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Executive Summary

Study Background

The Greater Manchester Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC) Pilot began in April 2009 and ran for two years until the end of March 2011. It was one of seven nationally commissioned pilots to develop more effective ways of safely managing lower risk offenders within the community, rather than them receiving custodial sentences. The target group for the GM IAC pilot was individuals aged 18 to 25 who lived in Manchester or Salford and who appeared in court and were at risk of custody, but who would normally receive a court sentence of less than 12 months for their offence.

Rather than enter the prison system the offender was sentenced to a 12 month IAC Order which comprised a number of different elements, including a mentoring service from Work Solutions to offer new pathways to education, training and employment (ETE) as well as personal and social development. In order to assess the impact of the intervention, New Economy was asked to provide a cost benefit analysis and qualitative evaluation of the employment mentoring service. The research comprised three main components:

1. The cost benefit analysis (CBA), quantifying the financial impact of the Work Solutions element of the IAC pilot.
3. A consultation programme undertaken with key stakeholders on the project, in addition analysis of relevant information gained from a series of interviews undertaken with offenders by the Greater Manchester Probation Trust.

Main Findings

Cost-Benefit Analysis

New Economy has developed a cost benefit methodology which is used across Greater Manchester to understand the value for money of new approaches. This has been developed in conjunction with analysts from a number of central government departments including HM Treasury and the Department for Work and Pensions. The CBA looks at the economic impact of people moving into employment as a result of the IAC order by monetising the assumed reduction in benefits payments, health improvements and reduced police responses to crime. Assessing the benefits of the IAC pilot involves a number of steps:

1. Identifying the target population – the number of people given an IAC order.
2. Identifying the target population on benefits at the time of being given an order.
3. Quantifying the number of offenders who found employment as a result of the mentoring element of the IAC order.
4. Allowing for deadweight – the outputs that would have occurred anyway, without the IAC order.
The overall benefit-cost ratio for the Work Solutions element of the IAC pilot is 1.2, which means that for every £1 put into the mentoring side of the IAC, £1.20 is paid back in benefits. The payback period for the IAC period is five years – that is, after five years the project will have paid for itself as a result of the benefits it creates.

**Desk-Based Review**

A desk-based review of broader mentoring interventions highlights that programmes are likely to display a number of characteristics in order for them to be effective and successfully impact on offenders’ lives. Evidence suggests that mentoring works best when delivered in conjunction with other interventions and the review also suggests that mentors need to meet with offenders on a regular basis in order to produce the best possible outcomes.

The longevity of mentoring programmes is also likely to influence their degree of success, while mentors need to meet with offenders on a regular basis in order to produce the best possible outcomes. The literature also highlights that people ‘at risk’ rather than people who are already demonstrating significant personal problems are more likely to have a successful outcome from taking part in a mentoring scheme. This suggests the possibility may exist to extend the IAC order to other groups of offenders, which in effect could act in a pre-emptive way to reduce re-offending.

Furthermore, the Prison Reform Trust highlights the limitations of short custodial sentences for young offenders aged 18-25 and suggests that introducing a community sentence such as that delivered by the GM IAC model could be one way of reforming the current system for dealing with young adults in the criminal justice system.

**Stakeholder and Offender Interviews**

From both a stakeholder and offender perspective, the IAC pilot has been well received and the fact that more than 20% of people who completed their order subsequently found employment is extremely encouraging. Moreover, the characteristics associated with successful mentoring programmes are evident within the Work Solutions delivered element of the IAC. This included mentors having regular meetings with offenders over a prolonged period of time and delivering the Work Solutions mentoring services as part of a wider suite of interventions.

The GM Probation Trust evaluation of the IAC indicates that the chance of obtaining employment was one of the key outcomes that offenders hoped to achieve. In addition to the benefit of securing a job, offenders who completed their order while on the pilot have highlighted a number of other important benefits – from simply feeling more confident and positive, right through to the support provided in helping to secure new accommodation or registering for benefits.

The success of the initial two year pilot has led to the GM IAC continuing and the most recent monitoring data suggests it is continuing to have a significant impact – in particular, the proportion of offenders successfully securing employment is reported to have risen to around 50%.
1 Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an evaluation of the employment mentoring element of the Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC) Pilot, which began in April 2009 and ran for two years until the end of March 2011. The IAC in Greater Manchester was one of seven nationally commissioned pilots to develop more effective ways of safely managing lower risk offenders within the community, rather than them receiving custodial sentences.

