the performance measures best supported by the literature for each of the priority areas and starting to specify *indicators* that might help in informing and guiding practice.
4. Specifying which performance indicators are of particular relevance for which CJA partner, while maintaining the coherence of the overall framework, so that definitions and understanding will be the same across the CJA.

Gaps...

1. Some key themes intentionally omitted (sex offenders, young people/whole system approach).
2. Welfare system - more work to do on that.
3. Shape of information sharing and wider performance systems not captured.
4. What else is missing either by theme or by partner?

Health Warning!

This Framework is limited – but is it “good to think with”?

- **Limitations:** not everything important is equally easy to measure; not everything important (even if measurable) is an ‘offender outcome’.
- For each outcome measure we indicate, **tentatively** *but on the basis of international comparative experience*, which *direction of travel* we think should be considered favourable for that outcome.
- Of course even if fewer interventions of X variety are desirable those that are imposed are sometimes wholly necessary. AND
- Many involve contestable matters of policy (whether we should do more or less of something, or whether we should be aiming to do something else entirely).

Women in the justice system – Outcome Measures

- **Proportion of women living at (or returning to) accommodation where domestic abuse has been recorded – less is more positive.**
- **Proportion of women diverted from prosecutions (e.g. first time offenders, those with mental health problems) – higher is better.**
- **Proportion of women bailed – higher is more positive.**
- **Previous imprisonments? – fewer women returning to prison is more positive , although could be contested.**
- **Imprisoned for non-payment of fine? – fewer women imprisoned for such minor offences is positive.**
- **Proportion of orders successfully completed? – higher is better.**

Women in the justice system – Outcome Measures 2

- **Proportion of breaches due to chaotic lifestyle? – lower is better.**
- **Accommodation of childcare needs in regards of requirements (e.g. supervision attendance, unpaid work) – better processes in place is more positive.**
- **Proportion of women supervised by male worker – lower is better.**
- **Location unpaid work – higher proportion in women-only environment is more positive.**
- **Mortality rate following imprisonment – less is more positive.**
- **Contact with children? – frequent and more prolonged contact that starts earlier in the sentence is more positive.**
- **Family members present at ICM meetings? – greater attendance is more positive.**
- **Community workers present at ICM meetings? – greater attendance is more positive.**

Women in the justice system – Outcome Measures 3

- **Number of strip searches on female prisoners? – less is more positive**
- **Proportion of staff trained in women-centered practice? – higher is more positive**
- **Self-harm in prison – less is more positive (although issues around recording)**
- **Suicide attempts in prison – less is more positive (although issues around recording)**
- **Proportion of female offenders registering as homeless (while under supervision or on return from prison) – less is more positive**

Prolific Offenders – Outcome Measures

- **Monitor rates of offending – reduction in offending is better**
- **Calculate cost of offending – reduction in cost is better**
- **Number of negative contacts with offender – reduction is better**
- **Proportion of prolific offenders sent to prison who have additional license conditions imposed – higher is better**
- **Proportion of orders successfully completed – higher is better.**
- **Proportion of breaches – lower is better**
- **Waiting time for drug treatment in the community – shorter is better**
- **Proportion of treatments completed – higher is better**
- **Referrals to other appropriate agencies – higher is better**
- **Proportion of referrals to other agencies leading to meaningful contact – more is better**

Prolific Offenders – Outcome Measures 2

- Intensity of supervision – more frequent is better (but may lead to higher reconviction rates)
- When coming to the end of order – continued support in place
- Waiting time for drug/alcohol interventions in prison – shorter is better
- Proportion of started interventions completed – higher is better
- Referrals to other agencies – higher is better
- Proportion of referrals to other agencies that led to meaningful contact – more is better
- Proportion of prolific offenders who receive enhanced ICM procedures– higher is better
- Attendance of agencies/social worker from the community at ICM – higher is better
- Length of tenancy – longer indicates greater housing stability
- Match between housing need and accommodation provided^[1], or “safe, suitable and likely to last”^[2] – these could be rated on a scale of 1-5 (taken from women)

