

**An evaluation of the Choices and Consequences and Prolific Intensive
programmes in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire**

Jake Phillips¹, Anna Kawalek² and Anne-Marie Greenslade²

18 September 2020

¹Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice

Sheffield Hallam University

²Leeds Law School

Leeds Beckett University

Contents	
Acknowledgments	1
Funding Statement	1
About the Authors	2
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	6
The programmes: origins, history, policy and legal context	6
Previous research on C2 and PI	9
Methodology	10
Aims of the research	10
Data collection	11
Observations	11
Interviews	12
Recruitment	12
Analysis	13
Findings	13
Theme 1: Alternative measures of success	13
Resolution and reduction of crime	16
Reduction of drug use	17
Other significant changes	18
Theme 2: Resources	20
Core statutory resources	20
Cost-benefit analysis	22
External resources	23
Housing	24
Drug services	25
Resources for women	26

Theme 3: Communication and partnership working	26
The importance of communication	27
Theme 4: The support needs to be personalised and individualised	30
Theme 5: The role of deterrence	32
Overarching model	32
Electronic monitoring	33
Polygraph testing	35
Regular contact with the judicial body	36
Theme 6: relationships between Service users and the authorities	39
Conclusion	42
Considerations for rolling the programme out to other areas of the UK	44
References	46

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the participants who took part in this piece of research – for giving up their time, and for their honesty and openness in talking about their experiences of both programmes.

Funding Statement

This research was undertaken with the support of a Sheffield Hallam University Chancellor's Fellowship held by Dr Jake Phillips in 2019-2020 which was funded by donations from former students of SHU to the Hallam Fund.

About the Authors

Jake Phillips is Reader in Criminology at Sheffield Hallam University. He primarily conducts research in the field of probation and community sanctions, with a focus on the intersection between policy and practice. In recent years he has conducted research on the deaths of people under probation supervision, the emotional labour of probation practice, the impact of inspection on probation policy, and how probation can support people to desist from offending.

Anna Kawalek is a Lecturer in Law from Leeds Beckett University. She researches justice innovation, problem-solving courts and criminal justice and she primarily teaches criminal law and criminological based discourse. Anna is writing a book on UK drug courts, theorising on their downfalls, alongside conducting a case study process evaluation for the Manchester problem-solving court. Anna is also co-founder and (co-chair) of the UK Chapter for Therapeutic Jurisprudence and is a Trustee and a member of the Advisory Board for the International Society. Both these roles involve being at the forefront of international and national decision making and discussions in the area.

Anne-Marie Greenslade is a Doctoral Researcher and Graduate Teaching Assistant at Leeds Beckett University. She is currently researching modern slavery legislation and policy in the UK, with a focus on the survivor pathway through frontline support services and the criminal justice system.

Executive Summary

This research examines the process and outcomes of two similar programmes delivered in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire called, respectively Choices and Consequences (C2) and Prolific Intensive (PI). Both programmes target people who have long histories of prolific and acquisitive offending and seek to support them to lead non-offending lives through a combination of strict controls as well as an in-depth and personalised package of support. The study was conducted in response to a request from the Probation Reform Programme in the Ministry of Justice who were seeking to consider the potential role of the programme in the future probation landscape.

The programmes have been subjected to very little empirical research. In order to explore both the process and the outcomes of the programmes we adopted a mixed methodology approach including observations of the court reviews as well as interviews with a range of stakeholders and service users. Our analysis identified six key themes which highlight both benefits to the programmes as well illuminate some of the challenges for improving the service and rolling them out to other areas. These themes are: Alternative measures of success; the importance of resources; communication and partnership working; the need for support to be personalised; the role of deterrence; and the importance of the relationship between the service user and practitioners. Overall, the impression of the programmes is positive and there is evidence that they benefit both service users and the services which run them. There is evidence that the programmes have the potential to improve peoples' lives, including:

- Increased recognition of the value of traits such as honesty, accountability, and transparency in service users, causing stronger relationships and trust between individuals and the local justice agencies and authorities;
- Increased meaningful employment, better accommodation and enhanced life structure in service users;
- Pulling individuals out of expensive prisons onto a more cost-effective community-based programme;
- Increased understanding of wrongdoing and the impacts of victimisation within offenders leading to changed attitudes towards offending;
- Established positive relationships with family and children;
- Less prolific criminal activity and drug using even if not reduced completely in all cases;
- Emotional benefits and closure for victims by settling unresolved crime.

We conclude with a series of recommendations for rolling the service out to other areas as well as reflect on what can be done to improve the way in which the programmes justify their work over and above current measures of compliance and reductions in reoffending. Our main recommendations for future consideration are:

- Austerity and cutbacks are threatening the survival of the schemes, but this is particularly true of PI. Resources should be reviewed prior to roll-out to ensure that they can be successfully delivered and sustained.
- Alternative measures of success might be hard to justify to the public and communities. Wider publication of success stories, other beneficial areas, and strong advertisement may work to dislodge punitive attitudes around the value of the programme.
- PI and C2 both rely on strong partnership working and good communication. The fact that both programmes are small act as both facilitators and barriers to this way of working. Having a small team means communication is easy; people share the same values and ethos and it is possible to be co-located. This is particularly pertinent for future role out of similar schemes especially in larger cities where caseload will be higher.
- Communication was considered so integral to the successful delivery of the programme that our participants said that this should be prioritised if similar models are rolled out elsewhere; however, this takes time to build and sustain, and it should be given adequate attention in any future role out.
- Electronic monitoring is considered a key element of the programme, primarily functioning to shore up the deterrence model which underpins the programme as well as enhancing stakeholder confidence in the process, including the public. As such, it should be retained. Three potential difficulties should be considered: firstly, the tag brings about stigma when visible, and should be removed if it cannot be covered to avoid thwarting desistance narratives. Secondly, resources should be prioritised to upkeep this area given of such significance. Thirdly, all forms of tagging should be legislated to bolster practice under the Bail Act.
- Both programmes target resources very closely to people with a long history of burglary offences and with problematic drug use. It is tempting to widen the eligibility criteria to include different groups of people, offences and lifestyles but it is important to note that there is very little evidence to suggest this would work.

- The problem-solving court aspect of the programmes is seen as a positive therapeutic vehicle where a fair but hard-line approach works well. This aspect of the programme should remain front and centre going forward.

Introduction

The Choices and Consequences (C2) and Prolific Intensive (PI) programmes both seek to support people who have long histories of acquisitive offending, mainly burglary, primarily carried out to fund drug use. Despite being in operation for over a decade, both schemes have been subject to just two empirical evaluations; one qualitative study which was focused on process and implementation (King et al., 2018), and one unpublished quantitative piece of work which was focused on outcomes (CCSU, 2016). Thus, despite the programmes having been in operation for over 12 years, the knowledge base around their effect and operation is scant.

This study addresses this gap by conducting an analysis of both the process and the outcomes of the programmes in a qualitative manner. It does so through the lenses of desistance-focused practice, which sees the process of stopping offending as a (sometimes long) process which – in all likelihood – will involve lapses and relapses (McNeill et al., 2012) and therapeutic jurisprudence which seeks to understand how judicial decisions are therapeutic in nature. From these two perspectives, penal supervision is about supporting desistance rather than treating people according to a deficit model of the causes of offending by identifying and supporting people’s strengths.

The programmes have significant potential for reducing offending amongst and improving the lives of people who are engaged in high volume drug- and alcohol-related offending, and it thus holds the potential for being rolled out to other areas. This study partly aims to consider the extent to which it can, or should, be introduced to other areas of the United Kingdom.

The programmes: origins, history, policy and legal context

Two Constabularies, located in the English counties of Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire, have been running C2 and PI since 2007 and 2011, respectively (Baker, 2014). The ‘pioneers’¹ of the first programme understood that custodial sentences were inappropriate for dealing with offenders with profound and complex needs, and so established a local community enterprise amalgamating rehabilitation, deterrence and retribution. The C2 process will not be covered in depth here because Baker (2014) provides a thorough overview, which remains largely intact for both programmes.² Nevertheless, it is useful to highlight some of the programmes’ key features.

¹ Assistant Chief Constable Chris Miller and His Honour Judge Michael Baker QC (Telegraph, 2015).

² See also the C2 website for a useful flowchart of the process: <https://www.herts.police.uk/assets/Information-and-services/About-us/C2-Programme/C2-structure-chart.pdf>

The programmes largely tackle the offending behaviour of people with a long history of serial and prolific burglary convictions who are keen to reform. Some offenders admit to criminal activity ‘which was frequently measured in hundreds of offences’ (Baker, 2014; CCSU, 2016). The programmes engage a multidisciplinary team, including the Police, Probation, a Judge, and drugs and social workers, and these holistic partnerships help desistance pathways to be forged amongst clients.

In terms of the process, the programmes work very similarly to one another. Once a potential service user is identified (which could occur during the arrest stage, or once someone has been remanded to prison pending a trial), an initial conversation takes place between the service user and the practitioners on the programme. At this point, the presiding judge can grant a period of bail to the defendant during which time the police complete the ‘taken into consideration’ part of the work with the offender – this is where service users are asked to ‘confess’ to all previous offences. Once the judge is satisfied that all criminality has been cleared the move is then to deferred sentence. The bail assessment period is variable in length per offender and is decided by the judge. After assessments of risk and need are carried out, a decision is made as to whether the service user is eligible for the programme, at which point they attend court where the presiding judge will – if they agree the service user has potential to be accepted on to the programme – defer sentencing so that further assessments can take place including a pre-sentence report. After a 6-month deferral – during which service users attend court monthly – the judge decides whether to accept the defendant on to the programme. If they do, then they receive a 36-month Community Order under the Criminal Justice Act 2003, section 148, with a set of requirements and conditions with which they must abide.

As part of the bail assessment and period of deferred sentence, service users are required to confess to all committed crimes previously undetected by the Police (Baker, 2014). In the case of C2, clients are also submitted to polygraph testing to seek some assurance about the extent to which they declared all offences and remain offence free. This enables unsolved crimes to be solved, thus providing victim closure and improved police clear-up rate. This process holds deterrence value (breach of the order risks reinforcement of the original sentence inclusive of the previously undetected crimes) but it is also seen to encourage openness and honesty between the service user and professionals and thus marks the start of a productive officer-offender relationship (Baker, 2014). If at any point the service user reoffends, or the Judge considers that they are not fully engaged with the programme, they can be breached and sentenced for the original offence plus any offences disclosed during the bail assessment period. Baker (2014) also

outlines the somewhat unconventional treatment of some breaches by the imposition of a short (3 month) sentence while keeping the community order alive. At all times, the service user must engage with their probation officer and the police team.

