



Clear Track



**SPRINGBOARD
SUNDERLAND**

Bi-Annual Evaluation Report of Clear Track

**Phase III Report ERIII/03/08
March 2008**

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

Danna-Mechelle Lewis – Tel: +44 (0)191 2227510
Email: danna-mechelle.lewis@ncl.ac.uk

Contents

Section		Page
1	Summary	5
2	Introduction	6
	<i>Theories of Change</i>	
3	The Third Sector at the Heart of Society	6
4	Better Public Services through Social Partnerships	8
5	NOMS and the Third Sector	9
	<i>Process and Structure</i>	
6	Structuring Clear Track as a Third Sector Organisation	11
	▪ The Referral Process	12
	<i>The Impact Assessment of Clear Track</i>	
7	Young Adult Offenders Experiences of being at Clear Track Compared with Young Adult Offenders Experiences of being at HMP Castington	17
	▪ Purposeful Activity	18
	▪ Safety and Respect	20
	▪ Being at Clear Track	20
8	The Impact of Clear Track upon the Attitudes and Moral Understanding of Young Adult Offenders	21
	▪ Attitudes towards Right and Wrong	23
	▪ Attitudes towards Risk Taking behaviour	23
	▪ Peer Pressure	25

Efficiency Analysis

9	The Delivery of a Cost-effective and Efficient Project	28
10	Recommendations	31
11	Clear Track: Moving Forward	31
	Abbreviations	45
	References	46
	Contact Details	47

Contents of Tables

Table		Page
ERIII 6.1	Number of Referrals made to the Clear Track Project between October 2006 and March 2008	14
ERIII 6.2	Purposeful Activity Experienced by Young Adult Offenders whilst being at Clear Track Compared to the Purposeful Activity Experienced by Offenders whilst in Custody	19
ERIII 6.3	Comparative Results between Clear Track and HMP Castington	22
ERIII 6.4	Changes in Attitude and Moral Understanding of Clear Track Participants	24
ERIII 6.5	Comparative Results from Clear Track Respondents between Stage One and Stage Two Questionnaires	26
AERI 3.5	Clear Track Aims and Purpose	29
Table R1	Accommodation and Supervision	33
Table R2	Multi-agency Partnerships	34
Table R3	The Referral Process	35
Table R4	Clear Track Requirements and Activities	36
Table R5	Staffing and Staff Developments	37
Table R6	Clear Track's Business Plan	38
Table R7	Custody Plus	39
Table R8	Eligibility and Suitability Criteria	40
Table R9	Substance Misuse	41
Table R10	Cost-efficiency and Effectiveness	42

Table R11	Induction Criteria	43
Table R12	Dissonance from Offending	44
Table R13	Increased Awareness	32

1. Summary

1.1. Through the development of working partnerships with the third sector, the Ministry of Justice have expressed a keen interest in engaging with the sector to provide better public services through social partnerships.

1.2. Third sector organisations such as CSV and Springboard Sunderland have long been an established component of social provision, often making a practical difference within communities, as well as being the driving force behind important changes in social policy.

1.3. The introduction of new strategies relating to working partnerships and the third sector could help to overcome some of the legislative and policy frameworks that have initially challenged the implementation of Clear Track.

1.4. Furthermore, by bringing together complementary agencies under a common goal of criminal justice and public protection, organisations such as CSV, Springboard Sunderland, Clear Track and the local Northumbria Probation Service are ideally placed to set the precedent for strengthening partnerships between statutory and third sector organisations in line with current proposals (see sections 3, 4 and 5).

1.5. At the time of writing, forty-three young adult offenders had been referred to Clear Track, of which twenty young adult offenders were sentenced to attend the project as a specified activity requirement as part of an overall community sentence (see sections 7 and 8).

1.6. Clear Track and its management team have worked purposefully and tenaciously to ensure the delivery of an effective project. However, due to the technical difficulties

which have arisen over the life of the pilot project which are outlined in this report and previous evaluation reports, Clear Track has been unable to reach its end of first year targets. Nevertheless, indicators of good practice and service delivery can be established through the evaluation of Clear Track to determine the pilot project's efficiency (see section 9).

1.7. Given the experiences of implementing Clear Track, as a project developed, delivered and administered by the third sector, it has become apparent that this innovative and unique approach to sentencing young adult offenders may have been ahead of time (section 9).

1.8. Due to the small number of Clear Track participants, the evaluation research would be unable to determine the reliability, validity, or generalisability of the findings drawn from the evaluation research. However, it would be considered reasonable to use the evaluation research findings to consider the impact the project has had upon its participants. However, the validity of these results would only be applicable to the Clear Track participants (see section 9) and remain ungeneralisable.

1.9. This report suggests one recommendation in relation to increasing awareness of Clear Track as a specified activity requirement amongst sentencers, probation officers, and other relevant criminal justice agencies/practitioners (see section 11, table R13) This recommendation aims to build upon recent measures taken by the Clear Track management team to promote the project as an alternative sentencing option.

2. Introduction

2.1. This report presents the Bi-annual Report, Phase III of the evaluation of the Clear Track project, following the management team's confirmation of the second annual report, Phase II submitted at the end of August 2007¹.

2.2. The overall rationale of the Clear Track 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 these key questions is a series of detailed findings, these are thematically and conceptually organised as:

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

2.3. Over the past few months there has been an active Government interest in developing effective partnerships between government and third sector organisations. As a result Government Ministers have called for consultation papers on the development of a *'third sector strategy'*. With this in mind, this report will focus on the current proposals in relation to the role of third sector organisations such as the Clear Track project and its parent companies CSV and Springboard Sunderland.

¹ A copy of the Second Annual Evaluation Report entitled *'Second Annual Evaluation Report of Clear Track, Phase II Report, ER11/08/07, August 2007'* can be downloaded from http://criminaljusticeresearch.ncl.ac.uk/index_files/Page2229.htm, viewed 02.03.08

2.4. At the time of writing one young adult offender was engaging with the project.

2.5. Section three of this report, the *'Impact Assessment of Clear Track'* focuses upon some of the preliminary findings from the completed evaluation research questionnaires. The first part of section three focuses on the experiences of being at Clear Track compared with the experiences of being at HMP Castington. The second part of section three focuses on the impact of Clear Track upon the attitudes and moral understandings of the young adult offenders who attended the project. However, these are preliminary findings and thus significant conclusions or links cannot be drawn from the findings; they should only be considered as indicative.

2.6. The report will also consider the recommendations made in previous reports in relation to the project's advancements.

Theories of Change

3. 'The Third Sector at the Heart of Society'²

3.1. In recognition of the invaluable role non-governmental organisations actively play in strengthening communities and creating change, and in recognition of the enormous contribution the third sector makes towards the economy and the environment, the Prime Minister Gordon Brown stated *'I believe that successful modern democracy needs at its heart*

² Quoted from the foreword by the Prime Minister Gordon Brown in *The Future Role of the Third Sector in Social and Economic Regeneration: Final Report*, July (2007), p3, HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office, Report CM 7189.

a thriving and diverse third sector'. He went on to add *'millions of people choose to bring about social change and to solve the problems we face through the third sector. In every part of our society voluntary organisations, community groups and social enterprises are making people's lives better, are fighting inequality and are creating a better environment for us to live'* (HM Treasury and Cabinet Office, 2007, p3).

3.2. The third sector also provides the mechanisms by which individuals can fulfil their civic responsibilities by providing the opportunity for voluntary participation in the community as the basis of establishing a greater good. In other words, the third sector exists as a result of like-minded citizens who have collectively joined together to tackle issues which are of concern, for example Make Poverty History³, Fairtrade⁴, Victim Support⁵, and Millennium Volunteers⁶.

³ Make Poverty History is an anti-poverty campaign founded in 2005. The movement brought together a coalition of charities, faith groups, trade unions and campaigning groups who are working together to eradicate global poverty. Make Poverty History was initially intended to be a one-year long awareness campaign, which has rapidly grown into a national and global anti-poverty coalition. It forms the national arm of the Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP), the largest anti-poverty coalition in the world. For more information go to <http://www.makepovertyhistory.org/>, Viewed 02.03.08

⁴ Fairtrade is an organised social movement and market-based approach to alleviating global poverty and promoting sustainability. The movement promotes the payment of a fair price as well as social and environmental standards in areas related to the production of a wide variety of goods. It focuses in particular on exports from developing countries to developed countries. The Fairtrade Foundation is an independent non-profit organisation that licenses use of the Fairtrade mark on products in the UK in accordance with internationally agreed Fairtrade standards. For more information go to <http://www.fairtrade.org.uk/>, viewed 02.03.08.

3.3. Overall, the Government recognises the strengths that the third sector could bring to helping provide better public services through social partnerships (Ministry of Justice 2007a). An alliance of this kind will enable the Ministry of Justice and its departments, such as NOMS and the National Probation Service, to tap into a wealth of growing resources, thus preventing the expense of investing in duplicate services, overall saving on public spending. An additional benefit of working in partnership with third sector organisations largely derives from the strong foothold these organisations have within local communities – that is, it is assumed that third sector organisations communicate directly with the community on matters of public concern.

3.4. By bringing together complementary agencies under a common goal of criminal justice and public protection, organisations such as Community Service Volunteers (CSV), Spring Board and Clear Track are able to work in partnership with NOMS, the local Probation Service and other agencies to help strengthen the social fabric of communities (HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office 2007). Together, through developed working partnerships, this multi-disciplinary, inter-agency approach is a

⁵ Victim Support is a charity in the UK which aims to help victims and witnesses of crime by raising awareness of their needs and by delivering dedicated services to them. It was established in 1974 and it is a national charity with branches in every community and each criminal court in England and Wales. For more information go to <http://www.victimsupport.org/>, viewed 02.03.08

⁶ From 1 April 2007, v (an independent charity set up to inspire young people to volunteer) assumed interim management (in agreement with the Office of the Third Sector (OTS) and the Department for Education and Skills (DfES)) of the Millennium Volunteers programme. Millennium Volunteers is an organisation that encourages young people to take part in voluntary projects in their local area.

potent way of promoting the value of rehabilitating young offenders with the overall focus of reducing recidivism and protecting the public.

