

---

UNIVERSITY OF  
NEWCASTLE



# An Evaluation Report of Clear Track

**Phase I Report** ERI/03/06  
March 2006

Sociology & Social Policy  
School of Geography, Politics  
and Sociology  
Claremont Bridge Building  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
NE1 7RU

**Evaluation/Management Team:**

Dr Elaine Campbell – Tel: +44 (0)191 2225030  
Fax: +44 (0)191 2227497

Email: [elaine.campbell@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:elaine.campbell@ncl.ac.uk)

Danna-Mechelle Lewis – Tel: +44 (0)191 2227502

Email: [danna-mechelle.lewis@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:danna-mechelle.lewis@ncl.ac.uk)

---



**SPRINGBOARD  
SUNDERLAND**



UNIVERSITY OF  
NEWCASTLE



# Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1</b>	Summary 1
<b>2</b>	Introduction 1
<b>3</b>	Background 1
	<b>Theories of Change</b> 2
<b>4</b>	The Housing Needs of Young Adult Offenders 2
<b>5</b>	The Effectiveness of Community Sentencing as an Alternative to Custody 3
<b>6</b>	Multi-agency Partnerships 3
	▪ Genericism versus Specialism 4
	<b>Process and Structure</b> 5
<b>7</b>	Addressing the Housing Needs of Young Adult Offenders 5
<b>8</b>	The Development of Multi-agency Partnerships 6
	▪ Working with Probation and the Courts 7
	▪ Implementing the Steering Group Committee 7
<b>9</b>	The Limitations of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 8
<b>10</b>	Implementing Clear Track as an Alternative to Custody 10
<b>11</b>	Criteria for Service Delivery and Good Practice 10
	▪ Criteria for Inclusion: The Referral Process 10
	▪ Criteria for Exclusion: Breach Proceedings 11
<b>12</b>	Staffing and Staff Development 11
	<b>The Impact Assessment of Clear Track</b> 12
<b>13</b>	Assessing the Effects of the Housing Needs of Young Adult Offenders 12
<b>14</b>	The Delivery of Multi-agency Partnership Interventions 13
	▪ The Steering Group Committee and its Influence 14
	▪ The Potential Impact of the Referral and Breach Process 14
<b>15</b>	Clear Track Requirements and their Impact in Challenging Offending Behaviour 14
<b>16</b>	Clear Track and its Staff 15

	<b>Efficiency Analysis</b>	16
<b>17</b>	Delivery of a Cost-effective and Efficient Project	16
<b>18</b>	Providing Cost-effective and Efficient Housing	16
<b>19</b>	Should the Clear Track Pilot Progress Further and if So, How?	17
	Abbreviations	20
	References	21
	Contact Details	22

## **Contents of Tables**

<b>ERI 2.1</b>	Table of the Requirements of the Generic Community Order	9
----------------	--	---

## 1 Summary

**1.1** Clear Track aims to work in partnership with probation, the courts and those agencies identified as having a primary role to play in the multi-agency delivery of care. This is an essential key to the success of the project and the delivery of an effective supportive intervention package.

**1.2** By providing this service Clear Track would be offering additional support to criminal justice agencies such as the Prison Service, the Magistrates' courts, and the Probation Service. This is achieved by freeing-up prison places for more serious offences and offenders, alleviating some of the unmanageable workload currently experienced by the Probation Service; and by offering sentencers a realistic alternative custodial sentencing option. These benefits would be brought to its full potential through the project's sustainability.

**1.3** The overall intention of providing an intensive, rehabilitative and reparative regime with supervision and accommodation is to reduce the negative outcomes which can accompany short-term custodial sentences such as loss of accommodation, problems with employment and loss of family ties.

**1.4** Providing a structured supportive package in this way, which pays great attention and sensitivity to young adult offenders' needs, can help deter individuals away from offending and also promote good citizenship and individual responsibility.

**1.5** On the whole, Clear Track aspires to provide a cost-effective and efficient service through the delivery of a comprehensive innovative package aimed at reducing re-offending.

## 2 Introduction

**2.1** This report presents the bi-annual report of Phase I of the evaluation of the Clear Track pilot project, following the Steering Group's confirmation of the evaluation proposal submitted at the end of December 2005<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the evaluation proposal entitled 'An Evaluation Proposal of Clear Track: Report EP/11/05' can be requested from Dr E. Campbell of Newcastle University.

**2.2** The proposal offers a detailed framework of the evaluation which is to be conducted over three years until 2008, and which will provide scientifically underpinned evidence of the effectiveness, efficiency and quality of the project, as well as monitoring its replicability and providing recommendations for taking the project forward.

**2.3** The overall rationale of the evaluation is organised around four levels of analysis which are capable of measuring and monitoring *what works? which mechanisms and processes are effective? under what conditions? and for which participants?* Presented under each of the key concepts is a series of detailed findings, these are:

- theories of change,
- process and structure,
- impact assessment of Clear Track,
- and efficiency analysis.

## 3 Background

**3.1** Set against the background of increased spending on the prison estate, overcrowded prisons, increased re-offending, and the publication of the 2004 Coulsfield Inquiry into 'Rethinking Crime and Punishment', the Home Secretary called for measures to *'provide good local community prisons which allow individuals to maintain family and community ties and have the ability to provide excellent support and interventions'*. This can be achieved when multi-agency partnerships co-ordinate services that are committed to working together to provide offenders with the *'right service in the right place, at the right time'* (Prison Reform Trust 2005).

**3.2** The points outlined above fundamentally underpin the creation of Clear Track as a concept. Community Service Volunteers (CSV) and Springboard Sunderland, alongside the Home Office Voluntary Sector Unit (VSU) established the three year pilot in the Sunderland area.

**3.3** By working closely with probation, magistrates and other relevant organisations, Clear Track aims to provide a realistic, viable and effective alternative custodial sentencing

option, through addressing the needs of young adult offenders<sup>2</sup>, and by delivering a holistic, intensive, rehabilitative and reparative regime in a supervised, residential setting.

## Theories of Change

### 4 The Housing Needs of Young Adult Offenders

**4.1** A large proportion of studies over the past few years have documented the links between homelessness and re-offending (see Home Office 2006, 2005, 2002a, Nacro 1991). Such studies and recent government research have identified that sustained reductions in crime are built on the foundations of decent, affordable, and stable housing. The Chief Executive of Nacro stated *'housing has tended to be marginal to the broad debate and policy around crime in a way that would be considered bizarre in matters of health, education, skills and employment'* she goes on to say *'the drug-addicted offender can receive the best drug treatment money can buy; the young offender the best of educations. But if their housing needs are not adequately met, the chances of their being able to play a full role in society, and turn their backs on crime are greatly diminished'* (Helen Edwards, Chief Executive of Nacro, 2001 Nacro Conference<sup>3</sup>). The DTLR Housing Minister goes on to argue *'there is no easy answer to reducing crime. But we can tackle the underlying problems of poverty and social exclusion...and we can ensure the housing needs of all vulnerable people in society are properly met'* (Sally Keeble MP, DTLR Housing Minister, 2001 Nacro Conference<sup>4</sup>).

**4.2** Thus, it becomes evident that practitioners and policy makers alike view stable and secure housing essential for offenders in a bid to reduce crime and re-offending. In an ideal situation,

offenders released from prison to be resettled back into the community, would be allocated appropriate accommodation; whilst those receiving short term prison sentences would be able to negotiate a 'period of absence' with the relevant housing authorities. However, this is not always the case, with a national shortage of available accommodation, a lack of government support and funding, local housing authority independence in selecting tenants with a 'good record', and the overall 'exclusionary' measures of prison, it is becoming increasingly difficult to house offenders in the community. The Prison Reform Trust (2005) found that one in four prisoners serving a short custodial sentence who previously had stable accommodation, lost their homes whilst in prison. Whilst prisoners released homeless were two and a half times more likely to re-offend when compared to those with homes to go to (Nacro 2000). The threat of homelessness is not only a concern for offenders whilst in prison; it is also a major concern upon release. Homelessness in this way may also prevent ex-prisoners from accessing support-services such as benefits or registering with a GP, as it becomes far more difficult to access such services when an individual is of no fixed abode (Social Exclusion Unit 2002).