1.2 The evaluation is in two main parts, a cost benefit analysis (CBA) of the programme, and a qualitative review of the findings of interviews with a number of members of staff delivering the IAC programme.

1.3 The GM IAC pilot was one of three run in metropolitan areas, the others being in Merseyside and West Yorkshire. It was operated from a single multi-agency location in Manchester and was staffed and managed by Greater Manchester Probation Trust (GMPT), Work Solutions (WS), GM Police, G4S and Partners of Prisoners Service (POPS). The GM IAC program has continued since the pilot ended, albeit with a reduced number of staff and on a reduced budget. For example, during the pilot there were five FTE mentors from Work Solutions, which has now been reduced to three FTE positions. The program is continuing to be run from the same location, with the same partners involved.

1.4 The target group for the GM IAC pilot was individuals aged 18 to 25 who lived in Manchester or Salford and who appeared in court and were at risk of custody, but who would normally receive a court sentence of less than 12 months for their offence. Rather than enter the prison system the offender was sentenced to a 12 month IAC Order which comprised a number of different elements, including:

- Supervision & Reporting – Led by GMPT offender managers;
- A mentoring service from Work Solutions to offer new pathways to education, training and employment (ETE) as well as personal and social development. Work Solutions also led on the delivery of a formal ETE specified activity programme;
- An enhanced curfew lasting for the first three months of the IAC order from G4S, offering interventions and motivational activity over and above standard arrangements commonly associated with electronic monitoring;
- Unpaid Work Hours – Totalling up to 100 hours over the course of the IAC order;
- A new programme of activity from Manchester Attendance Centre to promote citizenship, life skills, healthy living and self-esteem;
Assessment of family, social and personal support networks through intervention from POPs, in order to promote rehabilitation and compliance; and

New ways of communicating activity and progress to communities.

1.5 The main focus of this report is on the impact of the second IAC element outlined above – the services delivered by Work Solutions. In particular, the CBA looks at the economic impact of people moving into employment as a result of the IAC order by monetising the assumed reduction in benefits payments, health improvements and reduced police responses to crime. Appendix A provides a summary of the monetisation process.

1.6 New Economy has developed a Cost Benefit Methodology which is used across Greater Manchester to understand the value for money of new approaches. The details of the methodology are documented in the Greater Manchester CBA Technical Specification document. This methodology has been developed in conjunction with analysts from a number of central government departments including HM Treasury and the Department for Work and Pensions.

1.7 The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- **Section 2** outlines the results of the CBA, providing the detailed assumptions used to inform the analysis and quantifying the financial impact which the Work Solutions element of the IAC pilot has had;

- **Section 3** presents the main findings from a desk-based review of broader mentoring interventions implemented elsewhere, drawing on international examples from Canada and the United States. The section also summarises relevant literature from the UK in relation to the role of mentoring offenders and its impact;

- **Section 4** provides a summary of the findings from a consultation programme undertaken with key stakeholders on the project – which included a representative from each project partner and the Work Solutions mentors. The section also summarises the relevant information from a series of interviews undertaken with offenders who went on the IAC programme by the Greater Manchester Probation Trust; and

- **Section 5** draws together the main findings from the study and presents the key conclusions from the evaluation.

---

2 Cost Benefit Analysis

2.1 In this section, we present the CBA of the pilot stage of the IAC, which ran from 1 April 2009 until 31 March 2011. Given that some people will have still been on the order after this period, the timeframe of analysis has been extended to the end of July 2011 in order to capture additional job outcomes for people who started their orders while the IAC was in its pilot phase but continued on them after the pilot ended. The following points should be noted regarding the CBA:

- There are other outcomes which have not been quantified – for example, impacts on reoffending and health. This is because these outcomes are associated with the entire IAC pilot in GM and all project partners. The purpose of the CBA analysis is to assess the impact of those elements delivered by Work Solutions only;
- The CBA only looks at fiscal savings, not economic or social benefits to participants and society;
- The model makes allowance for optimism bias to ensure that the impact estimates are conservative; and
- One of the next steps is to combine the CBA outputs with analysis of reoffending and other benefits to provide an overall understanding of the value of the IAC programme.