4. Better Public Services through Social Partnerships

4.1. Government Ministers have recently called for consultation on the development of a *'third sector strategy'* in an attempt to improve policies and secure better public services through effective partnerships between the Government and third sector organisations (Ministry of Justice 2007a, HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office 2007).

4.2. Through the development of working partnerships with the third sector⁷, the Ministry of Justice⁸ have expressed a keen interest in engaging with the sector to improve policy development and the design of public services. Justice Minister Bridget Prentice mentioned that *'an independent and diverse third sector already helps the department to realise its*

⁷ The Government defines the third sector as non-governmental organisation that are value-driven and which principally invest their surpluses to further social, environmental or cultural objectives. It includes voluntary and community organisations, charities, social enterprises, cooperatives and mutual's (HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office, 2007, p5)

⁸ Launched on 9 May 2007, the new Ministry of Justice is responsible for criminal law and sentencing which were previously with the Home Office combined with the roles of the former Department for Constitutional Affairs and the National Offender Management Service (including the Prison and Probation services). The Rt Hon Jack Straw MP, who takes the role of Secretary of State for Justice, and the Lord Chancellor, heads the Ministry of Justice. Overall, it is responsible for policy on the criminal, civil, family and administrative justice system, including sentencing policy, as well as the courts, tribunals, legal aid and constitutional reform.

ambitions, and often with volunteers, but we believe that the sector's contribution can be enhanced to inform policy development and enable the design and delivery of quality services'. Furthermore, 'the Government wants to improve the public's understanding of the justice system by working more closely with voluntary groups and community organisations. Real change can be achieved by the voluntary sector and the state working together at all levels' (Ministry of Justice 2007b).

4.3. To help achieve this, four major areas of common interest have been jointly identified by the third sector and the Government. These will form the basis of the Government's proposed framework for partnership, which are:

- enabling greater voice and campaigning,
- strengthening communities,
- transforming public services,
- and encouraging social enterprise (HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office 2007).

In addition to these measures, the Government also proposes greater support for grant funding of small organisations, a new skills strategy, and a new drive to improve research on the third sector with a focus on local rather than national partnerships.

4.4. Third sector organisations have long been an established component of society, often making a practical difference within communities, as well as being the driving force behind many of the most important changes in society. Voluntary organisations account for over a million full-time workers (National Council for Voluntary Organisations 2007), whereas social enterprises account for around 5% of all businesses with employees and have an annual turnover of over 27 billion a year (Department of Trade and Industry 2006). The

third sector makes an enormous contribution to society, economy and the environment providing opportunities for communities and its members to contribute to the society in which they live. Community Service Volunteers (CSV)⁹ and Springboard Sunderland¹⁰ similarly provide opportunities for young people to engage in voluntary services throughout the UK and Sunderland respectively.

4.5. Whilst welcoming this contribution, the Government needs to carefully consider possible tensions that may arise from formalising strategy and policy relating to the third sector, in what some may consider a radical reform. On the whole, government organisations are familiar with underpinning policy principles such as commissioning, procurement and accountability (NOMS 2007), whereas non-government organisations, who adopt a social mandate, are less specifically defined by policy and legislation and thus may be unfamiliar with policies framed by government priorities.

4.6. Formalising third sector organisations in this way could be detrimental to the ethos of such organisations. For example, research into the working relationships between Glasgow city council and the voluntary sector found that involvement in contract-based public service delivery was eroding the voluntary ethos within

⁹ CSV was founded in 1962 in the UK, today it is the UK's largest volunteering and training charity. Overall, CSV aims to provide young people with the opportunity to engage in voluntary services. For more information go to <http://www.csv.org.uk>, viewed 02/03/08.

¹⁰ Springboard Sunderland Trust was launched in 1975 as part of a joint venture between CSV and Sunderland city council. Overall, Springboard Sunderland aims to provide young people with the opportunity to engage in experiential learning and training, as well as volunteering opportunities. Springboard Sunderland is a registered charity, for more information go to <http://www.springboard-ne.org>, viewed 02/03/08.

third sector organisations (Fyfe 2005). Hodgson (2004) also identified similar negative effects relating to inter-organisational trust within the context of voluntary sector initiatives in Wales (Hodgson 2004).

4.7. Still, the introduction of new strategies relating to working partnerships and the third sector could help to overcome some of the legislative and policy limitations that initially challenged the implementation of Clear Track as a community-based alternative to custody¹¹.

5. NOMS and the Third Sector

5.1. The establishment of NOMS¹² presents the opportunity to build upon partnerships between the third sector, the Prison Service and the National Probation Service (NOMS 2005). Building upon the Ministry of Justice's *Third*

¹¹ For more information refer to Campbell and Lewis (2006a), Evaluation Report of Clear Track, Phase I, Report ERI/03/06, Section 9 and Campbell and Lewis (2006b), An Annual Evaluation Report of Clear Track, Phase I, Report AERI/08/06, Section 8.

¹² The Government's plans for transforming the management of offenders called for a new approach in the delivery of care which aimed to work effectively to reduce re-offending, offering offenders a chance to change and address the multiple problems which they face (Home Office 2004). The Government proposed that introduction of an end-to-end management structure for every single adult offender would offer better management of risk and far better success in cutting re-offending (Home Office 2006). These proposals introduced the £4.3 billion funded initiative the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and in particular the offender management model, both of which brought together the Prison and Probation services under a single coordinating agency. These strategies were introduced under the new Management of Offenders and Sentencing Bill which was introduced in the House of Lords on the 12th January 2005 (House of Lords 2005). The Offender Management Act received royal assent on Thursday July 26th 2007. For more information see Campbell and Lewis (2006b), section 6 and Campbell and Lewis (2007b), section 5.

*Sector Strategy*¹³ (Ministry of Justice 2007a), NOMS aims to maximise the contribution made by the third sector in a bid to address fundamental objectives such as reducing re-offending and protecting the public (NOMS 2007). Furthermore, NOMS aims to strengthen the contribution of voluntary and community organisations, such as CSV, Springboard Sunderland and Clear Track, by taking account of policy changes, resource and other opportunities, and constraints which may impact upon the development of effective offender focused services (NOMS 2007).

5.2. Addressing Parliament in January 2006, Baroness Gibson called attention to the impact of NOMS on the Criminal Justice System, arguing that the introduction of NOMS and third sector partnerships had brought with it unnecessary tensions across multi-disciplinary inter-agencies, particularly in relation to the National Probation Service. She went on to state that *'morale in the Probation Service is low. Workers are bewildered and fearful. They do not know what is expected of them'* (House of Lords, 2006, Column 355). Baroness Gibson also mentioned that *'it must be recognised that skills which probation officers have developed over the years cannot be learnt overnight, no matter how keen or well intentioned the voluntary sector or charity worker may be'* (House of Lords, 2006, Column 353).

¹³ Addressing the House of Lords in January 2006, Baroness Gibson brought attention to the May 2007 Labour Party Manifesto. Baroness Gibson noted that the Labour Party Manifesto committed the Government *'to ensure that every offender is individually case-managed from beginning to end of their sentence, both in and out of custody'* and to offer *'voluntary organisation and the private sector...greater opportunities to deliver offender services'* (House of Lords 2006). Arguably, this then became the fundamental drive to establishing and developing effective partnerships between the Government, its departments and the third sector.

5.3. In recognition of some of the tensions which may face NOMS in the development of working partnerships with the third sector, NOMS felt that *'the difficulty in the past has probably originated from the distrust by "professionals" towards the VCS [Voluntary and Community Sector] and overcoming these negative cultural barriers is emphasised in the [consultation report on the role of the voluntary and community sector in NOMS] document'* (NOMS 2005b).

5.4. Arguably, there is a failure here to recognise the long established commitment and focus that many voluntary community organisations have sustained in the delivery of effective services. Third sector organisations, for example CSV, Millennium Volunteers, Springboard, Barnado's and the YMCA, have long been committed to creating change within communities.

5.5. Crawford (2001) suggests that successful collaborative working partnerships are dependent upon inter-agency trust, support and reciprocity.

5.6. However, it could be argued that government-based policy principles such as commissioning, procurement and accountability (NOMS 2007), that characterise proposed third sector strategies and frameworks, compromise overarching intentions of a collaborative ethos. Voluntary and community based organisations, who ordinarily exercise professional judgement and discretion, could now be held accountable through performance targets, key indicators and audits. Furthermore, the introduction of the *'commissioning contestability programme'*¹⁴,

¹⁴ As a commissioning organisation, NOMS activities will be carried out by a range of providers, primarily those within the National Probation Service and HM Prison Service. NOMS will use commissioning from a range of providers to secure places in custody or on community sentences, based on quality, value for money

could increase distrust amongst organisations and inter-agency partnerships through increased competitiveness for funding and other resources.

5.7. Third sector consultation proposals recognise the need to develop and support partnerships where organisations are working towards a common goal under a single umbrella of mutual support. As a result, the Government has introduced a variety of measures over the past ten years in an attempt to build a partnership with the third sector and to invest in promoting and growing the sector over the coming ten years (HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office 2007). Through developing effective working partnerships, CSV, Springboard Sunderland, Clear Track and the local Northumbria Probation Service are ideally placed to set the precedent of strengthening partnerships between statutory and third sector organisations in line with current proposals.