**4.3** Clear Track aims to tackle some of the issues which are currently associated with short term prison sentences. By providing a residential community custodial sentence aimed at addressing offending behavioural needs on an individual level, the project participant would be able to maintain social and family links whilst receiving the necessary supervision and interventions within their community. This 'social inclusion' approach reduces the negative outcome of loss of accommodation and its consequences, whilst potentially impacting upon offending behaviour and subsequent re-offending rates.

---

<sup>2</sup> Clear Track is currently in the process of developing an operational definition of the eligibility and suitability of potential participants, including suitable levels of risk.

<sup>3</sup> See Nacro News article *'Crime reduction starts with good housing, not more police, Nacro Conference told'*, <http://www.nacro.org.uk/templates/news/newsitem.cfm/2001120500.htm/archive> viewed 10/02/06

<sup>4</sup> Ibidem

## **5 The Effectiveness of Community Sentencing as an Alternative to Custody**

**5.1** In 1995 the Home Office described the main purpose of community sentencing orders as *'to prevent further offending by re-integrating the offender into the community through punishment by means of positive and demanding unpaid work...'* (Home Office 1995).

**5.2** By 2002 the Home Office National Standards had moved away from a disciplinary approach towards a more rehabilitative outlook expressing that offenders have to be fully occupied and the placements should be physically, emotionally or mentally demanding. Referring to the purpose of community sentencing as:

- providing a rigorous and effective punishment,
- reducing the likelihood of re-offending,
- rehabilitating the offender, where possible,
- enabling reparation to be made to the community,
- and minimising the risk of harm to the public. (Home Office 2002b)

The overall aim in achieving this would be to change attitudes and behaviours, and teach employment-related and problem-solving skills through 'modelling, reinforcement and guided-learning' (National Probation Service 2002).

**5.3** The process which contributes towards challenging offending behaviour must first be grounded in the knowledge of the triggers or causes of such behaviour. In 1999, a Home Office research study identified a number of social factors that affected the likelihood of re-offending; these included drug use, problems with employment and unemployment, problems with accommodation, financial problems and offenders with multiple problems. Other significant factors which were related to reconvictions were peer group pressure, problems with relationships, and being a past victim of violence.

**5.4** Similarly, a Social Exclusion Unit study into *'reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners'* (2002) found that prisoners who did not take part

in education or training were three times more likely to be re-convicted. The study also found that young offenders in custody had poor literacy and numeracy skills with just under a third having basic skills deficits, compared to under a quarter of those aged 25 and over. The Social Exclusion Unit went on to state that basic skills learning could contribute towards the reduction in re-offending by around 12 per cent.

**5.5** Furthermore there is evidence to suggest that an offender's experience of a community sentence could have a positive impact upon their offending behaviour. McIvor (1992) found that reconviction rates were lower amongst offenders who believed community sentences were worthwhile; she states *'contact with the beneficiaries had given offenders an insight into other people and an increased insight into themselves; the acquisition of skills had instilled in them greater confidence and self-esteem'* (McIvor 1998). Evidence has also shown that the supervision of offenders in the community could bring about positive changes in behaviour (see Barry and McIvor 2000).

**5.6** On the whole, it would seem that the effectiveness of a community sentence in reducing re-offending is partly due to identifying and tackling offender-related needs. Thus, in order for Clear Track to be able to effectively reduce re-offending it would need to ensure the delivery of a wide range of interventions tailored to address the needs of young adult offenders, whilst regularly monitoring and reviewing the development and progress of its participants.

## **6 Multi-agency Partnerships**

**6.1** In developing better partnerships to reduce re-offending Her Majesty's Government *'five year strategy for protecting the public and reducing re-offending'* states *'when offenders are committed to changing, we want offender managers to be able to call on support for them in a very wide range of areas...'* the report goes on to stress *'partnership working is in everyone's interests because tackling the problems offenders have tackles social exclusion and helps make society better and safer for everyone'* (Home Office 2006).

**6.2** In light of this Clear Track are committed to developing strong partnerships in tackling offending behaviour and reducing re-offending; such partnerships extend across the Home Office VSU, CSV and Springboard, as well as developing partnerships with the Probation Service, the Magistrates' courts and Youth Offending Teams (YOTs). Clear Track will also work together with local voluntary and community organisations, for example, Millennium Volunteers, community police, drug intervention practitioners, and Job Centre Plus, who will assist in the delivery of care for young adult offenders.

### ▪ **Genericism versus Specialism**

**6.3** Comparing the use of probation in England and Wales with other countries, it is possibly the largest and most professionalised, with service delivery probably the most coherent and accountable (Worrall and Hoy 2005). The service was developed in little more than a century from being a localised, voluntary, evangelical outreach provision<sup>5</sup> to being a profession whose work is integral to the criminal justice system by acting as advisors to courts – both criminal and civil – by supervising offenders in the community, and by supporting and supervising prisoners and ex-prisoners.

**6.4** The Probation Service today, however, has developed significantly alongside national standards and government strategies. The Home Office (1991) Blue Paper *'Organising Supervision and Punishment in the Community'* which emphasised the need for structured organisational change aimed at rationalising the service, limited the service's financial resources, making it more accountable to other criminal justice agencies, especially the courts. In

---

<sup>5</sup> The Probation Service had its roots in the work of the nineteenth century police court missionaries, first employed by the Church of England Temperance Society in 1876 to 'reclaim' offenders charged with drunkenness or drink-related offences. The Probation of Offenders Act 1907 gave Magistrates' courts the right to appoint probation officers whose role was to advise, assist and befriend offenders placed under this supervision, see <http://www.probationboards.co.uk/Facing%20Crime/A%20History%20of%20Probation/briefhistory.htm>, and <http://www.bbc.co.uk/crime/fighters/probationservice.shtml>, viewed 26/02/06.

essence, this could be viewed as the government's attempt at holding individual probation officers more accountable to management and management more accountable to the government<sup>6</sup> (see Home Office 1992).

**6.5** As well as issuing direction on the accountability of the supervision of offenders in the community, the government emphasised the need for probation to develop 'partnerships in dealing with offenders in the community' (Home Office 1990). Because of this there is a degree of tension between the 'care' and 'control' of offenders; and between 'accountability' particularly in the interests of protecting the public and the governments demands to work in partnership with other organisations within the community.

**6.6** In reality, adopting a more generic approach brings with it an element of apprehension in relation to issues of accountability and responsibility between agencies, perhaps resulting in a sense of occupational identity for the Probation Service set against the background of organisational restructuring through the introduction of the National Offenders Management Service (NOMs).

**6.7** In light of this, the Probation Service faces a different kind of challenge in working with voluntary sector organisations such as Clear Track, whose experience and professionalism in relation to this kind of work shares many of the offender-management elements familiar to the Probation Service, such as grounding service delivery in alternative, innovative practices.

**6.8** Nevertheless, the governments position is firm in emphasising that *'there is a large untapped resource'* within the voluntary sector that should be utilised to maximise the rehabilitative outcomes for every offender in achieving reductions in re-offending (Prison Reform Trust 2005). This may not be easy to achieve, particularly when the very different historic cultures of criminal justice agencies are

---

<sup>6</sup> Following the publication of the Home Office Blue Paper, the National Probation Service issued its first set of National Standards for the supervision of offenders in the community (see Home Office 1992).

brought together alongside non-profit making organisations.

## Process and Structure

### 7 Addressing the Housing Needs of Young Adult Offenders

**7.1** In exploring the potential needs of the project's participants, the Clear Track management team explored some of the key interventions which social housing and local housing authorities have employed to meet the needs of those vulnerable individuals most at risk of homelessness; for example, young people who are excluded from school, who have runaway from home, who have poor relationships with their parents<sup>7</sup>, and those who need supported independent living arrangements within the community<sup>8</sup>.