2.2 Benefits and costs are presented for the mentoring and ETE elements of the pilot, which were delivered by Work Solutions. All costs have been provided by Work Solutions and cover the period 1 April 2009 up to the end of July 2011. The analysis looks at the impact of people moving into employment as a result of the IAC order. In order to quantify this impact, it has been monetised based on the assumed reduction in benefits payments, health improvements and reduced police responses to crime.

IAC COSTS

2.3 All costs have been provided by Work Solutions and cover the period 1 April 2009 up to the end of July 2011. Table 4.1 breaks these down into four broad categories and shows how money was allocated in years 1 and 2 of the pilot. It also provides the corresponding financial information for April-July 2011, which has been used to inform the analysis. Total costs for the IAC equate to just over £630,000 for April 2009-July 2011.

2.4 It is important to note that the post-pilot phase of the IAC program has been running since April 2011 and the overall level of funding has been reduced. The mentoring element of the IAC program has been operating on a reduced budget of £12,500 per month. However, this smaller budget only began in August 2011. The reason for the higher figure of £90,000 between April and July 2011 (an average of £22,500 per month) is because the same level of
funding remained in April and May 2011 and costs for June and July 2011 were also relatively high because Work Solutions was in the process of reducing the number of mentors, which involved paying people during their notice periods.

Table 4.1: IAC Running Costs, April 2009-July 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>April 09-March 10</th>
<th>April 10-March 11</th>
<th>April 11-July 11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT &amp; office equipment</td>
<td>£8,073</td>
<td>£6,154</td>
<td>£3,133</td>
<td>£17,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>£212,559</td>
<td>£206,559</td>
<td>£67,158</td>
<td>£486,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>£43,055</td>
<td>£48,222</td>
<td>£16,890</td>
<td>£108,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>£9,338</td>
<td>£8,444</td>
<td>£3,600</td>
<td>£21,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£273,024</strong></td>
<td><strong>£269,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>£90,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>£633,184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Work Solutions (Costs aggregated into broad categories by New Economy)

IAC BENEFITS

2.5 Assessing the benefits of the IAC involves a number of steps and the following analysis was undertaken:

Step 1: Identifying the target population

2.6 In this case, the target population is the number of people being given an IAC order during the pilot. Based on data provided to New Economy by Work Solutions this figure is 342.

Step 2: Identifying the target population on benefits

2.7 This is the number of people who were on benefits at the time of being given an IAC order. Specific data on this for the IAC pilot are not available, therefore a proxy has been used based on research undertaken by the Ministry of Justice. On average, the research found that the proportion of all offenders claiming benefits at some point in the month before sentence was 54%. Applying this percentage to the total number of people given an IAC order during the pilot (342), 185 offenders are estimated to have been receiving benefits – it is assumed that Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) would have been the main benefit being claimed.

Step 3: People moving off benefits into employment

2.8 The third step is to identify how many of offenders assumed to be on benefits subsequently found employment as a result of the mentoring and/or ETE elements of the IAC order. Information provided by Work Solutions shows that 24% of people on the pilot moved into employment. However, this may be a slight underestimate because some people will have started on the IAC order during the pilot period, but will not have completed it until after the pilot ended. Extending the timeframe to July 2011 to better reflect this, the proportion of people gaining employment rises to 27%.

2 This includes a wide range of expenditure associated with items such as client support, irrecoverable VAT, marketing, depreciation etc.
Step 4: Allowing for Deadweight

2.9 This is the term used to identify the output that would have occurred anyway without an intervention – i.e. if the offenders had not been placed on the IAC order, would they have still found jobs as a result of other interventions? Specific information on the IAC pilot in GM is not available to inform this assumption. At a national level however, the Ministry of Justice\(^4\) has estimated that the proportion of offenders released from prison and in employment after 52 weeks release is around 11%. After 104 weeks of release this rises to 15%. Taking a mid-point of these two estimates to use as a proxy for the GM IAC pilot, it is assumed that 13% of people who found employment as result of the IAC would have done so irrespective of whether they were placed on the order not.