Process and Structure

6. Structuring Clear Track as a Third Sector Organisation

6.1. Since Clear Track was established in September 2005, the project and its management team have faced several challenges in relation to the implementation, process and structure of the project, such as limitations of the existing legislation (Campbell

and innovation. It will use providers in the public, commercial and not-for profit/voluntary sector. For more information on the 'commissioning and contestability programme' go to <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/about-us/organisation/directorate-search/noms/fcd-noms/fcd/>, viewed 07/03/08. Also refer to Campbell and Lewis (2006b) and Campbell and Lewis (2007b).

and Lewis 2006a, section 9; Campbell and Lewis 2006b, section 8), working partnerships (Campbell and Lewis 2006a, section 14; Campbell and Lewis 2006b, section 9), and the referral process (Campbell and Lewis 2007a, section 12 and 14; Campbell and Lewis 2007b, section 9). Consequently, the Clear Track project and its management team have thus far been unable to meet Clear Track's proposed aims and targets (see table AERI 3.5). On the whole, this is largely owed to the delay to the project's 'going-live' (Campbell and Lewis 2007a, section 11), the limited number of referrals and, subsequently, the limited number of participants.

6.2. Given the experiences of implementing Clear Track, as a project developed, delivered and administered by the third sector, it has become apparent that this innovative and unique approach to sentencing young adult offenders may have been ahead of time. For example, current political and policy changes, such as the revision of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, the introduction of NOMS and the restructuring of the Probation Service, the introduction of the contestability and commissioning programme, and current consultation proposals to develop third sector strategy policies, were introduced following the implementation and delivery of the Clear Track project. As a result, the Clear Track project was restricted in establishing itself as an alternative community-based sentencing option within a busy period of organisational realignment.

6.3. It should also be noted that significant policy changes, such as those outlined here, which are introduced into the practices of governmental organisations and its agencies, take time to be implemented into the working processes and practices of an organisation. As a result, the challenges which faced Clear Track during its first year of implementation have

impacted upon the process and structure of service delivery during year two of the project's life.

The Referral Process

6.4. At the time of writing, and since 'going live' in November 2006, forty-three¹⁵ young adult offenders had been referred to the project, of which twenty¹⁶ were sentenced to attend the Clear Track project as a specified activity requirement¹⁷ within an overall community sentence.

6.5. Since the last evaluation report (published in August 2007)¹⁸, fifteen young adult offenders had been referred to the Clear Track project, of which nine¹⁹ were assessed as suitable and one young offender was awaiting

¹⁵ Two young adult offenders were referred to the Clear Track project twice, and thus are counted as two separate referrals.

¹⁶ One young adult offender was referred to the Clear Track project twice and started the project on two separate occasions, and thus is counted twice as a 'referral' and twice as an 'attendee'. At the time of writing a further two referrals had been made to the project but were awaiting either a Clear Track assessment or to be sentenced by the courts.

¹⁷ For more information about Clear Track as a specified activity requirement refer to Campbell and Lewis (2007a), section 10.

¹⁸ For more information refer to Campbell and Lewis (2007b) section 10, table AERII 5.5

¹⁹ Five young adult offenders were assessed as unsuitable to attend the Clear Track project and one young offender was awaiting Clear Track assessment. This was because three young adult offenders were assessed as being 'too high risk', one young offender was assessed as having 'mental health issues', and one young offender had attended the project previously but had been non-compliant and had absconded. Because of the young offenders previous behaviour the Clear Track management team assessed the offender as not suitable.

assessment. Of the nine young adult offenders who were assessed as suitable to attend the project, only five were sentenced by the courts to the Clear Track project²⁰. No young adult offenders have been referred to the project during December and January, and only one young adult offender is currently engaging with the project.

6.6. Referral figures in table ERIII 6.1 indicate that the Clear Track project has been unable to meet its original target of engaging with 50 young adult offenders per year during year one of 'going-live'. At the time of writing, nine young adult offenders had been referred to the Clear Track project during the first five months of year two of 'going-live'. Only two of the nine young adults who were referred to the project later went on to attend Clear Track and two were awaiting sentencing. On average there have been 2.53 referrals made per month to the Clear Track project during the 17 months that the project has been 'live'. However, in any one month, there has been a range of 0 to 6 referrals made to the project, indicating that the lowest number of referrals made in any one calendar month was none and the highest number of referrals made in any one calendar month was six.

6.7. At this stage of the evaluation process, it is difficult to accurately determine why Clear Track has been unable to achieve its target of engaging with up to 50 young adult offenders per year or why there appears to be a significant fluctuation in the frequency of referrals made to the project. It could be argued that this may be the result of a lack of

²⁰ Three of the nine young adult offenders who were assessed as suitable to attend the project, were sentenced to custody by the courts. One offender who was assessed as suitable to attend the project was awaiting sentencing. For more information relating to the eligibility and suitability criteria for Clear Track refer to Campbell and Lewis (2007b), section 12.

young adult offenders, aged 18-21 years, 'available for' sentencing at court. However, the latest sentencing statistics show that in 2006, 22,089²¹ young adult male offenders and 2,790²² young adult female offenders were given a community sentence²³ (Ministry of Justice 2007c).

6.8. In relation to the regional sentencing patterns of criminal justice area courts the Sentencing Guideline Council statistics show that in 2006, Northumbria area magistrates courts sentenced 7,252 adult offenders for indictable offences, of which 2,031 (28%) offenders were given a community sentence. In the same year, Northumbria area Crown Courts sentenced 1,885 adult offenders for indictable offences, of which 547 (29%) offenders were given a community sentence (Sentencing Guidelines Council, 2008).

6.9. Recent government statistics fail to differentiate sentencing patterns by region and by age. However, we can see that almost one third of adult offenders in the Northumbria criminal justice area were given a community sentence for indictable offences in 2006 and that one sixth of young adult offenders in 2006 were given a community sentence nationally. On these figures, it could be suggested that

²¹ Total number of young male adult offenders, aged 18-20 (up until their 21st birthday) who were sentenced by the courts in 2006 was 123,660, of which 17.9% (n=22089) were given a community sentence (Ministry of Justice 2007c).

²² Total number of young female adult offenders, aged 18-20 (up until their 21st birthday) who were sentenced by the courts in 2006 was 19,034, of which 14.7% (n=2,790) were given a community sentence (Ministry of Justice 2007c).

²³ In total the number of young adult offenders, aged 18-20 (up until their 21st birthday) who were sentenced by the courts in 2006 was 142,694, of which 17.4% (n=24,879) were given a community sentence (Ministry of Justice 2007c).

both nationally and regionally, a significant number of adult *and* young adult offenders are 'available for' sentencing at the courts, and are therefore potential candidates for community sentences.

6.10. It could be argued further that the eligibility or suitability criteria of the Clear Track referral process fails to capture the significant characteristics of the young adult offenders who go on to be supervised by the Probation Service in the community, and as a result fails to identify their needs. Alternatively, young adult offenders who may benefit from attending Clear Track as a specified activity requirement could be overlooked, partly because sentencers and criminal justice decision makers are unaware of the need-risk focused activities which Clear Track provides. With this in mind, it could be suggested that the eligibility and suitability criteria should be reviewed regularly by the Clear Track management team and the Probation Service in a bid to ensure the efficiency of the assessment process.

6.11. In 2006, 111,735 offenders were supervised by the Probation Service in the community, of which the largest proportion of offenders were sentenced to unpaid work (32% (n=35,355)) as a requirement of their community order; followed by a supervision and accredited programme requirement (15% (n=16,359)); and a supervision requirement (13% (n=14,514)). Whereas, only 2% (n=2,009) of offenders were sentenced to a supervision and specified activity requirement as part of an overall community order (Sentencing Guidelines Council 2008).

Table ERIII 6.1: Number of Referrals made to the Clear Track Project between October 2006 and March 2008

October 2006							November 2006							December 2006						
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27 ²⁴	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30
														31						

January 2007							February 2007							March 2007						
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
	1	2	3	4	5	6					1	2	3					1	2	3
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
28	29	30	31				25	26	27 ²⁵	28				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

April 2007							May 2007							June 2007							
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4	5						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	3	4 ²⁶	5	6	7	8	9	
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	10	11 ²⁷	12	13	14	15 ²⁸	16	
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
29	30						27	28	29	30	31			24	25	26	27	28	29	30	

²⁴ The first referral made to the Clear Track project. The referral date of an offender does not mean that an offender started Clear Track on the same date.

²⁵ This referral was made via the YOT

²⁶ Two referrals were made on this date, both referrals were assessed as suitable to attend Clear Track. One of the referrals who was referred to the project via the Probation Service on this date absconded within a few days of arriving at the project. As a result, they were re-referred to Clear Track on the 15th of June. The Other referral who was made on this date was referred via the Youth Offending Team.

²⁷ This referral was made via the YOT

²⁸ This referral was referred on the 4th of June and re-referred to Clear Track on the 15th of June. The participant attended Clear Track on both occasions.

Table ERIII 6.1 (Continued): Number of Referrals made to the Clear Track Project between October 2006 and March 2008

July 2007							August 2007							September 2007						
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4							1
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30	31		23	24	25	26	27	28	29
														30						

October 2007							November 2007							December 2007						
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
	1	2	3	4	5	6				1 ²⁹	2	3								1
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
21	22	23	24	25	26	27	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
28	29	30	31				25	26	27	28	29	30		23	24	25	26	27	28	29
														30	31					

January 2008							February 2008							March 2008						
Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
		1	2	3	4	5					1	2								1
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	2	3	4	5	6 ³⁰	7	8
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	10	11	12	13	14 ³¹	15	16	9	10 ³²	11	12	13	14	15
20	21	22	23	24	25	26	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	16	17 ³³	18	19	20	21	22
27	28	29	30	31			24	25	26	27	28	29		23	24	25	26	27	28	29
														30	31					

²⁹ Two young adult offenders were referred via probation to Clear Track on the 1st of November; both offenders were assessed as unsuitable to attend the project.







