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Protecting and advancing the principles of justice
Resettlement Prisons will focus on the practical and external changes needed to make a prisoners resettlement into the community successful. Prisons with this function will prepare an individual for resettlement through maintaining or improving family ties and providing access to local community services.

Knowing the needs of the Resettlement Prison population and what works to assist their successful resettlement will be important in designing and delivering effective regimes in this new type of prison.

**The Resettlement Prison population will consist of:**

- Individuals allocated to a Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC), with more than 28 days to serve at the point of transfer and ≤/≤16 months to serve at the point of sentence
- Individuals allocated to the National Probation Service (NPS) with >28 days to serve at the point of transfer and ≤/≤16 months to serve at the point of sentence and HDC eligible or ≤/≤12 months to serve at the point of sentence and non HDC eligible
- Individuals transferred from a Training Prison
- Standard recall from licence with ≤/≤24 months to sentence expiry date
The challenge for Resettlement Prisons

In service-need for the different resettlement cohorts:

- **Short sentenced resettlement prisoners**
  - Settlement services
  - Mental and physical health and practical needs
  - High likelihood of reconviction

- **Prisoners continuing sentence plan**
  - Rehabilitative needs
  - Continuation of settlement services

- **Prisoners approaching release date**
  - Rehabilitative needs
  - Resettlement support
  - Managing transitions
Give more attention to higher risk people

- Look to actuarial predictors of reconviction e.g. OGRS as your first step in understanding risk.
- Are there particular risks around sexual or violent reoffending?
- If likelihood of offending is low, the individual may be harmed rather than helped by intensive services that imply they are likely to reoffend.

Focus on needs that are linked to offending

- Use standardised assessments of needs e.g. OASys
- Structure supervision and intervention around these needs as the priority
- Prioritise needs that are directly linked to offending

Let your delivery be responsive to the person’s characteristics and circumstances

- Think about age, gender, ethnicity, physical and mental health as these affect the way you will engage
- Remember that learning disability and personality disorder are very common
- Teach new skills for thinking and behaving differently.

Effective rehabilitative work requires an understanding of people’s particular needs and circumstances.

When you make decisions about which rehabilitative services to deliver, have you got the right information to hand about how many in your care need it or will benefit most from it?

Have you got a good system for identifying the need for services and for prioritising those for whom the intervention will be most critical?

Responsivity factors include the range of protected characteristics as set out in the Equality Act (2010). Evidence suggests services are flexible and responsive to the specific and often multiple needs of individuals.
Knowing how likely it is that someone will reoffend is our starting point for risk assessment and management.

- Most of our risk assessment tools are available as part of OASys. RSR is currently a stand alone tool used in the case allocation process at sentence stage.
- Segmentation tools will inform individual decisions about which services to provide.

### OGRS3
**Offender Group Reconviction Scale**: percentage likelihood of committing any proven reoffence within 2 years. An OGRS3 score of 50%+ means that an offender is more likely than not to commit a proven reoffence within 2 years. OGRS scores are used to target interventions on those most likely to benefit.

### OVP
**OASys Violence Reoffending Predictor**: percentage likelihood of committing any violent proven reoffence within 2 years (this includes minor violent offences such as common assault, criminal damage as well as more serious violent offences). An OVP score of 30%+ is one of the criteria for suitability for our violence specific accredited programmes.

### OSP
**OASys Sexual Reoffending Predictor, Contact scale**: – percentage likelihood of a contact sexual proven reoffence within 2 years (only available for offenders with a sexual index offence or previous conviction). Being able to differentiate between low and high risk of a sexual proven reoffence helps us to prioritise our resources where the risk is greatest.

### RSR
**Risk of Serious Recidivism**: – likelihood or committing a seriously harmful proven reoffence within 2 years (this only includes offences where the victim either dies or suffers trauma from which it would be hard or impossible to recover). If their RSR score is 6.9%+ an individual is automatically allocated to the NPS for management post-release. We consider an RSR score of 3%+ as an indication of an ‘elevated’ level of risk of seriously harmful reoffence compared to the average for offenders in the community.
The start of a sentence can be particularly difficult – the design of the physical environment, culture and regime may help.

Many will arrive needing a period of drug detox and/or ongoing support with substance misuse – estimates range from one half to two thirds of prisoners. A positive, busy and purposeful regime may help those who report boredom as a trigger for using drugs in prison.

