

**Sheffield
Hallam
University**

Hallam Centre
for Community
Justice

Transition to Adulthood
Pathway Programme
Evaluation

First Interim Report

Kevin Wong, Jackie Lowthian, Linda
Meadows, Dan Ellingworth and
Rachel Kinsella

Hallam Centre for Community Justice
Sheffield Hallam University

in partnership with

Social Justice Solutions

May 2016

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the individuals who assisted with and contributed to this report: the T2A project staff, partner agency staff and project beneficiaries. Special thanks to our colleagues: Neena Samota for project liaison, undertaking interviews and analysis; and Jessica Bamonte for formatting and proof reading this report.

This evaluation has been commissioned by the Barrow Cadbury Trust and their advice and support has been invaluable.

The authors

The Hallam Centre for Community Justice at Sheffield Hallam University is a dynamic research-driven centre that exists to stimulate and produce high-quality knowledge, understanding and networking in the field of crime reduction, community and criminal justice through the linked provision of information exchange, networking, professional development, consultancy, evaluation and research. The Centre has a broad range of experience and expertise which effectively combines academic, professional, managerial, administrative, knowledge management and research skills. Senior researchers have previously been practitioners and managers in the voluntary and private sectors, youth justice services, probation and prisons.

Social Justice Solutions provides strategic and business development advice, and capacity building support to voluntary and community sector organisations working with offenders. The company also offers research and evaluation services and training and staff development resources.

Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
The authors	ii
Contents	iii
1. Background	1
1.1 The Transition to Adulthood Programme and Alliance	1
1.2 T2A Pathway Programme	1
1.3 T2A Pathway Programme projects	2
1.4 Evaluating the T2A Pathway Programme	2
1.5 Report outline.....	3
2. Methodology	4
2.1 Data sources	4
2.2 Interpreting the findings.....	4
2.2.1 Qualitative findings	4
2.2.3 Quantitative findings	5
3. Project development	7
3.1 Design and development.....	7
3.1.1 Underpinning rationale	7
3.1.2 Common features of the delivery models.....	8
3.1.3 Effective partnership working.....	9
3.1.4 Outcomes	9
3.2 Facilitators	10
3.3 Barriers	11
4. Set-up, early implementation and operation	12
4.1 Facilitators	12

4.1.1 Co-location of staff.....	12
4.1.2 Adequate lead-in time.....	12
4.1.3 Investing adequate resources into service promotion.....	13
4.1.4 Streamlined referral process.....	14
4.1.5 Making adjustments to the service model.....	14
4.1.5 Selecting the right staff	14
4.1.6 Effective staff induction and training.....	15
4.1.6 Multi-agency case management	16
4.1.7 Facilitating greater understanding and awareness of the client group among statutory agencies.....	16
4.2 Barriers	16
4.2.1 Staff changes within the VSC lead organisations	16
4.2.2 Structural changes.....	17
4.2.3 Insufficient suitable referrals	17
4.2.4 Limited direct access to case management systems	17
4.2.5 Local variations in operational processes	18
5. Partnerships	19
5.1 Types of partnership arrangements	19
5.2 Facilitators	19
5.3 Barriers	20
5.3.1 Cultural dissonance	20
5.3.2 Duplication of services	21
5.3.3 Lack of service provision	21
6. Benefits of the T2A projects	22
6.1 Perceptions of project beneficiaries.....	22
6.1.1 Feeling supported	22
6.1.2 Building life skills	22

6.1.3 Providing a sense of control and purpose.....	23
6.1.4 Better able to manage their feelings and difficult situations.....	23
6.1.5 Providing reassurance.....	23
6.1.6 View their future more positively.....	23
6.2 Perceptions of project staff.....	24
6.2.1 Benefits for partner agencies.....	24
6.2.2 Benefits for the VCS lead organisation.....	24
6.3 Perceptions of partner agencies.....	24
6.3.1 Benefits to beneficiaries.....	24
6.3.2 Benefits to partner agencies.....	25
7. Results from the analysis of throughput data.....	26
7.1 Demographic characteristics.....	26
7.2 Offending background.....	27
7.3 Client needs.....	28
7.4 Client engagement.....	28
8. Conclusion.....	30
References.....	32
Appendix 1: T2A Pathway project summary details.....	34
Appendix 2: Case Studies.....	36
Appendix 3: Quantitative data issues.....	40
Performance data.....	41
Intermediate outcomes data.....	42
Reconviction analysis.....	42
Cost benefit.....	43
Appendix 4: Research approvals required.....	44
Process.....	44

NOMS Process	44
NHS REC Process	45
Key challenges	45
Unclear guidance	45
Separate processes	45
Clarification questions/modifications	45

1. Background

1.1 The Transition to Adulthood Programme and Alliance

The Barrow Cadbury Trust (hereafter referred to as the Trust) is an independent, charitable foundation, committed to supporting vulnerable and marginalised people in society. As part of its criminal justice programme, the Trust established the Transition to Adulthood (T2A) programme (www.t2a.org.uk) in 2008 to develop evidence for, and promote effective approaches to, young adults throughout the criminal justice process. This work is supported by the T2A Alliance, a coalition of thirteen leading criminal justice, health and youth organisations, convened by the Trust, which aims to promote an approach to young adults in the criminal justice system which is proportionate to their maturity and responsive to their specific needs.¹

Between 2009 and 2013 the T2A Alliance delivered three pilot projects working with more than 1,000 young adults. They demonstrated innovative approaches for young people involved with the probation service, reducing offending, addressing breach rates and improving social outcomes. More recently, the Alliance has developed a new programme aimed at testing innovative ways of working with young adults at key points in the criminal justice process, described as the **T2A Pathway Programme**.

1.2 T2A Pathway Programme

The T2A Alliance report, Pathways from Crime, identified ten points in the criminal justice process where a more rigorous and effective approach for young adults and young people in the transition to adulthood (16-24) can be delivered. This is illustrated by Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1: T2A Pathways approach



¹ http://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/T2A_Pathways-from-Crime_Executive-summary1.pdf

The report drew on the lessons learned from the T2A pilot projects (2009 to 2013) and provides an evidence base for the T2A approach, with examples of best practice, and case studies. The report outlines what could be done differently at each stage of the criminal justice process – from policing and arrest to custody and resettlement – and provides recommendations for commissioners, practitioners and policy-makers.

The **T2A Pathway Programme** is the most recent iteration of the T2A approach. It was launched in January 2014 with the aim of testing approaches that take account of maturity and transitions for young adults at the key points on the T2A pathway. Over three years the programme will deliver interventions to young adults in six locations across England. These six projects represent collectively a *whole pathway approach* to working with 16-24 year olds throughout the criminal justice process.

The projects, selected through a Barrow Cadbury Trust competitive grants programme, are run by voluntary organisations which provide targeted initiatives to support young people and address the underlying causes of crime. These organisations are: Addaction, Advance, PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust), The Prince’s Trust, Remedi, and Together for Mental Wellbeing.

1.3 T2A Pathway Programme projects

The work of each of the pathway projects is summarised in Figure 1.2 below.

Figure 1.2: Summary of the T2A Pathway projects

Project	Location	Age range	Key intervention	Pathways point(s)
Addaction	Liverpool	16-24	Treatment and one-to-one support	1 - Policing and arrest 5 - Sentencing
Advance Minerva	Tri-borough area of London	18-24	Early stage tailored support for young women	1 - Policing and arrest
PACT	HMP/YOIs in West Midlands	16-24	Family and relationship support	8 - Custody 9 - Resettlement
Prince's Trust	HMP/YOIs in Staffordshire	16-24	Mentoring to support entry to education, training and employment	8 - Custody 9 - Resettlement
Remedi	South Yorkshire	17-24	Restorative mentoring	3 - Restorative Justice 6 - Community sentence
Together	Rotherham	17-24	Early stage mental health assessment	1 - Policing and arrest 2 - Diversion

Further information on the projects is contained in Appendix 1.

1.4 Evaluating the T2A Pathway Programme

The Hallam Centre for Community Justice, Sheffield Hallam University and its partner, Social Justice Solutions, have been commissioned by the Barrow Cadbury Trust to evaluate the T2A Pathway Programme.

The over-arching aims of evaluation are to:

- Establish an **evidence base** for the T2A projects (supporting delivery organisations with data collection and research methods), to **demonstrate effective interventions** and **measure the impact** of delivering young adult-specific interventions at the T2A pathways points.
- Provide **robust evidence** that will be taken seriously by policy-makers and commissioners at a central and local level.

The evaluation is comprised of the following components:

- Documentation review;
- Theory of change workshop;
- Interviews with project staff, representatives from partner agencies and project beneficiaries;
- Reducing reoffending pathways 'intermediate outcomes' evaluation;
- Reconviction study;
- Cost benefit analysis.

The methodology upon which the findings for this report are based is detailed in Chapter 2.

1.5 Report outline

This is the first **Interim Report** for the evaluation. A further interim report, final formative evaluation report and final summative evaluation report are due to be produced in 2016 and 2017. This report presents research findings focussed on the development, set-up and early implementation of the T2A Pathway projects, examining the effectiveness of the processes and partnership arrangements used to deliver the approach within each project site.

The report is structured in the following way:

- Chapter 2 - Research methodology
- Chapter 3 - Project development
- Chapter 4 - Set-up, early implementation and operation
- Chapter 5 - Partnerships
- Chapter 6 - Benefits of the T2A projects
- Chapter 7 - Results from the analysis of throughput data
- Chapter 8 - Conclusions

In Chapters 3 to 5, the report identifies key facilitators and barriers experienced by the projects which provide learning for the commissioning and delivery of similar projects for policy-makers; commissioners; and practitioners. A series of short case studies for each of the projects is provided at Appendix 2.

2. Methodology

This interim report is primarily based on qualitative data but also draws on quantitative data collected by the projects to provide a more comprehensive account of the early implementation of the T2A Pathways Programme.