³⁰ This referral was assessed as suitable to attend the project but was sentenced to custody by the courts

³¹ This referral was made via Probation. This young adult offender had attended the Clear Track project previously (referral date 25th April 2007) and breached their due to non-compliance. On this occasion Clear Track management team assessed the young adult offender as unsuitable given their previous absconding and non-compliant behaviour.

³² This referral was made via probation and assessed as suitable by Clear Track. Clear Track management team are awaiting sentencing decision from the courts

³³ This referral was made via Probation and is awaiting a Clear Track assessment

Key to Table ER111 6.1

-  Referral made via the Probation Service to Clear Track, who later went onto attend the project
-  Referral made via the Probation Service to Clear Track, who later did not attend the project
-  Referral made via the Youth Offending Team to Clear Track, who later went onto attend the project
-  Referral made to Clear Track, who are awaiting Clear Track assessment or awaiting sentence
-  Black background signifies Year One of being 'live' for the Clear Track project
-  Blue background signifies Year Two of being 'live' for the Clear Track project

6.12. Arguably, this may indicate that probation officers who recommend sentencing sanctions through pre-sentence reports (PSR) to magistrates and judges may not favour specified activities as a requirement of an overall community order; or that specified activity requirements are not favoured by magistrates or judges as a sentencing option. It may also be an indication of the lack of awareness that criminal justice and court agencies may have in relation to the availability of requirements, and who may instead favour familiar sentencing options such as supervision or unpaid work.

6.13. Thus, it is recommended that the Clear Track management team continue to increase awareness amongst sentencers, probation officers and criminal justice agencies in relation to the availability of Clear Track as a specified activity requirement (refer to table R13). It is also recommended that the Clear Track management team continue to review the eligibility and suitability criteria in relation to Clear Track and its referral process (refer to table R8).

The Impact Assessment of Clear Track

7. Young Adult Offenders Experiences of being at Clear Track Compared with Young Adult Offenders Experiences of being at HMP Castington³⁴

7.1. The following results have been drawn from the second of three stages of evaluation research questionnaires. The survey was conducted with young adult offenders who had been sentenced by the courts to Clear Track as

³⁴ Some of the findings presented in this section have been compared with the HMIP inspection of HMP Castington in 2003 (HMIP 2003). HMIP surveyed forty-seven young adult offenders, aged 18-21 years at HMP Castington, as part of a 2003 inspection. For this reason, some of the figures within this section are displayed as percentages for comparable purposes only. Percentages have been rounded up or rounded down and as a result may not add up to 100. Some of the questions represented in the Clear Track survey were developed based on the HMIP survey for comparable purposes. Only those questions that were comparable are presented in this section. Please note that comparable data is drawn from 2003 in relation to HMP Castington and 2007/08 in relation to Clear Track. As a result of the difference in time frame, significant conclusions cannot be drawn from these findings and thus should only be considered as guidance in relation to this point. 'N' represents the total sample size; 'n' represents the total number of respondents who answered this part of the question. The total number of young offenders sampled for the HMIP survey was N=47 and the total number of young offenders sampled for the Clear Track survey was N=7. However, significant conclusions cannot be drawn from these findings due to the limited sample sizes and the preliminary nature of the results and thus should only be considered as guidance. For more information of the results of the inspection go to http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprison/inspection_reports/hmp-yoi-inspections.html/, viewed 02/08/07

part of an overall Community Order. At the time of writing, sixteen young adult offenders are eligible to take part in the survey; however, nine young adult offenders had breached their community order or had been resentenced for an outstanding offence at an average of week six during their stay at Clear Track³⁵. Thus, in total seven young adult offenders successfully completed the stage two questionnaire, of which one young adult offender was female and six young adult offenders were male. All of the young adult offenders were white British Nationals and were aged between 18-21 years. On average, the stage two questionnaire was completed in week seven during their stay at Clear Track.

7.2. Please note that the findings that follow are preliminary to the final evaluation report and the conclusion of the research study, therefore significant conclusions or links

³⁵ Nine young offenders had breached their Community Order between stage one questionnaire and stage two questionnaire being completed. Of the nine young offenders, the overall average breach of their community order was at week six. These include three outliers that have been included in the average of six weeks. If we exclude the outliers from the dataset, we can deduce that the average breach of a community order would have occurred at week 6.5. Thus, we can conclude that a breach of a community order is more likely to occur between week 6 and week 6.5. Because the sample size is so small it is difficult to determine if these outliers were typical of the overall dataset. Because we have no information to suggest that they were typical, we have calculated the average including and excluding the outliers. In conclusion, however, we can see that there is little difference to the overall calculation when excluding these outliers. The overall range was week 2 to week 10, this included one young offender who breached their order in week two, another young offender who breached their order in week three, three young offenders who breached their order in week six, three young offenders who breached their order in week seven, and one young offender who had breached their order in week ten. All of these young offenders had completed a stage one questionnaire but had not completed a stage two questionnaire.

cannot be drawn from the findings of this stage of the survey and thus should only be considered as indicative.

Purposeful Activity

7.3. When comparing the purposeful activity of young adult offenders, overall proportionately more young adult offenders engaged in '*vocational or skills training*' and '*drugs and alcohol programmes*' whilst attending Clear Track, when compared to those young adult offenders sentenced to custody. However, proportionately more offenders who were in custody were involved in '*education*' or '*had a job*' when compared to those young adult offenders sentenced to Clear Track (refer to Table ERIII 6.2).

7.4. It should be noted however, that Clear Track's purposeful activities are specifically designed to meet the needs of the young adult offenders who are sentenced to the programme and, as a result, engage in activities that are assessed as essential in addressing their offending behaviour. With this in mind, only one of the seven young adult offenders attending Clear Track mentioned that they had attended an '*offender behaviour programme*'. However, this does not necessarily mean that the remaining six offenders did not attend an offender behaviour focused programme. That is: Clear Track staff who assess the criminogenic needs of the young offenders attending the project may adopt a less formal approach to challenging the offending behaviour of some of its participants. Adopting a less formal approach to addressing offending may mean young offenders challenge their offending behaviour by engaging in purposeful activities which appear unrelated to offending behaviour focused programmes.

Table ERIII 6.2: Purposeful Activity Experienced by Young Adult Offenders whilst being at Clear Track Compared to the Purposeful Activity Experienced by Offenders whilst in Custody*.

Purposeful Activity	Clear Track (N=7)**	HMP Castington (N=47)
Offender who had done any Experiential Learning	100% (n=7)	-
Offenders who had done any Vocational or Skills Training	86% (n=6) ^{1*}	48% (n=16) ^{2*}
Offenders who had done any Drugs or Alcohol Programmes	72% (n=5) ^{3*}	13% (n=3) ^{4*}
Offenders who had a Job	43% (n=3)	49% (n=18) ^{5*}
Offenders who had done any Education	43% (n=3)	86% (n=32) ^{6*}
Offenders who had done any Offender Behaviour Programmes	14% (n=1)	4% (n=1) ^{7*}
Offenders who had done any Unpaid Work	14% (n=1)	-

* Only positive responses to this question are displayed here.

** All seven respondents answered every section of this question.

1* One offender mentioned that they had not been involved in any vocational skills or training whilst they had been at Clear Track, but they had applied.

2* Thirty-three respondents answered this part of the question (n=33). Five respondents mentioned that they had not been involved with any vocational or skills training whilst they had been in prison but that they had applied.

3* One offender mentioned that they had not been involved with any drugs or alcohol programmes whilst they had been at Clear Track but they had applied.

4* Twenty-three offenders answered this part of the question (n=23). One offender mentioned that they had not been involved with any drugs or alcohol programmes whilst they had been at Clear Track but they had applied.

5* Thirty-seven respondents answered this part of the question (n=37). Five offenders mentioned that they did not have a job whilst they had been in prison but they had applied.

6* Thirty-seven respondents answered this part of the questions (n=37). Two respondents mentioned that they had not been involved with any education whilst they had been in prison but they had applied.

7* Twenty-four offenders answered this part of the question (n=24). One respondent mentioned that they had not been involved with any offender behaviour programmes but they had applied.

7.5. All Clear Track participants had engaged in a form of experiential learning whilst sentenced to the programme (refer to Table ERIII 6.2).

7.6. Of the seven offenders who had been involved in purposeful activities whilst they had been at Clear Track, all seven mentioned that they liked the activities ‘a lot’ or ‘a little’. No offenders mentioned that they disliked the activities in any way. Some offenders went on to mention that they felt that being involved in purposeful activities would help them in the following ways:

“sort my life out, get my life back on track”
Questionnaire 3

“I’ll get qualifications from my training and my job... helping me earn money....better than being on benefits and that” Questionnaire 6

“gives you a boost doing something outdoors - break from tag” Questionnaire 16

“stop me from being bored” Questionnaire 18

“helpful for getting jobs, rock climbing makes me feel better as a person” Questionnaire 20

Safety and Respect

7.7. When offenders were asked ‘to what extent do you feel staff treat you with respect’, six offenders mentioned that they felt that they were treated ‘very well’ or ‘well’. One offender mentioned that they felt they were ‘not treated very well’.

7.8. All Clear Track participants (N=7) had mentioned that they had felt safe whilst being at the project compared with 23% (n=9) of offenders who had mentioned that they had felt unsafe whilst in custody.

7.9. No offenders had been victimised by another Clear Track participant whilst they were at the project compared to 16% (n=6) of offenders who felt that they had been victimised by another offender whilst they had been at HMP Castington³⁶.

7.10. Ten percent (n=4) of offenders had felt that they had been victimised by a staff member whilst in custody compared to 14% (n=1) of offenders who felt that they had been victimised by a staff member whilst at Clear Track. The Clear Track participant who felt that they had been victimised by a staff member did not mention why this had happened. However, they did mention that they had reported the alleged incident to another staff member and were awaiting an outcome to their complaint. This young adult offender has subsequently absconded from the Clear Track project. Of the four offenders who were in custody at HMP Castington and who had felt that they had been victimised by a staff member, only one young adult offender had reported the alleged incident.