**7.2** The Shelter 'safe in the city' Cluster Schemes Model, which successfully ran for six years in 1998, demonstrated the ability to prevent homelessness of those young people most at risk. Cluster schemes provide intensive, integrated programmes of support; by adopting a multi-agency partnership approach the scheme was able to develop strong community links in order to sustain the programmes support.

**7.3** The overall concept of the Cluster Schemes model will be integrated within the informative process of developing the project's residential provisions. By attempting to tackle the problems that can lead to homelessness in advance of crisis

---

<sup>7</sup> See the Safe in the City, Cluster Schemes Model, <http://england.shelter.org.uk/policy/policy-926.cfm>, viewed 10/02/06.

<sup>8</sup> The Satellite Housing Programme is a supported, independent living arrangement for adults who have a mental disability (see <http://www.familyservicend.org/srv-housing.html>, viewed 15/02/06). It is a community-based transitional housing programme that provides support and structure, while encouraging movement towards independent living. This American model was successfully adopted by Sunderland City Council, who in 2003 launched a similar programme 'supporting people, supporting independence' aimed at delivering high quality, cost effective, housing-related support services for a range of identified vulnerable people (see, <http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/supportingpeople/>, viewed 16/02/06).

point being reached, such as exclusion from the community, Clear Track will be able to deliver an intensive package of seamless support through multi-agency working as opposed to other more conventional methods. The intention here being that participants receive intensive, personalised programmes based within the project and its residential supervision. This will offer individuals opportunities to gain access to health services, employment, education and other essential resources that are the most appropriate for them, delivered in the order that is the most appropriate, whilst remaining in a community setting. The importance of addressing needs such as these is also reflected by the Government's National Action Plan framework for reducing re-offending (Home Office 2004).

**7.4** Providing access to resources of this kind is an essential step towards the rehabilitative measures used to tackle re-offending and attitudes towards offending behaviour. However, in providing residential supervision the overall aim of the project will be to provide a stable and supportive tenancy whilst enhancing responsible independent living. Such supported accommodation allows individuals to live independently and have access to twenty-four hour enhanced support if needed. This will help Clear Track participants to maintain independence and choice in their lives whilst at the same time promoting social inclusion. Models of this kind have been proven to work effectively in reducing homelessness, lowering incidences of anti-social behaviour, the management of risk associated with offenders and in providing a cost-effective good value service (Sunderland City Council 2004).

**7.5** The success of incorporating the Cluster Schemes model (Dickens and Woodfield 2005) and the 'supporting people, supporting independence' strategy (Sunderland City Council 2004) within the Clear Track process and structure, is partly dependent upon the type of property selected to meet the criteria of the programme's needs, and the needs of its participants. Careful consideration needs to be given to the type of accommodation required and its location, particularly when considering the reaction of the local residents. It may be considered socially unacceptable to house



offenders in the community, which also lends itself to the question, should Clear Track remain anonymous within the community?

**7.6** Once appropriate accommodation has been found, Clear Track will be able to provide enhanced supervision in a residential setting for its participants who have been convicted of an offence. The aim at this stage is for Clear Track to provide staggered levels of supervision throughout the intervention period, from intense supervision at one end of the accommodation scale towards independent living at the other. The ultimate goal being that participants live as independently as possible in the community as responsible tenants. Initial assessments would determine the level of supervision and life skill training required in order to achieve this. The assessment stage would also contribute towards monitoring behaviour and attitudes towards offending and the risk of re-offending, whilst at the same time identified levels of supervision would contribute towards protecting the public by reducing the likelihood of re-offending.

**7.7** Still, the intensive supervision and interactive regimes which Clear Track aims to provide could become an expensive resource and should only be used for those requiring this level of supervision. On the other hand, prospective participants should not present an unacceptable level of risk to either the community or to Clear Track and its staff.

**7.8** Having secured a lease on a privately rented property and a one-bedroom property from Sunderland Housing authority, the Clear Track project is in a position to house young adult offenders from March 2006. In addition, Clear Track's management team negotiated with Sunderland Housing Authority the allocation of up to eight houses once suitable accommodation becomes available.

**7.9** The properties, which are located in different parts of the city, can in total house up to six young people. As Clear Track grows and expands, it is planned that so too will the range of accommodation which aims to be as varied and diverse as possible depending upon the perceived needs and risk-factors associated with each individual participant. In due course, this will result in a 'scattered-site' approach to acquiring property across Sunderland city. A report '*Preventing Crime: What works, What doesn't,*

*What's Promising*' by the US National Institute of Justice (1998) supported the scattered-site residential strategy. It mentioned that residential programmes for juvenile offenders in rural settings fail to significantly reduce repeat offending; however dispersing inner-city public housing residents to scattered-site suburban public housing reduced risk-factors for crime including high school dropout rates. In addition to this, the report mentioned that intensive supervision and after-care of less serious juvenile offenders and intensive supervision and after-care of serious juvenile offenders were promising as '*what works*' strategies in reducing future offending and re-arrests.

**7.10** Furthermore, the project is also considering the possibility of purchasing accommodation, or purchasing land in order to build appropriate accommodation.

**7.11** The overall aim of the project's accommodation strategy is to develop a large portfolio of properties which will offer different levels of support for participants, with at least one property offering continuous enhanced support for those individuals requiring such levels of care and supervision. However, Clear Track's accommodation strategy should not be mistaken with 'bail hostel' accommodation strategies, partly because the project's participants will always be tenants within their own right<sup>9</sup> and partly because this diverts away from the project's aim to promote and encourage responsible independent living.

## **8 The Development of Multi-agency Partnerships**

**8.1** With respect to formalising good working relationships and in the interests of delivering an efficient supportive intervention package aimed at addressing the multiple needs of young adult offenders, Clear Track will work in partnership with probation, the courts and those agencies identified as having a primary role to play in the multi-agency delivery of care. In the offenders' best interests, each agency adopts a

---

<sup>9</sup> Although Springboard Sunderland will either own or hold head leases for all the accommodation used and they will all be fully compliant with all necessary regulations, for example Health and Safety regulations.

specialist approach whilst aspiring to the same ambitions which are designed to reduce re-offending and protect the public.

## ▪ **Working with Probation and the Courts**

**8.2** The interdependent relationship between probation, the courts and Clear Track is partly due to the way in which magistrates request pre-sentence reports and the way in which they sentence convicted offenders. Pre-sentence reports influence magistrates' decisions through informative measures aimed at addressing various levels of risk, and through suggesting appropriate sentencing options for the given offence. This decision is partly influenced by the Probation Service who liaises with the offender in producing the pre-sentence report. In practice it is at this stage that probation would recommend Clear Track as an alternative to custody and a viable sentencing option to magistrates when considering sentencing.

**8.3** However, the referral process is somewhat more complicated than is outlined above; there are issues of client eligibility and suitability, levels of risk which are posed by the offender and levels of supervision required to protect victims and the public, alongside accountability and governance issues. With this in mind, a close working relationship with both the courts and the Probation Service is integral to the referral process for the Clear Track project when mapping out these issues.

**8.4** The support of local magistrates at Sunderland and Houghton-le-Spring courts from the outset was largely due to the flexibility of the Chief Clerk to the Justices who recognised the need for Clear Track as an alternative to custodial sentencing options for magistrates. This offered the project's management team invaluable access through presentations and workshops to inform magistrates of the full potential of the project.

**8.5** The development of a working relationship with the Probation Service was somewhat more complicated due to the unforeseen legalities of the Criminal Justice Act. Due to the innovative nature of Clear Track there appeared to be an element of confusion with regard to the Criminal Justice Act and its flexibility in accommodating the project as a 'third sentencing option' combining both custody and community

sentences. (Home Office 2002c). The fundamental importance of this legal technicality delayed both the development of the Clear Track project and the inter-agency partnership with probation. However in retrospect, the benefits of resolving this matter in the grand scheme of the project will outweigh the initial delay to 'going-live'. Given the increased efficiency of the project's management team this time was utilised constructively to design and develop protocols essential to the process and structure of the project, such as a service user's handbook, accommodation rules, a service user's admission pack, generic risk assessments and admissions assessment strategies, and a one year work plan.