An estimated 40% of prisoners have a learning disability and may have difficulties understanding rules and processes, be particularly susceptible to bullying, and become isolated from staff and peers.

A proportion of the resettlement population will be young adult men, who may have significant issues with psychosocial maturity. This is characterised by difficulty in managing emotions and temper responses, putting problems into perspective and resisting peer influence.

This is a group where many have committed violent offences in the past - suggesting a propensity to use violence for gain or for emotional release. Further analysis of the population would enable us to enhance plans for managing and reducing the risk of violence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reoffending Factors</th>
<th>Evidence-Based &amp; Promising Approaches</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug misuse</td>
<td>CBT programmes, detoxification, opiate substitution, psycho-social support to maintain abstinence, 12 step programmes, structured therapeutic communities focusing on substance misuse</td>
<td>Drug use reduced or stopped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol misuse</td>
<td>Programmes that address the interaction between alcohol and violence</td>
<td>Alcohol use reduced or stopped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity/low self control</td>
<td>Cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) based programmes e.g. cognitive skills training and emotion management programmes</td>
<td>Problem solving and perspective skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes that support crime</td>
<td>Victim-offender conferencing (Restorative Justice), CBT programmes targeting attitude, pro-social modelling, positive staff interactions</td>
<td>Developing or enhancing a non-criminal identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network also engaged in crime</td>
<td>Mentoring, Circles of Support and Accountability for men who have convictions of sexual offences</td>
<td>Strengthened ‘social capital’ and non-criminal social communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of supportive and pro-social relationships</td>
<td>Therapeutic approaches that involve the family, relationship coaching interventions, encouraging and enabling family visits to prisoners</td>
<td>Strong and supportive family ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of work/ unstable employment</td>
<td>Literacy, numeracy and life skills, employment-focused programmes, gaining work related qualifications and employability skills, work-related mentoring</td>
<td>Increased employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of positive recreation / leisure activities</td>
<td>Structured and purposeful regimes and activities</td>
<td>Participation in pro-social activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness, or living in a criminogenic neighbourhood</td>
<td>Services which address the causes of homelessness, intensive case management and linking offenders to existing services</td>
<td>Finding and keeping suitable housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the resettlement cohorts*

*Due to the complex mix of prisoners in the resettlement cohorts, the data presented is a proxy for these cohorts. Source: DaSH Segmentation dataset, September 2016

**Male prison population by resettlement prison sentence type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence length</th>
<th>18-20</th>
<th>21+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2 years (w12m to serve)</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>8988</td>
<td>9704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;12 months &lt;4yrs (w 6m to serve)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4221</td>
<td>4571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4yrs or more (w 12m to serve)</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>7967</td>
<td>8211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard recall</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>5861</td>
<td>6083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>27037</td>
<td>28569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile of the Resettlement population

Age profile of the male resettlement population

- 18-20: 5%
- 21-29: 36%
- 30-39: 31%
- 40-49: 17%
- 50-59: 8%
- 60+: 3%

Ethnicity profile of the male resettlement population

- White: 77%
- Asian: 7%
- Black: 11%
- Mixed: 4%
- Other: 1%
- Unknown: 0%

Nationality status of the male resettlement population

- Foreign National: 0.1%
- British National: 7%
- Not recorded: 93%

Source: DaSH Segmentation dataset, September 2016
**Young Adults have specific risk, need and responsivity issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More problems with schooling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More are looking for employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer needed help with finding a place to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer had medical problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less likely to report drug problems especially class A drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More linked their offending with alcohol use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Williams (2015), Needs and characteristics of young adults in custody: Results from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) survey London: MoJ*
Research suggests that younger adults (18-20 years old) may be more preoccupied with relationships and troubled by stress than older, more mature adults.

Young adults are over-represented in assaults in prisons, committing 23% of violent assaults, involved in 28% of fights, and making up 20% of victims of assaults in prisons in 2014, despite representing only around 6% of the prison population during that year.

Young adults have higher attrition rates from some accredited programmes.