³⁶ Alleged incidents of victimisation were self-reported both at HMP Castington and at Clear Track. However, this may not necessarily reflect the number in context at any given time. For example, a young offender at HMP Castington who is held in segregation may be less likely to encounter victimisation from another offender when compared to an offender held in another part of the prison. Similarly, Clear Track participants who are housed individually may be less likely to encounter victimisation from another Clear Track participant when compared to Clear Track participants who are housed communally. However, it is equally likely that an offender who is housed at Clear Track may be victimised by another Clear Track participant who no longer attends the project.

Being at Clear Track

7.11. Whilst at Clear Track four offenders mentioned that they had '*needed space to think*'; three offenders had mentioned that they '*had felt tempted to commit a crime*' or that they '*had committed a crime*'; and three offenders had mentioned that they had wanted to '*run away*' or '*skive off*' from the Clear Track programme.

7.12. Whilst at Clear Track, all seven young adult offenders mentioned that they had been in touch with their YOT, social worker or probation officer and that it was easy to contact their YOT, social worker or probation officer if they needed to.

7.13. Eighty-six percent of offenders (n=6) felt that it was easy to gain access to using a telephone, to receive letters and for their family and friends to visit them whilst they were at Clear Track. One offender mentioned that it was difficult for family and friends to visit them whilst they were at Clear Track but did not mention why this was the case.

7.14. In summary, we can see that (also refer to table ERIII 6.3):

- Clear Track participants were more likely to engage in voluntary or skills training than those offenders in custody.
- Clear Track participants were more likely to engage in drug and alcohol programmes than those offenders in custody.
- However, offenders in custody were more likely to have a job or be involved in education than Clear Track participants.
- All Clear Track participants had engaged in a form of experiential learning.

- All Clear Track participants mentioned that they had enjoyed taking part in purposeful activities.
- The largest proportion of Clear Track offenders mentioned that they felt staff members treated them with respect.
- Offenders were more likely to feel safe being at Clear Track than being in custody.
- Offenders were more likely to be victimised by another young adult offender whilst they were in custody than being at Clear Track.
- Offenders were likely to be victimised by a staff member whilst they were in custody or whilst they were at Clear Track.
- Offenders at Clear Track were more likely to report feels of victimisation than those offenders in custody.

Table ER11 6.3: A Summary Table Showing the Comparative Results between Clear Track and HMP Castington³⁷

	Clear Track ³⁸ (N=7)	HMP Castington ³⁹ (N=47)
Stage 2 Questionnaire		
<i>Purposeful Activity</i>		
• Offenders who Engaged in Voluntary or Skills Training	86% (n=6)	48% (n=16)
• Offenders who Engaged in Drugs or Alcohol Programmes	72% (n=5)	13% (n=3)
• Offenders who had a Job	43% (n=3)	49% (n=18)
• Offenders who were Involved in Education	43% (n=3)	86% (n=32)
<i>Safety and Respect</i>		
• Offenders who had Felt Unsafe	0% (n=0)	23% (n=9)
• Offenders who felt they had been Victimised by another Young Adult Offender	0% (n=0)	16% (n=6)
• Offenders who felt they had been Victimised by a Staff Member	14% (n=1)	10% (n=4)

³⁷ Some of the questions represented in the Clear Track survey were developed based on the HMIP survey for comparable purposes. ‘N’ represents the total sample size; ‘n’ represents the total number of respondents who answered this part of the question.

³⁸ The Clear Track results shown in this table have been drawn from the second of three evaluation research questionnaires (N=7)

³⁹ The HMP Castington results shown in this table have been drawn from the HMIP inspection of HMP Castington in 2003 (N=47)

8. The Impact of Clear Track upon the Attitudes and Moral Understanding of Young Adult Offenders

The following results have been drawn from the first and second of three stages of evaluation research questionnaires. Comparing the findings from stage one⁴⁰ questionnaire with stage two questionnaire will enable the evaluation research to observe and compare trends over time, particularly in the field of behavioural change where the intention is to reduce the frequency of offending behaviour. By observing changes in attitudes towards offending and motivational issues, the evaluation research is able to objectively observe the level of impact, if any, Clear Track has had upon an offenders behaviour during the period spent at the project.

8.1. Please note that the findings that follow are preliminary to the final evaluation report and the conclusion of the research study, therefore significant conclusions or links

⁴⁰ At the time of writing, 20 young adult offenders were eligible to take part in the stage one survey. However, four young adult offenders had breached their community order or had been resentenced for an outstanding offence within an average of two weeks of being at Clear Track, before a stage one questionnaire could be completed. In total 16 young adult offenders successfully completed the stage one questionnaire (N=16), of which one young offender was female and fifteen young adult offenders were male. All of the young adult offenders were white British Nationals and were aged between 18-21 years. On average, stage one questionnaire was completed in week two. Some of the figures within this section are displayed as percentages for comparable purposes only. Percentages have been rounded up or rounded down and as a result may not add up to 100. Significant conclusions cannot be drawn from these findings due to the limited sample sizes and the preliminary nature of the results and thus should only be considered as indicative. ‘N’ represents the total sample size; ‘n’ represents the total number of respondents who answered this part of the question.

cannot be drawn from the findings of this survey and thus, should only be considered as indicative. Furthermore, due to the small sample size results drawn from the survey are only applicable to the Clear Track sample.

Attitudes towards Right and Wrong

8.2. When asked ‘*what is always wrong to do*’, Clear Track participants were consistently confident that it was always wrong to ‘*steal from your family*’, ‘*take money from a house you are visiting*’, ‘*burgle a house*’, ‘*have sex with someone under 16 years of age*’, and to ‘*carry a gun*’. However, only 56% (n=9) of Clear Track participants felt that it was always wrong to ‘*drink alcohol under age*’ at stage one questionnaire, an average of two weeks of being at Clear Track. This had decreased to 29% (n=2) of Clear Track participants at stage two questionnaire, an average of seven weeks of being at Clear Track.

8.3. The results displayed in table ERIII 6.4 indicate that there was no positive change in attitude or moral understanding between stage one questionnaire and stage two questionnaire. However, due to the small sample size in relation to the results and the limited timeframe between stage one and stage two questionnaires - i.e. is it a realistic expectation to change attitudes and moral understandings within a seven-week period – significant conclusions cannot be drawn from the results presented here. These results however, could be used as guidance to alert the Clear Track management team to the overall benefits of offending behaviour focused activities.

8.4. When Clear Track participants were asked ‘*how important is it for people to obey the law*’, the largest proportion of offenders felt

Table ERIII 6.4: Changes in Attitude and Moral Understanding of Clear Track Participants*.

	Clear Track Stage One Questionnaire (N=16)	Clear Track Stage Two Questionnaire (N=7)
Steal from your family	100% (n=16)	100% (n=7)
Take money from a house you are visiting	100% (n=16)	100% (n=7)
Burgle a house	100% (n=16)	100% (n=7)
Have sex with someone under 16 years of age	100% (n=16)	100% (n=7)
Carry a gun	100% (n=16)	100% (n=7)
Steal from people you don't know	100% (n=16)	71% (n=5)
Sniff glue	94% (n=15)	86% (n=6)
Take goods from a shop without paying	94% (n=15)	86% (n=6)
Steal from an unlocked car	94% (n=15)	86% (n=6)
Carry a knife as a weapon	88% (n=14)	86% (n=6)
Truant from school	81% (n=13)	43% (n=3)
Fare dodge	81% (n=13)	29% (n=2)
Take ecstasy	75% (n=12)	71% (n=5)
Lie to your parents	69% (n=11)	43% (n=3)
Hit someone who insults you	63% (n=10)	57% (n=4)
Smoke cannabis	63% (n=10)	43% (n=3)
Drink alcohol under age	56% (n=9)	29% (n=2)
Tell the police about another young person who commits a crime	50% (n=8)	29% (n=2)

* Offenders were asked 'which, if any, of the following things do you think is always wrong to do, no matter what the situation is' Respondents were asked to tick all those that applied to them.

that it was *'very important'* or *'important'* to obey the law during stage one questionnaire (88% (n=14)), an average of two weeks of being at Clear Track; which had increased to all Clear Track offenders during stage two questionnaire (100% (N=7)), an average of seven weeks of being at Clear Track. Similarly, there had been a decrease in the number of offenders who felt that obeying the law was not important, from two offenders at stage one questionnaire to no offenders at stage two questionnaire. Overall, this could indicate a positive change in attitudes in relation to obeying the law.

Attitudes towards Risk Taking Behaviour

8.5. When Clear Track participants were asked to think about the crimes they had committed, the largest proportion of offenders did not *'blame someone else for it'* at stage one (94% (n=15)) and at stage two (86% (n=6)) questionnaires. Overall, this suggests that the young adult offenders at Clear Track took responsibility for the crimes they had committed.

8.6. Furthermore, the largest proportion of offenders were *'sorry for the harm they had caused'* at stage one (75% (n=12)) and at stage two (71% (n=5)). Overall, this indicates that the young adult offenders at Clear Track felt a level of remorse for the crimes they had committed.

8.7. Ninety-four percent (n=15) of young adult offenders who responded to stage one questionnaire and 100% (N=7) of offenders who responded to stage two questionnaire felt that they *'got into trouble because they did things without thinking'* and that they *'sometimes break the rules because they do*

things without thinking'.

8.8. Furthermore, the largest proportion of offenders at Clear Track felt that they *'got so excited about doing new things that they didn't think about the consequences'* at stage one (50% (n=8)), and at stage two (71% (n=5)).

8.9. The largest proportion of Clear Track offenders felt that *'committing crimes was the best way to get what they wanted in life'* at both stage one (94% (n=15)), and at stage two (100% (N=7)). Overall, this suggests that young adult offenders at Clear Track could benefit from offending behaviour focused activities which challenged their perception and cognition relating to their offending behaviour.