From a theoretical perspective, the threat of sentence resurrection incentivises compliance with conditions attached to the community order, inclusive of incapacitative measures, such as electronic tagging, as well as comprehensive rehabilitative requirements,³ such as a drug rehabilitation requirement, programmes for education/employment, referrals to treatment within outside agencies, and restorative justice (Baker, 2014). As well as motivating compliance, the ‘consequences’ of reoffending whilst on the order are imposed in order to maintain ‘public credibility’ (Baker, 2014: 57). Minor breaches of the Order might be sanctioned with small fines or additional requirements (rather than programme revocation). In the case of a significant breach – such as a reconviction - the prolific nature of service users’ offending means that a custodial sentence of several years is a likely outcome (Baker, 2014).

The programmes fit well within the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) framework of practice. IOM aims to provide an ‘enhanced level of surveillance and control to a range of different types of offender, while also providing rehabilitation for those who are willing to accept help’ (HMI Probation and HMI Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, 2020: 11). Historically used to target high volume offenders, IOM adopts a multi-agency approach to both supporting and supervising people in the community. The main partners are usually the police; probation; and other services such as drug services and housing providers are heavily involved. In its recent thematic inspection of IOM, HMI Probation and HMI CFRS (2020) suggest that good IOM requires strong leadership, good partnership working and good staff training/development. It was also considered imperative for programmes to have good information and intelligence sharing processes.

C2 and PI make significant use of regular Judge-led reviews in a relaxed but formal court setting – this sets the programmes apart from most IOM schemes and means that they operate in way that is more akin to problem solving courts. The Judge has the power to remove and add provisions to the order, but in doing so, recasts their role from a neutral arbitrator of the law to a problem-solver. International therapeutic jurisprudence research demonstrates that the strong role of the judiciary, including their manner and styles of communication, is critical for mobilising outputs (Hora, 2002; Kerr et al., 2011; Petrucci, 2002; Winick and Wexler, 2003). The

³ These are provided for within Criminal Justice Act (2003): s177.

multidisciplinary team, including the Police, Probation, and drugs and social workers, might also attend the court reviews to help build alliance when forging desistance pathways with service users. C2 and PI borrow features from the international drug court model (Ashcroft et al., 1997), including the carrot-and-stick approach, multi-disciplinary approach, and court reviews overseen by a dedicated presiding Judge to inspire law compliance and rehabilitative outcomes (Baker, 2014)⁴. The key outputs of the programme are also similar as they seek to reduce to recidivism and rehabilitate offenders (CCSU, 2016).

Previous research on C2 and PI

There has been very little public, political, and empirical attention given to C2 and PI despite them being in operation since 2007 and 2011, respectively. To establish literature gaps for the current evaluation, we searched several databases but uncovered very few results. Non-empirical results include the programmes' websites, which provides some background programme information.⁵ The C2 programme is mentioned and acknowledged on the Justice Innovation Charity's website.⁶ Furthermore, Judge Baker, who pioneered the programme provides a useful report overviewing the sentencing process from the first-hand perspective of a C2 Judge (Baker, 2014), although provides no empirical findings vis a vis the programmes' effectiveness.

Empirical results for the programme include a restricted report from the Hertfordshire County Community Safety Unit (2016) evaluating the programme's achievement of key objectives between the period of 2007 to 2016 using a quantitative approach. Although only a small sample of 90 cases were analysed (itself reflective of the small number of C2 candidates), the CCSU (2016) reported a 75% reduction in offences for the period. That said, a large proportion of individuals had had their sentence revoked (78%) (CCSU, 2016). This suggests that the 'results' in these terms are a mixed bag. In relation to the latter finding, researchers commented that: 'the programme is a 4-year term so this length and extent of commitment for previously prolific offenders needs to be taken into account' (CCSU, 2016: 7). As such, alternative measures of success that go beyond reductions to offending are important, and this should be borne in mind.

Empirical research evaluating C2 processes was most recently offered in a qualitative study by King et al (2018). This research analysed the implementation of C2 by applying Kotter's

⁴ Powers are provided for Drug Rehabilitation Requirements under Criminal Justice Act (2003): 210

⁵ See <https://www.herts.police.uk/Information-and-services/About-us/C2-Programme> and <https://youturnfutures.com/integrated-offender-management/>

⁶ The charity is responsible for leading and overseeing research in the UK.

theoretical model of organisational change. The model of change was, in part, used to explain some of the lack of outcome successes from the aforementioned research (King et al, 2018). King et al (2018) speculated that disappointing outcomes for C2 might be a result of insufficiently embedded organisational changes. Some of the key findings included:

- A "lack of brand identity", general strategy, and long-term goals;
- "Absence of guiding coalition" amongst the multi-disciplinary services, and an 'us and them' mentality between the police and probation services;
- A blurring of roles and inconsistent understanding of what each role of the practitioner must achieve.

This research seeks to clarify the gaps left by these previous studies. The CCSU report was heavily focused upon outcomes whilst Baker's (2014) report focused only on process. As such, this study focuses on both process and outcome. We also seek to reconceptualise the King et al (2018) finding that recidivism results were disappointing, by exploring alternative notions of 'effectiveness' which seem particularly relevant to this model.

Methodology

Aims of the research

As already mentioned, this study takes a desistance-focused approach to understand the ways in which the programme does and does not achieve its stated aims. Previous research has also focused on process or outcomes and have been restricted to one mode of data collection. The current study adopts a mixed methodology approach to understand both the process and outcomes of the programme. Building on the findings presented throughout this review, the aims of the study are:

- To evaluate the process by which the programmes are implemented, administered and organised from the perspectives of staff and service users;
- To analyse the way in which sentencing judges handle service users during the review process.
- To identify what benefits staff, service users and the community gain from the project;
- To identify ways in which the programmes might expanded – either through introducing them in new areas, or by expanding the cohort through a change to eligibility requirements.

More specifically, the following set of research questions guided our research and data collection:

- To what extent do practitioners understand, recognise and value the model?
- Does the judiciary operate therapeutically during the review aspect of their work?
- Does C2 strengthen connections between probation, agencies, police and courts, as well as the adequacy of wrap-around treatment services?
- Does C2 mirror international best practice and well-established principles?
- To what extent does the carrot-and-stick approach incentivise offenders into compliance and what are the outcomes of compliance with the programme?
- Is there potential in rolling the programme out to other areas and, if so, what needs to be considered to ensure this is done effectively?

In order to answer these research questions, we collected qualitative data with two groups of stakeholders: criminal justice professionals and service users. In addition, we carried out structured and unstructured observations to gain an insight into the court review process. We had intended to make use of the Ministry of Justice's Justice Data Lab in order to calculate the reoffending rate of people who had been on the programmes. However, due to a range of issues it has not been possible for this work to be carried out in time to include in this report. It is, however, a piece of work that is worth pursuing for the purposes of better understanding how effective they are. The research was approved by Sheffield Hallam University's Research Ethics Committee and access was granted by the HMPPS National Research Committee, the Judicial Office and the two local constabularies.

Data collection

Observations

The first phase of data collection involved observations of the court process in order to shed light on how the court works in its real-life capacity, who is engaged, and how they are engaged. Visual observations were therefore carried out overtly by a researcher in the courtroom public gallery. In order to assess the extent to which the project is meeting its aims, and in line with research already outlined, observations considered the way in which the Judge and other key criminal justice personnel interact with clients.

At this stage, it was important that we collected some basic demographic information for service users, including offender name, so the methods can build upon one another; this allowed us to later interview the same participants, or follow up if we generated an unusual finding. Other demographics allowed us to understand whether there were any changes in the handling of cases according to these factors.

Interviews

The second phase of data collection comprised semi-structured interviews with two distinct groups of interviewees: criminal justice professionals, and service users. The interviews focused on participants' experiences of working on, or with, the project and to identify the benefits they have gained from being involved. Thus, professionals were asked about how the project is implemented and administered, what works well and what might be working less well. Interviews with this group also explored how the project facilitates certain types of working such as partnership working or practice which is desistance-focused.

The interviews with service users concentrated on their experiences of being referred to the project and how they experienced being supervised by the court and other relevant professionals. We asked participants to speak about what benefits they have gained - these benefits will be broadly defined, recognising that for some service users a seemingly small improvement in their entrenched lifestyle can be difficult to achieve. We also focused on the extent to which the programme is seen to be delivered fairly - a procedural justice angle alerts us to the idea that where decisions are seen to be transparent and fair, people are more likely to comply, and do so substantively (Leben, 2018).

Recruitment

Following approval from the HMPPS National Research Committee, we recruited practitioners by contacting senior staff in the police and probation services via email. They acted as key intermediaries and provided us with contact details for the relevant practitioners, which enabled us to organise mutually suitable interview dates. Following our court observations, where we met some staff in person, we were able to identify and liaise with other practitioners who were happy to participate. Early interviews were conducted face to face in confidential spaces at probation offices, police stations or in the Court, while later interviews took place over the phone. We recruited service users primarily through their probation officers, who introduced us and organised dates, times and venues for the interviews. All interviewees gave informed consent to participate and interviews were recorded with permission.

Sample

In total we interviewed 26 people (see Table 1 for a breakdown of our sample). This sample was large enough to take in a range of views and deep enough to achieve saturation in terms of themes.

Table 1

Site 1: C2		Site 2: PI	
Practitioners	Service Users	Practitioners	Service Users
6	7	7	3

The sample of service users represents the caseload in terms of gender and ethnic makeup. We had intended to interview service users who are no longer involved, either because they successfully completed the programme, or breached the terms of involvement but this proved unfeasible. The sample also includes the Judges from each site and the former Judge who set up the programme.

Analysis

The interviews were fully transcribed, anonymously, and analysed along thematic lines. The aim of the analysis was to identify the key aspects that work well, the main barriers to successful implementation and the main benefits as perceived by participants. When it came to analysing the benefits that service users gain from involvement in the project, we made use of a desistance framework for analysis which seeks to understand the extent to which the project might facilitate enhanced forms of capital which are associated with processes of desistance and reduced offending.

Findings

Our analysis of interview data resulted in six key themes being identified: Alternative measures of success; the importance of resources; communication and partnership working; the need for support to be personalised; the role of deterrence; and the import of the relationship between the service user and practitioners. These are dealt with in turn below. In each case we identify what it is that is important about each theme, what facilitates this working and what challenges exist. In doing so, we shed light on both the outcomes of the programmes as well as the processes which lead up to these outcomes. As will be shown, these two things are very closely interdependent.

Theme 1: Alternative measures of success

Most criminal justice interventions are evaluated with reference to reoffending rates, recidivism or other proxy measures of success which are – nonetheless – tied to being under probation supervision such as compliance or successful completion of an Order (Ugwudike and Phillips, 2019).

Offenders who agree to participate in PI or C2 are knowingly committing to four-year programmes, during which time they will be required to make serious changes to their lifestyles and challenge attitudes that have often been entrenched since youth. The length of the programmes thus allows space for the complex unpicking and reassembling of this self-narrative (Maruna, 2001). Nonetheless, this level of commitment is a huge undertaking for individuals who have only known chaotic routines and managed their lives on a far more immediate basis (CCSU, 2016).