2.1 Data sources

The findings in this report are based on data drawn from the following sources:

- Interviews with 19 T2A project staff undertaken in November and December 2014 - these included: frontline workers; operational managers; strategic managers; and a research manager.
- Interviews with 18 representatives from partner agencies undertaken in May 2015 - including agencies which referred clients to the T2A projects and/or received referrals from the projects.
- Interviews with 20 project beneficiaries - varying in age from 16 to 24.
- Analysis of throughput data provided by the T2A projects on numbers of clients commencing with the projects, their needs and numbers exiting the projects. Further details about these data are provided in Chapter 7 which presents the findings from these data. The process for determining the data that has been collected is detailed in Appendix 3.
- Workshops with the T2A projects:
 - A theory of change workshop was facilitated by the research team with project staff and partners in November 2013, prior to the projects' commencement in January 2014 focussing on: projects' theories of change; the evaluation support required by the projects; and the feasibility of selecting project clients to enable a randomised control trial and/or comparator cohort impact assessment to be made.
 - A further workshop was held in September 2014, eight months after the projects started, focussing on project delivery models and data being collected by the projects.
- Reviewing project documentation to inform the development of the methodology for the evaluation including: project bids/applications to the T2A Pathways Programme; project assessment tools; and operating models.

2.2 Interpreting the findings

2.2.1 Qualitative findings

The qualitative findings are based on a relatively small number of purposively selected interviews from all the stakeholder groups.

Across the project sites, all the project staff and a majority of partner agencies who were involved in the projects at the time when the fieldwork took place² were included in the sample. Not all of the interviewees had the same degree of direct involvement with the bidding, development, set-up and implementation of the projects. Some project staff had only limited experience of the project as they only recently commenced in post. Some partner agency interviewees only had limited experience of the projects given that their operational experience was in referring to or accepting referrals from the project. This was particularly the case with partner interviewees who had only recent operational experience of the project, for example, two weeks. As a result the findings, conclusions and learning from the stakeholders presented in this report may not fully represent the range of experience, and thus need to be interpreted with a degree of caution.

The research team provided each of the projects with a list of beneficiary interviewees sampled from the project throughput data, aimed at ensuring a spread of age, gender, ethnicity, involvement in criminal activity (or not), and level of engagement with the project. They required the projects to initially contact the sampled beneficiaries to obtain their consent to participate in the research. Due to difficulties in contacting beneficiaries from the sampled list and/or securing their involvement, those which were interviewed did not necessarily meet the sampling criteria but were generally selected on the basis that they were still engaged with the project and were willing to participate in the research. The findings, conclusions and learning from these project beneficiaries may not be representative of all beneficiaries, in particular those who had exited the project without successfully completing. The beneficiaries interviewed during this phase of fieldwork may therefore have been more positively disposed towards the projects. The extent to which these beneficiaries fully represent all beneficiaries is indicated by the analysis of the numbers and proportions of beneficiaries and their reasons for exiting the projects, as detailed in Section 7.4.

Appendix 4 provides a detailed account of the process undertaken by the research team to obtain ethics approval for undertaking this evaluation from the National Health Service Ethics Committee and the National Offender Management (NOMS) Research Ethics Committee. It provides useful learning about resource allocation and allowing time for the ethics approval process in planning the evaluation of similar programmes.

2.2.3 Quantitative findings

The T2A projects were asked to return two sets of data:

- Throughput data for all T2A project beneficiaries, using a standardised data template (provided by the research team) that addressed the clients' demographic characteristics, the criminogenic needs of the clients present, and details of any exits from the project. These data have been used to assess the projects' throughputs, and to record the information required to extract Police National Computer (PNC) data on past and future convictions for the reoffending analysis which will be undertaken at the end of the evaluation;

² Some partner agency interviewees were on leave at the time of the fieldwork. The research team will aim to obtain their views on the T2A projects in the next phase of fieldwork.

- Project data relating to the intermediate outcomes that the project recorded in relation to their client group. For the purposes of this evaluation, intermediate outcomes reflect outcomes linked to the NOMS Reducing Reoffending Pathways (NOMS 2014), augmented by additional women-specific pathways.

The analysis of the throughput data allowed direct comparisons to be drawn between those projects that returned data. However, the bespoke nature of the intermediate outcome datasets does not allow direct comparisons to be drawn, due to the different foci of the projects and the methods for recording project outcomes. While the throughput data have been used for this report, the intermediate outcome data have not been used for this report due to gaps in recording and inconsistencies in some of the data.

Specific limitations of the throughput dataset are included in Chapter 7 and Appendix 3.

An account of the challenges in obtaining approval for the evaluation data collection is contained in Appendix 4. This has been included as there is learning around optimising the value from evaluating programmes such as this by more tightly specifying the type of data that need to be collected.

3. Project development

3.1 Design and development

The interviews with T2A Project Managers, frontline staff and partner agencies explored the rationale for the project and identified the conceptual elements of the project model. They also examined the process of design and development.

In the majority of cases, project and partner agency interviewees had not been involved in the bidding or development phase of the project and were unable to comment on the process of design. The findings in this section are therefore based on observations by interviewees about how the projects have been configured rather than a comparative assessment between intended and actual design. Almost all staff, and a majority of partner agency interviewees, were able to articulate a rationale for the project they were involved in and to explain how it was intended to work. However, it should be noted that some partner interviewees had limited understanding of the T2A project itself, instead they had a broad understanding of what the VCS lead organisation did but were not able to distinguish T2A clients that they dealt with from other clients that the VCS lead organisation referred to them.

3.1.1 Underpinning rationale

Project and partner agency interviewees suggested that the key underpinning rationale for projects working at the early stages of the T2A Pathway (Policing & Arrest; Diversion; and Restorative Justice) was to divert young adults away from criminal justice processes altogether. There was a belief that in offering access to needs assessment and support, as an alternative to (or in some cases, alongside) criminal justice sanctions, young adults could be diverted from crime.

For projects operating at the middle stages of the T2A Pathway (Prosecution; Sentencing; Community Sentences; and Managing the Transfer Process) interviewees suggested that their project was in some way intending to bridge the gap between youth and adult justice services by recognising the different needs of young people, and attaching significance to age and maturity. This was described by one interviewee as follows:

"...even though they're adult in one respect, from 18 and above, they're not in the majority of other respects...I think they find it really complex and I've heard that from a lot of guys that I work with, even 23 year olds that have said 'I used to have this and this help, these guys working with me at the YOT and now I've got no help and I feel like I've been set up to fail, probation aren't bothered, they don't give me enough time, they don't do this, they don't do that'." (Project staff interviewee)

Interviewees involved in projects working at the Custody, Resettlement and Desistance points on the T2A Pathway recognised the importance of needs assessment, relationship-building and support during custody, followed by a period of on-going support in the community after release.

3.1.2 Common features of the delivery models

Across all of the T2A projects, project and partner agency interviewees advanced the notion that the projects were working to a welfare-based agenda which approached project beneficiaries as troubled young adults first and offenders second. This was regarded as different to the generally more traditional enforcement-based approach found in the adult justice system. Interviewees suggested that the T2A projects aimed to work holistically and help their service users to negotiate multiple problems through building a trusting relationship and collaborating with other agencies to broker appropriate support.

In some projects, there was a recognition of the power of restorative processes, although it was not evident that any direct victim-facing work formed a part of any project's intervention. The restorative element was referred to by one participant in terms of discussing the impact of the offence on the victim and showing the young person that their actions had consequences.

An explicit goal of all of the projects is to help their service users navigate the various transitions they are faced with and to emerge from troubled and troublesome lifestyles into something more positive and life-enhancing. There was some evidence of this goal being translated into practice revealed by the project beneficiary interviewees; that the projects were 'different' to interventions they had previously received and helped them to view their futures more positively. Having someone 'believe in them' seemed to be particularly important combined with the nature of the relationship with the Key Worker or Mentor. Some of this was expressed in terms of the informality of the relationship:

"You can just talk to [them] it doesn't seem like [they're] a worker, it seems like [they're] more your friend than [they are] your worker which is better probably, that's what every worker should be like." (Project beneficiary)

The approach illustrated by this comment highlights a feature of the project models, described by several staff and partner agency interviewees as being 'person-centred' or 'client-led'. This is something that is not uncommon in projects of this type that seek to offer a holistic service (Clinks and Social Justice Solutions, 2013). However, this approach was not experienced by all the service users interviewed. For example, one service user commented:

"[They] was just giving me a plan and then every time I come back [they] was just asking me how I'd done that week..." (Project beneficiary)

There was a recognition among project interviewees that their clients needed more time and more intensive support than adult offenders and many had a wide range of (often complex) needs. The range of needs recorded by the projects is examined in the throughput data analysis in Chapter 7. The term 'hand-holding' was used by several project and partner agency interviewees and it was suggested that an informal, befriending relationship was the best mechanism for achieving success with young adults.

Securing engagement was viewed as a particular challenge in working with this age group and it was recognised that to be successful projects needed to develop specific techniques to promote and sustain engagement. This may not have been initially recognised by all

projects at the design and development stage since some had to review their operating model following implementation to increase the duration of support available. The extent to which the projects sustained engagement with their clients is examined through the throughput data analysis in Chapter 7.

3.1.3 Effective partnership working

Another common design element of the projects was that of effective partnerships and multi-agency working, in some instances based on the co-location of T2A project staff with other agencies. In some cases (not all), the projects had been jointly conceived and developed by staff from the VCS lead organisation and statutory sector partner agencies. This was based on three key reasons:

- firstly, the statutory partners were going to be the primary referral route for the project;
- secondly, that effective partnership working would improve communication and access routes for support and enhance the overall quality of interventions for the young adults supported by the T2A projects and improve their outcomes; and
- thirdly, it was also viewed as the means through which improved understanding of the issues faced by this particular cohort of offenders could be communicated by the projects to their statutory partners. However, it was unclear to what extent this was an explicit design aim, rather than a post-implementation observation or unintended outcome that had arisen out of the delivery of the pilot.