8.10. The largest proportion of offenders at Clear Track also felt that they *'wanted to stop committing crimes'* at stage one (88% (n=14)) and stage two (86% (n=6))

8.11. However, when asked if *'they were likely to commit crimes again'*, 19% (n=3) of Clear Track participants mentioned that they were likely to commit crimes again at stage one questionnaire, compared to no offenders at stage two questionnaire. Overall this could indicate that there had been a change in attitude towards their future offending behaviour between arriving at Clear Track at the half-way point of the programme.

Peer pressure

8.12. The largest proportion of Clear Track participants felt that they were not pressured by friends to *'try or take drugs'* during stage one (81% (n=13)), and at stage two (86% (n=6)).

8.13. During stage one questionnaire (an average of two weeks of being at the Clear

Table ERIII 6.5: Comparative Results from Clear Track Respondents between Stage One and Stage Two Questionnaires⁴¹

	Clear Track ⁴² (N=16) Stage 1 Questionnaire	Clear Track ⁴³ (N=7) Stage 2 Questionnaire
<i>Attitudes towards Right and Wrong</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who felt that it was very important or important to obey the law 	88% (n=14)	100% (N=7)
<i>Attitudes towards Risk Taking Behaviour</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who did not blame anyone else for the crimes they had committed 	94% (n=15)	86% (n=6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who were sorry for the harm that they had caused as a result of the crimes they had committed 	75% (n=12)	71% (n=5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who felt that they got into trouble because they did things without thinking 	94% (n=15)	100% (N=7)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who felt that they sometimes break the rules because they do things without thinking 	94% (n=15)	100% (N=7)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who felt so excited about doing new things that they did not think about the consequences 	50% (n=8)	71% (n=5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who felt that committing crimes was the best way to get what they wanted in life 	94% (n=15)	100% (N=7)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who felt that they wanted to stop committing crimes 	88% (n=14)	86% (n=6)

⁴¹ Some of the questions represented in the Clear Track surveys were developed for comparable purposes. Table ERIII 6.5 provides a comparative summary of the results drawn from stage one and stage two questionnaire. Some of the figures within this table are displayed as percentages for comparable purposes only. Percentages have been rounded up or rounded down and as a result may not add up to 100. Significant conclusions cannot be drawn from these findings due to the limited sample sizes and the preliminary nature of the results and thus should only be considered as guidance. ‘N’ represents the total sample size; ‘n’ represents the total number of respondents who answered this part of the question.

⁴² The Clear Track results shown in this table have been drawn from the first of three evaluation research questionnaires (N=16)

⁴³ The Clear Track results shown in this table have been drawn from the second of three evaluation research questionnaires (N=7)

Table ERIII 6.5 Continued: Comparative Results from Clear Track Respondents between Stage One and Stage Two Questionnaires⁴⁴

	Clear Track ⁴⁵ (N=16) Stage 1 Questionnaires	Clear Track ⁴⁶ (N=7) Stage 2 Questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who felt that they were likely to commit crimes again in the future 	19% (n=3)	0% (n=0)
<i>Peer Influence</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who did not feel pressured by friends to try or take drugs 	81% (n=13)	86% (n=6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who did not feel pressured by friends to act tough or hard 	81% (n=13)	43% (n=3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who felt pressured by friends a bit to act tough or hard 	19% (n=3)	57% (n=4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who did not feel pressured by friends to have sex 	100% (N=16)	100% (N=7)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Track respondents who did not feel pressured by friends to commit crimes 	75% (n=12)	86% (n=6)

⁴⁴ Some of the questions represented in the Clear Track surveys were developed for comparable purposes. Table ERIII 6.5 provides a comparative summary of the results drawn from stage one and stage two questionnaire. Some of the figures within this table are displayed as percentages for comparable purposes only. Percentages have been rounded up or rounded down and as a result may not add up to 100. Significant conclusions cannot be drawn from these findings due to the limited sample sizes and the preliminary nature of the results and thus should only be considered as guidance. ‘N’ represents the total sample size; ‘n’ represents the total number of respondents who answered this part of the question.

⁴⁵ The Clear Track results shown in this table have been drawn from the first of three evaluation research questionnaires (N=16)

⁴⁶ The Clear Track results shown in this table have been drawn from the second of three evaluation research questionnaires (N=7)

Track project) 81% (n=13) of Clear Track respondents felt that they were not pressured by friends to *'act tough or hard'*. This had decreased to 43% (n=3) of respondents during stage two questionnaire (an average of seven weeks of being at the Clear Track project), leaving a majority of 57% (n=4) of respondents feeling that they were pressured *'a bit'* by friends to *'act tough or hard'*.

8.14. All Clear Track respondents felt that they were not pressured by friends to *'have sex'* at both stage one (N=16) and at stage two (N=7).

8.15. Furthermore, the largest proportion of Clear Track respondents felt that they were not pressured by friends to *'commit crimes'* at both stage one (75% (n=12)) and at stage two (86% (n=6)).

8.16. In summary we can see that (also refer to table ERIII 6.5):

- All Clear Track respondents felt that it was always wrong to *'steal from your family'*, *'take money from a house you are visiting'*, *'burglar a house'*, *'have sex with someone less than 16 years of age'*, and to *'carry a gun'*.
- Young adult offenders at Clear Track were confident that it was not always wrong to *'drink alcohol under age'*.
- Overall, there had been an increase in the number of Clear Track respondents who felt that it was *'very important'* or *'important'* to obey the law between stage one and stage two questionnaires.
- The largest proportion of offenders at Clear Track did not *'blame someone else'* for the crimes they had committed.
- The largest proportion of offenders at Clear Track were *'sorry for the harm they had*

caused' as a result of their offending behaviour.

- On the whole, the largest proportion of offenders at Clear Track felt that they *'got into trouble because they did things without thinking'*, *'sometimes break the rules because they do things without thinking'*, and *'got so excited about doing new things that they didn't think about the consequences'*.
- Even though the largest proportion of offenders at Clear Track felt they *'wanted to stop committing crimes'*, the majority of offenders at Clear Track felt that *'committing crimes was the best way to get what they wanted in life'*.
- On the whole, offenders at Clear Track did not feel pressured by friends to *'try or take drugs'*, to *'have sex'*, or to *'commit crimes'*.
- However, some young adult offenders at Clear Track did feel *'a bit'* pressured by friends to *'act tough or hard'*.

Efficiency Analysis

9. The Delivery of a Cost-effective and Efficient Project

9.1. As has been established in previous Clear Track Evaluation Reports⁴⁷ the success of Clear Track as a pilot intervention is largely determined by its effectiveness and its cost-efficiency. Clear Track as an effective intervention assures Ministers of Justice, stakeholders, policy makers, and funders that

⁴⁷ See Campbell and Lewis (2005) section 12; Campbell and Lewis (2006b) section 13; Campbell and Lewis (2007a) section 17; and Campbell and Lewis (2007b) section 17.

Table AERI 3.5: Clear Track Aims and Purpose

Clear Track's Purpose:

The overall purpose of Clear Track is to establish whether young adult offenders (aged 18-21), who would have otherwise received a custodial sentence, have a better chance of developing themselves as effective and productive citizens by attending Clear Track as a community custodial sentence.

Clear Track aims to achieve this by:

- engaging with low-risk young adult offenders, aged 18-25, who at the time of sentence would have otherwise received a prison custodial sentence.
- developing a holistic approach to support young adult offenders, addressing accommodation, employment, training and education and other needs such as social support.
- supporting offenders in a community setting.
- developing a partnership approach to the delivery of service for the participants of Clear Track.
- establishing whether Clear Track effectively addresses the offending behaviour of its participants.
- demonstrating a cost-effective and efficient community custodial sentencing option.

This will be measured by the following targets:

- to engage with up to 50 young adult offenders, aged 18-25, per year, over three years.
- to provide an average length of stay of up to 16 weeks.
- to provide a range of work-based learning activities, interventions and unpaid voluntary work for participants at Clear Track.
- to measure and compare the cost of Clear Track with the estimated cost of a prison establishment holding young adult offenders aged 18-25.
- to provide participants with the opportunity to engage in constructive activities, such as voluntary work, education and training upon leaving Clear Track.
- to measure change in behaviour and attitudes which occur throughout the treatment period.
- to measure and compare the reconviction rates of participants leaving Clear Track with the estimated reconviction rates of offenders leaving prison.
- to network with stakeholders and other organisations.

long term investment is justified through increased engagement with young adult offenders, reduced recidivism, and increased public protection, as outlined in the Clear Track aims (see table AERI 3.5).

9.2. Clear Track as a community-based alternative to custody aims to engage with up to fifty young adult offenders, aged 18-21, per year over three years, an estimated total of 150 young adult offenders. These figures were based upon research drawn from the initial expression of interest, a consultancy proforma⁴⁸ and proposed consultancy evaluation papers. As a result, existing aims and measures were designed based upon consultancy proposals relating to the overall purpose of Clear Track as a Virtual Young Offenders Institution.

9.3. Clear Track and its management team have worked purposefully and tenaciously to ensure the delivery of an effective project. However, due to the technical difficulties which have arisen over the life of the pilot project, namely limitations of the sentencing and legislative framework (Campbell and Lewis 2006a, section 9; Campbell and Lewis 2006b, section 8), working partnerships (Campbell and Lewis 2006a, section 14; Campbell and Lewis 2006b, section 9), and the referral process (Campbell and Lewis 2007a, section 12 and 14; Campbell and Lewis 2007b, section 9), Clear Track – since ‘going-live’ in November 2006 – has been unable to reach its end of first (operational) year targets (see table AERI 3.5). Subsequently, the evaluation of

⁴⁸ The proforma is the basic go/no-go analysis that developers use to decide on whether to move forward with a project. The Invest to Save Budget requires a number of documents during the life of a project, from the first expression of interest through to the final evaluation. A proforma aims to answer several questions such as, what is being proposed? What revenues will be generated? What costs are involved? Are the proposals feasible? and so on.

