

Note of meeting: REDUCING REOFFENDING BOARD

26 November 2018

Organisations in attendance:

Organisations in Attendance
Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)
London Heads of Community Safety (LHOCS)
London Borough of Brent (LB Brent)
Metropolitan Police Service (MPS)
Her Majesty's Prisons and Probation Service (HMPPS)
Centre for Public Innovation (CPI)
London Councils
Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)
National Probation Service (NPS)
Public Health England (PHE)
Wormwood Scrubs
Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRC)

Organisations Absent:

Organisations Absent
Ministry of Justice (MoJ)
NHS England
Youth Justice Board (YJB)

1. Welcome and apologies

Deputy chair welcomed board members to the Reducing Reoffending Board, and gave apologies for absence as received, including head chair who was unable to attend and chair.

2. Actions from previous meeting and progress made on discussions

1	NPS to discuss possibility of NPS chairing the criminal justice task and finish group.	Things have moved on with the work of the Violence Reduction Unit and so this action will be removed
2	1-sider update on devolution to be shared at every RRB meeting.	Complete – circulated as part of MOPAC update paper
3	Share co-ordination of actions from the SCYPB and keep a rolling log.	Complete – circulated as part of MOPAC update paper
4	Circulate note from previous CSTR workshop with Board members.	Complete
5	MOPAC to produce a brief statement on the Board’s role in addressing disproportionality. Focus on access and outcomes to rehabilitation services, data need and how commissioning is undertaken. Key principles/standards to be developed.	MOPAC is doing a broader piece of work on disproportionality and this will come back to the RRB at the next meeting
6	There is a session in October to bring data together on disproportionality. Feedback from this session to be shared with the Board.	Ongoing through closedown. NPS and CRC confirmed no outstanding issues.
7	Each priority area to be assigned a principal organisation and additional partners. No further subgroups to be set up, but updates from all organisations to be given at the start of each meeting, particularly highlighting risks/concerns.	Complete – in the form of a paper to this meeting
8	Forward planner to be developed for next three board meetings.	Complete
9	MPS to share IOM review.	Complete
10	London Councils to complete and share response to survey on persistent offenders and consider whether a feedback session outside the Board would be useful.	Complete
11	3 or 4 paragraph updates on female offenders to be circulated by partners. All partners to let us know if they would be interested in being involved in commissioning.	Complete - circulated as part of MOPAC update paper
12	MOPAC to circulate a more detailed briefing on the female offender blueprint, for partners to consider and feedback on.	Complete - circulated as part of MOPAC update paper
13	MOPAC to check with CRC and NPS on when they would like to bring in a discussion on underdeveloped pathways to the Board.	CRC has responded with suggestions
14	London Councils to consider representation from local authorities, beyond LHOCS, such as housing, education, etc. MOPAC to consider GLA representation.	This will be on a case by case basis

3. Persistent Offenders Presentation

NPS and MOPAC introduced this item, with NPS taking the lead in persistent offenders in the lead roles paper. Justice Matters in September was about persistent offenders and particularly violent offending. There was discussion on reconsidering eligibility criteria and there was a request to also look at other data, such as disproportionality and the link to domestic abuse.

NPS have agreed to lead on the development of the persistent offender RRB priority area in conjunction with MOPAC. This will mean:

- The development of data analysis against the proposed eligibility criteria based on (dependant of NPS/CRC sharing data with MOPAC),
- Setting up a partnership group chaired by the NPS to review data analysis and scope options,
- Establishing a core set of principles for London IOM schemes that all partners can sign up to,
- Seeking agreement from partners regarding resource and governance commitments,
- Regular updates to the RRB.

MPS asked if OGRS aren't suitable if there is an advantage of all local authorities using the same method. There is an advantage to consistency in the way we work across boroughs however would caution the conclusion isn't that OGRS have no value but maybe should be used with another tool

MOPAC picked up that Gripping the Offender (GtO) had a focus on Under 25s but then they felt there weren't enough services on over 25s. MPS would like to focus on younger cohort, predominantly 14-25. Also, some MPS colleagues would like a more enhanced IOM scheme around domestic abuse and stalking.

LHOCS highlighted that there is already a risk management panel in place for young offenders and would be nervous about sticking youth into the IOM structure. Also, from a local perspective there is a need to rationalise why we put some people in some categories. Adults have very different services to children and so we have to think how it works best at a local level bringing services together. The repeat nature of domestic abuse needs a slightly different focus; it would be useful for a local authority to be part of these conversations.

LB Brent expressed concern over duplication, and that we need to know what we want to achieve, what are the core principles, and what is the best way of working out eligibility criteria. Timeframes are also of concern with many things such as LCPF proposals and probation redesign feeding into this. MOPAC would suggest the first meeting take place after some data analysis; NPS have agreed to sharing data.