That's usually my argument with people, it's a three-year order for a reason because those entrenched behaviours take a long time to change. So that's the main strategy I suppose, main aim, is to help people turn their lives around completely (Probation Officer 3: PI).

Currently, the sole measure of success is quantified by the number of service users who complete the entire programme. This equates to approximately 13% of C2 service users (Police Officer 1: C2; Police Officer 2: C2), while the PI scheme shows a higher rate of 22% (n=2) (You Turn Futures, Unpublished report)⁷. These figures largely reflect the original aims of the programme when implemented in 2007 (Baker, 2014) and backed up by this quote from Judge Baker when we spoke to him:

When it started I set a target in my own mind of a 15% success rate... I do remember correspondence with a local prison governor saying he thought that was extraordinarily low and I remember thinking when I got that I thought the response was extraordinarily optimistic but 15% was what I'd always originally set. (Judge)

However, it's important to note that success here does not necessarily refer only to successful completions but to 'a complete change of life-style' (Baker, 2014: 57). The response of the prison governor is more representative of the instant, target-driven agenda that is generally preferred by recent governments (Jones and Kawalek, 2019). A completion rate of 15% does seem particularly low, especially considering around 70% of community orders either run their full course or are revoked early for good progress (Ministry of Justice, 2019). However, this figure does not represent the more nuanced and personal areas of progress that are made by service users and recognised by staff and service users during interviews. One probation officer acknowledged that

⁷ It should be noted that the latter result is drawn from a much smaller cohort (NGO Practitioner 1: PI)

recording smaller, less palpable achievements was a “*more difficult thing to show Joe Public*” (Probation Officer 1: PI), and practitioners had a range of examples of what success looks like:

For some people it might be the smallest thing that somebody looking in might think, oh, that's not a massive step for them but actually for them it is. For example, just one of our guys for the first time actually being honest about lapsing in his drug use whereas he's never normally honest (Probation Officer 4: C2)

I mean there's somebody who's gone into employment who used to be not working a nine to five, again, that's a success (NGO Practitioner 2: PI).

Even if they don't complete the programme you see a change in I'd say almost all of them that come on to the programme (Police Officer 3: C2).

Practitioners also indicated that these changes can be more far-reaching in the longer term, suggesting that immediate results – or lack thereof – may not necessarily provide the only signals of the programme’s efficacy. As per research on the desistance process, change can be a long time coming and probation’s impact is not always felt until some years afterwards (Farrall et al., 2014):

I got the distinct impression that people who had failed but failed well realised when they were sentenced, resentenced, that they had missed a real opportunity so my thought was, and to some extent remains, that we're looking at something very long-term in which it's only much later in life that one is going to find offenders who have been really significantly influenced by the programme (Judge).

We have some people that fail the programme, go to prison but actually we never hear from them again (Probation Officer 1: C2)

The difficulty here is that there is currently no formal follow-up between the authorities and service users, regardless of whether they complete the programme or not. While some practitioners talked about staying in contact with individuals, this was voluntary and therefore inconsistent. The informal nature of this follow-up means that there is no recorded data with which to analyse long-term outcomes. What is clear is that completion figures alone are simply not enough to gauge success, particularly given the profound life changes that are asked of individuals and the commitment that is applied in making those changes. It may be beneficial for

the service to consider measuring ‘intermediate outcomes’ as a way of substantiating and demonstrating what the programme achieves (Wong, 2019).

Resolution and reduction of crime

As part of their commitment to the programme, service users are asked to divulge all undetected crimes with some individual having confessed to offences measured in the hundreds (Baker, 2014; CCSU, 2016). Verifying these crimes uses vast amounts of police time and resources but, alongside the deterrent of a longer custodial sentence in the event of a breach of Order (Baker 2014), this can bring resolution to both the police and victims. One police officer described returning a purse full of family photos to an elderly victim, three years after the item had been stolen from her home during a burglary.

To give that back to that elderly victim, can you imagine the tears? She was just - I mean I've gone cold just thinking about the reactions we got from her. The closure she got. She was so grateful (Police Officer 1: C2).

As stated previously, the CCSU report (2016) found that service user engagement with the C2 programme was commensurate with a 75% reduction in offences compared to the previous two years. Considering some service users are committing many offences per week to fund their problematic drug use, the reduction in the number of victims is likely to be substantial. Similarly, research participants reported that individuals were committing significantly less crime, with some desisting immediately.

He stopped committing crime because he didn't want to go to prison and now I feel like he doesn't commit crime because he understands it's wrong and he understands it hurts people. That's one of the biggest changes I've seen. (Probation Officer 1: C2)

He had not burgled anybody's house in the two and a half to three years since he had been on the programme and that in itself is success. (Judge)

I'm not doing crime. There has been no intelligence whatsoever, because I don't even think of doing any crime, even when I'm short of cash or whatever that doesn't enter my head no more. (Service User 1: PI)

Notably, a greater empathy towards victims was shown to be a strong factor in the reduction of residential burglaries (Police Officer 1: C2; Probation Officer 1: C2). Where individuals

continued to offend, they were selectively opting for commercial buildings – these crimes were not condoned by practitioners but was viewed as a positive because “*I’d much prefer to have someone shoplifting than I would breaking in to people’s houses*” (Probation Officer 1: C2). As one of the primary goals of the programmes is to reduce crime, these findings should be considered successes despite the low completion rate. They can be periodically collated within the timeframe of the individual service user commitment and will provide a regular set of statistics against which to measure the efficiency of the programme. The high proportion of service users returning to prison (CCSU, 2016) also indicates increased levels of detection due to closer contact with the offender.

As soon as those things start going wrong then we can start putting measures in to place straightaway to then get that individual back in to court and then taken out and back in to prison again. So success is not just about coming through the programme, success as well is in regard to the team identifying that individual has now become so high risk that they need to be back in prison again to protect the community (Police Officer 1: PI)

I also class lots of the cases that didn’t get through as successes because they were in jail much quicker because we had oversight of them than they would have been if we hadn’t got much oversight on them (Probation Officer 1: PI)

While this is not the aim of the programme, it is an indirect effect of stronger relationships between service users and the authorities. Fundamentally, the programme is couched in an ethos of honesty, trust and transparency, which flows both ways between service users and practitioners (Police Officer 1: C2; Service User 2: C2; see also Themes 5 & 6). Where these relationships are forged, the circumstances that would ordinarily lead service users to commit crime can be discussed and resolved, maintaining the service user’s commitment to the programme and ultimately to ending a life of crime.

Reduction of drug use

The principal reason for committing crime amongst this cohort is the need to fund drug and alcohol use (Ashcroft et al., 1997; Baker, 2014). However, even with long-term, intensive rehabilitation, the nature of addiction means that measurements of success are, again, variable and nuanced.

Maybe there should be different measures of success because for me somebody who's a lifelong Class A addict committing hundreds of burglaries who's now in full-time employment with a family but still has this small self-funded cannabis problem, I think every Tom, Dick and Harry normal person would view them as rehabilitated (Police Officer 1: C2).

If someone is smoking cannabis, not committing crime, not using Class A and he's working and paying taxes and integrated into society, is that necessarily a failure? (Probation Officer 1: C2)

When he started the programme he was addicted to diazepam, drank daily and Class As and when he finished the programme he stopped the prescription drugs, had stopped the Class As and alcohol remained but he was managing it. When you look at successes for me that's the kind of stuff you're measuring (Probation Officer 2: PI)

The suggestions above imply that determining whether drug addiction has successfully been overcome is relative, both in respect of the service user's previous substance misuse and against wider societal norms. Coupled with diminished or absent criminal activity it could be said that the programme's success stories need to be understood on a spectrum rather than an unequivocal gauge of programme completion.

Other significant changes

The programme aims to engender holistic changes for service users, many of which will develop as a result of the more specific crime and drug rehabilitation goals. Practitioners were able to recall in detail those service users whose achievements had been transformational:

He'd never walked into court through the front door and he did complete the programme and from day one he never touched Class A drugs. We just totally got him right at the right time and he's the one that's got five, six children and was learning to read and write so he could do stuff with his own kids (Probation Officer 3: PI).

This is someone who now trusts and works with the police so much he's even bringing his own son in because he doesn't want his son to go down the route obviously, he did because he's seen how different life can be. ... One of them even

dragged his own son to the police station when his son has committed a crime. That's the level of relationship we end up having with these people (Police Officer 1: C2).

I met him when he first come in on C2, he was very down about his life, didn't really have much in terms of housing, family network support. He rebuilt his relationship with, I think it's his mum... He sees more of his little boy because he really built the relationship with his ex-partner (Police Officer 2: C2)

The examples cited here underline another key indicator of success. Where service users reconnected with family, particularly their children, it improved their sense of grounding and motivation to stay on track. This links to the theme of accountability to loved ones, which has been demonstrated to reduce criminal activity in individuals and the idea that family relationships should be the golden thread that runs through all criminal justice interventions (Farmer, 2017). Where ex-service users have forged positive relationships, fear of violating or fracturing these bonds can have a significant influence on desistance (Villeneuve et al., 2019):

I've got more of a heart now. I realise a lot of things now. Being on the C2 course has brought me closer to my family. My mum's proud of me now. I engage with my daughter quite a bit now, she's 14 years old so she knows what's right and wrong (Service User 2: C2).

However, where service users have come from difficult backgrounds, the opportunity to establish better familial relationships may not be available. Although personal accountability can be facilitated through positive relationships with practitioners (see Theme 6), this is not a panacea to wider familial, societal and cultural problems.

Fundamentally, holistic changes involve a sea change in the service user's lifestyle and almost all service user participants made reference to having more structure as a result of the programme. This coincides with an attitudinal transformation that embraces the changes.

Yeah, I just don't want to go back to how I used to be. My life was worthless. I had no meaning to myself. Now I've got a meaning, I've got a purpose to be here now and a lot of things have changed since I've come off drugs and I'm abstinent. A lot of things have changed. I've got a lot of rewards from it (Service User 2: C2).

My mind isn't working the same. I'm not driving down the road looking for people to rob. I'm driving down the road looking at roofs, thinking 'Your tile's slipped' or 'Oh, you need a bit of leadwork doing' (Service User 2: PI).

My mind is more structured I'd say, more disciplined. It's not about waking up thinking, oh, where am I going to get money from? How am I going to get my gear? I'm waking up thinking, right, I hope this bloody bus turns up otherwise I'm going to be late for whatever. It's different priorities now. Whereas before I was always late to get to stuff, now I'm early, I'm always early to get to places so it's changed my mindset on a lot of things (Service User 7: C2).

The current measures of success do not consider the reality of service user pathways and provide only the endpoint of necessarily complex and nuanced journeys that take place within the context of both programmes. It is difficult to identify definitive means of gauging success but our participants raised important questions about how success is perceived by criminal justice authorities, those involved with programmes, and the public. There are certainly options to utilise the quantifiable measures that are already being recorded and create a more complete picture of individual and overall successes. A greater understanding of long-term outcomes should also be considered.