Clear Track is unable to determine the pilot project’s efficiency or cost-effectiveness at this stage in the evaluation. Nevertheless, indicators of good practice and service delivery can be established through the evaluation of Clear Track to determine the pilot project’s efficiency.

9.4. During the 17 months that the project has been ‘live’, Clear Track has received forty-three referrals and has engaged with 20 young adult offenders. Due to the small number of Clear Track participants, the evaluation would be unable to determine the reliability⁴⁹, validity⁵⁰ or generalisability⁵¹ of the findings drawn from the evaluation research. In other words, the trustworthiness of any conclusion drawn from the evaluation research findings would be questionable.

9.5. Furthermore, any comparable means of measuring the success of the pilot project would also become the object of scrutiny. For example, the measurement and comparison of the operational cost of Clear Track with the estimated operational cost of a young adult offenders institution in the Prison Service; or the measurement and comparison of reconviction rates of participants leaving Clear Track with the estimated reconviction rates of

⁴⁹ Reliability: is a concept concerned with the consistency and stability of a measure, in other words, should the research be repeated would the same results be obtained.

⁵⁰ Validity: is a concept concerned with the accuracy of the results, in other words, are any relationships established in the findings ‘true’ or are such relationships due to the effect of something else or a chance result.

⁵¹ Generalisability: is a concept concerned with which findings are more generally applicable outside the specifications of the situation studied. In other words, can findings that are drawn from the Clear Track evaluation research be applied as ‘true’ and therefore duplicated should other Clear Track projects be established in the future.

offenders leaving prison. The consequences of speculating such results would be detrimental, not only to the professional reputation of those stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project, but it could also have a professionally damaging impact upon the validity of the Clear Track project and as a result may not be viewed as substantial by peers.

9.6. The Clear Track sample size is not sufficient to ensure the reliability or generalisability of the evaluation research findings; thus any results would not be statistically significant. However, it would be considered reasonable to investigate the evaluation research findings to determine the impact the project has had upon its participants, and thus the validity of any results would only be applicable to the Clear Track participants.

9.7. Limiting the focus of the research to those participants who attended the project would allow stakeholders to determine the scope in which Clear Track has successfully engaged with its participants. In other words, to what extent has Clear Track been able to provide its participants with the opportunity to address their offending behaviour. This can be achieved by focusing upon the impact Clear Track has had in relation to its participants through measures such as:

- discouraging participants away from crime whilst on the project,
- keeping participants occupied,
- 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.

10. Recommendations

10.1. In relation to the recommendations made in the second annual report and previous reports, Clear Track has made progress over the past five months in relation to revising the eligibility and suitability criteria of Clear Track (see table R8); providing appropriate interventions to help address problematic substance misuse behaviour amongst Clear Track participants (see table R9); improving the Clear Track induction process and ensuring that all Clear Track participants are provided with appropriate support and assistance throughout the induction period (see table R11); and by monitoring, reviewing and re-assessing the offending behaviour of Clear Track participants (see table R12).

10.2. The recommendation of Custody Plus (table R7) has become invalid since the project's service delivery in November 2006. This is partly due to the fact that the project is currently receiving referrals through the local Northumbria Probation Service; and partly because the then Home Secretary, Dr John Reid, postponed the implementation of Custody Plus as a sentencing option until such a time that the Probation Service and the Prison Service are able to cope with the additional workload (House of Commons 2006).

10.3. Progress made by Clear Track as recommended in previous reports can be seen in tables R1 to R12.

efficiency of the project at this stage (for more information relating to effectiveness and efficiency refer to section 9). This is largely owing to the project’s engagement with a small number of participants to date.

11. Clear Track: Moving Forward

11.1. Since the project went ‘live’ in November 2006, Clear Track has received forty-three referrals, of which 20 participants have started the project. However, the rate of referrals to Clear Track has not been consistent over this time, resulting in a sporadic and irregular process (see table ERIII 6.1). As a result, Clear Track has, on occasions, been without any participants with which to engage. At the time of writing, Clear Track had one participant attending the project.

11.2. As a result, it is not possible to determine the overall effectiveness and

11.3. With this in mind, this report suggests one further recommendation in the interests of evaluating Clear Track’s progress (see table R13). Some of the steps recommended in table R13 are currently being implemented by the Clear Track management team. However, at this stage of the evaluation research it is recommended that the Clear Track management team are able to differentiate the Clear Track project as a specified activity from other community-based activities when addressing sentencers, probation officers, and other relevant criminal justice agencies in an attempt to increase confidence and awareness of the Clear Track project.

Table R13: Increased Awareness

Increased Awareness	Recommendations
<p>Increasing awareness, in relation to the availability of Clear Track as a specified activity, amongst sentencers, probation officers and criminal justice agencies is an essential element of increasing the potential of referrals made to the project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To increase awareness through the regular and frequent distribution of information leaflets and posters to probation officers, magistrates, judges and other relevant criminal justice agencies. ➤ To liaise with probation officers, magistrates, judges and other relevant criminal justice agencies through management meetings, steering group meetings and seminars.

Table R1: Accommodation and Supervision*

Accommodation and Supervision Provisions	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<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"> ➤ To monitor and assess the accommodation and supervision needs of participants. ➤ To accordingly provide enhanced residential supervision for participants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Accommodation policy in place. ➤ Event log, information exchange policy, and community interaction policy in place. ➤ Established links with Sunderland Housing Group and Homewood. ➤ Advice and guidance on accommodation strategies drawn upon from similar organisations. ➤ Conducted thorough market research to establish which properties would best suit the needs of the project whilst creating minimal disruption to the local community. ➤ Sessional workers in place to supervise offenders who are to be referred to the project. ➤ Regular communication with Group 4 Security regarding supervision of offenders on the Clear Track programme

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R2: Multi-agency Partnerships*

Multi-agency Partnerships	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<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"> ➤ Overall, efforts should be made to continually strengthen multi-agency working throughout the strategic planning and development of the project. ➤ There is a need to establish mechanisms which aid the negotiations of strategic planning and the decision making progress. ➤ Formal procedures need to be established in relation to information sharing and storage between multi-agency partnerships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear Track has established strong links regarding networking with Sunderland Drug and Alcohol Forum and Sunderland Housing Group. ➤ Multi-agency Steering Group meetings are held monthly. ➤ Monthly practitioner meetings are currently being negotiated. ➤ Policy and procedures are in place to ensure the security and confidentiality of information sharing and data protection between multi-agency partnerships, particularly the local Probation Board. ➤ Clear Track are awaiting the allocation of local Probation Officers from each Sunderland office, this will form part of Clear Track’s referral process. Once Clear Track has been allocated the officers, the project will be in a position to hold regular Practitioners meetings. ➤ Clear Track have made presentations to Youth Offending Service and Sunderland Social Services Leaving Care Team

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R3: The Referral Process*

The Referral Process	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<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"> ➤ To ensure an eligibility and suitability criteria is established for the referral of young adult offenders to Clear Track. ➤ To monitor the referrals of young adult offenders from the Magistrates' courts. ➤ To fully explore, with relevant partners, the sustainability of referrals of young adult offenders being made from the Crown Court. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear Track staff will attend the initial pre-sentence assessment with Probation and the potential referral to determine if the offender is eligible and suitable to be referred to Clear Track. ➤ Clear Track has the relevant assessment protocols in place to monitor offenders from the initial pre-sentence meeting. ➤ A young person's guide is in place to offer advice and guidance to newly referred participants. ➤ Information given to potential referrals at the assessment stage, such as an information booklet ➤ Clear Track has established good communication links with Probation Officers and PSR writers. ➤ Sporadic and irregular communication links between Clear Track and the Probation Service have significantly impacted upon the referral process ➤ Clear Track have distributed information leaflets and posters to all probation officers.

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R4: Clear Track Requirements and Activities*

Clear Track Requirements and Activities	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<p>In order for Clear Track to be able to effectively reduce re-offending, the project 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"> ➤ 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. ➤ For Clear Track management team to regularly monitor and review the development and progress of its participants. ➤ To closely monitor and measure client satisfaction through the implementation of evaluation questionnaires. ➤ To devise and implement an 'exit' strategy to ensure positive re-integration into society including progression into education, employment and accommodation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear Track has developed Individual Action Plans (IAP) and reviews to monitor and review the progress of the offender. ➤ Questionnaires are in place to give offenders an opportunity to anonymously feedback to staff, as well as a complaints structure. ➤ An exit strategy is in place to assist with offender related needs as they exit the programme. This will include multi-agency partnerships to tackle issues such as education, accommodation, training and employment needs. ➤ Regular communication takes place between Clear Track and Probation to monitor the quality of the project's activities and the compliance of Clear Track participants. ➤ Weekly information sharing between Probation Officers and Clear Track via e-mail and phone.