RUNNING THE CBA MODEL

2.10 The assumptions around costs and benefits can then be fed into the CBA model\(^5\) in order to arrive at a monetary value for: getting people into employment and reducing the percentage of offenders receiving benefits; and the impact of decreasing crime as a result of people moving into paid employment.

2.11 The model assesses impacts over a five year period to estimate longer term gross cashable efficiency savings and the extent to which an intervention essentially pays for itself when compared to the funding costs. This analysis has been undertaken for the IAC pilot and it has been assumed that employment lags behind the start of mentoring delivered by Work Solutions and then peaks in year 2. It then drops off slightly in years 3, 4 and 5.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM THE CBA MODEL

2.12 Table 4.2 presents the results from the CBA model, providing both actual and “discounted” costs and benefits. The discounted costs and benefits provide a Net Present Value (NPV). The NPV is the discounted value of a stream of future costs or benefits. It is used to describe the difference between the present value of a stream of costs and a stream of benefits. A discount rate must be used when calculating an NPV in order to convert all costs and benefits to ‘present values’. Using the Treasury’s Green Book, the recommended discount rate is 3.5%.


Table 4.2: Costs and Benefits of the IAC Elements Delivered by Work Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Fiscal CBA</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Net Present Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual costs</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>£273,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>£78,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted costs</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>£273,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>£78,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New Economy CBA Model

2.13 The two main points to note from Table 4.2 are as follows:

- The overall benefit-cost ratio for the IAC pilot is 1.2\(^6\) which means that for every £1 put into the mentoring element of the IAC, £1.20 is paid back in benefits; and

- The payback period for the IAC period is five years – that is, after five years the project will have paid for itself as a result of the benefits it creates.

2.14 A complete version of the CBA spreadsheet is provided in Appendix B.

---

\(^6\) £740,000 divided by £617,512.
3 Literature Review

3.1 In this section, we present the main findings from a desk-based review of broader mentoring interventions implemented elsewhere, drawing on international examples from Canada and the United States. The section also presents relevant evidence from the UK and summarises a more general paper published in 2010 which presents a review of previous work on the role and impact of mentoring. In addition, it highlights some of the main findings from a January 2012 paper by the Prison Reform Trust on young adults in the criminal justice system in England and Wales.

UK – Offender Mentoring Schemes in the South West

3.2 In 2008 the Ministry of Justice published a report mapping offender mentoring schemes in the South West\(^7\). It also provided a summary of the available literature on the effective application of mentoring. The research highlighted a number of key points, including:

- Programmes that lasted over ten months, include on average of 15 meetings and have a steering group, are considered to be the most successful;
- Mentoring schemes that have been successful in reducing re-offending tend to be those where the mentor and mentee meet at least once a week and spend at least five or more hours together at each meeting;
- Successful schemes have shown that mentoring appears to work for particular groups of offenders (e.g. females, BME), with particular needs and at particular times of their criminal justice journey;
- The success of a scheme may be influenced by whether it is one of a number of interventions;
- The effectiveness of the scheme may be influenced by whether the mentors are perceived by offenders to be separate from the criminal justice system, and therefore more likely to engage in a relationship with them as a result of this; and
- Funding streams are often complex, short lived and impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of mentoring.

Canada – Alternative Measures Program

3.3 The Alternative Measures Programme (AMP) was introduced in Canada in 1996. This sentencing option is available to adult offenders sentenced to less than 2 years in prison. If the judge "is satisfied that serving the sentence in the community would not endanger the safety of the community" then he or she can allow the offender to serve the prison sentence in the community, subject

---

\(^7\) Ministry of Justice, July 2008: “A Scoping Exercise of Offender Mentoring Schemes in the South West”.
to supervision. At the same time, the judge imposes a jail term but suspends it as long as the offender fulfils the conditions of the sentence.