Theme 2: Resources

Core statutory resources

Funding for the programmes primarily comes from the relevant local authorities, with the local police force contributing the largest share and probation providing the rest (Judge). The C2 programme was initiated in 2007, some time before the effects of the 2008 recession were felt. However, PI began as an offshoot of IOM in 2011, by which time the Coalition Government had begun to implement austerity measures. Since then, public sector cuts appear to have had a detrimental impact on both programmes, although the respondents from PI in particular seemed to feel this most keenly:

It's very difficult to make something work well when you've got less and less and less resource... we've just had so much taken away from us. (Probation Officer 1: PI)

I suppose really kind of resources on the human side of things is struggling at the moment, we are struggling on that, to provide that support to the individual. (Police Officer 1: PI)

Comparing from the beginning to now there's a lot of struggles we do face in terms of funding and resources which really do impact and drain on our capacity to deliver what we set out to achieve in the beginning. (Probation Officer 4: PI)

Cuts to police and probation numbers mean that individual caseloads have stretched to capacity (Police Officer 1: PI) which, in turn, creates difficult choices for service leads. In probation, the more specialised nature of PI provisions have been “*diluted*” (Probation Officer 1: PI) and the cohort has been reduced from over twenty to three or four (Probation Officer 4: PI). Where further police cuts need to be made, the entire scheme could be under threat: “*there's £150,000 saved and that's the cost of one or two police officers*” (Judge). In fact, only one participant felt that the PI scheme was adequately funded although this was an NGO practitioner rather than a representative from the programmes, and it was recognised that the funding was “*under threat going into next year*” (NGO Practitioner 1: PI). Another significant issue was the dispersal of services; previously all practitioners involved with PI had been located in the same building.

It used to be a real one stop shop so we would have everyone based under one roof, whether that be the education, training, employment, the drug workers, all specifically working with the PI cases. (Probation Officer 4: PI)

Police and probation officers alike complained that the reduced access to colleagues and information was costing them more time and communication had deteriorated. This suggests a reduction in the overall efficiency of the scheme, which appears to be surviving on the goodwill of the remaining practitioners.

We do hit a number of obstacles in trying to fight for the resources and funding to keep the scheme going. (Probation Officer 4: PI)

I don't feel it's working well right now. I think it hasn't worked well for quite some time but not for the want of trying... IOM is a model that I would back to the back of my teeth in terms of it works, it worked, it set the principle, the principle in itself is absolutely spot on but you can only do so much when people start taking the resources out. (Probation Officer 1: PI)

Conversely, C2 practitioners did not express as much frustration as their PI colleagues about funding, although it would be incorrect to state that resource issues do not exist within the C2 programme. There has been difficulty obtaining funding for alcohol testing kits (Judge) and some C2 service users voiced their concerns about the lack of direct support after office hours:

The Judge says, he says it every time, 'if you're feeling like you're having a difficult moment pick up the phone.' Reality is you pick up the phone... no one will answer... and also, here's the other thing, it's not a nine till five problem is it? It's a 24 hour a day problem so what happens after five o'clock? Sorry, after three o'clock? (Service User 5: C2)

I suppose the worst part is after four o'clock there's no one there if you need support. There's been times when I've been stranded, the bus driver's given me the wrong ticket... so the only option I've got is to walk from St Albans to Hemel and I'm going to be late on my curfew so I start getting anxious, you know... Okay, there's someone on the phone but he can only say, 'well, there's not much we can do but thanks for calling us and letting us know'. (Service User 7: C2)

The consequences of feeling stranded, both physically and metaphorically, increase the risk of service users breaching their orders, either by relying on more established coping strategies such as drug use or through breaking curfew as in the case mentioned above. Given the already stretched resources, it is unrealistic to recommend 24-hour support, but there is evidently a gap in the programme for vulnerable individuals who will inevitably face challenges at evenings and weekends.

Cost-benefit analysis

Although the criminal justice system has generally erred towards punitive measures in dealing with drug-using offenders (O'Connor, 2018), it is difficult to promote incarceration as the most cost-effective means of reducing drug-related criminal activity. The PI scheme costs less than keeping the same cohort in prison although we could not access accurate figures on this. Yet, in a politically charged landscape, governments are rarely keen to endorse programmes that appear to give offenders the “soft option”, even if this is not the reality (Theme 5):

It is labour intensive, and I don't see the Government ever giving money towards that, but instead of somehow materialising tens of millions of pounds to build

another prison, a fraction of that could be spent in rehabilitating some of these offenders. That's a different issue, a more political issue (Judge).

Even discrete expenses can provide a greater worth than their face value; one example given was of the police purchasing a tennis racquet for a service user, enabling him to play sports with his children (NGO Practitioner 1: PI). Rehabilitation may require more human resources and time, but short-term measures will only produce immediate results. Theme 1 outlines the enduring advantages of the programme and, if criminal justice aims shift to a more prospective vision, there is a positive case for greater investment now.

Ultimately I think it's a great scheme to allow people to slowly get back in to society who may not have that opportunity to change their lives if they were just in a prison cell, but at the same time I think there needs to be probably more support and a bit more additional resources used so that these individuals can actually get the best out of being out of jail so the lack of resource or the lack of structure doesn't entice them back in to jail. (NGO Practitioner 2: PI)

External resources

PI and C2 practitioners have made strong links with other organisations to provide a range of holistic services and create a package of support (Police Officer 1: C2). This is an ongoing effort, however, as austerity gnaws at the voluntary sector just as savagely, causing some charities to close or reduce services (Greenslade, In progress; Kawalek, 2020). It is thus incumbent upon the authorities to "*keep on tapping into all of our sources*" (Police Officer 1: C2) which further stretches their own human resources:

Obviously during the cuts on different services and stuff like that I can understand why other agencies withdrew their staff in to working more centralised in their own business areas, however it's kind of had a detrimental effect on the way we run the programme. (Police Officer 1: PI)

That's something we always struggle with, is education, training and employment, it's very much trying to get funding, trying to help people find courses. There are agencies out there that help but if colleges, places that offer apprenticeships, if we had a pathway in to them, we are always working on. (Probation Officer 1: C2)

The PI programme now works in partnership with YouTurn Futures, a non-profit organisation, to carry out most of this legwork and organise the agency contracts. While this frees up police and

probation time, a potential downside to this is weaker direct relationships between the authorities and partnership organisations although we should note we did not observe this occurring.

Housing

Housing is one of the most immediate needs and is imperative to the success of the programme. New service users cannot be released from prison until accommodation is secured, as the authorities “*lose all control if they're just bouncing off of sofas*” (Police Officer 4: C2). Given the challenging lifestyles of the cohort, the programme tends to rely on housing associations and charities rather than councils (Police Officer 1: C2; Judge), however, turnaround times are inconsistent, meaning that some individuals are waiting for months in prison after agreeing to participate in the scheme (Co-ordinating Police Officer: C2; Service User 1:C2). Meanwhile, they can be subjected to repeated physical violence by other prisoners who perceive them as siding with the police (Observational data). This asks a lot of personal resolve from service users to sustain their commitment under these conditions. Furthermore, accommodation standards are not always conducive to rehabilitation:

It's quite common for offenders to be struggling in the particular accommodation that they are in, for example there may be another individual within that accommodation unit that they've got in to the habit of taking drugs with or who they will say keeps coming and offering them drugs or is winding them up. (Judge)

It was really hard to stay clean and live with 40 other idiots basically... They offered me somewhere in the summer and my drugs worker at The Haven said don't take it, it's a house full of druggies basically, they're going to set you up to fail and that wasn't C2's fault, that was The Haven's fault because the housing worker hadn't spoke to them. (Service User 5: C2)

Part of the issue here is the cost of housing, particularly in this part of the country. For those service users looking to secure more independent accommodation, high rental prices act as a barrier. Coupled with fewer employment opportunities (due to limited work experience and qualifications) the ability to leave supported accommodation is severely impaired.

At the moment for me it's trying to find somewhere decent to live that isn't this trap that they get you in which is put you in accommodation that's £280 a week rent, plus £20 on top that I have to pay a week so £290 a week each for a two bedroom flat, that's £2,500 a month for a two bedroom flat. I can't get a job first.

Sorry, I can't move out. I have to move out before I get a job. You kind of feel stuck in that situation. (Service User 6: C2)

Moreover, where individuals are simply unable to leave their current housing, those spaces are denied to potential new service users. This further compounds the issue of offenders waiting indefinitely in prison after agreeing to participate in the programme.

Drug services

Drug services are another essential component of the scheme and are instrumental in monitoring drug use for the purposes of Court Reviews (Baker, 2014). The PI programme originally had a designated drug worker situated in the same building as the police and probation, meaning that service users could turn up at any point and speak with someone. The dismantling of this arrangement, however, means that drop-in support has significantly disintegrated.

We're so busy, we do encourage them to drop in at any occasion but sometimes they drop in and none of us here because we're off doing other things. (Police Officer 1: PI)

C2's current drug service provider came under criticism from practitioners and service users alike.

It's not my drug workers fault, they changed contracts at the beginning of the year and I've had nothing but problems with appointments, trying to reduce was a complete nightmare because you ask to reduce and then you're still waiting to be reduced six weeks later (Service User 5: C2).

There's no routine with [them], they see different keyworkers every time they attend and they're constantly changing staff so there's no routine for the service user and I think routine is a very important thing for them (Co-ordinating Police Officer: C2)

I had two of the offenders saying 'I know that I could/should have done more on this myself but I turn up to [the drug service] for appointments and the person isn't there. They say they're going to phone me; they don't phone me.' I'm increasingly getting the impression that that organisation is struggling (Judge).

The other big one is drugs services. We use, I think they're called [anonymised] this month... It changes regularly (Police Officer 4: C2).

This should not necessarily be understood as a direct criticism of the drug service provider. Rather, the way in which commissioning occurs means that service delivery is irregular which, in turn, weakens the overall efficiency of the programme in a vital area of support; this can erode trust amongst its statutory partners and service users. Given the ethos of trust that underpins C2, this considerably affects the ability of practitioners to maintain consistency across the programme.

Resources for women

Women make up a small percentage of this cohort but this does not negate the need for women's services in this area, although it is reflective of a wider lack of national and local support provisions for women, particularly in specialist areas of support (Probation Officer 1: C2):

Well, the men, they do boxing and things like that so they should have something for the women then. ... They've got the Digswell, they've got Emmaus, they've got their groups, they've got everything, the NA all around them, people from their groups all around them where I've got my group and no one around me and things like that. No NA around me. So I do feel a bit left out ... I'm jealous. It's like you get fucking everything, I'm here, what the fuck am I getting? I've just to go Resolve, Resolve, Resolve, Resolve, Resolve (Service User 4: C2).

This service user also described feelings of disenfranchisement and frustration that she was prevented from exchanging numbers with another attendee. While there are understandable policy reasons for discouraging association outside of the group, the dearth of support for female service users can leave this demographic feeling particularly isolated.