18-20 year-old men are involved in a disproportionately large proportion of recorded self-harm incidents, accounting for 13% of such incidents in 2014.
Resettlement only prisoner cohorts

CRC cases, with >28 days to serve at the point of transfer and =/<16 months to serve at the point of sentence AND

NPS cases with >28 days to serve at the point of transfer and =/<16 months to serve at the point of sentence and HDC eligible or =/<12 months to serve at the point of sentence and non HDC eligible

Due to the complex mix of criteria determining these cohorts, the data presented here is a proxy, using individuals sentenced to =/< 2 years. These are referred to in the following slides as short sentenced resettlement prisoners.
While the number of prisoners with sentence of six months or less has decreased the number of prisoners sentenced to more than 6 months but less than 12 months has increased. By the end of 2016, this population had increased by 13% from the previous year.

There has been a 2% decrease in the number of prisoners sentenced to more than 12 months to less than 2 years.

In the period July 2016 to September 2016:

• 12% of adult men in prison were serving a sentence of 2 years or less*

• 18-20 year old men account for nearly 6% of the prison population. Within this group, 19% of young men were serving a sentence of 2 years or less.*

Men serving short sentences are more likely to present with high likelihood of reconviction and significant needs in a wide range of areas. These men will only be in custody for a relatively short period, and through the gate support will be critical for this group.

Source: Offender management quarterly statistics, July to September 2016 (prison population tables up to December 2016).

*Excludes fine defaulters
Short sentenced resettlement prisoners – Young men aged 18 to 20 sentenced to =/< 2 years (with 12 months left to serve)

63% of young men have an OGRS score of 50% or more. Young men with violent offences are the most prevalent group with a higher likelihood of reconviction.

Offence type & risk (OGRS3) - young men aged 18 to 20, sentenced to =/< 2 years

Source: DaSH Segmentation dataset, September 2016.
69% of adult men have an OGRS score of 50% or more.
The most prevalent offence types are violence, followed by acquisitive offences.

Source: DaSH Segmentation dataset, September 2016.
Prisoners transferring from Training Prisons

CRC cases being transferred from the Training Prison with 10 months to serve before release AND

NPS cases being transferred from the Training Prison with between:-

• 14-24 months to serve before release or

• 4-6 months to serve before release (depending on assessment of Offender Manager)

*Due to the complex mix of criteria determining these cohorts, the data presented here is a proxy, using individuals sentenced to > 2 years to < 4 years and prisoners serving 4 years + (excluding indeterminate sentences)*
At the end of 2016:

• 15% of adult men in prison were serving a sentence of two years to up to four years.
• Young men aged between 18 to 20 account for nearly 6% of the male prison population. 27% of these young men were serving a sentence of >2 years to < 4 years.

The number of admissions (between July & Sept 2016) with a determinate sentence length or 4 years or more has increased by 7% from the same period last year.

At the end of 2016:

• 39% of adult men in prison were serving a determinate sentence of more than 4 years.
• Young men aged between 18 to 20 years account for nearly 6% of the male prison population. 25% of these young men were serving a determinate sentence of 4 years or more.

Source: Offender management quarterly statistics, July to September 2016 (prison population tables up to December 2016).
Young men aged 18 to 20 sentenced to > 2 years to < 4 years (with <=6 months left to serve)

55% of young men have an OGRS score of 50% or more. The most prevalent offences in this group are violent & drug offences.

Source: DaSH Segmentation dataset, September 2016.
Adult men (21+) sentenced to >2 years to < 4 years (with <=6 months left to serve)

59% of adult men have an OGRS score of 50% or more. The most prevalent offences type are acquisitive, followed by violent offences.

Source: DaSH Segmentation dataset, September 2016.
Young men aged 18 to 20 sentenced to 4 years or more (with <=12 months left to serve)

43% of young men have an OGRS score of 50% or more. The most prevalent offence type is violence.

Source: DaSH Segmentation dataset, September 2016.
Adult men (21+) sentenced to 4 years or more (with <= 12 months left to serve)

41% of men sentenced to 4 years or more have an OGRS score of 50% or more. This group has a lower risk of general reconviction than the resettlement groups with shorter sentences, as there are more individuals with a sexual offence type.