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R5: Staffing and Staff Development*

Staffing and Staff Development	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<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"> ➤ To ensure all staff are sufficiently skilled in working with the demands of the project and its participants. ➤ To ensure all staff have sufficient training and are confident to undertake their role and responsibilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The training needs of Clear Track staff have been carefully identified, alongside the recent development of a training manual. ➤ Practitioner specialist will be recruited when needed to deliver in-house training sessions.
<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"> ➤ To explore and analyse staff application forms to identify staff skills. ➤ To monitor and analyse staff training needs to identify areas of expertise needed to implement the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sessional workers have been carefully recruited through an application process and an interview panel to meet the needs of both the project and its participants. ➤ Many of the sessional workers were selected due to their previous experience of working with offenders and young people with challenging and emotional needs. ➤ Clear Track has explained the current delay with 'going-live' to sessional workers. ➤ Clear Track has compiled a thorough database of its staff, including their qualifications and experience describing areas of strengths and weaknesses. ➤ Through meetings with sessional staff, Clear Track has identified training needs, this includes managing challenging behaviour and dealing with emergencies. ➤ A second recruitment of sessional staff were interviewed Feb 2007. However, the lack of referrals to the project has meant that these sessional staff have been put on hold

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R6: Clear Track’s Business Plan*

Clear Track’s Business Plan	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<p>A business plan would assist Clear Track and its stakeholders to determine its goals and targets in order to effectively monitor the project’s progress and development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To devise a business plan with clear and achievable goals and targets, both long-term and short-term. ➤ To monitor the project’s progress in relation to each goal and specified targets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear Track discusses goals and targets with stakeholders at Steering Group meetings. ➤ The Director of Training and Enterprise for CSV, the Manager of Sunderland Springboard, the Home Office and the Clear Track Management are updated regularly with the project’s progress.

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R7: Custody Plus*

Custody Plus	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<p>Clear Track as a Custody Plus provision would be able to demonstrate the project’s potential as a community-based element to the sentence.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To initiate negotiations with the Prison Service with regard to developing the project as a Custody Plus prototype. ➤ To continue in the development of negotiations with the Chief Officer of the Probation Service with a view to developing a referral process between Probation and Clear Track 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Due to going-live in November 2006 Clear Track have been unable to pursue this issue ➤ Clear Track have given presentations to all Sunderland Probation offices to increase awareness of Clear Track as a sentencing option. Every local probation office has a Clear Track information pack. Clear Track are awaiting the identification of Senior Practitioners from local Probation Service offices to form a constant link between Clear Track and Probation for referrals. ➤ Clear Track has distributed relevant information to the local Northumbria Probation Service electronically. This will enable Probation Officers to access information via internal IT systems.

*Note: The recommendation of custody plus has become invalid since the project’s service delivery in November 2006. For more information refer to Campbell and Lewis 2007, Section 19 and Campbell and Lewis 2007, Section 18.

Table R8: Eligibility and Suitability Criteria *

Eligibility and Suitability Criteria	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<p>Selecting appropriate candidates for Clear Track is an essential component to successfully addressing offender related needs, challenging offending behaviour and reducing re-offending. The eligibility and suitability criteria are objective measures used in the selection of appropriate referrals</p>	<p>➤ To revise the eligibility and suitability criteria with a view to providing robust and comprehensive detailed criteria aimed at providing an effective and efficient referral process.</p>	<p>➤ <i>Clear Track is to review the age criteria of the young adult offenders who are sentenced to Clear Track. The age criterion currently stands at 18-21 years of age, increasing this to 18-25 years of age.</i></p>

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R9: Substance Misuse*

Substance Misuse	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<p>The preliminary findings of the evaluation research indicate that alcohol consumption amongst Clear Track participants is more problematic than drug use amongst the same group, especially in relation to their offending behaviour.</p>	<p>➤ To provide appropriate interventions to help address problematic substance use behaviour of Clear Track participants.</p>	<p>➤ <i>Clear Track are working in close partnership with local organisations who specialise in substance misuses.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>Young adult offenders are assessed according to their substance misuse needs and then referred to appropriate interventions. Once assessed Clear Track residents with substance misuse issues are fast tracked to be seen by a substance misuses specialist.</i></p>

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R10: Cost-efficiency and Effectiveness*

Cost-efficiency and Effectiveness	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<p>The lack of referrals made to the project could affect the project’s overall cost-efficiency and effectiveness.</p>	<p>➤ For the Clear Track management team, its stakeholders and the Probation Service work effectively in increasing the frequency and number of referrals during year three of the project’s life.</p>	<p>➤ <i>Clear Track promotes the programme on a weekly basis to the local Northumbria Probation Service via phone calls, e-mails, and regular practitioner meetings.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>Clear Track also works alongside the Youth Offending Service in relation to accessing referrals.</i></p>

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R11: Induction Criteria*

Induction Criteria	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<p>The preliminary findings of the evaluation research indicate that HMP Castington performed better on a number of key induction criteria</p>	<p>➤ To improve upon the Clear Track induction process and to ensure that all Clear Track participants are provided with appropriate support and assistance throughout the induction period</p>	<p>➤ <i>All residents receive an individually tailored induction period which is dependent upon their needs. The main aim of the induction process is to settle, stabilize and introduce individuals to their new and unfamiliar surroundings.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>Clear Track staff members work on a 1 to 1 basis giving Clear Track participants maximum support with their Education, Employment, Health and other needs.</i></p> <p>➤ <i>Clear Track staff members work effectively to build and develop a mentor/mentee relationship with all residents, providing a basis for trust which in turn encourages change.</i></p>

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

Table R12: Dissonance from Offending*

Dissonance from Offending	Recommendations	Progress made by Clear Track
<p>Individual assessments which aim to identify the type and nature of interventions needed can contribute towards an understanding of an offender and the underlying nature and motivation for their offending behaviour</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To continually review and re-assess each individual offender to monitor change, progress and developments made in relation to personal circumstances and their dissonance from offending. ➤ To comprehensively document and explain the benefit and purpose of each individually selected programme and its activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Clear Track regularly reviews the progress and needs of its participants.</i>

*Note: The latest Progress made by Clear Track is shown in italics.

▪ **Abbreviations**

CJS	Criminal Justice System
CSV	Community Service Volunteers
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
GCAP	Global Call to Action Against Poverty
HMIP	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
HMP	Her Majesty's Prison
MP	Member of Parliament
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
OTS	Office of the Third Sector
PSR	Pre-Sentence Report
Rt Hon	Right Honourable
VCS	Voluntary and Community Sector
YOT	Youth Offending Team

References

- Campbell E and Lewis DM (2005), *An Evaluation Proposal of Clear Track, Report EP/11/05, November 2005*, Newcastle University
- Campbell E and Lewis DM (2006a), *An Evaluation Report of Clear Track, Phase I Report, ERI/03/06, March 2006*, Newcastle University
- Campbell E and Lewis DM (2006b), *Annual Evaluation Report of Clear Track, Phase I Report AERI/08/06, August 2006*, Newcastle University
- Campbell E and Lewis DM (2007a), *Bi-annual Evaluation Report of Clear Track, Phase II Report ERII/03/07, March 2007*, Newcastle University
- Campbell E and Lewis DM (2007b), *Second Annual Evaluation Report of Clear Track, Phase II Report AERII/08/07, August 2007*, Newcastle University
- Crawford A (2001), *Joined-up but Fragmented: Contradiction, Ambiguity and Ambivalence at the Heart of New Labour's 'Third Way'*, In R Mathews and J Pitts [Eds], *Crime, Disorder and Community Safety: A New Agenda?*, London Routledge
- Department of Trade and Industry (2006), *Annual Small Business Survey, 2005*, Department of Trade and Industry
- Fyfe NR 2005, *Making Space for "Neo-Communitarianism"? The Third Sector, State and Civil Society in the UK*, *Antipode* 37 (3), 536-557
- HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office (2007), *The Future Role of the Third Sector in Social and Economic Regeneration*, Final Report, Cm 7189, <http://hm-treasury.gov.uk>, HM Treasury
- HMIP (2003), *Summary of Young Adult Questionnaires, HMP Castington Inspection Report*, http://inspectors.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspect_reports/hmp-yoi-inspections.html/, viewed 02/08/07
- Hodgson L 2004, *Manufactured Civil Society: Counting the Cost*, *Critical Social Policy*, 24 (2), 139-164
- Home Office (2004), *Reducing Crime – Changing Lives: the Government's Plans for Transforming the Management of Offenders*, London, Home Office
- Home Office (2006), *A Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reducing Re-offending*, Cm 6717, London, The Stationery Office
- House of Commons (2006), *Oral Answers to Questions [1st December 2006], Volume 454, Part No 15, Column 559*, <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmhansrd/cm061211/debtext/61211-0019.htm>, viewed 12.03.07
- House of Lords (2005) *Management of Offenders and Sentencing Bill*, <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200405/ldbills/016/2005016.htm>, viewed 15/08/06
- House of Lords (2006), *National Offender Management Service [12th January 2006], Volume 677, Part No 86, Column 353*, <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200506/ldhansrd/vo060112/text/60112-15.htm>, viewed 15/02/08
- Ministry of Justice (2007a), *Third Sector Strategy, Improving Policies and Securing Better Public Services Through Effective Partnerships*, Consultation Paper [CP 33/07], <http://www.justice.gov.uk>, Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Justice (2007b), *Better Public Services Through Social Partnerships*, News Release 20th December 2007, <http://www.justice.gov.uk/news/newsrelease201207a.htm>, viewed 13/02/08
- National Council for Voluntary Organisations (2007), *The UK Voluntary Sector Almanac, The State of the Sector*, National Council for Voluntary Organisations
- NOMS (2005a), *Action Plan for the Development of Effective Partnership with the Voluntary and Community Sector, 2005-2007*, Home office, London
- NOMS (2005b), *The Role of the Voluntary and Community Sector in NOMS, Report of the Consultation on the Draft Strategy*, June 2005, Home Office, London
- NOMS (2007), *Third Sector Action Plan, A Draft, Securing Effective Partnerships to Reduce Re-offending and Protect the Public 2008-2011*, NOMS
- Sentencing Guidelines Council (2008) *The Sentence, The Sentencing Guidelines Newsletter, January 2008, Issue 8*, <http://www.justice.gov.uk>, viewed 11.03.08

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

Miss Danna-Mechelle Lewis
Research Associate/Doctoral Student
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 2227510
E-mail: danna-mechelle.lewis@ncl.ac.uk

Website: <http://criminaljusticeresearch.ncl.ac.uk>
Email: criminaljusticeresearch@ncl.ac.uk