Austerity has clearly impacted all sectors over the past decade, but the symbiotic nature of statutory and voluntary organisations in programmes such as PI and C2 means that these schemes continually feel the reverberations of funding cuts (Cooper and Mansfield, 2020). Police and probation officers are required to stay vigilant to changes in their partner organisations, which, combined with stretched resources of their own, has a deleterious effect on their ability to deliver a quality service. This is further compounded by inconsistencies within the two core external services, housing and drug support, without which the programmes would be unable to operate at all. Additional consideration should also be given to female service user provisions.

Theme 3: Communication and partnership working

The importance of communication in schemes such as PI and C2 came out very strongly, reflecting those findings from HMI Probation and HMI Constabulary, Fire and Rescue Service's

thematic inspection into IOM (2020) in our interviews, especially with staff working on the project.

The importance of communication

Communication is seen as beneficial to most forms of practice in this field with Phillips et al (2020) arguing that one of the key benefits to delivering probation practice in community hubs (venues in which different services are housed so that service users can access the support they need as and when) is the ease and speed of communication between different agencies. Poor communication has regularly been cited as a reason for failures, for example in serious further offences (HMI Probation, 2020a) or the Joseph McCann case in which communication was considered critical to the failure to manage McCann effectively (HMI Probation, 2020b). In its inspection of IOM, HMI Probation and HMI CFRS (2020) highlighted the need for good communication, reflected in interviews with both police and probation staff in our sample:

We do have a great working relationship as a team. We sit together, work together, and so it is a great working relationship and it's really open with regards to communication and everyone's quite comfortable to share their thoughts about how we work together or how we think that we should put intervention in place for one of the guys. (Probation Officer 2: PI)

So the communication with court's always been really good. (Probation Officer 3: PI)

So that open communication is very, very important so that we're all on the same page and also able to support us holistically rather than it being a bit bitty. (NGO Practitioner 2: PI)

It is important to note that the model adopted by PI and C2 is seen to promote good relations with the courts, especially considering data which suggests that Transforming Rehabilitation initially led to poorer communication between courts and probation providers (HMI Probation, 2017). The co-located nature of the team came out as significant in terms of facilitating good communication:

They [the drug team] still don't live with us but they do turn up now for the RAG meetings which means that we get that information on a fortnightly basis... Whereas we used to have them in the office, so they would just talk to the officers about what's going on, the officers now are required to actually get in touch with

them and find out what's happening because we don't automatically get told. It's not an impossible thing to do, it just makes more life difficult than it used to be.
(Probation Officer 1: PI)

One area where the programme stands out in terms of communication and collaboration is the way in which the programme works with the judge. Whereas sentencers are ordinarily removed from the police and probation officers who manage a case, our interviewees gave the impression that the sentencer was part and parcel of the whole team:

He will, if he's got chance, invite us back in to chambers afterwards but we don't sit there and personally dissect personalities of people or anything like that, but he will say, 'What about so and so? Where do we think we're going with him? Do you think he's got it in him? Where are you with this situation?' (Police Officer 1: C2)

Having a good rapport with the judge helps because it's the same judge that's reviewing them constantly, the one-to-one sessions for the service user from the judge directly helps. With the input from probation and the C2 team in the court reviews, again, is probably spot on really. (Co-ordinating Police Officer: C2)

Communication is critical because the programme depends upon and is underpinned by an ethos of partnership working. There is an explicit acknowledgement that no one organisation can do everything that service users require.

I suppose things can get quite repetitive, or perhaps you're relying on a certain agency to do something and they haven't been able to do it for whatever reason. I think that's part and parcel of most multiagency working, which is why I think it's good that each person is co-worked by a probation. (Probation Officer 1: C2)

A lot of other areas would be quite jealous of our set up because you could have joint sessions with your offender and look at what the issues are and you as the probation officer can be the one enforcing everything and they can see that you're having that discussion with the drug worker and things won't get lost or they can't muck you about. It keeps things tight (Probation Officer 3: PI)

I think it's great working multiagency. I think to manage a case well you need to be having a lot of professional discussions around them. A lot of people notice different things about people. I think that collaborative working is something I

really enjoy and I think it's really beneficial for that person (Probation Officer 1: C2)

Yeah, and that's where the multiagency works so well, because everybody has got their own strengths and, yeah, we learn stuff along the way but I'm not going to start chatting to someone about why they're using and triggers and bits because I'm not an expert in that. Police officers who manage them do but then what they do with that information is feed it straight back into probation! It's about knowing your own roles within the project and doing your own role to the best of your ability. (Police Officer 1: C2)

This reflects work research on desistance-focused practice in which a holistic view of the service user is encouraged, so that the focus of practice is not restricted purely to criminogenic risk factors. Rather, practice works to support service users in all aspects of their lives. Communication was considered so integral to the successful delivery of the programme that our participants said that this should be prioritised if similar models are rolled out elsewhere:

We have a great relationship with [the drug service] but that relationship doesn't come overnight, so if this was to ever start in another force it's something that they really need to focus on, getting those good lines of communication. (Police Officer 1: C2)

However, communication does not occur easily and – as suggested by the previous quote – takes time to build, something to be borne in mind for further rollout. Moreover, our data suggest additional barriers to successful communication. One such example relates to communication between the core C2/PI teams and external organisations such as job centres:

Because I think that's just a huge part of it, because we get so many sort of fib stories about 'I've got to go to the Job Centre now' and it's like actually they don't need to, but that's just their story to get out of coming to probation. So if we had that open line of communication, and also when they say that they've been there but they haven't been there – that kind of thing. (Probation Officer 2: PI)

One solution to this could be a single point of contact within the agency in question:

That information sharing again to try and help these individuals out so we know that they're claiming the benefits, what they're entitled to and who to go and speak

to. Sometimes these people tell us lies so then we need to just confirm with the DWP at point of contact to say rather than repeating ourselves over and over again, saying this is who we are, this is what we do, we've got one point of contact and then we can just get those questions and queries asked nice and quickly. (Police Officer 1: PI)

However, job centres are not necessarily in a position to help because of the extent to which the DWP budget has been cut in recent years. Of course, this discussion of communication becomes relevant to the discussion above regarding resources and lack thereof. Other barriers to good communication are situated in the structures which surround attempts to communicate well. The following quote alludes to the difficulties in setting up good channels of communication because external providers will have their own priorities, targets and constraints which may impede their ability to communicate and work effectively with programmes such as C2 and PI:

I think communications with drug services at the minute could be better. I think they're under their own – They've got their own targets and all of that to meet as well which is difficult. (Probation Officer 3: PI)

I do a lot of multiagency work apart from C2 so I know sometimes that can be really difficult. Different agencies have different agendas, they have different policies. (Probation Officer 1: C2)

This may, in part, be a product of the small-scale nature of the programme which means it is limited in terms of how much power it can wield to help other agencies meet their own targets.

Theme 4: The support needs to be personalised and individualised

One reason for the importance of good communication, collaboration and multi-agency is that they enable the support provided to service users to be personalised and individualised. Such a way of working and providing services to people who are attempting to desist from offending is well recognised in the literature on how probation providers can facilitate desistance (McNeill et al, 2012). The service users with whom we spoke were positive about the level of support provided, and about the fact that the programme could help them with a range of issues they have been facing. Rather than focusing on criminogenic needs, PI and C2 provide a much more holistic form of support:

Yes, support. Just everything. Even with housing and like I was in rent arrears and things like that. They've helped me with that. Just everything of my life really

whenever I've had problems with it, you know, like if I don't know how to get it sorted and that I can go to them and ask them and if they don't know then they will find out. (Service User 1: PI)

There's no real one-to-one support and this time round I've had that one-to-one support and that's where I can praise them. I like it. I feel like it's important. I've never had that before. (Service User 3: PI)

The support I get. I could pick up the phone any time. Because I suffer from bipolar as well so my mental health, it was pretty bad it was. I was suicidal and that. I can pick up the phone at any time of the night and call my C2 worker and he will sit there and listen. He doesn't judge me. He takes the piss out of me a bit but he doesn't judge me and he just listens to me. It's what I need. Yeah, it's what I need. It's what I needed. It's what I want and what I need. (Service User 2: C2)

One reason why the support provided by the service needs to be personalised is linked to the specific cohort of people who are accepted on to the programme. As discussed above, people only get accepted onto the programme if they have a history of prolific burglary offences which, in turn, is likely to have its roots in drug use, trauma, inequality and adverse childhood experiences:

...but I don't know if it would work for everyone. I think that there's certain people that need to just get over what they've got on in their life. I've had a lot of shit in my life and that's kind of put me back, but this programme is now setting me up to where the system had failed me and now the system isn't failing me. This system that they're doing now hasn't failed me yet, whereas the whole system before this one, this sentence here, I'd been failed because it's just a revolving door. (Service User 2: PI)

One of the main challenges to delivering this type of personalised support is that of resources, reflecting the discussion in the previous section:

I think structure is key for these people, because otherwise twiddling your thumbs, boredom, boredom could lead to all kind of things so structure and having a timetable so that they have some type of routine and use different agencies to support that, so I think that's very good.... Ultimately I think it's a great scheme to allow people to slowly get back in to society who may not have that opportunity to change their lives if they were just in a prison cell, but at the same time I think

there needs to be probably more support and a bit more additional resources used so that these individuals can actually get the best out of being out of jail so the lack of resource or the lack of structure doesn't entice them back in to jail. (NGO Practitioner 2: PI)

This view sheds light on how the professionals in the service view the causes of offending – that it occurs as a result of people's daily routine activities (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1993), yet there is also a recognition that without the support to obtain meaningful employment and housing people's chances of successfully desisting are seriously hampered. It was clear from our interview and observations of practice that PI and C2 both enable service users to access the support which they need to start on the road towards desistance.

Theme 5: The role of deterrence

Overarching model

As detailed in the literature review, PI and C2 deal exclusively with high-profile and persistent burglars – some of whom have committed over two hundred burglaries (Baker, 2014). Releasing offenders of such prolificacy back into the community under probation supervision is relatively controversial, because effective risk-management carries much gravity. This is achieved through a penological deterrence model employing swift, certain and fair justice (Bartels, 2017) whilst dovetailing principles of rehabilitation and retribution.

The scheme is made unique by its early-stage requirement for all offenders to show willing by circulating local areas alongside police officers, confessing to the houses they have burgled, which in turn helps settle unsolved crime (Baker, 2014). Although enrolment onto the programme defers sentence, breach of IOM provisions risks revocation and punishment for all crimes on record, including those newly detected. The severity of these crimes means that expulsion from the programme typically leads to a prison sentence of several years, likely longer than it would have been due to the inclusion of newly catalogued offences. From a risk-management perspective, this threat acts as a strong deterrent of future offending behaviour and the data showed that offenders were keenly aware of the 'consequences' of non-compliance. For instance,

It's keeping that at the back of your head. Do you want this or do you want to be looking at a window that you can't even look out of because it's that dirty and filthy. A door. A sink stuck to the wall. A toilet stuck to the wall. No privacy at all (Service user 3: C2).