In relation to this third point above, it was anticipated by some project interviewees that this increased understanding would improve approaches to young adults being developed by statutory agencies and other voluntary sector providers in the area. Some interviewees suggested this would offer the best prospect for a 'whole pathway approach' to be delivered. However, it is outside the scope of this report (and this evaluation) to assess the extent to which has occurred and will occur during the lifetime of the projects.

3.1.4 Outcomes

All of the projects aimed to reduce risk and the likelihood of offending/reoffending - a key outcome of the T2A Pathway Programme, although based on documentation provided by some of the projects to the research team in the period between being awarded the grants (October 2013) and project commencement (January 2014), this was not explicitly recognised by all the VCS lead organisations delivering the projects.

Most of the projects had additional outcomes around: improving safety; increasing access to healthcare (psychological and physical); improving relationships (with families and partners) and reducing the risks of domestic violence; improving self-worth; and providing opportunities for personal growth. In essence, the T2A projects were attempting to build resilience and encouraging aspiration, giving young adults the tools they need to overcome future adversity.

The extent to which the additional outcomes specified by the VCS lead organisations have been met will be examined in a later report through an analysis of the intermediate outcome data recorded by the projects.

3.2 Facilitators

The interviews with project staff and partner agencies identified the following as factors which facilitated the design and development of the T2A projects.

- **Experience of previous work.** Some VCS lead organisations drew on this, for example, they identified that their projects needed to adopt a flexible and responsive approach to their clients that took account of maturity - such as not discharging a client if they missed appointments at the office, instead visiting the clients in their homes.
- **Building on existing relationships with statutory partners.** Where these were not in place, the VCS lead organisation found it difficult to engage with these agencies during the design and development phase and this contributed to delays in implementation.
- **Highlighting the potential additional provision** represented by the T2A projects at a time when statutory agencies have fewer resources, for example, the T2A project could increase the level and duration of support that a young person required, on top of services already being provided.
- **Identifying the specific gap in service provision** that the T2A project could meet.
- **Conceptualising the project as a multi-agency service** and understanding what this meant operationally, i.e. the need to quickly establish risk-management and information-sharing mechanisms with agencies which referred in to the project.
- **Engaging all relevant stakeholders** across the locality at the earliest opportunity, in particular senior stakeholders who may be able to ensure a more strategic approach to working with young adults.
- **Arguing the case for the benefits to all agencies from adopting the T2A approach**, e.g. the VCS lead organisation using the T2A Pathway approach as the selling point for the project.
- **Incorporating service user feedback** into project design was regarded as a feature that could make project models robust and more likely to be effective - this was adopted by some projects.

A key question that has arisen from the analysis of both the interview data and review of the project documentation is the extent to which the T2A Pathway projects are simply replicating the pre-existing services of the VCS lead organisation, for a specified age group of clients - the 16-24 year old cohort. In some instances, the agencies adapted their service for this cohort, in other instances few changes appear to have been made.

3.3 Barriers

Conversely to the preceding section, the project and partner agency interviews identified the following factors as barriers to project design and development.

- **Lack of partner agency involvement** - not all of the projects involved partners at the bidding/design stage. This was regarded by some partner agency interviewees as a barrier to project set-up and effective service development, particularly where it involved information-sharing between agencies. Where this did not happen, projects had to spend time and energy back-tracking to understand the operational contexts of their partners, developing appropriate promotion and referral systems and drawing-up information-sharing protocols.
- **Lack of understanding by VCS lead organisation staff** of the differences in the age-boundaries for services provided by statutory partners. For example, one interviewee referred to the fact that in their area Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) only works with young people up until the age of 16 years, whereas Youth Offending Services provide a service up to the age of 18 years. Not taking this into account at the design stage had implications for the ability of the T2A to access specialist mental health support for their beneficiaries.
- **Difficulties in translating 'theoretical' models into deliverable activities.** This was particularly the case where the project proposal had been designed by a central 'business development team' and had included limited input from experienced practitioners. This was also the case where the staff involved in designing the model had moved on and it was being implemented by different people who did not appear to have been fully briefed on the rationale underpinning the original project design.
- **Project models which were designed with insufficient resourcing** to deliver the range of functions specified in the proposal including management and administration. For example, one project staff interviewee commented that the allocation of one and a half hours of management time per week was insufficient to run the project effectively.
- **Lack of expertise in working with young adults by VCS lead organisation staff** involved in designing the T2A project. This was particularly the case where agencies were transferring adult delivery models to the young adult age group. It was manifested most starkly in insufficient time allocated for the intensive support required and the time required for trust-building with the young adult before undertaking formal needs assessments and case paperwork. In addition there was a lack of understanding that while adults often had more practical needs, for example, with housing and employment, younger people needed more support of 'the whole person' with rapport and relationship-building at the centre.

4. Set-up, early implementation and operation

In a broad ranging meta-analysis examining interventions for reducing youth reoffending, Ross *et al.* (2011) found that one of the key characteristics associated with programme effectiveness was the quality of programme implementation. They found that a less effective but well-implemented programme could out-perform a more effective programme that was poorly implemented.

This chapter examines the facilitators and barriers to effective set-up, early implementation and operation of the T2A projects.

4.1 Facilitators

4.1.1 Co-location of staff

Where co-location of staff³ was in place from the outset, project and partner agency interviewees felt this aided effective set-up and early implementation. The efficacy of such co-location arrangements is reflected in statutory multi-agency structures such as YOTs and in the wider evidence base around integrated offender management arrangements (Senior *et al.*, 2011; Wong & Hartford, 2009; Wong *et al.*, 2012). Some projects were able to work from shared bases where their organisation had been operating previously. This provided ease of communication and immediate access to colleagues from other agencies working towards shared agendas. For example, one of the custody-based projects operates from a shared area in the prison. This affords easy access for service users but, importantly, also facilitates speedy communication with other staff working with the same individual.

In terms of set-up, those projects that were able to quickly access administrative and case management systems used by partners and secure desk space in shared offices were able to make the most efficient start. For others, even where strong partnership arrangements already existed, this took a little longer to achieve.

4.1.2 Adequate lead-in time

Project and partner agency interviewees from two projects expressed concern about insufficient lead-in time prior to the project becoming fully operational. In one case this was acknowledged by the statutory partners and it was made clear that if they were starting again, they would “*make sure everything was in place before starting*”. Planning for a lead-in time (and making good use of it) prior to project commencement is general good practice and was identified as a key success factor in a recent Youth Justice Reinvestment Custody

³ Staff from a range of agencies – police; youth offending services; probation; prison; health; housing; and other voluntary organisations – working from the same office or premises.

Pathfinder pilot evaluation undertaken by members of the research team (Wong *et al.*, 2013a).

Where there was no previous track record of multi-agency working or no pre-existing service offered by the VCS lead organisation, set-up inevitably took longer. Two projects in this situation in one of their areas of operation found that referrals took longer to establish, accessing office space/client meeting rooms from key partners was harder to achieve, and getting IT systems established to facilitate secure electronic communication was very challenging. All of the above was only possible through negotiation of governance structures and documents such as: terms of reference, information-sharing agreements and memorandums of understanding. This level of administration and relationship-building during the set-up and early implementation phase was very time consuming.

While five of the six projects appeared to be able to accommodate the requirements of the evaluation - one of the terms of the grant agreement - project staff interviewees from one project felt that they were sacrificing delivery time, that could have been spent working with beneficiaries, to develop the data collection systems necessary for the evaluation. They were fully supportive of developing an evidence base but felt a lead-in time prior to the project being fully operational to ensure that data collection systems were in place would have been helpful. It is worth noting that staffing levels in this project appeared inadequate and there was a concern expressed by project interviewees that they were spending too much time on administration with a potentially detrimental effect on the quality of work with beneficiaries.

4.1.3 Investing adequate resources into service promotion

As part of the early implementation phase all projects needed to promote the new service to attract referrals. This generally involved providing information to practitioners working in referral agencies on what the project could offer, who it could work with, what it would provide and what it aimed to achieve. Guidance on eligibility criteria and referral processes were critical. Successful tactics deployed by projects included:

- face-to-face briefings delivered to existing meetings of staff in partner agencies (police; probation; youth offending services; prisons; health services; drug/alcohol services; housing services, etc.);
- building one-to-one relationships with partner agency staff through email and telephone contact, with occasional face-to-face meetings; and
- using resources such as case studies to illustrate how the additional support service for young adults can deliver outcomes.

One project benefited from direct involvement of two key staff from a key partner agency during the implementation phase. These staff had been involved in the planning and design process and were then directly engaged in the early implementation of a training package intended to create awareness of the new service amongst colleagues and promote referrals. The package was co-delivered with staff from the VCS lead organisation which was regarded by project and partner agency interviewees as highly valuable in sending out a signal about joint working.

The project and partner interviewee data also suggested that there was a naivety among some project staff, who may have overestimated the worth and value of their project to other agencies. As a consequence there was insufficient planning for the intensity and sustained level of promotion required to 'win round' sceptical partners.

4.1.4 Streamlined referral process

A key benefit for some projects was in implementing a streamlined system for managing referrals. This involved providing very clear guidance about project eligibility criteria and establishing a single point of contact for receiving referrals and coordinating the service.

4.1.5 Making adjustments to the service model

Project staff interviewees reported that once the projects were up and running, some adjustment to ways of working was required. For example, a number of projects made an early decision to focus on building a relationship with the young person before doing any 'paperwork' such as needs assessments or case management processes. Such adjustments are to be expected throughout the lifetime of all projects as exemplified in the pilot programme evaluations referred to elsewhere in this report (Senior *et al.*, 2011; Wong *et al.*, 2012; Wong *et al.*, 2013a).

The speed with which projects adjusted their model varied; some projects took longer to adjust. For example, one project spent a year attempting to establish a referral route through the courts and only managed to commence the operation of an alternative route, through police custody suites, 17 months following the commencement of the project.