Source: DaSH Segmentation dataset, September 2016.
Risk of reconviction for young men (aged 18 to 20)

Young men on short sentences (<2 years) have a much higher likelihood of general reconviction. Young men sentenced to 2 years or more are more likely to be reconvicted in the 2 years after release for a violent offence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Length</th>
<th>OGRS3 (50+)</th>
<th>OVP (30+)</th>
<th>RSR (3+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years (w &lt;= 12m to serve)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2 &lt;4yrs (w &lt;= 6m to serve)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4yrs+ (w &lt;=12 m to serve)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard recall</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented describes those with a complete OASys assessment –approximately 77% of the total resettlement cohort has a valid OASys

Key to the table:
- Risk of any reconviction in 2 years **OGRS3 (50+)**
- Risk of violent reconviction in 2 years **OVP (30+)**
- Risk of serious harmful reconviction in 2 years **RSR (3+)**
Risk of reconviction for adult men (21+)

Adult men serving shorter sentences are more likely to be reconvicted of any offence within 2 years of release. The profile for men for serious harm is less risky than their younger counterparts but they still pose a risk for general and violent reconviction.

The data presented describes just those with a complete OASys assessment –approximately 77% of the total resettlement cohort has a valid OASys

Key to the table:
- Risk of any reconviction in 2 years OGRS3 (50+)
- Risk of violent reconviction in 2 years OVP (30+)
- Risk of serious harmful reconviction in 2 years RSR (3+)
Recalled prisoners

Resettlement Prisons will hold those on standard and indeterminate recall for their first weeks back in custody
Recall (PI 27/2014 and PSI 30/2014)

Recall decisions are fundamentally based on an individual’s behaviour indicating increased Risk of Serious Harm (RoSH) to the public, where this risk cannot be safely managed in the community.

Recall should be the **final option** where the risk of serious harm cannot be managed, there is imminent risk of reoffending or the person is out of contact with their OM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard recall (most recalled prisoners on a given day are on standard):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Applies to all sentence types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recall potentially until SED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suitable if person does not meet FT criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process following standard recall:**

| • Parole Board reviews case within 28 days and can (1) direct release, (2) fix a date for release, (3) not direct release or (4) order an oral hearing. If not released, then the case is reviewed annually by the Parole Board |
| • Executive re-release powers can be used at any time (determinate sentences only) |
| • Release is automatic at SED (determinate sentences only) |
Recalled prisoners have a higher risk profile than the general prison population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recall type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Time since first sanction (years)</th>
<th>Previous breaches</th>
<th>Likelihood of any reconviction in 2 yrs (%)</th>
<th>Likelihood of a violent reconviction in 2 yrs (%)</th>
<th>Likelihood of a serious reconviction in 2 yrs (%)</th>
<th>High or Very High RoSH (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All other Sentenced prisoners</td>
<td>64494</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All recalled prisoners</td>
<td>5125</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard a</td>
<td>3912</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended b</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed term c</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPP or DPP d</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life e</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDC f</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a Recalled prisoners on standard recall. b Recalled prisoners serving extended sentences. c Recalled prisoners on fixed term recall. d Recalled prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection. e Recalled prisoners serving life sentences. f Recall from Home Detention Curfew.

Adapted from Fitzalan Howard et al. (in press), Understanding the process and experience of recall to prison. This snapshot profile of men and women recalled to custody indicated a group presenting with higher risk than most prisoners. On a given day the number back in prison on a fixed term recall may be relatively small but the numbers returning over the course of the year will be much higher. This group are very likely to reoffend (69.7%) but they do not present with high risk of serious harm to others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High levels of criminogenic need across several domains</td>
<td>Fitzalan Howard et al. (in press), Understanding the process and experience of recall to prison. London: MOJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised levels of learning disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of procedural injustice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little knowledge on how to progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged from OM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of self harm and suicide risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of hope, helplessness, poor coping &amp; emotional control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those on Fixed Term Recall may be source of contraband?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relations with staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achieving Better Outcomes for Resettlement Prisons

“What Works”

**Aim** - Resettlement prisons aim to prepare an individual for successful transition back into the community, improving or maintaining family ties and providing access to local services.
At the core of rehabilitative success is the need for a safe and decent prison environment, where prisoners are able to focus on planning for the future without being distracted by fears about their personal safety.

Reducing violence, self-harm, debt and drug misuse are a priority, supported by the consistent and fair use of authority. Once safety and decency are in place, then a clear, shared sense of purpose around rehabilitation and progression is vital.

Staff interactions with prisoners need to be meaningful, consistent and constructive for them to make a difference.