Violent Offenders – Offender Outcomes

- **For Community Payback Orders, percentage of hours given which are for rehabilitative programmes – higher is better**
- **Proportion of violent offenders in community-based anger management programme – higher is better**
- **Proportion of programmes completed – higher is better**
- **Proportion of prisoners convicted for crime related to violence or attempted violence engaged in anger management programmes (social skills training, cognitive therapy, relaxation techniques) – higher is better**
- **Proportion of prisoners convicted for crime related to violence or attempted violence who complete anger management programmes (social skills training, cognitive therapy, relaxation techniques) – higher is better**
- **Proportion of violent offenders sharing a cell – lower is better**

Violent Offenders – Offender Outcomes 2

- **Access to activities and life skills courses e.g. money management skills, educational and vocational training – increased is better**
- **Number of prison learning hours – higher is better**
- **Increased use of transition services. Coordination with housing services to assess needs post-release – earlier in the sentence is better**
- **Housing independence and stability (living in their own accommodation, contributing to cost of living, has their name on a lease, no more than one move in the post-release period) – increase is better**
- **Those leaving prison after short sentences are less likely to obtain housing upon release – higher number of short sentence violent offenders obtaining housing is better**

Families – Outcome Measures

- **Specific communities with above average incidents of crime – reduced rates are more positive**
- **Bail for adults with sole custody of child/children – higher is better**
- **Bail for adults who are main financial contributor in family with children – higher is better**
- **Number of children being referred to the Sheriff Court – lower is better**
- **Distance of prison from family – closer is usually better**
- **Access to child centred activities for prison visits – more is better**
- **Number of families of prisoners identified by and engaged with service providers – higher is better**
- **Number of families involved in pre-release planning – higher is better**
- **Number of families who lose their home during the imprisonment of main financial contributor – fewer is better**

Families – Outcome Measures 2

- Referrals to appropriate agencies to support families with a member returning from prisons – higher is better
- Incidents of domestic violence while under a social work order – less is better
- Number of adolescents and parents engaging in job training – higher is better
- Percentage of vulnerable children engaged in after school community activities – higher is better
- Numbers of parents completing parenting programmes – higher is better
- Percentage of most disadvantaged parents completing programmes – higher is better
- Number of families and children registered with a GP – higher is better
- Waiting time for drug treatment in the community – shorter is better

Families – Outcome Measures 3

- **Waiting time for counselling services – shorter is better**
- **Substance misuse among any family members – lower is better**
- **Rent arrears – less is better**
- **Housing independence and stability (living in their own accommodation, name on lease, no more than 2 moves in a year) – increase is better**
- **Children’s school attendance – higher is better**
- **Children’s risk of school exclusion – lower is better**
- **Social exclusion experienced by children at school – lower is better**
- **Parents and older adolescents involved in further education and training – higher is better**
- **Parents and older adolescents who complete further education and training programmes – higher is better**

Example of what this might mean for Housing....

- Proportion of female offenders registering as homeless (while under supervision or on return from prison) – less is more positive
- Length of tenancy – longer indicates greater housing stability
- Match between housing need and accommodation provided[1], or “safe, suitable and likely to last”[2] – these could be rated on a scale of 1-5 (taken from women offenders)
- Housing independence and stability (living in their own accommodation, contributing to cost of living, has their name on a lease, no more than one move in the post-release period) – increase is better
- Those leaving prison after short sentences are less likely to obtain housing upon release – higher number of short sentence violent offenders obtaining housing is better
- Rent arrears – less is better
- Housing independence and stability (living in their own accommodation, name on lease, no more than 2 moves in a year) – increase is better

What next?

1. Roadtesting until Autumn, 2014 (feedback and quality assurance in Scotland and elsewhere).
2. Dialogue with CPPs, justice, housing and welfare partners.
3. Workshop in November 2014 and formal launch.
4. Any suggestions?

Questions for this workshop....

- Is this framework good to think with?
- What is missing?
- What needs further analysis?
- What do you think has been included but needs strengthened?
- What key messages should we feed in on a general basis and on a theme by theme basis?

In summary

- How can we use this research to drive improvement and partnership development?
- Support for an offender outcomes approach while also responding to the needs of Government - and local democracy - to respond to scrutiny around offender 'groupings';
- We need to strike the balance between *managerial* (value for public money) and *welfarist* approaches to community justice *and* between *democratic* and *bureaucratic* accountability - will this research help us do that?

Thank you.
Any questions?

Rob Strachan rscja@scotborders.gov.uk

Richard Sparks r.sparks@ed.ac.uk