Service user feedback was viewed as very important by most project staff. Some projects learned quickly that traditional methods, such as opportunities for beneficiaries to participate in governance structures, would not be effective for this cohort of clients. They instead elicited feedback during Key Worker/Mentor meetings with clients and recorded this as part of general case management. Intelligence from this process was then fed into supervision and team meetings, enabling the service model to be revised when appropriate. Some projects also used service user feedback forms from the outset and used early feedback to revise the way the service operated.

4.1.6 Selecting the right staff

Employing frontline staff with the right attitude and qualities was regarded as important for effective service delivery by all of the interviewees.

Most of the project beneficiaries suggested that it was the quality of the relationship with their Key Worker or project Mentor that was the crucial factor in building trust, supporting engagement and creating the conditions in which change became possible. This has been described as using the "relationship as a therapeutic tool for change".

The project staff interviewees identified persistence, optimism and creativity as key qualities for frontline workers as illustrated by the following account:

"We had a young person who was referred to us and working with one of our mentors, he was in care and he went to see him for the first time and he was in the doorway and this young person was lying in bed, couldn't be bothered to get up, and he was just talking to him through the door for an hour and then went away and then came back again and did the same thing and the young person was still just in bed, not engaging, and he went away and then came back again and eventually something changed and that young person thought 'you know what, this person keeps coming back so they've obviously got something to say, something they can offer me' and eventually he did engage and got out of bed and they ended up going outside and the YOS funded them to hire some bikes to get him out, cos he was a lot better in terms of talking about what was going on for him when he wasn't having to sit opposite him and just cycling along things came out. But that took a long time to get to that point." (Project staff interviewee)

4.1.7 Effective staff induction and training

Staff induction and training were cited as being very important aspects of effective implementation and operation. They were described by several project staff interviewees as being particularly valuable in building staff confidence and competence early in the project's life. Examples of the types of training provided include:

- dealing with challenging behaviour;
- safeguarding;
- motivational interviewing;
- developing support plans;
- suicide awareness;
- risk management;
- therapeutic approaches;
- women in the criminal justice system;
- race and criminal justice; and
- mental health.

Staff who had been recipients of such training commented that they had found it very effective and useful in developing their practice.

"I've worked with tricky people the whole time in my career but having effective methods of dealing with them isn't always something at my fingertips so that's been nice to see it working". (Project staff interviewee)

Some projects had been able to devise joint training with their statutory partners and this was regarded a particularly effective way of achieving a genuinely multi-agency approach. For statutory partners there was the opportunity to learn more about how to effectively engage the young adult cohort and for voluntary sector partners there was learning about the operational context their colleagues in statutory agencies worked within. For all

concerned, joint training contributed to a shared understanding of approaches to work with young adults. This finding is reflected in other evaluations of voluntary and statutory sector working, including Senior *et al.*, 2004 and Wong *et al.*, 2012.

4.1.8 Multi-agency case management

Project and partner agency interviewees identified multi-agency case management and feedback between partners as operational features that facilitated effective service implementation. These included:

- three-way meetings with project, partner and young person;
- project attendance at YOT team meetings, probation case meetings and prison sentence planning and resettlement meetings;
- feedback to partner agencies via their own case management systems; and
- joint case reviews and attendance at meetings such as prison sentence planning boards.

The above processes reflect the effective practice observed in other multi-agency offender case management arrangements (Wong *et al.*, 2012a)

The ability to enter data directly onto a partner's IT-based case management system (in both community and custody-based projects) was seen as highly desirable, resulting in efficient updating and risk management processes.

4.1.9 Facilitating greater understanding and awareness of the client group among statutory agencies

Aside from the practical issues mentioned above, in one project it was suggested by a senior manager from one of the VCS lead organisations that the *"key enablers to implementation have been [winning] hearts and minds."* This was particularly the case in relation to young women offenders *"who may well have been victims of far worse crimes than they have been picked up for"*. A critical success factor for this project lay in helping operational colleagues in statutory agencies understand this: *"it is about creating awareness and we have seen some lightbulb moments when officers undergo training. This shapes their ability and understanding to refer such women into [support services]."*

4.2 Barriers

4.2.1 Staff changes within the VSC lead organisations

Project interviewees reported that staff changes had occurred within some of the VCS lead organisations in the early phase of the projects, which had impacted on implementation. They reported that having to re-recruit and induct new staff members in the early stages had contributed to a reduction in numbers of cases that projects were able to work with. Given the centrality of forming trusting relationships with young adults any turnover in staff is likely to have an initially negative impact. However, in one project, although there had been a significant staff change, a partner agency commented on the fact that the service

had been sustained very effectively through this change period, suggesting that mitigating the impact of staff changes was possible.

4.2.2 Structural changes

Project and partner agency interviewees identified that a key barrier to the establishment of some of the T2A projects has been substantial changes within statutory partners such as restructuring, funding cuts and staffing changes. This created difficulties such as a lack of engagement on the part of partners and challenges in motivating partner agency staff to think positively about the new service, contributing to a reluctance to make referrals.

“I think the trickiest part is (name of Statutory Agency deleted) are going through many changes...there may be a loss of jobs so at the moment they’re very cagey with regards to letting you work with them...they want to make sure they’re doing as much as they can so they don’t lose their jobs...I feel they’re not wanting to give any work this way...” (Project staff interviewee)

Similar problems have been observed in other young offender pilot projects (Wong *et al.*, 2013a), where such difficulties are not uncommon; however, to resolve them, requires sustained effort to engage with statutory partners.

4.2.3 Insufficient suitable referrals

One of the prison-based projects experienced difficulties in accessing sufficient numbers of referrals from a key prison location due to their being insufficient numbers of young people who met the project criteria. This effectively resulted in the service not being delivered at this particular prison. However, staffing levels would have been insufficient had there been higher demand levels so it was decided that the loss of one prison location was not actually a problem, and in reality delivery across two prisons rather than three was more likely to yield positive results. However, a question remains about the extent to which the project had been adequately scoped out in the design stage, analysing data to inform service development.

Once fully operational, other projects found they were receiving unsuitable referrals, perhaps due to project information material not clearly describing eligibility criteria or, more likely, insufficient time having been devoted to face-to-face contact with partners in promoting the project. One project was receiving telephone referrals without any paperwork being in place even though the organisations had agreed to develop a partnership agreement setting out how they would work together and defining referral processes.

4.2.4 Limited direct access to case management systems

One operational obstacle faced by some projects was different feedback systems used by different partner agencies. For example, one partner has ensured that the project staff can access the statutory agency’s case management system and update records in real time. This ensures that the most current risk information is available on the system and can be accessed by relevant practitioners and case managers. Other partners, however, may

require the T2A Pathway project staff member to update the statutory partner by telephone or email and they will then update the computerised case management system. This leads to duplication and is not the most efficient method of collaborative working. However, this constraint may be due to difficulties in establishing data sharing protocols between VCS and statutory partners, which has been identified as problematic in other pilot evaluations (including Wong *et al.*, 2012b)

4.2.5 Local variations in operational processes

An operational barrier for one of the projects operating at the Policing & Arrest and Diversion points on the T2A Pathway was a variation in the use of the Community Resolution disposal between local policing areas. It is primarily aimed at first-time offenders, where there has been an admission of guilt and the victim's views have been taken into account. Intended for use in resolving minor offending or anti-social behaviour as opposed to progression through the traditional criminal justice process, this disposal should have been the key route for driving referrals towards the T2A project. However, since it was not in use in all of the project's areas of operation there was perception from this project's interviewees that it was of limited value.

5. Partnerships

5.1 Types of partnership arrangements

The documentation review and analysis of interviews with project and partner agency staff have identified that the following types of partnership arrangements have developed across the projects.

- **Formal partnerships with written agreements** between the VCS lead organisation and key statutory partners, which include provisions for shared office space/co-location of staff, joint service delivery, joint training, information-sharing protocols, joint communication systems (including all partners accessing and updating case recording systems) and some form of joint strategic governance, such as a project board or steering group.
- **Semi-formal partnerships** which may include some (but not all) of the above, including some written agreements that facilitate referrals to and from the partners (these could be statutory and/or voluntary sector).
- **Informal partnerships based on verbal agreements** that offer a basic commitment to make/accept referrals and share some information with structures in place to facilitate this.
- **Informal networks of stakeholders** that comprise potentially interested parties but with no structures for communication and/or referrals.

The nature of partnership working and the range of partners/stakeholders involved have been influenced by the point of the T2A Pathway at which projects are operating and the specific aims of particular projects.

5.2 Facilitators

The interviews with project staff and partners identified the following range of facilitators which have enabled partnership working.

- **A project steering group/board** with the active involvement of senior managers from partner agencies. This was perceived as lending credibility to the project and provided a direct way of escalating any problems to senior managers.
- **The visible support of prison governors** (senior managers) for prison-based projects promoted frontline staff engagement within the establishment.
- **Being a part of local strategic governance structures**, for example where projects were linked to structures such as local Reducing Reoffending Boards, also provided a mechanism to cascade issues to senior managers from partner agencies.
- Written partnership working agreements and information-sharing protocols.

- **Visibility of project staff being operational in partner environments**, such as police custody suites, probation offices and/or prisons, facilitated referrals to the project.
- **Becoming part of an existing crime diversion or rehabilitation initiative**. For example, for one project being involved in a custody Triage Scheme facilitated partnership working.
- **Access to a wide range of specialist organisations** to enable support across all need areas with referral arrangements in place (to enable a holistic approach).
- **Providing risk information to partners** and where possible, updating their case management systems, and **providing information on outcomes** to partners that help meet their priorities.

5.3 Barriers

Project and partner agency interviewees reported a number of barriers to effective partnership working. These are examined below.

5.3.1 Cultural dissonance

Cultural dissonance between the VCS lead organisation and statutory partners, i.e. differences in the operating cultures and values, was identified as a common problem in the implementation of the T2A projects. This is common issue and has been identified in other research projects such as Senior *et al.*, 2007 and Wong *et al.*, 2012. In the context of the T2A projects cultural dissonance was manifested in the following ways.