**8.6** In addition to working alongside probation and the courts, the project has also networked with other local community agencies such as community police, youth offending teams, drug intervention practitioners, local education and health service agencies and employment agencies, for example Job Centre Plus and Millennium Volunteers.

## ▪ **Implementing the Steering Group Committee**

**8.7** The offending and offender focus of the steering group should always be central to the Steering Group agenda. Members of the Steering Group must be senior managers with the authority to make decisions and carry out suitable recommendations. It was suggested at the opening of the Steering Group meeting that an impartial member of the committee would make the most suitable chair. A senior representative from the Home Office VSU was selected to fulfil this role.

**8.8** Representatives from a range of agencies formed the Steering Group committee; these included Her Majesty's Prison Service National Offender and Voluntary Sector co-ordinator, the Area Manager for the South of the Tyne Northumbria Probation Service, Chief Clerk to the Justices of Sunderland and Houghton-le-Spring Magistrates' courts, CSV Director of Training and Enterprise, Springboard Sunderland Trust Secretary, Drug Intervention Practitioners' co-ordinator, Clear Track

management team, and the evaluation team. At this early stage of the project's development discussions mainly evolved around the process and structure of Clear Track particularly in relation to the legalities of the project, such as accountability, liability and governance. Minutes of all meetings are available in confidence from the Clear Track management team.

**8.9** With respect to the steering group committee, the Clear Track management team have identified the need to draw together members of supporting agencies within the community, such as community police, drug intervention practitioners, local education and health agencies and employment agencies, to establish a practitioner's group committee. A practitioner group of this kind would be designed to provide a multi-agency management structure to support the needs of Clear Track and its participants. Overall efforts should be made to continually strengthen multi-agency working in the strategic planning and development of Clear Track.

## **9 The Limitations of the Criminal Justice Act 2003**

Key changes to the sentencing framework available to sentencers came into effect in April 2005 as a result of the Criminal Justice Act 2003<sup>10</sup>. The changes were brought into effect as part of the reform to the sentencing framework, with the aim of increasing its effectiveness at reducing re-offending, targeting prison sentences for more serious offenders and providing robust powers to deal with dangerous offenders.

**9.1** This included the introduction of the new community sentencing framework which resulted in a single generic community order<sup>11</sup> with a range of possible requirements<sup>12</sup>. The new order combines punishment with changing offenders'

---

<sup>10</sup> A copy of the Act can be found at <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/20030044.htm>, viewed 20/02/06.

<sup>11</sup> As outlined in Chapters 2 – 4 under part 12 *Sentencing of the Criminal Justice Act 2003* Chapter 44.

<sup>12</sup> This does not apply to 16-17 year olds until at least April 2007, see Youth Justice Board 2005, *Criminal Justice Act; Guidance for Youth Offending Teams*, Youth Justice Board England and Wales, <http://www.youth-justice-board.gov.uk/Publications/Downloads/CJA%2003%20Yot%20GuidanceOct.pdf>, viewed 25/02/06.

behaviour and compensatory measures sometimes directly to the victim of the crime. The order comprises of one or more of twelve possible requirements combined to produce an individual package for each adult offender, with the content of the sentence determined by risk of harm, likelihood of reconviction and offending –related needs (see table ERI 1.1).

**9.2** Despite the new provisions within the Criminal Justice Act 2003, the sentencing framework fails to reflect the Home Office White Paper's advice (2002c) which called for a '*genuine third option...that combines community and custody sentences*'. On the whole, this reduces the feasibility of the implementation of potential programmes such as Clear Track which aim to bridge the gap between community and custodial sentencing.

**9.3** Still, until matters are resolved at government level negotiations may be made under the single generic community order<sup>13</sup>. Clear Track as an intensive pilot intervention comprises of several of the twelve basic requirements outlined in the Criminal Justice Act 2003 such as unpaid work (as defined by section 199), supervision (as defined by section 213), residence (as defined by 206) and attendance centre (as defined by section 214). However, the Act states that unpaid work cannot be required by the court unless specifically recommended by the pre-sentence report.

**9.4** Whilst Clear Track is represented by several of the twelve basic requirements, the question remains would the project be suitable for those young adult offenders likely to be sentenced under the order. In defining suitability the National Probation Board (2005) states '*while there is no legislative requirement relating to intensive orders, such orders are likely to be suitable for those offenders at the high seriousness level of the community order, who may also be at the threshold of custody*'. In relation to the national implementation guidelines of the new community sentence structure probation goes on to say '*the guidance provides twelve basic (model) combinations and*

---

<sup>13</sup> As defined under section 177, Chapter Two *Community Orders: Offenders Aged 16 or Over*, of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, Chapter 44, Part 12, *Sentencing*. Go to <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/30044--p.htm>

### **Table ERI 2.1 Requirements of the Generic Community Order**

Section 177 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 states: where a person aged 16 or over is convicted of an offence, the court by or before which he is convicted may make an order (in this part referred to as a “community order”) imposing on him any one or more of the following requirements:

- |                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| ▪ unpaid work             | as defined by section 199                           |
| ▪ supervision             | as defined by section 213                           |
| ▪ activity                | as defined by section 201                           |
| ▪ programme (accredited)  | as defined by section 202                           |
| ▪ drug rehabilitation     | as defined by section 209                           |
| ▪ alcohol treatment       | as defined by section 212                           |
| ▪ mental health treatment | as defined by section 207                           |
| ▪ residence               | as defined by section 206                           |
| ▪ prohibited activity     | as defined by section 203                           |
| ▪ exclusion               | as defined by section 205                           |
| ▪ curfew                  | as defined by section 204                           |
| ▪ attendance centre       | as defined by section 214 (for those aged under 25) |

(Criminal Justice Act 2003)

Each community order will comprise of one or more of the requirements above, these must be:

- compatible with each other
- suitable for the offender
- able to ensure that restrictions of liberty is commensurate with the seriousness of the offence
- not in conflict with the offender’s religious beliefs, or with the requirements of work, education or another order

The Criminal Justice Act 2003 states that a number of the requirements cannot be made by a court unless specifically recommended by the pre-sentence reports, these are:

- unpaid work
- activity
- programme

(Youth Justice Board 2005)

*indicates that there is no maximum number of requirements for those offenders in the high seriousness band of the community order, but as a guide, in most cases there should be a minimum of three to four core requirements, one of which should be supervision’.*

**9.5** In light of this, it can be seen that there are potential provisions for Clear Track as a basic requirement of a community order. The dilemma however lies in the overall recognition of Clear Track as either an order or a requirement of the courts. As a pilot intervention this could impact upon the overall outcome of the project in relation to measuring its success. Furthermore, the success of future similar projects could be dependant upon the resolution of limitations within the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

## **10 Implementing Clear Track as an Alternative to Custody.**

**10.1** As a community custodial sentencing option Clear Track aims to reduce re-offending and to promote citizenship by assisted reintegration into society. To accomplish this Clear Track will concentrate on addressing offending behaviour and assisting with offender related needs through a structured weekly programme of interdependent concurrent activities as well as:

- discouraging participants away from crime whilst on the project,
- keeping participants occupied,
- providing participants with a sense of purpose,
- providing a range of work-based learning activities, interventions and voluntary work,
- helping and supporting participants with emotional, physical and mental health needs including substance misuse,
- rebuilding the confidence and self-esteem of participants in doing everyday things,

- helping and supporting the rebuilding of relationships with families and personal development,
- and developing cognitive skills through challenging perceptions of self and others, attitudes towards offending and motivational issues.