3.4 The offender enters into a form of contractual agreement to answer for their crime. Types of measures available as part of the AMP include:

- **Educational Programs** such as "Stoplift", which aimed at educating people about shoplifting and its impacts on the community and business, or other educational program that relates specifically to the alleged offence;

- **Counselling/Treatment** for the underlying issues that led to the person's involvement in the criminal justice system. Alternative measures allow for referrals to be made to counselling or treatment centres; however, participation in counselling or treatment cannot be imposed as an alternative measure;

- **Community Service** whereby the person performs a predetermined number of hours of volunteer community service work to a non-profit agency in the community (the maximum number of hours a person may be requested to complete varies across the country from 50 to 120 hours); and

- **Parental Action Letters** which are sent to the parents/guardians and young persons involved for the first time in the criminal justice system and who have allegedly committed minor property offences (these letters are used, for example, in Manitoba and British Columbia often with first time referrals to alternative measures for youth).

3.5 Within the Alternative Measures Program, the Youth Protection Centre in the Quebec City area has developed an intensive probation program for young offenders who would otherwise have been put in custody. This is a multidisciplinary initiative involving psychologists, social workers, teachers, police and family members who provide ongoing support and close monitoring of the youth. During the first two years of the initiative, the reoffending rate for the participants was 44%, compared to 77% for the control group, who were placed in custody.

3.6 Community Correction Act (CCA) programs were developed in 1979, with the aim of diverting specific offenders from state prisons by creating correctional sanctions and services at the local level. In 1994, the CCA was expanded to include the diversions of offenders from local jails. The program represents a partnership between the state of Ohio and local governments. It provides a system of specific facilities on residential and non-residential basis to a convicted offender.

---

Typical services offered by the community correctional facilities in Ohio include:

- **Life Skills** – Corrective Thinking (CT) is the core treatment curriculum used throughout the program, focusing on thinking barriers and correctives to enhance 10 life areas: Thinking; family; social; spiritual; job/school; financial; legal; leisure; health/grooming; and society/community;

- **Chemical Dependency** – Offenders participate in chemical dependency treatment that focuses on connecting criminal behaviour and chemical use/abuse, and provides a common method for overall behavioural change through chemical dependency process groups;

- **Education** – Offenders with a wide range of educational needs are assisted by certified teachers through classes from basic literacy to preparing and taking the General Educational Development exam; and

- **Family Services** – Designed to assist the offender and significant others in being part of a supportive home environment after release. Services are provided to an individual offender or the family as a group and include program orientation that takes place prior to visitation, parenting education, intervention, and referral to appropriate community agencies.

Marion (2002)\(^9\) has explored whether alternatives to prison and jail are cheaper than imprisonment in Ohio, and whether such alternatives present more effective methods of reducing recidivism. The major findings of the study are:

- Community corrections programs are, on the whole, much cheaper than traditional prison settings. When the study was published in 2002, it estimated that the state of Ohio was saving anywhere between $2,000 and $11,000 per person by using community correction instead of prison;

- Inmates (or clients) in community-based correctional programs generally stay under the control of the state for shorter periods than those in prisons and jails; and

- The research evidence suggests there is less recidivism or re-incarceration for clients from community-based correctional programs than for prison inmates.

**Models of Mentoring for Inclusion & Employment**

In a paper published in 2010\(^10\), Finnegan et al. examine the evidence on the impact of mentoring. A review of the international literature by the authors

---


highlighted a number of relevant points in relation to the impact of mentoring, including:

- Dubois et al (2002)\(^{11}\) found some evidence that mentoring has some impact on reducing high-risk behaviours and improving education and employment outcomes, in addition to suggesting that programmes have more positive outcomes where mentoring is one of many supportive interventions.

- A study by the Youth Justice Board (2005)\(^{12}\) in England and Wales found that mentor projects were successful in reintegrating the targeted young people into education, training and the community. However, the study also highlighted that there was limited improvements in numeracy, literacy or behaviour.

- Joliffe and Farrington's (2007)\(^{13}\) rapid evidence assessment considered 17 US mentoring schemes and one in the UK that aimed to reduce reoffending. The research found that seven demonstrated a positive impact on re-offending. They concluded that, overall, the results suggested that mentoring significantly reduced subsequent offending by 4%-11%.