The overarching deterrence model was well-embedded and fits with evidence on how deterrence works, namely that the certainty and celerity of punishment are much more likely to deter offending than the severity of said punishment (Pratt et al., 2006). However, the requirement to disclose previous offending histories was also vulnerable to negative perception from erstwhile participants. It was reported that those now imprisoned for revocation claimed that the programme was a “*stitch up*” (Service user 2, PI). Yet this same characteristic was also perceived as key for justifying and legitimising the model to the community, especially victims, by upholding the programme’s ‘credibility’ (Baker, 2014: 57). As such, a challenge for new schemes will be ameliorating the conflicting perceptions of the role that deterrence plays in the programmes’ underpinning rationale. Additionally, deterrence underscored many of the programme’s conceptual and practical features including: the surveillance monitoring tag, the polygraph testing (within C2 only), and regular contact with the judicial body.

Electronic monitoring

Electronic monitoring, inclusive of GPS tagging, and curfew monitoring are carried out using a “Buddi Smart Tag”, as well as continuous alcohol testing (SCRAM), all of which are required by all early-stage participants. Monitored by police officers, this component was in place to allow intensive surveillance of participant behaviour, to deter poor behaviour, and to provide accountability from all perspectives:

They know where I am, because I've got a tag on my leg (Service user 2: PI)

I've got one of my defendants, he's also got a gambling habit, and he would sneak into some betting shop in the afternoon and all of a sudden the policeman's there and I didn't realise the police were actually keeping a tab on him all the time (Judge)

The use of this technology was seen favourably across participants, and was thought to sanction swift, certain and fair justice (Police officer 1: C2; Probation officer 2: PI; Independent agency: PI). This observation includes, perhaps surprisingly, service users. When asked what helps to relinquish a life of crime, one offender reported:

The Buddi [smart tag] for starters, which takes me away from being able to hang around with criminals and being able to go to crime hot spots. If I do create a crime I'm basically giving myself up. (Service user 2: PI)

This data sample elucidates the importance of tagging for achieving key programme objectives. The same participant stated that the tag also acted as a motivational strategy; ongoing programme compliance dissolves the need for a tag as desistance becomes stabilised (Service user 2: PI). As such, its removal was symbolic. Moreover, it helps justify the model to the public by providing reassurance that prolific offenders are under close surveillance and responsivity from the police. However, limitations of the tag were also gleaned from the data.

Firstly, its visibility was seen by some as stigmatising; although it could usually be covered by clothing, one participant worked in a physically hot environment, requiring him to wear shortened trousers, thus exposing the tag. He reported that this could pose problems from an employability perspective:

I just said I possibly could have got the sack if they had seen that, so I said I don't want to put it back on (Service user 1: PI).

On the one hand, this finding is alarming given that the programme seeks to reintegrate participants back into host communities through the development of prosocial identities. Moreover, this is, in itself, not unique to the programmes under study, but is relevant to all who are subject to electronic monitoring. However, this example also brought to light the flexibility of the programme which, reportedly, allowed for its removal under this special circumstance:

The judge wasn't happy but they said okay then and, to be fair, my next review period was good anyway so it was fine, they weren't worried about putting it back on and that. (Service user 1: PI)

Arguably, such adaptability could only be orchestrated by a small-scale intense model in which individual progress and circumstances are well-known by Judges. A flexible approach to the tag might therefore prove difficult for schemes dealing with larger cohorts.

Secondly, by its very nature, the programmes require ample resources. However, to effectively police offending behaviour, the tagging element was thought to be especially labour intensive (Judge). Notably, this opinion was generated by just one single interviewee, and we do not have cost-benefit data analysis to elaborate on this discussion point. Nevertheless, tagging was viewed as a critical facet to the deterrence model, and so resources should be reviewed prior to roll-out to ensure that this area can be successfully delivered and sustained.

Thirdly, only some aspects of the tagging system were provided for in statute, meaning that its imposition and its provisions were discretionary, thus complicating breach proceedings. Although

the Bail Act (1976) legislates monitoring of the electronic curfew, there is a gap for other tagging guises. As quoted:

A voluntary undertaking so it's a bit of a grey area in regard to that so if we could see a legislative change where actually they had to wear it and if they don't wear it they breach it like they would do like an electronic monitor curfew tag. (Police Officer 1: PI)

This means that some parts of the tagging model are technically voluntary. This could provide inconsistencies if some offenders refuse the tag and could erode feelings of fairness across the cohort. As such, regulation of the tag through statutory foothold would help practitioners to support the area and would enhance deterrence, as well as ensuring consistency.

Polygraph testing

A key difference between the programmes is that C2 uses polygraph testing, but PI does not, primarily due to the availability of the test and less awareness in PI of its benefits (NGO Practitioner 1: PI). This testing was viewed favourably across C2 Service users and practitioners alike:

It helps as a guideline to support their version of events... and the Judge likes it because one of the biggest things about C2 is just be honest....the reality is if somebody has used on a Saturday night but they've been providing negatives tests for the last two weeks, they're fully engaging with everybody they're not going to back to prison so why lie? So that's what the polygraph's really used for. (Police Officer 1: C2)

It's all about honesty with C2. You have to be honest. There's no such thing as a little white lie, even if it's going to get you in trouble still be honest. I think when I first started it I didn't really care. I was lying on my polygraph tests (Service user 2: C2).

This form of testing gives rise to some controversy because academic research leaves a question mark over its ability to provide accurate results and therefore its suitability for the justice sphere (Grubin et al., 2016; Wood et al., 2020). However, it was reported that the tests at C2 were never used singlehandedly, only in conjunction with other methods, such as drugs and alcohol testing and surveillance monitoring. It therefore does not provide clear-cut answers, but rather helps to support and provide credibility to service users' stories as well as deterring anti-social behaviour.

As such, it appears to help to sustain the general ethos of the model, which promotes trust, openness, honesty and transparency. If expanded to PI and beyond, it should be done so with reliable technology and should continue to compliment other methods of knowing how well clients are engaging and complying.

Regular contact with the judicial body

Unlike many similar schemes in England and Wales, PI and C2 operate a problem-solving court, chaired by a specialist Judge. This facet was viewed auspiciously by participants across both models and the feedback was consistently and overwhelmingly positive. Court sessions took place between one to three months depending on progress to provide check-ins with the judicial body. Notably, three official breaches would tend to lead to full revocation of the order,

It still keeps him motivated, it still gives him his little virtual pat on the back from the judge saying, 'you're doing this and look how your life has changed.' That means the world to them. (Police Officer 1: C2)

[It's] very useful because it gives us stages whilst we're going through the programme. Even with those court reports we can see how progress is being made and of course the judge is generally... they really are putting their head on the block really because if things do go wrong it will be them that will be questioned in regards to, well, you knew this, why did you not resentence and why did you sentence to this programme? (Police Officer 1: PI).

It's a good interactive environment. It is still very much, 'oh, I'm going to court, so I have to be on my best behaviour'. I think it works well. It also gives each officer an opportunity to sometimes catch up on what other people are doing (Police Officer 4: C2).

I mean having those regular reviews and that regular correspondence with the Crown Court Judge that sentenced them to the scheme initially, it just hold them to account, it keeps them, well, hopefully motivated but if not then they know that actually ultimately the judge can take that away from them at any point but it's rewarding for them (Probation Officer 3: PI).

It's the backbone of the Community Order really (Probation Officer 3: PI).

In terms of the deterrence model, the court becomes a central hub to operationalise enforcement measures in alignment with “choices and consequences”. It provides a stark reminder of the legal penalties associated with non-compliance. Undoubtedly, the court is not equipped with a full array of sanctioning and rewards compared to the international problem-solving court examples (Ashcroft et al., 1997; Bartels, 2017). However, the threat of expulsion, increased time on the tag, extra requirements and more frequent reviews, alongside tokens of praise were enough to substantiate this key feature.

To use a bit of an analogy, it's a little bit like when you're a child and you'd done something good or done something bad and you'd want to tell your parent about it, they all put it like that with them going to court, because very much if they make a mistake it will very much be, 'What is the Judge going to say in court?', then we can use that as a, 'Do you know what? If you pick yourself up and have a good month for the rest of the time the Judge is not going to dictate on this one mistake (Probation Officer 1: C2).

[He] tells me that he's proud of me. I love it. He tells me that I'm doing good and to carry on and that I should be proud of myself (Service user 2: C2).

Less significant consequences were considered key for mobilising outputs throughout, through deterrence:

The mechanism for breaching and for enforcing even at the early stages when technically it's not breach, I think works extremely well. It is fast. It is reactive. It gives the judge all the information that I need. It's challenging for me personally in making certain decisions that I have to make on offenders who are struggling some time into the order (Judge).

It's took me to get shouted at by the judge the other week. Basically, I'm a cat with nine lives but used all 8 or 7 of them, or something like that he said. 7 or 8 of them. I was lucky. I don't want to go back to prison, it's not for me (Service user 1: C2).

The interactional styles of the Judge were paramount for shaping the carrot-and-stick approach, and can be summarised as: authoritarian, personable, motivation, positive, and giving praise (observational data). This finding ventures into the terrains of therapeutic jurisprudence and procedural justice, which theorise that Judicial interpersonal styles can ensue positive responses

by empowering offenders (Warren, 2000; Winick and Wexler, 2003). Having a Judge distribute praise through positive reinforcement was considered powerful. It signalled, often for first time, that someone in authority cared about their success and wellbeing (Judge):

Today back in court, obviously I was a bit worried still because obviously I've been on it, you heard the judge say, I've been on it a long time now and [they] can be a bit- [they] actually is fair, I do say [they are] fair, do you know what I mean? (Service user 1: PI).

If you just do little goals bit by bit and then, yeah, you're rewarded because you're praised. You're praised by the C2, you're praised by people around you, you're praised by the Judge for the little goals that you're achieving bit by bit (Service user 4: C2).

Judges were reported to take a reasonable approach to positive test results whereby early stage relapse was expected and would generally not amount to a breach or violation of the order.

The Judge, [they] didn't criticise me for the couple of times that I'd used. He said if you hadn't I would have been like something's not right here. You went through a really tough time, you've bounced yourself back, you're doing great again (Service user 4: C2).

However, let's be clear that this was no soft option, and Judges were not afraid to revoke individuals for non-compliance, which could lead to long sentences.

bluntly, if I get anybody who commits another burglary, that's it, it will be game over no matter how well they have done (Judge).

He was fuming with me and I think he was on the verge of revoking me (Service user 1:C2).

Awareness of the risk of violation, brokered through contact with the Judges, was therefore critical to the success of C2 and PI.