## **11 Criteria for Service Delivery and Good Practice**

**11.1** Given the complexity of Clear Track as an innovative service drawing together several interventions, it is necessary to consider the protocols in relation to key areas of work which aid in the delivery of good practice. Generally procedures are agreed as a priority in advance of ‘going-live’; however it is not unusual in the interests of research and development for them to evolve throughout the pilot period. Record keeping of service delivery would also contribute towards the validity of the project, ensuring its consistency and reliability with those authorities held accountable.

**11.2** There are several key protocols which are applicable to Clear Track when managing offenders and the project, such as the referral process, breach proceedings, supervision and residential rules and procedures, a holistic assessment framework, codes of conduct for both staff and participants and an ‘exit’ strategy. The Clear Track management team are working alongside probation, CSV and Springboard Sunderland management to successfully formalise and implement these procedures.

### **Criteria for Inclusion: The Referral Process**

**11.3** The referral process works on several levels; firstly the Probation Service must recommend eligible candidates for Clear Track to magistrates as outlined in pre-sentence reports. Secondly, given the advice of the pre-sentence reports, magistrates must then consider appropriate sentencing in relation to the severity of the offence committed in light of the offender’s previous convictions. Finally, Clear Track’s management team would then consider

the suitability of the project in addressing the needs of candidates.

**11.4** Potential Clear Track participants could be filtered out of the referral process at all stages should the project be deemed inappropriate by either the Probation Service, magistrates or the Clear Track management team. As a result it becomes necessary for the project to establish a criterion for inclusion where both probation and magistrates are able to assess the eligibility of offenders for the project. Additionally, Clear Track's management team would carefully need to consider the suitability of the project for each individual candidate, as there would be limited benefit for inappropriately selected cases. The suitability of the project in addressing individual needs would also be highlighted at the initial assessment stage.

**11.5** Such procedures are vital particularly when considering the level of 'risk' the offender may pose in terms of the severity of the offence and the likelihood of re-offending. As a result custody may be the only option available in some circumstances. Thus, this triage of communication could ultimately act as a protective proviso, the accuracy of which is partly dependent upon the appropriate considerations within pre-sentence reports. However, this should not be misunderstood as a subjective filter, eliminating those candidates deemed as likely to fail.

**11.6** The Clear Track management team are supportive of the eligibility and suitability criteria for inclusion that considers conditions such as sentence length, severity of offence, age, gender, and conditions of residence; for example individuals referred from the Sunderland and Houghton-le-Spring Magistrates' courts will be residing in the Sunderland area. However, there are also potential dangers which could accompany such selection processes, such as selecting candidates who are certain to succeed in the programme. For this reason and in maintaining an objective approach the project's management team aim to assess each candidate individually.

**11.7** By adopting a joint referral process Clear Track will be in a position to liaise with an allocated probation officer minimising the number of candidates who may be inappropriately selected for the project. To

achieve this a Clear Track representative would aim to respond to a referred offender within one hour of being sentenced.

**11.8** The intention at this stage is for Clear Track referrals to be made via the Magistrates' courts with a long-term view to considering the suitability of referrals from the Crown Court.

#### ▪ **Criteria for Exclusion: Breach Proceedings**

**11.9** With respect to implementing an eligibility and suitability criteria, Clear Track aims to adopt a 'no exclusion' approach to its structured activities by encouraging individuals to partake in the daily regime of their tailored programme; however, there may be times when an individual can no longer be included in the project due to a breach of the court order. Breach of a court order is viewed as a serious offence by the courts and Probation Service.

**11.10** Through providing 'joint-supervision' Clear Track and probation will work together in monitoring non-compliance of the court order. In establishing an effective breach process Clear Track aims to adopt the National Probation Service's national standards of non-compliance. Stringent procedures are in place to deal swiftly with non-attendance and re-offending. Should breach occur the courts will still have the option to allow the order to run if continued engagement is deemed the most appropriate option.

**11.11** However, an element of responsibility lies with Clear Track in supporting its participants and in informing them of the expectations, boundaries and rules of the project through house rules and policies, codes of conduct and other informative measures relevant to the project.

## **12 Staffing and Staff Development**

**12.1** Existing Springboard Sunderland staff were seconded to manage and develop the pilot project. Short-term secondments of staff from their parent agencies can provide flexibility in order to meet a range of needs and an ability to respond adequately to the changing

circumstances of a three year pilot, offering people who are appointed job security in their host organisation. At the same time, the project's sustainability would provide seconded staff with the opportunity to agree confirmation of employment in their current position.

**12.2** Both the project manager and deputy manager were appointed due to their demonstrated knowledge and diverse skills, including knowledge about and commitment to the delivery of the project. The Clear Track team also comprises of a mentoring officer, whose role would be committed to advising and supporting the project's participants whilst acting as a positive role model.

**12.3** Commitment to the project may become divided when seconded staff have a dual-role of responsibility between agencies. It is essential that the success of the pilot is not compromised in this way, the key point being that staff remain focused on the implementation and delivery of the project in maximising its success, as well as taking full advantage of shared responsibility amongst the Clear Track team when undertaking such operations.

**12.4** In the interests of delivering an efficient and effective service, Clear Track would benefit from an imaginative approach to staffing which would encompass an appropriate mix of a wide range of skills and experience. To achieve this Clear Track will create a pool of sessional workers.

**12.5** An advertisement was placed in the papers of the local community to attract potential candidates within the area<sup>14</sup> who possessed experience in working with hard to help individuals who may have a history of offending, as well as up-to-date knowledge in current issues affecting young people with a criminal record. Duties and responsibilities for the position included:

- supporting and supervising individuals and or groups on Clear Track,

---

<sup>14</sup> On the 8<sup>th</sup> of February an advertisement was placed in the Sunderland Echo newspaper – Wearside's local paper including Sunderland, on the 9<sup>th</sup> of February an advertisement was placed in the Evening Chronicle newspaper – a North East region-wide local paper including Northumberland and the coast, Newcastle and Gateshead. The closing date for applications was the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2006.

- maintaining appropriate effective records, including individual action plans and reviews,
- preparing and implementing work schedules for Clear Track participants,
- liaising with the Clear Track Manager and other Springboard staff with regard to the performance and development of participants,
- assisting in liaisons with families and other relevant agencies,
- assisting in the development and organisation of learning programmes for participants,
- carrying out duties in accordance with quality systems and procedures which are currently in force throughout Springboard Sunderland,
- contributing to the maintenance of a safe and efficient environment within the guidelines of Springboard Sunderland's Health and Safety, Equal Opportunities and other policy guidance with regard for the health, safety and welfare of participants and staff,
- assisting in the continuous enhancement of the work of Springboard, including new initiatives and developments as part of the ongoing commitment to quality and progress.

**12.6** Over seventy application packs were requested from a range of professions including prison officers, police officers and probation staff. Interviews for successful applicants<sup>15</sup> are to be held on the 28<sup>th</sup> of February 2006.

## **The Impact Assessment of Clear Track**

### **13 Assessing the Effects of the Housing Needs of Young Adult Offenders**

**13.1** Providing enhanced residential supervision for Clear Track's participants is a fundamental key to the overall outcome of the project's aims.

---

<sup>15</sup> Nineteen candidates have been short listed for interview alongside three additional internal applicants.

It essentially impacts upon the project and its participant's at several junctures. These are as follows:

- Providing residential supervision within a community setting impacts directly upon local residents within the surrounding area. Where prisons exclude offenders from society in a bid to protect the public by reducing the likelihood of re-offending, residential supervision in the community exposes the public to the potential risk of causing serious harm to victims, the public or the likelihood of re-offending. Careful consideration needs to be given to minimising the impact of these risks.