There was a perception among some interviewees from the VCS lead organisation that they were not taken seriously by statutory agencies, exemplified by the following observation:

"I feel they just think, I don't know if they think we're a bit airy fairy and a bit, not really qualified to do much, which is not the case, we've all got a [subject] background and qualifications." (Project staff interviewee)

Such a view by statutory agencies was perceived by project staff to have affected the level of referrals to the T2A project.

Conversely some statutory sector partners reported feeling undermined by the voluntary sector:

"Sometimes they [staff in the voluntary organisation] don't really get what we need to do to meet security, and you sometimes feel they see you as just a turn-key." (Partner agency interviewee).

Some VCS interviewees also reported feeling undervalued by other voluntary sector organisations:

"I also think the [VCS agency] workers can see us as a joke, one example is one of the workers once called us 'arm stokers' but I think it's cos they think we're just there to listen and nod and we're not there to do." (Project staff interviewee)

5.3.2 Duplication of services

Another barrier to effective partnership working reported by project and partner interviewees was the perceived and/or actual duplication of services, particularly in prison. There was an expectation in relation to prison-based provision that this would be addressed by the new Transforming Rehabilitation (TR) providers:

“...still quite a bit of overlapping going on with the different agencies all doing their own thing and working in their own silos but the [TR provider] which has just come in to 'umbrella' all those agencies is weeding all that out...” (Partner agency manager)

5.3.3 Lack of service provision

The lack of specialist services to which the T2A projects could refer their clients was viewed by project staff as further barrier to multi-agency collaboration. Particular gaps identified included: adult mental health provision; substance misuse services; and housing.

6. Benefits of the T2A projects

This chapter identifies the benefits of the project as perceived by project beneficiaries, project staff and partner agencies. These findings need to be treated with caution given that they are based on a relatively small sample (from each group of interviewees) and for the following reasons:

- Project beneficiaries - these were selected by the projects primarily on the basis of their willingness to participate in an interview; and they were still engaged with the T2A project. They were therefore unlikely to be representative of all beneficiaries.
- Project staff - they were likely to be positive about their project.
- Partner agencies - these interviewees were selected by the T2A projects and in some cases may have limited direct experience of the projects.

6.1 Perceptions of project beneficiaries

The project beneficiaries interviewed were generally positive about their experiences of working with the T2A Pathway projects and all were able to talk about positive benefits they had gained through the process of support. They expressed high levels of satisfaction about the way the service was provided and the quality of the support they received from staff. It was evident that the central relationship with a Key Worker or Mentor was the most important aspect of the project's offer. The key benefits for the project beneficiary interviewees are detailed below.

6.1.1 Feeling supported

The range of support that the young people were receiving was extremely wide and this reflected the holistic nature of the projects. The things which the beneficiaries appreciated the most were abstract – being listened to, being believed and 'believed-in' and not being judged. These were elements of the approach mentioned frequently as helping the young people (and in some cases, their families) to move forward. It might be said that the most obvious difference the T2A projects made was for beneficiaries to 'feel supported' as opposed to feeling alone and unsupported.

"She wants to help me the best she can and that's something that I couldn't even imagine would happen and it has been so supportive, very encouraging to carry on with everything else I do." (Project beneficiary)

6.1.2 Building life skills

An important benefit reported by beneficiaries was in building 'life skills'. This included being given options about apprenticeships, thinking skills, learning how to prioritise, how to manage problems such as money management, and included communication skills, as reported by a project beneficiary.

“Team leading skills, communication, when I started I didn’t talk to no-one, it’s got me more confident.” (Project beneficiary)

6.1.3 Providing a sense of control and purpose

Beneficiaries reported that the projects had assisted them gain some control over their lives. This derived from the way in which the support was generally directed by the client and a ‘co-production’ approach to devising goals and action plans was taken. For some beneficiaries, the project had given them a sense of purpose.

“Yeah I can wake up and not think ‘what am I doing today?’ where I’m going to get off my head at my mate’s and I’m waking up and thinking ‘I’ll go to gym, go to see my mate for five and then go home if there’s nowt else to do’ not stay out all day getting off my head. It’s good really.” (Project beneficiary)

6.1.4 Better able to manage their feelings and difficult situations

For many beneficiaries, the project had helped them express their needs which had helped them to relieve their stress and anxiety. A number of beneficiaries reported that project staff had helped them develop alternative and more effective strategies for dealing with difficult situations. This is exemplified by the following account.

“...if they looked at me funny or got cocky and went ‘and who are you?’ I’d go up to them and grab them by neck and throw them, whereas now I’ll just look at them, shake me head and walk away and it’s stopped me from getting in a lot of trouble.” (Project beneficiary)

6.1.5 Providing reassurance

A common benefit reported by beneficiaries was the reassurance and emotional support that they received from project staff:

“She’s like my safety net at the minute, every time I fall she’s there to catch me.” (Project beneficiary)

However what was less clear was the extent to which this had built up dependency on the project staff and the extent to which beneficiaries were able to exit the project successfully.

6.1.6 View their future more positively

Generally beneficiaries reported that their involvement with the projects had enabled them to view their future more positively. This is exemplified by the following account.

“...it’s given me a reason to get up in the morning and given me a reason to find a job and keep playing my music and stuff like that, which is a big thing in my life...” (Project beneficiary)

6.2 Perceptions of project staff

Project staff identified the same benefits as those identified by their clients. They also identified benefits to partner agencies and to the VCS lead organisation, as detailed below.

6.2.1 Benefits for partner agencies

Project staff suggested they were having the following positive benefits on partner agencies:

- a greater awareness among partner agencies of the needs of young adults generally and of the specific needs for young women;
- a change in safeguarding procedures in one statutory partner as a result of the project drawing attention to gaps in the existing policy; and
- a greater awareness among prison staff of family issues.

6.2.2 Benefits for the VCS lead organisation

Project staff acknowledged that their own organisation had benefited from the T2A project in the following ways:

- a greater understanding of the value and potential of 'upstream' preventative work;
- improved relationships with statutory partners resulting from joint work on the project, in some cases at both a strategic and operational level. This had embedded effective inter-agency work in the operational localities and improved the prospects of future multi-agency working in other areas as the learning could be used in other service developments;
- a broader network of agencies with which the lead provider organisation were now working.

6.3 Perceptions of partner agencies

Partner agency interviewees were able to identify some benefits from the T2A projects which broadly fell into two categories: benefits to beneficiaries and benefits to the agencies themselves. These are considered below.

6.3.1 Benefits to beneficiaries

Partner agency interviewees identified the following benefits to beneficiaries:

- building the resilience of the beneficiaries and developing the protective factors for these vulnerable young people such as improving confidence and self-esteem and enhancing life skills;
- engagement with services - in particular, where the beneficiary was regarded as 'hard to reach' or 'difficult'. Partner agency interviewees acknowledged that the voluntary

nature of the T2A projects and the fact that they were seen as being 'outside of the system' made this engagement more successful;

- greater motivation among beneficiaries based on the perceived levels of engagement with the T2A project and engagement with other services.

6.3.2 Benefits to partner agencies

Partner agency interviewees also commented positively on the benefits of the T2A projects for other agencies. These included:

- greater understanding by staff from statutory agencies (prisons and police in particular), of the way in which age, gender and family issues impacted on the offending for young adults and how targeted support could be effective in reducing risks of reoffending. This was particularly the case where specific training for statutory agency staff was part of the delivery model;
- a perceived reduction in demand on services attributed to two projects - one in relation to a reduction in the demand on emergency services, the other in reduced demand on the criminal justice worker based in courts and police custody;
- saving time for statutory agency staff, for example, reducing the workload of probation staff by dealing with the 'donkey work', such as completing benefit claim forms for clients, leaving them to complete paperwork, reports and risk assessments. In the case of probation, it was reported that a T2A contact with a probation client counted as a probation national standard appointment.

7. Results from the analysis of throughput data

The throughput data used for this report are drawn from data provided by the T2A projects, in response to a request from research team to provide records for all the clients who commenced with the projects for a 17 month period from 1st January 2014 to 31st May 2015.

As suggested in Chapter 3, most projects spent the first 12 months setting up, which in part, may account for the low figures against the annual throughput targets that most of the projects were aiming for - approximately 50 clients per annum.

The findings in this section therefore need to be **treated with caution** given the small populations on which they are based.

In addition, the number of records against the throughput variables reported in this chapter will vary based on the level of recording. For example, while a project may have provided records for 50 clients, they may only have recorded data against one of the variables for 30 of their 50 clients

7.1 Demographic characteristics

Table 7.1 below sets out the age profile of the clients across different projects. Given that the T2A Programme is intended to work with 16 to 25 year olds, Addaction shows a relatively young age profile, with 80% of their clients aged 17 or below, and an average age of 17. This reflects that the YOT is their current principal referral route. The Prince's Trust shows a relatively old profile, with 85% aged 19 or over, and an average age of 20.3 years, while Remedi shows the widest spread of ages.

Figure 7.1: Age profile of the project beneficiaries

Age Group	Addaction	Advance	PACT	Prince's Trust	Remedi	Together	Total
16 or under	18 36%	3 16%	1 6%	0 0%	14 13%	0 0%	43 17%
17	22 44%	0 0%	5 31%	0 0%	21 19%	3 11%	46 18%
18	4 8%	5 26%	1 6%	5 15%	19 17%	8 29%	40 16%
19	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	9 26%	13 12%	4 14%	29 12%
20/21	1 2%	5 26%	3 19%	16 47%	21 19%	6 21%	48 19%
22 or over	2 4%	6 32%	6 38%	4 12%	23 20%	7 25%	42 17%
Average age	17.0	20.0	19.9	20.3	19.1	19.9	19.0
TOTAL (N)	50	19	16	34	113	29	258

Figure 7.2 presents the gender profile of clients: Advance's client group is predominantly female (with one transgender client) which accords with their female client focus; The Prince's Trust is working with an entirely male cohort which accords with their target client group - young adult males in custody. PACT has a reasonably even gender division, working in male and female establishments, while female clients in Addaction, Remedi and Together make up between 11% and 21% of their cohorts.