Some shortcomings were found in context of the breach proceedings in court. Firstly, one Judge reported that *"it's rare for it to be stone cold obvious that I should revoke and resentence to custody"* (Judge). This could give rise to consistency problems and undermine fairness. Training through the UK Justice Innovation Charity and development of a bench book might help enrich and standardise the area. Secondly, relatedly, the narrow assortment of rewards and sanctioning

within the judicial toolkit could pose ethical problems where poor behaviour falls into a black hole regarding the appropriate response. This is especially true for those reaching the end of the order, where full revocation for poor behaviour seems too harsh but no response to non-compliance is too lenient. This could be surmounted by a widening the collection of breach responses, particularly at the harsher end. Thirdly, there was one example of a service user reporting an unfair breach at PI. He described a time that he was relying on a lift to an appointment, which did not come to fruition and he was unable to contact his probation officer leading to a breach in court (Service user 2: PI). Therefore, full consideration of the context should be key when administering breaches.

Theme 6: relationships between Service users and the authorities

A key part of C2 and PI was ensuring that service users were surrounded by a supportive network of professionals. Although it meant that the schemes are heavily intensive, these relationships were key for facilitating pathways to desistance by building accountability, trust and honesty.

I'd regret it if I messed up. I would, because I feel ashamed if I let everyone down because they've put so much hard work in to supporting me by putting things in place that I've never done before, so where credit's due, you know what I mean?
(Service user 1: PI).

This method of justice means that individuals working for the authorities, including Judges, probation staff, and the Police, are required to recast their roles to become more therapeutic. This is thought to bring about a safe space to stabilise the chaos (often) characterising the lives of people on the programmes. Participants compared the multi-disciplinary team to a family:

They feel that they've got, if you like, a family around them that they can talk to about their problems, their issues. I think it just gives them safe ability rather than that chaotic lifestyle (Police-Officer 2: C2).

This theme of openness between the clients and professionals starts at the outset of the programme. Indeed, the act of asking clients to admit to their previous offending starts the habit of honesty in the offender. It may also have a cathartic effect upon them which creates a basis for a continued constructive relationship with police/probation/judge and (as discussed above) it provides an incentive to avoid offending because these admissions will hang over the client until the community order is completed. Chiming with the previous theme, a key area was service users' rapport the Judge, which had a refreshed therapeutic orientation:

I can pass her in the street and say hello now, do you know what I mean. That's how good our relationship is with the judge (Service user 2: PI.)

Participants felt that there were two key mechanisms that fortified their relationship with the Judge. The first was consistency where the Service user sees the same Judge each time. This is a well-renowned international problem-solving court principle that has been empirically proven for engendering recidivism and remedial responses (Hora, 2002; McIvor et al., 2006; Petrucci, 2002). The data illustrates that a consistent bench helped to elicit accountability amongst Service users as well as enhancing judicial understanding of cases and knowledgebases of individual circumstances.

I think you need the same Judge so they get to know you. If you had a different Judge every week they can't really evaluate how you're getting on. All they've got is what's on paper in front of them and even [Judge] the other day said he could see that I was a bit stressed out and stuff with what was going on with my missus whereas if that was just any normal Judge he might have just thought that's what I'm normally like (Service user 5: C2).

I feel like I'm getting to know the Judge now if that makes sense. Not on a personal level but he knows about me, he must know my body language, my facial expressions. That's a nice thing to know... I wouldn't like going to a different doctor every time. I don't know. He'll know what I'm like. He knows me. He doesn't have to read a bit of paper to be able to know me (Service user 2: C2).

You have to get to know somebody and if I was here seeing a different person each time that will be a bit of a shambles because it's just like you're dealing with somebody each time that doesn't know you properly whereas with her I've got a relationship with her... She's seen me progress. (Service user 3: PI)

A consistent bench has been historically difficult to achieve for UK problem-solving courts (Jones and Kawalek, 2019; Kawalek, 2020; Kerr et al., 2011). Therefore, this should be retained to bolster the outputs of new models.

Secondly, an intuitive technique used across the programmes is judicial letter writing. Service users were required to write to the Judge prior to court reviews to provide information to ratify the session. Although we know that literacy levels amongst people in the criminal justice system are lower than those in the general population (Creese, 2016), it was reported that this did not

hinder this aspect of the programme and no service users mentioned it (although it may be that those who were unable to engage with this element of programme were no longer complying). The letter was a therapeutic mechanism to reflect on progress, both positive and negative, formal and informal, and could involve a myriad of issues. This technique was given exceptionally positive feedback across participants from both schemes:

I've got a gist of how it's going and how they're feeling and it's great. I've had somebody who's written almost like a life story for me. He said, 'Oh. I'm going to write to you every day.' I said, 'Yes. Do so.' He's written all about his upbringing and everything else. It's interesting and entertaining. I've got a whole load of these letters that they write to me on a monthly basis.... it's a completely different sort of relationship. (Judge)

I got to let it out a bit more. A bit of closure as well and not just that, then he gets to understand how my life is. Like I say, he's not just reading something and be like, ah, I know him now. There was emotion in it. (Service user 2: C2)

Therapeutic relationships transcend the court and are visible in other areas. Service users place great emphasis on their relationships with Probation Officers and feelings of not wanting to let down their officer appeared to help forge desistance through a similar accountability rationale:

She's a brilliant probation officer, she is, she's a brilliant probation officer and she has helped me a lot. (Service user 1: PI)

She's perfect. I don't know. I've got nothing bad to say about her so that I'm fully happy about. (Service user 2: PI)

Again, consistency of officer was deemed critical to the models' successful operation as it not only helps to developed rapport, but also trust (Police Officer 1: C2). Interestingly, the same humanitarian style is also evidenced in Service user and police officer relationships.

Even now he'll ring me up most mornings. He did it this morning again. He knows what time I'm up and about so he normally gives me a call, makes sure I'm alright, see how the day's gone, the day before I haven't spoke to him and he's done that the whole way through (Service user 5: C2).

So then he picked me up on the Monday and took me to the drug appointment and that and I got my script sorted out and then obviously I was still feeling down and

I spoke to [name] and [name] and speaking with them about everything, that sort of helped as well (Service User 1: PI).

By allowing practitioners to oversee offenders reshape their lives, it was generally reported that these relationships are rewarding. Most had applied for their jobs as IOM to make a difference:

It's rewarding as well to see someone make those changes and improve their relationships with family members (Probation Officer 4: PI)

It's something that you can actually have a direct influence on someone's life. It's quite rewarding when you get people to the end. It can be quite frustrating as well but, no, it's quite rewarding (Coordinating Police Officer: C2).

However, a weakness here is the emotional labour flowing from such intense relationships (Phillips, Waters, et al., 2020). Many reported feelings of disappointment when Service users broke the provisions of the order:

Being so intense, being with somebody a lot of the time and then seeing them mess up all the time, initially staff tend to feel it personally and it takes a while for them to push that away and learn that they've got to just sit above it and actually see it for what it is. (Probation Officer 1: PI)

By that point it was too late, she'd ruined the order for herself. Definitely, I don't know, there is an emotional feeling when it goes right. There's an emotional feeling when things go sour, wrong. Sometimes you fear, you sit in the court and they're getting re-sentenced and you get the anxiety for them. (Coordinating Police Officer: C2)

As such, some thought should be given to how reconcile this aspect of the model with staff wellbeing over the longer-term. A further barrier to be considered is follow-up support. Given the bonds created with the officials and the sheer length of the programme, some careful consideration should be given to how to manage when this ties eventually become relinquished.

Conclusion

Our data suggest that there is considerable potential in rolling this type of programme out to other areas of the UK. However, as it stands, the programme is understood in relatively restrictive terms, especially around the way the programmes' successes are measured, namely: reduced reoffending and increased rehabilitation. These measures are simple and narrow, and they do not

account for more meaningful, prospective and nuanced successes that the programmes facilitate well, and which many service users found more onerous than a cursory prison sentence. Short term measures, like the proven reoffending rate, will only produce immediate results whilst completion figures alone are inadequate measures of the progress people make whilst on the programme, particularly given the profound life changes that are asked of individuals and the commitment that is required in making those changes. Historically, these tight measures have overshadowed and eclipsed ‘smaller’ successes in the programmes, but perhaps ironically, each of them is an instrumental pathfinder towards achieving the longer-term outcome goals of the programme.

Both schemes benefited several domains including, but also spanning, primary outcome delivery. Key benefits of the programme include:

- Increased recognition of the value of traits such as honesty, accountability, and transparency in service users, causing stronger relationships and trust between individuals and the local justice agencies and authorities;
- Increased meaningful employment, better accommodation and enhanced life structure in service users;
- Pulling individuals out of expensive prisons onto a more cost-effective community-based programme;
- Increased understanding of wrongdoing and the impacts of victimisation within offenders leading to changed attitudes towards offending;
- Established positive relationships with family and children;
- Less prolific criminal activity and drug using even if not reduced completely in all cases;
- Emotional benefits and closure for victims by settling unresolved crime.

As such, we recommend that quantifying successes should be reconceptualised into these more nuanced, holistic, and meaningful indicators and finding a way to map and capture these successes should be endeavoured. Success is relative and should be viewed on a spectrum; for example, one Service user we spoke to now only uses cannabis but had previously used class A drugs problematically and committed hundreds of burglaries to fund his drug consumption. Another individual gave up a life of burglaries but had been reported to have engaged in shop lifting on a couple of occasions. Under the current quantifiers, both these individuals would not be success stories, yet by all accounts, they had made considerable progress on the ‘journey’ towards a crime-free life. Comprehensive measurements could be achieved through longitudinal research mapping

the above or programmes collecting and keeping regular data to capture these more complex areas, and/or providing more formal follow up to track this area. To this end, the biggest barrier for successful implementation in the future will be continuing to frame success and outcome delivery in a way that tells only part of the story.

Considerations for rolling the programme out to other areas of the UK

One aim of the study was to explore the extent to which the programme should or could be rolled out to other areas. Here we outline some areas which need consideration were this to happen:

- Austerity and cutbacks are threatening the survival of the schemes, but this is particularly true of PI. Resources should be reviewed prior to roll-out to ensure that they can be successfully delivered and sustained. We recommend a conversation with the Justice Innovation Charity, who are keenly interested in the maintenance of the scheme. Accommodation for participants is required for the scheme to work well, and this must also be conducive to rehabilitation and desistance narratives by enabling users to relinquish ties with detrimental social circles. However, we found that in addition to being expensive, this was not always (or instantly) available. This needs to be made more readily available.
- We are concerned that alternative measures over hard recidivism figures might be hard to justify to the public and communities. Wider publication of success stories, other beneficial areas, and strong advertisement might be a way of dislodging punitive attitudes around the value of the programme.
- PI and C2 both rely on strong partnership working and good communication. The fact that both programmes are small act as both facilitators and barriers to this way of working. Having a small team means communication is easy; people share the same values and ethos and it is possible to be co-located. On the other hand, the team is reliant on external agencies over which they have little influence which can make bringing them 'in' more difficult. It is clear from our data that if the programme were to be rolled out, building systems which enable the conditions for good communication are imperative. Similarly, fragmentation between the parties is debilitating; locating all stakeholders within the same building will be important when rolling the programme out more widely. There should be also consistency in key workers to ensure that accountability and coherency is achieved.
- After hours support needs to be considered – linkage to probation staff, the police, and Judges during these times will be difficult but should not be an expectation. However,

perhaps the schemes could be linked to a more general 24-hour support service, such as Men's Health Forum, which offers 24/7 stress support for men by text, chat and email, or the Samaritans helpline, which offers a similar service to all genders.

