

## **IOM performance 2012/13**

### **Introduction**

Commencing the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 three new cohorts of offenders were identified to form those managed under the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) scheme.

The three cohorts are selected on the 1<sup>st</sup> April each year. The Prolific and Priority Offenders (PPOs) consisted of 30 individuals.

Those subject to a Community order with a Drug rehabilitation requirement of which there were 29, and finally those that were designated as High Crime Causers (HCCs) of which there were 30.

During the course of the year these offenders were tracked using a methodology that will identify whether interventions implemented by the IOM team have reduced their offending. This methodology, by the nature of offending, is not an exact science and for a simple measurement a baseline of convictions for the above three groups for the year 2011/12 were compared with convictions amassed by the cohorts during the course of 2012/13.

During the course of the year some of the offenders will be de-registered from the scheme, hopefully for positive reasons such as not offending, however it is the cohorts identified as at the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 that will continue to be tracked.

To further complicate the issue both PPOs and HCCs may also be subject to a DRR and therefore in two cohorts.

### **Performance**

#### **PPOs**

Baseline of offences (2012/13)= 43      (2010/11)= 88  
Average convictions-1.4  
Actual convictions 2012/3 = 51  
Increase 8 convictions    + 18.6%

#### **DRRs**

Baseline of offences (2012/13) =117      (2010/11=267)  
Average convictions-9.2  
Actual convictions 2012/3 = 120  
Increase +3 convictions = +2.5%

#### **HCCs**

Baseline of offences 2012/3 =245      ( 2010/11=221)  
Average convictions-8.1  
Actual convictions 2012/3 = 146  
Reduction- 97 = - 39.6%

## **Conclusion**

This is the first year I have reported to the IOM strategy group where the actual number of convictions has actually risen in two of the groups that are tracked for statistical purposes.

In terms of the all cohorts I have left the number of convictions from the year 2010/11 for comparison.

In terms of the PPO cohort the first striking figure is the actual low number of convictions, i.e. 43. This was partly due to the fact that a number of this cohort had been in custody the year previously and therefore any increase was due to the fact that they were starting from a point of no convictions in the preceding 12 months. The other interesting fact is that 17 of those convictions were committed by 2 individuals. On a positive note 7 of the cohort were in the community for the whole period and were not convicted

In terms of the DRR cohort it is of note that this cohort has reduced in size to only 29 individuals (usually around 60) thus the actual reduction in convictions. Of note that within this cohort 6 individuals were responsible for 89 of the 120 convictions.

With regard to the HCC cohort it was pleasing to report a substantial reduction in the number of convictions but again 4 individuals were responsible for 69 of the 148 convictions.

J. Evans  
April 2013