Figure 7.2: Gender of clients

Gender	Addaction	Advance	PACT	Prince's Trust	Remedi	Together	Total
Female	8 16%	21 96%	8 50%	0 0%	12 11%	6 21%	55 21%
Male	42 84%	0 0%	8 50%	34 100%	101 89%	23 79%	200 79%
Transgendered	0 0%	1 4%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 0.4%
TOTAL (N)	50	22	16	34	113	29	264

Figure 7.3 below presents the data relating to clients' ethnicity. The first point to note is that in two projects, Advance and The Prince's Trust, almost a third of cases have no ethnicity recorded in the data. Addaction, Remedi and Together have the highest proportion of White clients, while Advance and The Prince's Trust have relatively high Black and Mixed Race clients, which will of course reflect in part the population characteristics of the areas from which their client groups are drawn.

Figure 7.3: Ethnicity of clients

Ethnicity	Addaction	Advance	PACT	Prince's Trust	Remedi	Together	Total
Not stated	0 0%	6 27%	0 0%	11 32%	0 0%	1 3.4%	18 7.3%
Asian	2 4%	0 0%	1 6%	2 6%	2 2%	0 0%	7 3%
Black	4 8%	6 27%	1 6%	5 15%	4 4%	0 0%	20 8%
Mixed Race	1 2%	3 14%	1 6%	6 18%	2 2%	2 7%	15 6%
White	42 84%	7 32%	13 81%	10 29%	105 93%	26 90%	203 77%
Other	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 0.4%
TOTAL (N)	50	22	16	34	113	29	264

7.2 Offending background

Figure 7.4 below presents data relating to whether the clients have a criminal record. It should be noted that these data are, in many cases, produced by initial assessments of need, and rely on self-reporting by the client. In some other cases, though, such as The Prince's Trust operating in prison and YOIs, all the clients will have a criminal record. It should be noted that these data have not been verified, for example through Police National Computer (PNC) records. Addaction did not return any cases with data relating to criminal record. In the case of Addaction, the project and partner agency interview data suggest that

while no criminal records were returned some clients referred by the YOT to the project had been arrested by the police for possession of cannabis and had been given a Community Resolution (an out of court disposal), which required them to attend the YOT.

Figure 7.4: Prior criminal record

Does the client have a criminal record?	Advance	PACT		Remedi	Together	Total
Yes	12 80%	15 94%	34 100%	104 94%	6 21%	171 84%
No	3 20%	1 6%	0 0%	6 6%	22 79%	32 16%
TOTAL (N)	15	16	34	110	28	203

7.3 Client needs

The throughput database also included a section which asked the projects to record, in a standardised format, the presence of criminogenic needs, as used in OASys assessments, namely: accommodation needs; employment, training and education (ETE) needs; health needs (mental and physical); needs associated with drugs and alcohol misuse; needs related to finance and benefit; needs associated with criminogenic attitudes; and for female clients, additional needs associated with domestic violence, and sex work.

Figure 7.5 presents the average number of needs recorded for each client at their initial assessment. This shows that the Prince's Trust clients had the lowest average number of recorded needs at 1.6 needs and PACT clients had the highest at 6.2 needs. Projects with proportionally more female client may be recording higher average numbers of needs due to the larger number of needs that can be recorded for them.

Figure 7.5: Average number of reducing reoffending Pathways needs

Project	Average number of needs per client
Addaction	No needs data returned in the requested format
Advance	4.6
PACT	6.2
Prince's Trust	1.6
Remedi	3.0
Together	4.9
Across all the projects	3.2

7.4 Client engagement

Figure 7.6 presents the figures for the clients engaged with by the different projects. Remedi is by some considerable way the largest project in terms of throughput, while Advance and Together are relatively small. This perhaps reflects the size of the staff teams and the differing levels of resources for the projects. Remedi and Addaction engaged clients from

the earliest points in time, 9th August 2013 and 6th December 2013 respectively. These points in time pre-date the commencement of the T2A programme and perhaps indicate that the clients were moved across to the T2A project once it started. Remedi maintained engagement with their clients over the longest period at an average of nearly 20 weeks, which in part reflects variation in the duration of the intervention models between projects, for example Addaction work with clients over the shortest intervention time.

Figure 7.6: Numbers of clients engaged with, dates and average length of engagement

Project	Number of Cases ¹	Earliest Date of Commencement	Latest Date of Commencement	Average number of weeks engaged	Number of cases with valid exit dates
Addaction	50	6/12/13	20/5/15	7.9	40
Advance	22	27/5/14	13/3/15	11.9	14
PACT	16	7/1/15	30/4/15	-	No exit dates provided
Prince's Trust	34	26/6/14	7/5/15	10.3	Very low number of cases where records available
Remedi	113	9/8/13	26/5/15	19.9	81
Together	29	18/3/14	28/4/15	18.8	16
TOTAL	248	9/8/13	26/5/15	15.8	164

8. Conclusion

The T2A projects had generally established themselves at the point when the last round of fieldwork was completed, in May 2015. While the projects operated at different points on the T2A Pathway their delivery models had common features such as: a welfarist approach to young adults; a befriending relationship between project staff and clients; and a holistic response to the multiple needs of clients.

Some projects benefited from their past experience of delivering similar services, and others from existing working relationships with key statutory partners, such as police, probation and YOTS. Some projects were able to align their service to meet a locally-identified unmet need that was recognised by key statutory agencies. Some VCS lead organisations ensured that sufficient, suitably experienced management resource was allocated to support the set-up and operation of the project, however this was not universal.

Some projects appeared to be on track for achieving the target numbers of clients that they had projected in their grant application. Challenges remained for others in securing referrals to meet their targets, in some instances this was due to a mismatch between available resources and the scope of the delivery model, which may have been too ambitious.

Deploying staff with the right attitude and skills to work with the client group combined with effective staff induction and appropriate training enabled projects to operate effectively. This was further assisted by well organised multi-agency arrangements which included: written agreements which provided clarity about roles and responsibilities; data sharing protocols; and for some projects the co-location of VCS with statutory staff.

Partnership working operated at different levels across the projects. Those which involved senior managers from statutory agencies either through the T2A project steering group or other multi-agency fora and those with project staff being visibly operational in partner agency environments saw benefits. Cultural dissonance between VCS and statutory agency staff was evident in some projects.

Many of the facilitators and barriers to the development, set-up and operation of the T2A projects are not new, they are common to these types of initiatives and there is a considerable, existing body of evidence which provides learning about them.

Project beneficiaries, project staff and partner agencies were able to identify common benefits for project beneficiaries, generally based around: enhancing self-esteem; adopting a more positive outlook on their lives; and learning life skills. Benefits for the VCS lead organisation were acknowledged by project staff including: an appreciation of the benefits of delivering a preventative initiative; better working relationships with statutory agencies; and expanding their network of agencies. Project and partner agency staff recognised that partner agencies had also gained through: enhancing staff understanding of the needs of young adults and females specifically; reduced demand on services; and reduced workloads.

The analysis of throughput data shows that the average age of clients across the projects ranged from 17.0 to 20.3 years which fits within the 16 to 24 year age range for the T2A Pathway Programme. Across the projects, the majority of clients (84%) had a criminal record, those which had no previous record were predominantly working with a diversion from arrest project. The throughput data support the contention of the projects that they were working with clients with complex needs. Four of the five projects which provided data were working with clients who had on average three or more criminogenic needs. The analysis of throughput data identified varying durations of client involvement with the projects, in part, due to different delivery models.

References

Barrow Cadbury Trust (2012) *Pathways from Crime: Ten steps to a more effective approach for young adults in the criminal justice system*, London: Barrow Cadbury Trust.

Barrow Cadbury Trust (2005) *Lost in Transition: a report of the Barrow Cadbury Commission on young adults and the criminal justice system*, London: Barrow Cadbury Trust

Clinks and SJS for T2A Alliance (2013) *Going for Gold: Developing effective services for young adults throughout the criminal justice process*, London: Barrow Cadbury Trust.

Fox, C., Albertson, K. and Wong, K. (2013) *Justice Reinvestment: Can the Criminal Justice System Deliver More for Less?* London: Routledge.

Ministry of Justice (2013) *Transforming Rehabilitation: a strategy for reform*, London: Ministry of Justice.

National Offender Management Service (2014) *An introduction to NOMS Offender Services Co-commissioning*, London: NOMS

Pruin, I. and Dunkel, F. (2015) *European responses to young adult offending*, Transition to Adulthood Alliance and University of Griefswald.

Senior, P., Meadows, L., Feasey, S. and Atkinson, J. (2004) *Enhancing the Role of the Voluntary and Community Sector - A Case Study of the Yorkshire and Humber Region*, Sheffield: Hallam Centre for Community Justice.

Senior, P., Wong, K., Culshaw, A., Ellingworth, D., O' Keeffe, C., and Meadows, L. (2011) *Process Evaluation of Five Integrated Offender Management Pioneer Areas*, London: Ministry of Justice.

University of Oxford (2011) *Found in Transition? Local Inter-Agency Systems for Guiding Young Adults into Better Lives, Final Report of the Formative Evaluation of the T2A Pilots*, Oxford: Centre for Criminology and Criminal Justice.

Wong, K., O' Keeffe, C., Ellingworth, D. and Senior, P. (2012a) *Intensive Alternatives to Custody Process Evaluation of Pilots in five areas*, Ministry of Justice Research Series 12/12, London: Ministry of Justice.

Wong, K., O'Keeffe, C., Meadows, L., Davidson, J., Bird, Hayden., Wilkinson, K., and Senior, P. (2012b) *Increasing the voluntary and community sector's involvement in Integrated Offender Management*, London: Home Office.