- The drug support services should be able to cater for the eclectic mix of users in the programme. We can see the potential to roll out the programmes to other demographics including women and a broader range of crime types, but to do so, they must be able to provide tailored and specialised services. There is a real risk that if this type of programme becomes too big, it loses its unique nature and those key factors such as strong relationships and good communication are lost.
- Communication was considered so integral to the successful delivery of the programme that our participants said that this should be prioritised if similar models are rolled out elsewhere; however, this takes time to build and sustain, and it should be given adequate attention in any future role out.
- Electronic monitoring is considered a key element of the programme, primarily functioning to shore up the deterrence model which underpins the programme as well as enhancing stakeholder confidence in the process, including the public. As such, it should be retained. Three potential difficulties should be considered: firstly, the tag brings about stigma when visible, and should be removed if it cannot be covered to avoid thwarting desistance narratives. Secondly, resources should be prioritised to upkeep this area given of such significance. Thirdly, all forms of tagging should be legislated to bolster practice under the Bail Act.
- Both programmes target resources very closely to people with a long history of burglary offences and with problematic drug use. It is tempting to widen the eligibility criteria to include different groups of people, offences and lifestyles but it is important to note that there is very little evidence to suggest this would work. Doing so would also, inherently, make the programme larger thus potentially mitigating the benefits gained from being small and focused in nature.
- The problem-solving court aspect of the programmes is seen as a positive therapeutic vehicle where a fair but hard-line approach works well. This aspect of the programme should remain front and centre going forward. However, some areas are worthy of scrutiny, including some clarity and consistency around reward and sanctioning powers in court.

- Intense therapeutic work between service users and all staff relationships were critical to the success of the model and had consistently positive results across both sites. For the judicial aspect, a consistent bench and letter writing should be rolled out to cornerstone this relationship in court. However, some further thought should be given to emotional labour for all staff as well as follow up support over the longer-term for service users when these relationships are no longer in place following graduation from the programmes.
- A challenge for new schemes will be ameliorating the conflicting perceptions of the foundational deterrence model's value with some ex-offenders viewing the scheme as a "stitch up" (e.g. confessing to undetected crimes). That said, this very same feature is key for upholding public credibility and so this tension needs managing.
- The polygraph testing appears to help sustain the general ethos of the model, which promotes trust, openness, honesty and transparency. We think there is scope for it to be expanded to PI and beyond but it needs further evaluation. Moreover, polygraph testing should only be carried out with reliable technology and should serve to complement other areas of practice rather than providing clear cut results. There are ethical issues around using polygraph testing as if they return accurate results when, in fact, the evidence suggests that they do not.

To sum up, the participants in this research were all, in general, positive about both C2 and PI and there is much to commend. However, there are some key issues which need attention to both improve the implementation of the programmes and more accurately assess how successful they are. The programmes represent an innovative approach to working with people with entrenched offending histories and long-standing problematic drug use. They make use of a range of legal, theoretical and policy frameworks that combine to help people turn their lives around and become productive members of society. If rolled out, the model holds significant potential to reduce offending by this cohort of prolific offenders, improve their lives in substantive ways and reduce the number of victims.

References

- Ashcroft J, Daniels D and Herraiz D (1997) *Defining drug courts: The key components*. Drug Courts Resource Series NCJ 205621. U.S. Department of Justice.
- Baker M (2014) Choices and consequences - an account of an experimental sentencing programme. *Criminal Law Review* (1): 51–60.
- Bartels L (2017) *Swift, Certain and Fair: Does Project HOPE Provide a Therapeutic Paradigm for Managing Offenders?* Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-58445-4.

- Brantingham PL and Brantingham PJ (1993) Environment, routine and situation: Toward a pattern theory of crime. *Advances in criminological theory* 5(2): 259–294.
- CCSU (2016) *C2 evaluation – from commencement of scheme (2007) to 12.06.16*. Hertfordshire: County Community Safety Unit.
- Cooper V and Mansfield M (2020) Marketisation of Women’s Organisations in the Criminal Justice Sector. In: Albertson K, Corcoran M, and Phillips J (eds) *Marketisation and Privatisation in Criminal Justice*. Policy Press. Available at: <https://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/marketisation-and-privatisation-in-criminal-justice> (accessed 24 July 2020).
- Creese BR (2016) An assessment of the English and maths skills levels of prisoners in England. *London Review of Education*. IOE Press. DOI: 10.18546/LRE.14.3.02.
- Farmer M (2017) *The Importance of Strengthening Prisoners’ Family Ties: to Prevent Reoffending and Reduce Intergenerational Crime*. London: Ministry of Justice.
- Farrall S, Hunter B, Sharpe G, et al. (2014) *Criminal Careers in Transition: The Social Context of Desistance from Crime*. Oxford: OUP Oxford.
- Greenslade A-M (In progress) *How effective is UK modern slavery legislation and policy at a frontline level?* Leeds Beckett University, Leeds.
- Grubin D, Madsen L, Parsons S, et al. (2016) A Prospective Study of the Impact of Polygraphy on High-Risk Behaviors in Adult Sex Offenders: *Sexual Abuse*. Sage Publications/Sage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA. DOI: 10.1177/107906320401600303.
- HMI Probation (2017) *The work of probation services in courts*. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- HMI Probation (2020a) *A thematic inspection of the Serious Further Offences (SFO) investigation and review process*. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- HMI Probation (2020b) *Independent review of the case of Joseph McCann*. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- HMI Probation and HMI Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (2020) *A joint thematic inspection of Integrated Offender Management*. Manchester: HMI Probation. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/cjji/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/02/A-joint-thematic-inspection-of-Integrated-Offender-Management-2.pdf>.
- Hora HPF (2002) A Dozen Years of Drug Treatment Courts: Uncovering Our Theoretical Foundation and the Construction of a Mainstream Paradigm. *Substance Use & Misuse* 37(12–13). Taylor & Francis: 1469–1488. DOI: 10.1081/JA-120014419.
- Jones E and Kawalek A (2019) Dissolving the stiff upper lip: Opportunities and challenges for the mainstreaming of therapeutic jurisprudence in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 63. Therapeutic Jurisprudence: Today & Tomorrow: 76–84. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2018.06.007.
- Kawalek A (2020) *Problem-Solving Courts, Criminal Justice, and the International Gold Standard: A Therapeutic Jurisprudence Perspective*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Kerr J, Tompkins C, Tomaszewski W, et al. (2011) *Dedicated drug courts pilot evaluation process study*. Ministry of Justice Research Series 1(11). London: Ministry of Justice.
- King S, Hopkins M and Cornish N (2018) Can models of organizational change help to understand ‘success’ and ‘failure’ in community sentences? Applying Kotter’s model of organizational change to an Integrated Offender Management case study. *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 18(3). SAGE Publications: 273–290. DOI: 10.1177/1748895817721274.
- Leben S (2018) Exploring the Overlap Between Procedural-Justice Principles and Emotion Regulation in the Courtroom. *Oñati Socio-Legal Series* 9(5). 5: 852-864–864.
- Maruna S (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. London: American Psychological Association.
- McIvor G, Barnsdale L, Eley S, et al. (2006) *The operation and effectiveness of the Scottish drug court pilots*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research.
- McNeill F, Farrall S, Lightowler C, et al. (2012) *How and why people stop offending: discovering desistance*. Research Reports or Papers. London: Institute for Research and Innovation in Social Services. Available at: <https://www.iriss.org.uk/sites/default/files/iriss-insight-15.pdf>.
- Ministry of Justice (2019) *Offender Management statistics quarterly: October to December 2018*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/offender-management-statistics-quarterly-october-to-december-2018> (accessed 3 April 2020).
- O’Connor R (2018) What we learned about alcohol and drug treatment in prisons from the 2016-17 statistics. In: *Public Health Matters*. Available at: <https://publichealthmatters.blog.gov.uk/2018/01/31/what-we-learned-about-alcohol-and-drug-treatment-in-prisons-from-the-2016-17-statistics/> (accessed 21 July 2020).
- Petrucci C (2002) *Respect as a Component in the Judge-Defendant Interaction in a Specialized Domestic Violence Court that Utilizes Therapeutic Jurisprudence*. ID 2263908, SSRN Scholarly Paper, April. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. Available at: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2263908> (accessed 21 July 2020).
- Phillips J, Albertson K, Collinson B, et al. (2020) Delivering desistance-focused probation in community hubs: Five key ingredients. *Probation Journal*. SAGE Publications Ltd: 0264550520939176. DOI: 10.1177/0264550520939176.
- Phillips J, Waters J, Westaby C, et al. (eds) (2020) *Emotional Labour in Criminal Justice and Criminology*. 1st ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Pratt TC, Cullen FT, Blevins KR, et al. (2006) The Empirical Status of Deterrence Theory: A Meta-Analysis. In: *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory*. Advances in criminological theory. Piscataway, NJ, US: Transaction Publishers, pp. 367–395.
- Ugwudike P and Phillips J (2019) Compliance during community-based penal supervision. In: Ugwudike P, Graham H, McNeill F, et al. (eds) *Routledge Companion to Rehabilitative Work in Criminal Justice*. Routledge.

- Villeneuve M-P, F.-Dufour I and Turcotte D (2019) The Transition Towards Desistance from Crime Among Serious Juvenile Offenders: A Scoping Review. *Australian Social Work* 72(4). Routledge: 473–489. DOI: 10.1080/0312407X.2019.1586967.
- Warren RK (2000) Public trust and procedural justice. *Court Review* 37(3): 12.
- Winick BJ and Wexler DB (2003) *Judging in a Therapeutic Key: Therapeutic Jurisprudence and the Courts*. Durham, N.C: Carolina Academic Pr.
- Wong K (2019) *If reoffending is not the only outcome, what are the alternatives?* Academic Insights 2019/07. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- Wood J, Alleyne E, Ó Ciardha C, et al. (2020) *An Evaluation of Polygraph Testing by Police to Manage Individuals Convicted or Suspected of Sexual Offending*. Canterbury: University of Kent. Available at: https://www.kent.ac.uk/school-of-psychology/downloads/kent_polygraph_report.pdf (accessed 21 July 2020).
- You Turn Futures (Unpublished report) *PI Research*. Bedfordshire: You Turn Futures.

Sheffield Hallam University

An evaluation of the Choices and Consequences and Prolific Intensive programmes in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire

PHILLIPS, Jake <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7606-6423>>, KAWALEK, Anna and GREENSLAKE, Anne-Marie

Available from the Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/27269/>

Copyright and re-use policy

Please visit <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/27269/> and <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html> for further details about copyright and re-use permissions.