It is essential that staff have the right attitudes and skills to tackle criminal attitudes whilst using everyday interactions to coach self-management and self-motivation.
Rehabilitative Culture achieved by:

**RELATIONSHIPS**
- Five Minute Intervention, Strategy of choices, Conditions of success, Families work, OM Keyworkers

**MANAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP**
- Coaching, Councils & Committees, Communications

**ACTIVITIES**
- Interventions, Substance misuse services, Education, Work, Leisure, Peer support

**FAIR PROCESSES & SYSTEMS**
- Reward and recognition, Fair and transparent policies, Procedural Justice, Adjudications...

**A NORMALISED ENVIRONMENT**
- Access to outdoors, Clean and decent, Broken things get fixed, Signs and symbols
### Changing lives - What does good look like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People with busy days - punctuated by healthy food, time for exercise and other leisure activity and proper rest</th>
<th>Quality care is provided to help individuals manage their substance misuse and mental or physical ill health</th>
<th>Individuals are hopeful that they can have a better life. There is a strong focus on desistance</th>
<th>People feel they have the headspace to think about their futures (they do not need to reserve their cognitive capacity for self-protection).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are supported to be of service to others</td>
<td>Supervision is delivered in line with what is known to be effective. Transition arrangements are seamless</td>
<td>People have a safe and stable home to go on and a source of financial support</td>
<td>All interventions provided are evidence based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A range of education and vocational activity is provided to broaden options for future employment</td>
<td>Staff encourage and coach positive change and understand that reward brings enduring change</td>
<td>A rehabilitative approach to offender management is undertaken where proportionate risk management procedures are in place</td>
<td>Resources are targeted at interventions which are most likely to deliver the best outcomes for offenders, victims and communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Services are more likely to deliver positive outcomes when they recognise and address factors which impact on an individual’s ability to engage and benefit. For example:

- Maturity
- Gender
- Trauma and abuse
- Learning disabilities and difficulties
- Care leaving
- Personality disorder
- Mental health
- Health, including social care needs and disability
- Culture, religion, ethnicity
- Migration
Ensuring fairness of process – Procedural Justice

Procedural justice refers to the fair and just treatment of people by authority figures. It includes how decisions are made and how people are treated.

Being treated with procedural justice helps people to:

➢ Increase the trust and confidence they have in authority, and how legitimate the law and decisions made by those in authority are seen to be
➢ Accept and abide by decisions, and creates commitment to obey rules/the law (immediately and over time)

How people and their problems are managed influences these outcomes more than the final decision made (whether this is in their favour or not).

Four principles of procedural justice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>NEURALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having the chance to tell your side of the story, and knowing that this will be heard and sincerely considered when a decision is made.</td>
<td>Seeing the authority figure as a neutral and unbiased decision maker, someone who is transparent and consistent when applying the rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPECT</th>
<th>TRUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeing the authority figure as someone who treats you with respect and courtesy, who values your rights and takes your issues seriously.</td>
<td>Seeing the authority figure as trustworthy, who is sincere and authentic, who is motivated to do the right thing for everyone involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What difference does fairness make?

• Where court decisions are perceived as procedurally just, there is greater compliance with orders, people accept the outcomes more willingly, they have a more positive view of the court system and their willingness to obey court decisions lasts longer into the future.

• Where people in prison perceive the prison to be procedurally just, they show better psychological adjustment, are less likely to break the prison’s rules, and have higher rates of desistance after release. Perceived fairness of staff also helps with adjustment to prison and well-being of boys and young men on remand.

• Where staff in prison perceive their workplace to be procedurally just, they report better well-being, greater job satisfaction, and a stronger rehabilitation orientation (they feel less punitive).

• Domestic Violence perpetrators are less likely to reoffend after arrest if they perceive the arresting officers as being procedurally just

• Violent offenders are less likely to report carrying a gun if they view police as being legitimate and using procedural justice
Violence, suicide and self-harm

What do we know?
Drivers of prison violence

- Poor conflict resolution skills
- Immaturity and impulsivity
- Over-sensitivity to insult, rumination
- Poor tolerance of stress & frustration

- Procedural injustice
- Illegitimate uses of authority
- Lack of respect
- High use of force

- Poor food
- Overcrowding
- Dirt & dilapidation
- Lack of basics
- Can't fix things (e.g. broken windows)

- Boredom
- Psychoactive substances demand
- Anti-social hierarchy & status
- Debt & Bullying
- Sleep disturbance

Individual (imported factors)

Lack of Respect & Justice

Poor Environment & Decency

Lack of Activity
## What does the evidence tell us about reducing violence?