Wong, K., Meadows, L., Warburton, F., Webb, S., Ellingworth, D. and Bateman, T. (2013a) *Youth Justice Reinvestment Custody Pathfinder: Findings and delivery lessons from the first year of implementation*, London: Ministry of Justice.

Wong, K., Meadows, L., Warburton, F., Webb, S., Young, H. and Barraclough, N. (2013b) *The development and Year One Implementation of the Local Justice Reinvestment Pilot*, Ministry of Justice Analytical Series, London: Ministry of Justice.

Appendix 1: T2A Pathway project summary details

Advance works in the London boroughs of Hammersmith & Fulham, Kensington & Chelsea and Westminster (the Tri-boroughs) to provide early stage tailored support for young women who are in contact with the criminal justice system (Stage 1 of the T2A Pathway). It offers *assessment* and *Key Worker support* to women aged 18 to 24 who have been stopped by the Police for minor offences and anti-social behavior. Advance provides a gender-specific approach that recognises women's experiences of domestic and sexual abuse/violence and offers support to address needs in relation to mental health, alcohol and drugs. The service works closely with the Tri-borough Community Safety Teams and the local police teams and custody referral service. They also offer training to better equip police officers to work effectively with young women.

<http://advancecharity.org.uk/#/the-minerva-project/4545402738>

PACT provides family and relationship support during custody and following release to enable successful resettlement for young people aged 16 to 25 (points 8 and 9 of the T2A Pathway). The project operates across Staffordshire and is able to take referrals for young men from HMYOI Werrington, HMYOI Swinfen Hall and HMP Stafford and referrals for young women from HMP/YOI Drake Hall. The service combines PACT's *Transforming Relationships model* with *Family Group Conferencing* to achieve improved communication and contact with families during custody and improved resettlement prospects for release. The PACT Family Engagement Worker (FEW) works in the prisons and the community, delivering a whole-family approach to community reintegration.

<http://www.prisonadvice.org.uk/news/pact-t2a-pathway-project-means-more-support-staffordshire>

The Prince's Trust works across the West Midlands providing mentoring in the transition from custody to the community to support young people (aged 16 to 25) into employment, education and training (points 8 and 9 of the T2A Pathway). The project operates from HMYOI Brinsford and HMP Featherstone to offer young men with at least 3 months left to serve a chance to participate in a motivational group session followed by one-to-one mentoring support. The support sessions, tailored to meet individual needs, take place in the prison and in the community for up to 3 months after release, with some young people signing-up to further Prince's Trust support schemes, such as mentoring for self-employment and work-placements.

http://www.princes-trust.org.uk/about_the_trust/what_we_do/programmes/leaving_prison_mentoring.aspx

Remedi works across South Yorkshire to provide restorative mentoring for young adults (aged 17 to 25) in the criminal justice system. It aims to address the harm caused by the offence and facilitate resettlement (points 3 and 6 of the T2A Pathway). The project

provides a combination of *mentoring* (befriending, encouragement, guidance, practical and emotional support) and *restorative practices* (mediation, family conferencing, restorative conferencing) to promote desistance from offending. The project works closely with partners in probation and youth offending services.

<http://www.remediuk.org/mediation/>

Together works in Rotherham with vulnerable young adults (aged 17 to 24) in contact with police and emergency services to provide early stage *mental health assessment* and *interventions* at the pre-conviction stage (points 1 and 2 of the T2A Pathway). The approach aims to divert young adults out of the criminal justice system by provide the earliest possible support. The project works closely with South Yorkshire Police; Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council; and Rotherham, Doncaster and South Humber Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust. A key aim is to increase joint working and improve information-sharing between agencies.

<http://www.together-uk.org/projects/rotherham-pathways-project-2/>

Young Addaction works in Liverpool with young adults (aged 16 to 25) who have drug and alcohol needs. The service is offered at point of arrest or sentence in the Youth and Adult Courts to provide an opportunity for diversion where young people are charged with or convicted of offences relating to possession of illegal drugs, alcohol and anti-social behavior (point 5 of the T2A Pathway). Referrals come from police custody suites, probation and courts. The project offers a six week group *treatment programme* and *one-to-one support*. On successful completion the young person is offered a Conditional or Absolute Discharge.

<http://www.addaction.org.uk/service-finder.asp?section=98&itemid=160>

Appendix 2: Case Studies

Case Study 1

The client is a 19 year old female who had been working with the project for over 3 months. She described a life with family troubles and a first arrest at the age of 17, after which she was put on a diversion project. Despite this she was arrested again at the age of 18. Finding herself in a situation with no source of formal support and difficult family relationships and little hope for her future she contacted her young person's probation officer for further advice. She came to the project seeking support with her family relationships and offending behaviour during her transition to adulthood.

The project worker helped by listening to her, helping her to consider options and by being supportive and encouraging. The worker also accompanied her to court hearings and helped her to write letters to the CPS, court and her solicitors. One to one sessions with her project worker helped to motivate and re-focus her emotions and aspirations. She attributed her growing self-esteem and confidence directly to the quality of support received from the project worker. Her motivations for further studies were encouraged by making her think about future goals. As a result of her engagement with the project she has greater self-confidence now and feels more supported and relaxed. She is currently considering applying to university and feels the support of her project worker has been crucial in helping her with this: *"She wants to help me the best she can and that's something that I couldn't even imagine would happen."*

Case Study 2

The client is a 21 year old female part way through a long custodial sentence. She had been working with the project for between 2 and 3 months.

She described a very troubled past, with an extensive criminal record which was violence and weapons related. Her relationship with her mother was a central area of concern for her and prior to involvement in the project she had not seen her for three years. The main support she was seeking from her project worker was to help build bridges with her family.

The T2A worker helped to facilitate telephone contact with her mother, and subsequently arranged a private visit. She stated that she felt very supported through this difficult process and that, despite on-going problems in the relationship with her mother, she now had a better understanding of the complexities in that relationship. Her expectations were more realistic and she felt better able to manage the situation.

She was very resistant to group work but was opening up to the possibility of enrolling on certain courses, such as the Virtual Campus, and domestic abuse support, to which the T2A worker had referred her.

She described the impact of the support she received from her T2A worker as being a very significant part of her ability to cope: *"She's like my safety net at the minute, every time I fall*

she's there to catch me.". The 'open door' policy of the project made a major impact and allowed her to express her feelings and better control her behaviour. She acknowledged that her 'anger issues' were directly related to the relationship with her mother and being able to understand that better meant that she was less likely to take that anger out on other people. Her self-esteem and confidence were also growing which she attributed to the support she was receiving from the project.

Case Study 3

This client is male, under 18 years old, and had been arrested for possession of cannabis. He was living with his parents and had been referred to the project on two separate occasions: on the first occasion by a parent, on the second occasion by the Youth Offending Team.

On the first occasion the client received information about the effects of drugs and received advice on how to reduce drug use. An action plan was devised which the project worker reviewed with client each time they met. However, the client felt that at each meeting the project worker gave the client more things to do. On the second occasion, the client reported that another but better action plan was devised. This time, the project worker went through the consequences of getting arrested with cannabis and the effects of other drugs and alcohol. The client received a gym pass which allowed him to go the gym after college. The project worker had referred the client to a GP because the client was having problems sleeping. The caseworker also agreed to refer the client to Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and make a referral to Connexions.

The client reported that he had reduced his cannabis use. He was arguing less with his parents and girlfriend. He felt more comfortable talking to people. He felt physically better and was sleeping better. He also reported that he had more money to spend on going out. He felt there was less chance of his getting arrested again

Case Study 4

The client is an 18 year old White British male. He was referred to the project following a first offence for theft with the aim of providing him with additional support in his transition as he turned 18. He had a strained relationship with his family, and had previously struggled with anxiety. He had not engaged with education and was unemployed.

The project provided him with a mentor who he sees fortnightly. He can also call her as needed between appointments. He has built up a good relationship with his mentor and respects and values the advice and support that she gives him. They undertake a variety of activities together, including going for walks and to cafes which gives him the opportunity to talk to her in a relaxed and informal setting. She has also accompanied him to appointments, for example, at a local college to provide encouragement and support and to help him overcome his anxiety. While his mentor provides support and advice, she doesn't solve the problems for him but helps him to find his own solutions

Advice and support from the client's mentor has improved his future prospects, self-confidence and familial relationships. The client is now able to keep to a budget, has applied

to start an apprenticeship at a local college, and is waiting to see a counsellor. He is pleased with the progress he has made and reports that he has grown in confidence and is able to control his anxiety. He does not feel that he would have been able to achieve what he has in this short space of time without help from the project and now feels, for the first time, that his *"future's bright"*.

Case Study 5

The client is a 19 year old male, half-way through a custodial sentence, with 4 months still to serve. He became aware of the project when he attended a meeting about it but was unsure what to expect from the project. He was worried about leaving prison and was anxious about applying for work and considered that he would be unlikely to find a job on release.

At the first meeting with the T2A worker he was very surprised, and pleased, to find that he had choices and could exercise some control about what to focus on. He was not keen to be involved in any group work and preferred to work one-to-one. He made it clear that getting a job was a priority and with support from the project he managed to get a place on a fork-lift truck driving course. He was due to start this in the week he was interviewed and felt that if he could achieve the qualification it would enhance his job prospects. He also needed help to find independent accommodation for his release. The T2A worker had made applications to supported housing projects on his behalf but with no successful outcome as yet. He felt that the worker had put a lot of time and effort into this and was hopeful that something would be arranged.

He stated that the support he received from his T2A worker had helped motivate him and instilled belief that he could have a positive future. He suffers from anxiety and depression and he felt that the consistent and non-judgemental support he received from the project was making a very big difference to his emotional well-being. His involvement in the project had helped to build his confidence and strengthen his communication skills. He believed this would enable him to achieve his goal of finding work.