Action: CRC to follow-up with CRC on data

Action: MOPAC to develop timelines and action plan for this work prior to the next Board meeting

4. Lead Roles and Next Steps

MOPAC presented this paper, which came out from the last meeting. The paper attempts to promote more partnership engagement, and also presents some check and challenge to the board.

PHE stated that she couldn't take on the mental health part on her own and this is a role she needs a partner with, which should be MOPAC or NHS England. In the next 12 months we hope to achieve continuity of care in substance misuse treatment from prison to the community. Dual diagnosis will be another focus - what do we do to ensure those with drug addictions and mental health are being given proper support. Prisons are not noting the additional needs that someone has when released - too low a proportion of those released are noted with mental health issues. PHE would like a task and finish group to look at what we need to do to address this and what are the roles of partners.

Action: MOPAC to convene a task and finish group

It would also be a good idea to have someone from DWP attend. Wormwood Scrubs is also willing to join from prison perspective. This conversation should include NHS England to have a mental health representative attend. LHOCS said we should convene something around dual diagnosis. This could form part of the above mentioned task and finish group. Local authorities and CCGs need to be part of conversation

For female offending there already exists a board and NPS can meet with MOPAC to see what she might want support on. There is a real opportunity moving forward to re-look at governance of female offending in context of the London blueprint being developed. CRC to help NPS with female offending; MPS will support that as well as they're helping with the female offending pilot

Action: NPS to meet with MOPAC to see how they fit into blueprint and will come back to board

The Prison Pathfinder project has invested £450k in HMP ISIS in a violent reduction initiative. MPS - research work coming out one of their programmes which are eagerly awaited. Through the gate initiative - the aim is by April should be able to achieve it.

MOPAC said that over next three months the priorities are around enforcement (see paper for details) and from April onwards in terms of interventions. The Working group have not been convened recently meeting to be set up with partners in Jan 19.

LHOCS highlighted the amount of crossover and asked if there can we have something to see how priority areas cross over, such as task finish group from PHE and how these fit into violence reduction. MOPAC believes this could be incorporated into the workplan. We need a project plan, key deliverables, partners who deliver them, and timescales. Key updates and progress will be measured against these milestones

Action: MOPAC to review work plan and timescales for the next meeting.

5. DIP Review

This was Item 7 on the agenda but was moved to Item 5. CPI presented this item where the concept to engage with drug using offenders - predominantly class A users. The DIP was aimed at adults - young people were not in scope. The project looked at all 32 boroughs to see what DIP intervention was there, if any, going in depth in 7 boroughs which represented a cross-section of inner and outer London, ranging from high levels to no levels of DIP funding or cover. The project looked offending history for one year prior and post.

The key findings include that there weren't many criminal justice workers who see all their time in custody or court; roles are much more fluid. DIP was designed for opioid and crack users but what we've seen across London is they now work with drug use in fullest sense and alcohol. There is a fragmented landscape across London, with 11 of 32 boroughs no longer funding drug work in police custody. Additionally, the police landscape which DIP was designed to fit into no longer exists; there are no longer police custody suites or magistrates' courts in every borough. The majority of funding is from local authorities' public health grants. MOPAC only fund 15 boroughs to deliver DIP services and some boroughs run DIP services without any MOPAC funding. The key decision is whether to continue the current approach, cease all DIP funding provided by MOPAC, or amend the current approach to funding and delivering DIP Services. A number of recommendations were made, and these can be found on the PowerPoint Presentation.

LHOCS was concerned the report does not reflect a local authority perspective, and the LCPF allocation for the next two years have been decided and proposals put forward, so some of the recommendations are no longer relevant. The recommendations are too heavily focused on what LCPF can do. PHE is concerned with the tone around local authorities not giving MOPAC the data it needs. Also, people have their own local systems and providers have their own way of capturing data and so standardising will be difficult. There was also concern with treatment outcome being looked at by the DIP review. As DIP was funded to get people in the door and is separate to the treatment which is entirely down to local authorities.

PHE does not believe the money we have is enough to do what we are talking about. MOPAC expressed optimism as the custody centre footprint in London is shrinking. NPS would like to keep money in treatment for offenders as it's such a big issue for the NPS and CRC.

Action: Full DIP report to be shared once completed, sub group to be re-visited and brought back together.

6. MOPAC UPDATE PAPER

There was no time to talk through the paper however board members are encouraged to read the update paper.

7. Forward Planner

Board members are encouraged to send feedback and thoughts on the forward planner to MOPAC.

Next meeting date: 5th February 09.00-11.00 in Committee Room 3, City Hall

Action Summary:

1	CRC to follow-up with CRC on data
2	MOPAC to develop timelines and action plan for this work prior to the next Board meeting
3	MOPAC to convene a task and finish group re: substance misuse and continuity of care with prisons.
5	NPS to meet with MOPAC to see how they fit into blueprint and will come back to board
6	MOPAC to have timescales worked out by next meeting
7	Full DIP report to be shared once completed, sub group to be re-visited and brought back together.