### What can reduce violence?

- Cognitive skills training
- Legitimacy & procedural justice
- Activity, good diet and sleep
- Respectful relationships which promote meaningful interactions (i.e. Five Minute Intervention)
- Increasing social connection

### What does not reduce violence:

- Punishment - on its own it will not change behaviour or deter people from impulsive actions
- Deterrence
- PAVA & Taser (Incapacitation tools)
- Making conditions harsher
Risk factors of suicide & self-harming behaviours

Risk factors are broadly similar for suicide and self-harming behaviours. Whilst we know self-harm can be predictive of suicide, it is also important to separate the two behaviours. This can help to develop our understanding of prisoners in crisis and the underlying reasons.

- Adverse childhood experiences/trauma
- Family history of suicide/self harm
- Breakdown of familial relationships
- Unhealthy coping strategies
- Poor emotion regulation, including anger
- Impulsivity

- Mental illness (depression/mood disorders)
- Substance misuse
- Previous history of self-harm/suicide attempts
- Younger age
- Lack of social support

- Early days in custody
- Sentence (remand/life sentences/recall)
- Location (locals/YOI's and high security)
- Availability of methods/means
- Transfers (between prisons)
- Court appearances (change in status)

- Feeling lonely – self-isolating
- Hopelessness
- Less connected—e.g recent bereavement or breakdown of a familial relationship
- More likely to be involved in prison conflicts

Environmental triggers

Custodial factors

Imported vulnerabilities

Imported vulnerabilities
What can help someone at risk of suicide and self-harm?

### Relationships with staff
- Empathic & non-judgemental attitudes
- Providing a safe environment to talk in confidence
- Helping prisoners to solve their daily problems and ease their frustrations may improve the experience of the prison environment
- Multi-disciplinary care planning & communication that prisoners are involved in
- Increasing staff knowledge and providing them with adequate support and assistance

### Someone to talk to – increasing social connections
- Staff
- Prisoners – peer mentors, listeners
- Family & friends
- Samaritans, Pen Pals, Sane

### Keeping busy
- Plenty of flexible opportunities for activity that involves interacting with others e.g. sports, gym, education and work, to reduce stress and isolation
- In cell activities (to help avoid rumination/negative thoughts)
Drivers of safety

- Cognitive skills training
- Conflict resolution training
- Stress tolerance training e.g. mindfulness

- Procedural justice
- Respectful relationships
- Legitimate authority
- Rehabilitative culture

- Nutritious diet
- Enable personal space
- Clean environment
- Dynamic security

- Time out of cell
- Providing & receiving peer support
- Exercise & fresh air
- Work
- Good sleep patterns
Designing a Safe and Secure Resettlement Prison

How resettlement prisons enable, facilitate, and promote offender engagement and constructive relationships between staff, prisoners, and service providers. This is an essential platform for the rehabilitative prison hierarchy and integral to the delivery of safe, secure, legal and decent custody and to successful rehabilitation. Creating the right prison culture where prisoners feel safe and hopeful promotes desistance, rehabilitation and change.
What would a safe Resettlement Prison look like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychiatric screening and mental health services with effective diversion scheme for those who are psychotic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A clean and cared for environment with access to outside space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for structured and purposeful activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm, quiet, reflective spaces, privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution training is provided for staff and prisoners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunity for engagement in programmes/interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and analysis of flashpoints for violent incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitative culture and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong procedural justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of reward and motivational enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-designed reception and induction areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities to enable family contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would a secure Resettlement Prison look like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical security is proportionate to mitigate negative effects of imprisonment</th>
<th>Individuals are assessed swiftly, and fairly (e.g. CSRA)</th>
<th>Visitors know what security is in place and understand why it is there</th>
<th>Security in visitors centres is proportionate and dynamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who need help with drug use are directed to appropriate services</td>
<td>Access and support for individuals to maintain contact with family and friends via telephone and other forms of communication</td>
<td>Those who may be vulnerable to and/or engaging in extremism in custody are identified and managed appropriately</td>
<td>People vulnerable to and/or engaging in group affiliated offending are identified and managed appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear processes for exchanging information with key stakeholders outside the prison such as the police, community probation and Youth Offender Services</td>
<td>Staff wrongdoing is minimised by ensuring elements of procedural justice are used, holding staff to account for their actions, effective training and improving organisational ethics</td>
<td>Improving relationships, making systems fairer and ensuring transparency</td>
<td>Security measures, such as BWVCs and body scanners, should be used transparently and with a rehabilitative focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enablers to resettlement