- The financial restraints of the project complicate the decision to purchase or to rent suitable property in order to be able to provide residential supervision. This complex debate identifies both the benefits and barriers that could potentially impact upon the project. Purchasing property could increase the value of the project, whilst allowing the freedom to restructure the property to match Clear Track's accommodation needs. At the same time however, inflated property values and the additional cost of renovation work could consume a large portion of the limited budget. Renting property on the other hand, could be viewed as a financial loss bringing with it restraints such as accountability and liability of the building and limits to building modifications. In addition to this, most offenders with housing needs will not qualify as a priority for housing assistance by local housing authorities who are currently experiencing extensive waiting lists due to a national shortage of available housing.

- Providing enhanced supervision within a residential setting differentiates Clear Track from other community-based sentencing. The provision of enhanced supervision increases confidence amongst magistrates in using this sentencing option for offenders as an alternative to custody particularly when considering issues around re-offending, non-compliance with the order and the risk of absconding. Supervision within a residential setting may also be the crucial difference between motivating offenders to attend the project and the risk of non-compliance or a breach of court orders.

## **14 The Delivery of Multi-agency Partnership Interventions**

**14.1** Developing strong multi-agency partnerships is an essential key to the success of Clear Track when delivering a wide range of interventions tailored to address the needs of young adult offenders on an individual level. Acting as advocates, the Probation Service, the courts and other local agencies are ideally placed to promote the best interests of Clear Track, particularly as the project not only impacts upon its participants, it also impacts upon the confidence of sentencing decisions and upon community confidence in promoting public safety.

**14.2** Furthermore, an amicable inter-agency partnership between the Probation Service and Clear Track would be of advantage to both parties. By bridging the gap between community penalties and current custodial sentences, Clear Track could effectively alleviate some of the unmanageable workload currently experienced by the Probation Service through joint supervision and the management of offenders (Morgan 2003, Rethinking Crime and Punishment 2003).

**14.3** Clear Track could also provide the Probation Service with an opportunity to enhance available sentencing options for sentencers. Should the pilot prove successful in becoming a national strategy, the Probation Service will be in a position to converge with its success as well as being able to demonstrate an acquired professional knowledge which would assist in the implementation of future projects. Above all else, a successful project would impact upon professionally audited targets and goals. At the same time Clear Track would benefit from the longstanding experience and expertise of the Probation Service in effectively managing offenders.

**14.4** As a pilot intervention and a non-profit making organisation, Clear Track will be aiming to provide a cost-efficient and effective service at no additional cost to the Probation Service which in turn could impact upon their cost-benefit efficiency.

**14.5** As has been discussed earlier, the limitations of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 delayed the development of both the project and



the inter-agency partnership with the Probation Service. The fundamental importance of this legal technicality needs to be addressed in full particularly as recognised government representatives urge the development of alternatives to prison through community custody as sentencing options (see the Prison Reform Trust 2005, Coulsfield Inquiry 2004, Lord Chancellor's Department 2002 and Rethinking Crime and Punishment 2002), yet the restrictions of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 impacts upon the implementation of such developments. Given the success of the Clear Track pilot and should Clear Track be implemented as a national strategy the relevant government bodies would need to rethink the structure of the Criminal Justice Act on the back of their 'Rethinking Crime and Punishment' campaign.

#### ▪ **The Steering Group Committee and its Influence**

**14.6** The Steering Group and practitioners' group Committee will be able to provide continual support in their commitment to 'joint-working' and the strategic development of Clear Track. However, there is a need within the development of successful steering group committees to establish mechanisms which aid the negotiations of the strategic planning and decision making process, particularly when interest conflicts arise between multi-agency partners. Having adopted a more central role than any other partner, the Home Office VSU representative is best placed to mediate between the interests of the agencies should the need arise.

#### ▪ **The Potential Impact of the Referral and Breach Process**

**14.7** Overall, referral to Clear Track as a sentencing option aims to impact upon prison overcrowding freeing prison places for serious offences and offenders, the benefits of which would be brought to its full potential should the project become a national strategy. Furthermore, Clear Track offers magistrates an alternative to custodial sentencing options for those offences at the threshold of a custodial sentence.

**14.8** The benefits of adopting the Probation Service referral criteria means Clear Track will be working with a robust model which has been embedded within offender management good practice guidelines. However, there is a need for the project's management team to carefully consider the limitations which could be imposed through the client group eligibility and suitability process.

**14.9** As a pilot project Clear Track is in a position where documentation of this kind and formal efficient record keeping is a necessity for exploring and building upon '*what works*' in the management of the project and for the development of future projects, however this should not be mistaken as an exercise for describing how existing decisions were made. In addition to this, formal procedures need to be established in relation to information sharing and storage between the multi-agency partnerships.

**14.10** In addition to the referral process, non-compliance would need to be closely monitored by both probation and the Clear Track management team. Given the high needs of the client group and the strenuous demands made of them there may be some individual cases of non-compliance, which is not an uncommon outcome of court orders. Should this occur Clear Track would need to review its policies and interventions to try to highlight why this may have happened. However, a series of breach proceedings should alert the management team to a shortfall in support and provisions which could subsequently impact upon the participants of the project and the overall aim of effectively reducing re-offending.

### **15 Clear Track Requirements and their Impact in Challenging Offending Behaviour**

**15.1** Providing an intensive supportive structured regime of activities designed to address each participants needs could help deter individuals away from offending in a variety of ways which are as follows:

- **Unpaid and Voluntary Work:** undertaking unpaid work for the benefit of the community would also involve an element of punishment to the order by depriving the

offender of free use of their leisure time. Spending time helping others would help restore a sense of dignity and self-esteem, as well as improving the community's perception of the offender. Furthermore, Clear Track participants are given an opportunity to learn and develop skills which may increase their employability as well as improve their problem-solving skills, team-working, decision-making and communication skills. Interactive voluntary work also results in visible benefits for the community, and unlike prison, voluntary work allows participants to retain their jobs and support their families. It may also help unemployed participants to develop a healthy routine and to overcome social isolation (Worrall and Hoy 2005).

- **Vocational Training and Education:** enables participants to learn new skills which would help in tackling problems without resorting to crime such as social skills, anger management or debt management. Attending teaching sessions could help improve essential skills such as literacy, numeracy and other skills needed within the workplace. By working in partnership with Springboard Sunderland and CSV, Clear Track will be able to offer a wide range of vocational training and apprenticeship qualifications such as:
  - *Business administration (City and Guilds Business Administration NVQ level 2 & 3),*
  - *Care (City and Guilds Health and Social Care NVQ level 2 & 3),*
  - *Catering and hospitality (City and Guilds Catering and Hospitality NVQ level 2),*
  - *Childcare and education (City and Guilds Children's Care, Learning and Development NVQ level 2 & 3),*
  - *Construction (City and Guilds Trowel Occupation NVQ level 2),*
  - *Graphic design and print (City and Guilds Desktop Publishing NVQ level 2 & 3),*
  - *Horticulture (City and Guilds Amenity Horticulture NVQ level 2 & 3),*

- *Motor Vehicle (City and Guilds Motor Vehicle 4101 NVQ level 2).*

Clear Track will also offer an 'Entry to Employment' (E2E) course which aims to provide a variety of opportunities for young people, including vocational training, help with literacy, numeracy and personal and social skills. In addition to the National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) certificates, courses will also offer other qualifications which will aid individuals in gaining a career in their chosen vocation.

- **Experiential Learning and Outdoor Activities:** which are designed to develop constructive skills such as team-building, confidence and motivation, problem-solving skills and initiative will also be incorporated into the programme. This could include sports and activities such as water sports, climbing, art, and drama and so on.
- **Mentor Support:** acting as a positive role model and maintaining regular one-to-one contact with participants, mentors will be able to facilitate change through identifying and challenging visible problematic behaviour. Through gaining the young persons trust and confidence a mentor will be able to tackle key issues affecting the young persons outlook on life, for example family problems, low self-esteem, confidence and self-worth.
- **Health Education:** encompasses a wide range of topics which may contribute towards the underlying factors resulting in offending behaviour such as drug and alcohol awareness, aspects of physical health and mental health, dental hygiene and so on.