3.10 Significantly, Finnegan et al. (2010) also highlight the main characteristics of an effective mentoring programme. These include:

- People ‘at risk’ rather than people who are already demonstrating significant personal problems are more likely to have a successful outcome from taking part in a mentoring scheme;

- The duration of the mentoring scheme and the time spent with the mentor are important factors in the success of a mentoring scheme. The literature suggests longer schemes (e.g. a year or more) with frequent contact of once a week or more are more effective. Some studies found short-term mentoring relationships had negative effects;

- Having a strong support system in place for the mentoring scheme is desirable as this has been found to have a positive impact on outcomes;

- Mentoring is more likely to yield positive results when it is used as a component within a wider programme of support for those at risk; and

- A number of authors discuss the importance of setting clear boundaries between mentor and mentee and ensuring the mentor retains authority and professionalism.

\(^{11}\) Dubois et al. (2002) Effectiveness of mentoring Programs for Youth: A meta-analytic review, American Journal of Community Psychology 30(2)  
Old Enough to Know Better? A briefing on young adults in the criminal justice system in England & Wales

3.11 Published in January 2012 by the Prison Reform Trust\(^{14}\), this paper highlights the need to develop a more focussed and intensive approach to rehabilitating young offenders. It sets out the actions which need to be taken in order to make this objective a reality.

3.12 One of the key points highlighted by the paper is the fact that young adults are disproportionately responsible for offences. 18-25 year-olds make up one in ten of the population as a whole, however they account for a third of those sent to prison each year, a third of the probation caseload and a third of the total social and economic cost of crime. However, the Prison Reform Trust argues that the measures needed to prevent young offenders from falling into a pattern of behaviour are not adequately delivered by the criminal justice system – reconviction rates suggest that the short, sharp, shock of a spell in custody is not working. As a result, the Trust makes a series of recommendations in terms of reforming the current system:

- Introducing a robust community sentence, tailored to the specific needs of young offenders. Significantly, the GM IAC model is one of the initiatives suggested by the Trust that could be used to provide this.
- Diverting first-time and low-level offenders out of the criminal justice system through the use of restorative pre-court disposals, similar to the youth restorative disposal;
- Expanding the age-remit of youth offending teams (YOTs) to accommodate 18-20 year-olds – this would enable the complex needs and challenges of this age group to be more effectively addressed through the multi-agency structure of YOTs;
- Developing sentencing guidelines specific to young adults – in recognition of their age, maturity, intellectual and emotional capacity;
- Establishing specialist services for young adults both in the community and in prison to reduce alcohol and drug misuse as drivers to crime; and
- Ensuring that the new diversion and liaison schemes at police stations and courts are equipped to respond to the particular needs of young men and young women with mental health problems or learning difficulties and learning disabilities.

4 Consultation Programme

STAKEHOLDER VIEWS ON THE IAC

4.1 A consultation programme was undertaken with the following eight IAC project stakeholders in order to explore issues such as: rationale/background to the IAC; project management and governance; success of the IAC order; and impact/success of the mentoring/ETE elements delivered by Work Solutions:

- Three Work Solutions mentors;
- Partners of Prisoners (POPS) officer;
- G4S Community Worker;
- Senior Offender Manager – GM Probation Trust
- Business Development Manager for Probation; and
- Offender Services Manager at Work Solutions.

4.2 Five themes were discussed with stakeholders and the main findings from each of these are summarised below: A copy of the topics discussed and questions associated with them is provided in Appendix C.

Overview/Background to involvement with the pilot

4.3 This theme explored stakeholder views on the original rationale behind the IAC and their specific role on the project. One of the findings to emerge was that while each of the six other IAC’s in the UK pilot also had a mentoring element, these were viewed in GM as more traditional programmes and the aim was to develop a support mechanism that would better prepare people for the jobs market. There was also the view that the mentoring should fit the broader model of the IAC – it was not about ‘befriending’, rather it was related to raising aspirations.

4.4 It was also noted by one of the stakeholders that when people make the transition to adulthood, the level of engagement can often tail off. With the IAC, the aim was to smooth this transition and to give them a suite of interventions such as family support – interventions that could be delivered from a single site based in Shudehill, Manchester.