Case Study 6

The client is a 24 year old female who had been engaged with the project for ten months. She was referred to the project via her tenancy support worker. At the time of her referral, she was facing a wide range of issues including difficulties with managing money and bills which had resulted in her getting into debt. She was also using drugs, self-harming and had attempted suicide. Social services have been involved in her life for a long time and currently involved with her in relation to the care of her young child. Past experiences of social services and the removal of two of her children from her care have resulted in very negative views of social services.

Since engaging with the project, she has received support in addressing her debt and has stabilised her bill payments and is in receipt of her own benefits. Project staff attend appointments with her to help explain what is being discussed and what decisions are being made and have supported contact with social services. Regular home visits are conducted with the service user to talk through her drug taking and self-harming and project staff are also supporting her with her confidence, self-esteem and goal setting.

She has experienced a period of stability and has stopped taking drugs and self-harming. She is living independently, cooking for herself, managing her own bills and maintaining her personal hygiene. Relationship with social worker has also improved slightly, which is significant given the key role they play in her life and the potential for relapse hinging on this relationship and willingness to engage with social services.

Appendix 3: Quantitative data issues

Various data scoping activities with the T2A projects have been undertaken by the research team since the commencement of the evaluation. The key focus of these activities has been to assess what data the projects were already collecting; how this could support the various parts of the evaluation and what additional data collection might need to take place:

The main activities undertaken during the period are outlined below:

Date	Type of Activity	Outline of activity
November 2013	Data review	All sites were sent a data pro forma which collected information on the types of data they were collecting; the operation of their service (in so far as it might affect data collection); types of systems in use to manage cases and data; partners and referral processes. The purpose of this exercise was to provide background data to help the research team to shape the intermediate outcomes, reconviction and cost elements of the evaluation.
November 2013	Workshop	As part of our introductory workshop to sites, we ran a session on data where we undertook individual sessions with each of the sites to explore in more detail the data pro forma responses we received from the data collection review above. Data from the workshop were analysed by the research team and a further clarification exercise undertaken with sites where gaps/questions about the data remained.
December 2013	Options paper	Based on the data review and workshop, we prepared an options paper providing an overview of the information in relation to a potential impact evaluation; assessing the options available (and feasibility of these) for delivering an impact evaluation.
January 2014	Briefing paper	A data briefing paper was prepared for the sites which outlined the proposed approach in relation to intermediate outcomes and reconviction study.
April 2014	Progress update	The progress update was prepared to update the Trust on the outstanding issues which were impeding the finalisation of the methodology. These primarily related to awaiting data from a small number of sites.
September 2014	Data review	Sites submitted intermediate outcomes data to the research team for review.
September 2014	Workshop	We ran a second workshop a large part of which was devoted to individual sessions with sites reviewing their throughput and intermediate outcomes data.
October 2014	Data collection pro forma	Following the workshop, we created a standard template for sites to record standard data on clients and throughput.

Date	Type of Activity	Outline of activity
November 2014	PNC data	Representatives from the research team and the Barrow Cadbury Trust met with the MoJ to discuss access to PNC data. The MoJ's preference (and only option offered) was for the application to be made to the Data Lab which would undertake the analysis, however, this would provide a limited level of analysis and would not allow any comparison of reoffending by individuals to be made against any intermediate outcome data.
December 2014	Options paper	Following the discussions regarding access to PNC data an options paper was produced which identified the advantages and disadvantages of obtaining data from the Justice Lab and directly from the PNC data controllers.
February 2015	Analysis of first throughput data return	The first data return using the standard template was submitted by sites at the end of January 2015. This was analysed and a report produced based on these data.
February 2015	Options paper	A further options paper was prepared to outline the options of intermediate outcomes data collection across the sites.
May 2015	Second throughput data return	The second data return using the standard template was submitted by sites with data until the end of April 2015.
May 2015	First intermediate outcomes data return	The first intermediate outcomes data return was submitted by sites with data until the end of April 2015.

As indicated by the range and amount of activity above, achieving clarity on the methodology for gathering data on cases for reporting on throughput and to support an assessment of PNC has been a protracted and iterative process. This is in large part a result of projects 'bedding in' their approaches during the implementation and set-up phase which has required the research team to respond to changes in the disparate nature of the projects, their aims and outcomes, and the different tools in use.

The final approach that has been agreed with the sites and the Trust is outlined below:

Performance data

This is based on the throughput data submitted by sites using a standard pro forma and enables consistent reporting across the sites on:

- how they have performed against throughput targets for numbers of initial commencements;
- the demographic characteristics, and the offending needs of the client cohorts; and

- the numbers of clients exiting the project, and why (for example, successful completion; disengagement from the programme; dismissal from the programme; recalls into custody; custodial sentence related to a new offence).

These data will be reported on every 4 months and will be analysed for each period, and each project, as well as cumulatively.

Intermediate outcomes data

Where projects have specifically focussed on change in relation to criminogenic needs, and are collecting appropriate data, intermediate outcomes will be assessed. In this context, intermediate outcomes are taken to mean factors directly associated with the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) 7 Pathways to Reducing Reoffending (NOMS 2014).

All the projects undertake some measurement of distance travelled though this is necessarily different given the variation in the projects. Following discussion with the Trust it was agreed that we would use the projects' existing methods of assessing distance travelled. The different tools in use are indicated in the table below:

Project	Assessment tool
Pact	Relationship Radar
Addaction	Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Tool
Advance Minerva	Teen Star
Prince's Trust	My Journey
Together	Assessment and Outcomes Form
Remedi	Bespoke assessment of needs met (for cases after 1 st April 2015)

For all of the projects, we will report on distance travelled for those cases which have completed during the period of analysis, using the first and last assessment. For the most part, sites are providing us with the data in their existing form to minimise the data collection burden on the sites. Where projects have requested data collection pro forma (i.e. Advance Minerva and Together) these have been provided.

Reconviction analysis

Due to the diversity across the projects, and the lack of comparability between the projects' intermediate outcomes, it is not possible to draw direct comparisons between these. The one key impact shared by the projects is the aim of reducing proven reoffending: this is therefore the key dimension of the impact evaluation, as well as being a key input into the cost benefit analysis.

Two possible approaches to the reconviction analysis exist, which are likely to be determined by issues of data access, rather than methodological rigour. The first approach is through the Ministry of Justice's (MoJ) Data Lab: the second involves an application through the Police Information Access Panel (PIAP) to receive a PNC (police national

computer) data download of individualised offending data, enabling us to carry out a wider range of analysis ourselves. The exact approach is still being finalised as data access issues are still to be resolved with either the data owners (the police) and/or one of the data processors (the MoJ).

Cost benefit

The exact approach here will, in part, depend on decisions relating to reconviction data access. Our intention is to start collecting cost data during 2016, the final year of the projects and to combine this with data on reconvictions for a final report in 2017.

Appendix 4: Research approvals required

In addition to the ethical approvals we received from our Faculty Research Ethics Committee at Sheffield Hallam University, it was necessary for the research team to also apply for research approval from the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) National Research Committee (NRC) and from the NHS Research Ethics Committee (REC) in order to conduct interviews with the following groups:⁴

Participants	Research Approval Required
Prisoners (both young offenders and adult offenders in custody)	NOMS National Research Committee/NHS Research Ethics Committee (based on the NHS research ethics approval guidance)
Offenders under the supervision of the National Probations Service (NPS) or Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC)	NOMS National Research Committee
CRC and NPS staff	NOMS National Research Committee
Prison staff	NOMS National Research Committee

Process

As the research required approval from both NHS and NOMS, the research team completed the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) as this provided a single system for applying for permissions and approvals from various review bodies. As part of the NHS REC process, it was necessary for the research to be sponsored by Sheffield Hallam University (SHU), which required the application to also be reviewed by SHU Research and Innovation team and SHU Insurance prior to submitting it via IRAS.

The tasks and timeframes involved are detailed below. These have been split for the NOMS NRC process and for the NHS REC process as despite completing our single application in IRAS, the applications were submitted and reviewed separately.

NOMS Process

Task	Date
Submitted application to NOMS NRC	13th January 2015
Application considered by NOMS NRC	10th February 2015
Clarification questions requested by NOMS NRC	24th February 2015
Submitted additional information	10th March 2015
Research approval received from NOMS NRC	16th March 2015

⁴ We were also including individuals with mental health needs in the research who may be accessing wider NHS services, although this was not the reason for them being included in the research. However, one of the projects supporting these individuals received part-funding from an NHS Foundation Trust.

NHS REC Process

Task	Date
Sent application to SHU Research and Innovation team to receive sponsorship from SHU insurance	31st October 2014
Additional information and revisions made following advice from Research and Innovation Team and whilst trying to seek guidance on whether this project required NHS REC approval.	4th November 2014 - 9th January 2015
Received sign off from Research and Innovation team and SHU Insurance	12th January 2015
Submitted application to IRAS	13th January 2015
Attended REC committee meeting	2nd February 2015
Research approval received by NRES	6th February 2015

Key challenges

Unclear guidance

At the time of completing the application, the guidance stated that research involving prisoners required review by the full REC meeting. Similarly, prisons were also classed as NHS research sites. Advice was sought from IRAS to try and clarify whether we needed to apply to NHS REC, as the research was not specifically health-related, but involved individuals who may be engaged with health services (although this was not the reason for their involvement in the research), but no clarification was provided. On submission of our application to IRAS, we received a query from the REC Manager as to whether our research required approval from NHS REC. Guidance was sought from their Regional Manager, but we were still asked to attend the REC meeting (standard procedure for all NHS REC applications) to discuss our research proposal. A lot of time was spent trying to obtain clarification on whether our research required NHS REC approval prior to submitting our application and prior to attending the REC meeting.

Separate processes

Although IRAS is described as an a single system for applying for permissions and approvals from various review bodies, we were required to fill in separate questions for each of the review bodies and only the NHS REC part of the form could be submitted electronically via IRAS. The form for NOMS NRC had to be downloaded and emailed separately, alongside all the supporting documents that we had already uploaded onto IRAS for the NHS REC application.

Clarification questions/modifications

Time was required following submission of our application to respond to clarification questions from NOMS NRC.