## 16 Clear Track and its Staff

**16.1** Throughout the recruitment period skills will be sought which would be beneficial to the development of the project and the delivery of care. Due to the varying levels of experience and knowledge of potential candidates, the Clear Track management team will need to consider levels of basic and related training needed for the development of professional skills; these should be related to a staff development plan, staff

appraisals and the terms and conditions of employment.

**16.2** The dual role of responsibility which may accompany the secondment of staff to the project could impact upon staff commitment to the projects as well as staff morale. In blurring the boundaries of responsibility staff could be left confused and apprehensive of their role within the project, potentially effecting team dynamics.

## **Efficiency Analysis**

### **17 Delivery of a Cost-effective and Efficient Project**

**17.1** In 2005, with £1,625,225 of funding for three years from stakeholders Invest to Save Budget<sup>16</sup> (ISB), the Helen Hamlyn Trust and the Springboard Trust, CSV and Springboard Sunderland implemented Clear Track aspiring to provide a cost-effective and efficient service through the delivery of a comprehensive innovative package aimed at reducing re-offending through inclusion.

**17.2** Funding is confirmed on a yearly basis subject to progress. Budgetary spending remained on hold during the first year of the pilot due to the postponed timeframe of the project in relation to 'going-live'<sup>17</sup>. Funding from the ISB of £527,500 is currently pending agreement, with additional funding granted from the Helen Hamlyn Trust at £40,000 and the Springboard Trust at £123,400; an overall potential sum of £690,900 for the tax year 2006 to 2007<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> ISB is a joint Treasury/Cabinet Office initiative with an aim to create sustainable improvements by helping develop projects that bring together two or more public service bodies to deliver services in an innovative way. The innovation should be intended to deliver improved value for money and customer-focus. A key principle to the ISB programme is that investment is provided in the return for reform.

<sup>17</sup> Please refer to Paragraph 19.2 within section 19.

<sup>18</sup> CSV Director of Training and Enterprise will be meeting with the Home Office and the Treasury/Cabinet Office ISB on the 28<sup>th</sup> of March 2006 to discuss the unspent budget of the first year, as well as the prospect of 'carrying forward' some of these funds into year two of the project.

**17.3** Over the next three years, Clear Track aims to build an evidence-base of what has or has not been effective in improving service delivery and therefore producing a quality public service. Overall this depends on knowing how the project performs against its overall aims.

**17.4** However, the measurement of such outcomes would be unrealistic at this stage in the project's development. To compare Clear Track, its effectiveness and its costing to the costs of the Prison Service and its effectiveness, would be a distorted representation, and would be of limited comparative utility.

**17.5** Nevertheless, the project's management team will need to account for budget spending, both projected and actual, on a bi-annual basis. The team will also need to consider budgetary decisions prior to investment in the interests of the best value for public money and the development of a cost-effective and efficient service.

### **18 Providing Cost-effective and Efficient Housing**

**18.1** As residential supervision is a key provision of the project it seems inevitable that a large portion of the budget will be spent on providing this service. The decision to purchase or to rent property draws upon the budget in different ways; for example, renting property could be viewed as a financial loss, whereas inflated house prices could place significant strain on other resources. Whilst considering the best value for public money, Clear Track management team also need to consider the type of accommodation that will match the needs and aims of the project and its participants. In recouping this potential drain on resources the project will request an 'occupancy charge', a nominal fee that not only contributes towards the cost of the accommodation, but also offers individuals an opportunity to develop budgeting and life skills. This will be determined through a financial assessment where those individuals in receipt of housing benefit will not have to pay towards the cost of their support service. This method of good practice could dramatically increase the project's cost-benefit efficiency when compared with current prison costs.

**18.2** In addition to the accommodation costs, there is also the consideration of supervision costs. Even though Clear Track will not be offering a 'bail hostel' approach to residential support and supervision, accommodation will be available offering access to twenty-four hour onsite enhanced support for a small number of clients if needed. In addition, Clear Track properties aim to have varying levels of support services attached to them. On the whole, enhanced residential supervision as a provision could prove to become a potentially expensive resource. When considering a cost-effective viable alternative Clear Track management team propose three options. Firstly, it may be deemed reasonable to contract-out supervision duties during the evening and weekends to a specialist security company. However, this may be viewed as a potential cost-cutting hazard; adopting an impersonalised approach such as this may be potentially damaging to the highly valued key worker or mentor relationships<sup>19</sup> that are established over time with the project's participants. Such measures may also be viewed as hazardous by the media and the community, particularly in the interests of public safety and the likelihood of re-offending.

**18.3** A second option is electronic monitoring curfew arrangements which may also be viewed as a viable cost-effective alternative. In 2003, two-thirds of electronic monitoring was carried out under the Home Detention Curfew Scheme which was also an important element of the special supervision programme for young offenders in the community (Magistrate 2003). However, the US National Institute of Justice (1998) reported that home detention with electronic monitoring for low-risk offenders fails to reduce offending when compared to the placement of similar offenders under standard community supervision without electronic monitoring.

**18.4** A third option in addressing supervision could be facilitated by a staffing structure designed to provide twenty-four hour enhanced support for a small number of participants. The dilemma in accommodating this approach lies in

---

<sup>19</sup> The benefits of the key worker relationship have been described by young people as being feeling valued, feeling that key workers took a very personal interest in their welfare, and having an outlet to talk about problems (see Dickens and Woodfield 2005)

the specialist training and the cost of additional resources which may be needed.

**18.5** In light of this argument it becomes clear that the project's management team will need to carefully consider its supervision arrangements, and the potential impact upon the project and its participants, the project's aims, outcomes and financial limitations. Furthermore, an evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the project would be compromised due to the unaccountable and immeasurable influence of contributing external factors such as this.

## **19 *Should the Clear Track Pilot Progress Further and if So, How?***

**19.1** This section looks at the overall results and outcomes of the pilot to determine if there are sufficient benefits to warrant taking Clear Track forward as a pilot project.

**19.2** In assessing whether the Clear Track project has delivered the expected outcomes, it has not been possible to undertake a rigorous analysis of raw data to identify the projects effectiveness and efficiency. This is due to the postponed timeframe of the project in relation to 'going-live' which was subsequently influenced by delayed funding decisions.

**19.3** Six months was allocated for the initial establishment of the project which commenced in September 2005. This was originally scheduled for April 2005, with the project's first participants expected in September 2005. Despite this Clear Track appears to have made significant progress within target of the allocated agenda, as outlined in this report.

**19.4** By utilising the information generated throughout the establishment of Clear Track it has been possible to assess the project's progress. Based on this and the information compiled within this report, there is clear potential and opportunity for taking Clear Track forward to the next phase of the project's development. In doing so, several recommendations can be made to exploit the full potential of the project; these are presented in the following tables.

Accommodation and Supervision Provisions	Recommendations
<p>Careful consideration needs to be given to the structure of the accommodation process and supervisory measures in terms of impact, efficiency, and effectiveness. There is also a need to be aware of and reduce the negative effects that community residential supervision may have upon victims and the public.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To monitor and assess the accommodation and supervision needs of participants.</li> <li>➤ To accordingly provide enhanced residential supervision for participants.</li> </ul>

Multi-agency Partnerships	Recommendations
<p>Developing strong multi-agency partnerships is an essential key to the success of Clear Track when delivering a wide range of interventions tailored to address the needs of young adult offenders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Overall, efforts should be made to continually strengthen multi-agency working throughout the strategic planning and development of the project.</li> <li>➤ There is a need to establish mechanisms which aid the negotiations of strategic planning and the decision making progress.</li> <li>➤ Formal procedures need to be established in relation to information sharing and storage between multi-agency partnerships.</li> </ul>

The Referral Process	Recommendations
<p>In order for Clear Track to consider the suitability of referrals from the Crown Court, the project will need to closely monitor the referral process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To ensure an eligibility and suitability criterion is established for the referral of young adult offenders to Clear Track.</li> <li>➤ To monitor the referral of young adult offenders from the Magistrates' courts.</li> <li>➤ To fully explore, with relevant partners, the sustainability of referrals of young adult offenders from the Crown Court.</li> </ul>