- Maximise prisoner contact time for service providers. Core day supports delivery and access to resettlement services.
- Share prisoner information with service providers to inform decision making and review progress.
- Strong integration of service providers ensures effective service coordination and supports desistance.
- Publish, advertise and promote current information about services, content and eligibility criteria in accessible format.
- Motivate prisoners to access and participate fully in programmes and interventions.
- Encourage prisoners to understand and accept responsibility to engage with services.
- Address prisoners’ anti-social attitudes, thinking and behaviours through pro-social interaction and engagement.
- Support prisoners resettlement into the community through collaboration with partner providers.
- Effective use of ROTL, HDC and electronic monitoring.
- Provide a dedicated resettlement hub.
- Access to digital rehabilitation content in-cell.
## Home Detention Curfew (HDC) & Electronic Monitoring

- Allows for the early release of low-risk prisoners serving sentences of imprisonment between 12 weeks and just under 4 years.
- Eligible, suitable prisoners will be released under an electronically monitored curfew to facilitate transition back into the community.
- Date a prisoner becomes eligible for release on HDC is dependent on the length of their sentence but they must serve a minimum of a quarter of their sentence and a minimum of 28 days in custody before being released.
- The maximum period on HDC is 135 days (4 ½ months).

## Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL)

- Primary purpose is to assist with the resettlement of prisoners into the community.
- Most prisoners will be able to apply for resettlement ROTL once they have served half the custodial element of the sentence.
- Category B prisoners must not be considered for Resettlement Day or Overnight Release.
What is the impact of Electronic Monitoring on Offending?

To answer this question, studies referenced in a 2012 Systematic Review by Danielsson & Makipaa were reviewed. A systematic review considers only those strongly designed research studies where results are most likely to be reliable.

What was found?
- Twenty-one studies met the stringent quality criteria for inclusion in this summary.
- The most robust evidence is from non-UK based applications of EM.
- Some studies did not identify the type of EM used.
- Many studies did not isolate the impact of EM from other approaches.

What the “First Look” Evidence Review suggests:
- The impact of EM by itself only seems to last for as long as a person is being monitored.
- EM leads to more long-lasting good outcomes when used in conjunction with other services, especially rehabilitation programmes.
- EM is a cost-effective alternative to short term imprisonment.
- EM enables people to be released early from prison without getting into further trouble.
- EM works best with higher risk individuals.
- EM may not be necessary with people who are lower risk.
- There is no evidence of EM increasing rates of reoffending in any context, pointing to potential additional uses such as an alternative to remand imprisonment.

Evidence Gaps – What don’t we know?
From the evidence reviewed for this summary, confident conclusions could not be drawn about:
1. Precisely who EM works for (there is limited and sometimes contradictory information on sexual offending, violent offending and on risk);
2. What kind of EM works best.
Disciplinary measures used most often in Dutch & German prisons include reprimands, restrictions on money & property, and restrictions on movement or leisure activities. Measures are imposed very quickly in response to a violation and care is taken to relate the measure to the alleged infraction.

Money earned through prison jobs/education is divided – approx. 60% transferred to prisoner “savings” account, remaining 40% to “current” account which can be spent in prison. Rationale is that all sentenced prisoners must save money for their release, with aim for savings to cover the four weeks immediately after release.

Prisoners can have access to small, individual visiting rooms equipped with sofa/sink/table or family visiting room – brightly decorated with toys/changing facilities to enable prisoners, partners and children to spend time together in private without being constantly observed by prison staff.

‘Giving up Crime’ workbook: a theory and evidence-based method that uses a personal workbook for detainees supported by their mentoring prisoner officers or other practitioners. Its rehabilitation model is designed to assist detainees in initiating, implementing and maintaining a process of intentional self-change.

‘Prison Cloud’ technology: coordinated approach to providing a whole package of digital capabilities and opportunities for prisoners. Incorporates individual/group profiling, e-learning, (limited) internet-access, telephony, video on demand etc.