Clear Track Requirements and Activities	Recommendations
<p>In order for Clear Track to be able to effectively reduce re-offending it would need to ensure the delivery of a wide range of interventions tailored to address the needs of young adult offenders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The different partners involved in the delivery of interventions and activities need to work closely together to maximise the range, quantity and quality of care.</li> <li>➤ For Clear Track management team to regularly monitor and review the development and progress of its participants.</li> <li>➤ To closely monitor and measure client satisfaction through the implementation of evaluation questionnaires.</li> <li>➤ To devise and implement an ‘exit’ strategy to ensure positive re-integration into society including progression into education, employment and accommodation.</li> </ul>

Staffing and Staff Development	Recommendations
<p>In order to maximise potential benefits of the project, Clear Track will need to consider levels of basic and related training needed for the development of staffs’ professional skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To ensure all staff are sufficiently skilled in working with the demands of the project and its participants.</li> <li>➤ To ensure all staff have sufficient training and are confident to undertake their role and responsibilities.</li> </ul>
<p>As part of the pilot of Clear Track, the management team could consider implementing an in-house audit. The benefit here is in providing evidence-based practice identifying the range of available staff skills, experience and staff training needs. This will help in creating and sustaining a culture of work suited to the objectives of Clear Track and future projects, as well as task-appropriate allocation in maximising the utilisation of the diverse skills available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To explore and analyse staff application forms to identify staff skills.</li> <li>➤ To monitor and analyse staff training needs to identify areas of expertise needed to implement the project.</li> </ul>

## ▪ Abbreviations

CSV	Community Service Volunteers
DIPs	Drug Intervention Practitioners
DTLR	Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (UK)
E2E	Entry to Employment
ISB	Invest to Save Budget
Nacro	National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders
NOMs	National Offender Management Service
NVQ	National Vocational Qualification
VSU	Voluntary Sector Unit
YOT's	Youth Offending Teams

## References

- Barry M and McIvor G (2000), *Diversion from Prosecution to Social Work and Other Service Agencies*, Crime and Criminal Justice Research Findings No. 37, Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Edinburgh, <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/cru/resfinds/crf37-00.asp>, viewed 25/02/06.
- Coulsfield Lord (2004), *Crime, Courts and Confidence: Report of an Independent Inquiry into Alternatives to Prison*, Esmee Fairbairn Foundation, London
- Criminal Justice Act (2003), *Chapter 44, Amendments of Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984*, <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/20030044.htm>, viewed 20/02/06
- Dickens S and Woodfield K (2005), *New Approaches to Youth Homelessness Prevention: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Safe in the City Cluster Schemes*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, London
- Home Office (1990), *Partnership in Dealing with Offenders in the Community*, Home Office, London
- Home Office (1991), *Organising Supervision and Punishment in the Community: A Decision Document*, Home Office, London
- Home Office (1992), *National Standards of the Supervision of Offenders in the Community*, Home Office, London
- Home Office (1995), *Strengthening Punishment in the Community*, Cmnd2780, Home Office, London
- Home Office (1996), *An Evaluation of Prison Work and Training*, Home Office, London
- Home Office (1999), *Explaining Reconviction Following a Community Sentence: The Role of Social Factors*, Research Study 192, Home Office, London
- Home Office (2002a) *Jobs and Homes – A Survey of Prisoners Nearing Release*, Findings 173, Home Office, London
- Home Office (2002b), *National Standards for the Supervision of Offenders in the Community 2002*, Revised 2002, Home Office, London
- Home Office (2002c), *Justice for All*, The Stationary Office, London
- Home Office (2004), *NOMs Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan*, Adult Offenders and Rehabilitation Unit, Home Office, London
- Home Office (2005), *Resettlement Outcomes on Release from Prison*, Findings 248, Home Office, London
- Home Office (2006), *A Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reducing Re-offending*, Cm6717, Home Office, London
- Lord Chancellor's Department (2002), *Home Secretary and the Lord Chancellor: Clear Message on Sentencing*, Press Notice, 194/02, 14<sup>th</sup> June 2002
- Magistrate (2003), Tagging, *Magistrate*, Vol 59, No 4, p111
- McIvor G (1992), *Sentenced to Serve: The Operation and Impact of Community Service by Offenders*, Avebury, Aldershot
- McIvor G (1998) Pro-social Modelling and Legitimacy: Lessons from a Study of Community Service, In S A Rex and A Matravers [Eds], *Pro-social Modelling and Legitimacy: The Clarke Hall Day Conference*, Institute of Criminology, Cambridge, cited in *Alternatives to Prison: Options for an Insecure Society*, A Bottoms, S Rex and Gwen Robinson [Eds], Willan Publishing, Devon
- Morgan R (2003), Thinking about the Demand for Probation Services, *Probation Journal*, 50(1), 7-19
- Nacro (1991), *Going Straight Home*, Nacro, London
- Nacro (2000), *Good Resettlement the Key to Reducing Re-offending Among Released Prisoners*, <http://www.nacro.org.uk/templates/news/newsitem.cfm/2000090400.htm/archive>, viewed 10/02/06
- National Probation Board (2005), *Delivering Intensive Community Orders under the Criminal Justice Act 2003*, Probation Circular PC56/2005, National Probation Directorate, London
- National Probation Service (2002), *Briefing*, Issue 8, December 2002
- Prison Reform Trust (2005), *Home Secretary Speech to the Prison Reform Trust, 19<sup>th</sup> September 2005*, Prison Reform Trust Press Release, <https://prisonreformtrust.org.uk>, viewed 11/11/05
- Rethinking Crime and Punishment (2002), *Alternatives to Prison*, RCP Briefing Paper, London, [http://www.rethinking.org.uk/informed/pdf/alternatives\\_to\\_prison.pdf](http://www.rethinking.org.uk/informed/pdf/alternatives_to_prison.pdf), viewed 25/02/06.
- Rethinking Crime and Punishment (2003), *Rethinking Crime and Punishment: What You Really Need to Know about the Criminal Justice*, Rethinking Crime and Punishment, London [http://www.rethinking.org.uk/informed/pdf/need\\_to\\_know.pdf](http://www.rethinking.org.uk/informed/pdf/need_to_know.pdf), viewed 25/02/06.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2002), *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-prisoners*, Social Exclusion Unit, London
- Sunderland City Council (2004), *Audit Commission Inspection Report March 2004, Supporting People Programme*, City of Sunderland.
- US National Institute of Justice (1998), *Research in Brief, Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, USA
- Worrall A and Hoy C (2005), *Punishment in the Community, Managing Offenders, Making Choices*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Willan Publishing, Devon
- Youth Justice Board (2005), *Criminal Justice Act; Guidance for Youth Offending Teams*, Youth Justice Board England and Wales, <http://www.youth-justice-board.gov.uk/Publications/Downloads/CJA%2003%20Yot%20GuidanceOct.pdf>, viewed 25/02/06



## Contact Details

Dr Elaine Campbell  
Senior Lecturer in Criminology  
Degree Director for Sociology Masters Programmes  
University of Newcastle  
School of Geography, Politics and Sociology  
Claremont Bridge Building  
Claremont Road  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
United Kingdom  
NE1 7RU

**Telephone:** +44 (0)191 2225030  
**Fax:** +44 (0)191 2227497  
**E-mail:** [elaine.campbell@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:elaine.campbell@ncl.ac.uk)

Miss Danna-Mechelle Lewis  
University of Newcastle  
School of Geography, Politics and Sociology  
Room 543, 5th Floor  
Claremont Bridge Building  
Claremont Road  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
United Kingdom  
NE1 7RU

**Telephone:** +44 (0) 191 2227502  
**E-mail:** [danna-mechelle.lewis@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:danna-mechelle.lewis@ncl.ac.uk)