The IAC order itself

4.5 Within this theme, issues such as attendance, breaches, the level of intensiveness and the flexibility of the IAC were discussed with stakeholders. The main findings to emerge include:

- The IAC was very intense for the first three months, with offenders being required to attend at least two appointments a week. The general view is that the majority of offenders appreciated that the start of the IAC was extremely intense, however not everyone was aware of what was expected of them when they first came on the order and the
initial period of the IAC presented them with a culture shock, particular if they had experienced more traditional sentences in the past;

- In total, 44 people on the IAC pilot were actually in employment when they came on to the order. The consultation programme looked at the extent to which this presented any problems in terms of these offenders having the time to complete their unpaid work requirement. The general consensus is that this did not create any significant problems on the whole. The IAC was designed to be flexible and the centre at Shudehill stayed open late on a Monday and Wednesday to accommodate peoples' schedules, while those people already in employment were able to complete their unpaid work requirement at weekends. This flexibility was also evident in the way the pilot evolved over a two year period – as the pilot progressed, new elements were added to address issues raised as part of a first year evaluation, which included provision for a substance misuse programme and an initiative aimed at targeting people from the BME community; and

- In terms of attendance, stakeholders felt that on the whole it was good. Offenders ran the risk of breaching the order if they consistently missed appointments and when attendance did vary, it tended to be morning appointments that were those most likely to be missed. To reduce the risk of missed appointments, G4S would provide transport for people where necessary.

Mentoring/ETE delivered by Work Solutions

4.6 The third theme looked specifically at the role of the mentor and whether the IAC elements delivered by Work Solutions were successful. The overwhelming view to emerge from the consultations was that the mentors performed a vital role on the IAC. In particular, stakeholders noted that:

- The mentors developed close relationships with the offenders, enabling them to help overcome the barriers that got the offender in trouble to start with. The fact that mentors met with offenders on a regular basis was also recognised as being beneficial by stakeholders – the Ministry of Justice report\(^\text{15}\) cited in the previous section noted that mentoring schemes that have been successful in reducing re-offending tend to be those where the mentor and mentee meet at least once a week;

- Mentors and Offender Managers began to work very closely during the IAC pilot. They were ultimately paired together and this led to a good working relationship developing between the two parties;

- The other partners on the project were able to discuss with an offender’s respective mentor any problems which that offender may have that could impact on their abilities to complete the IAC order.

\(^{15}\) Ministry of Justice, July 2008: “A Scoping Exercise of Offender Mentoring Schemes in the South West”.
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such problems could then be addressed by the mentors thanks to this informal feedback mechanism;

- Offenders knew they could confide in their mentor and the mentors helped to bridge the gap between the offenders and everyone involved on the IAC – they knew how to speak to offenders in order to get positive responses from them; and

- Offenders also recognised that there was a clear distinction between the role of the offender manager and that of the mentor, with the mentor generally seen as being separate from the criminal justice system. This is an important finding and as the study undertaken in the South West and highlighted in the previous section showed, having such a distinction can impact positively on how effective a mentoring programme is.

Impact of the IAC pilot

4.7 This theme looked at the IAC as a whole and stakeholders were asked to give their overall views on what worked well in the pilot and then to consider anything that could be improved. In terms of things that went well, the following positive outcomes were consistently highlighted:

- The impact on getting offenders aged 18-25 back into employment and subsequently helping to reduce the level of-offending – more than 20% of offenders were able to secure employment as a result of the IAC and this is viewed as a success story by stakeholders. An example was provided of one offender who successfully completed his IAC order and went on to find employment in the centre of Manchester on a construction scheme, successfully beating 600 other applicants to the job. Moreover, in February 2011 it was highlighted that as part of GMPT service user feedback, the IAC has achieved the highest scores in all areas linked to social capital and skills gained, with offenders becoming more confident as a result of the training and support received, as well as being given new opportunities for the future;

- The multi-agency approach – the IAC team had a very close working relationship and was well integrated, helped largely by having a single location at Shudehill. The two main parts are the probation team and mentors, both of whom had day to day contact with the offenders on the pilot. This is an extremely positive finding – as shown by the literature review in the previous section, Dubois et al (2002)\(^{16}\) suggests that programmes have more positive outcomes where mentoring is one of many supportive interventions;

- The quality of the overall programme – the fact that orders were for 12 months allowed enough time to give full consideration to the needs of

\(^{16}\) Dubois et al. (2002) Effectiveness of mentoring Programs for Youth: A meta-analytic review, American Journal of Community Psychology 30(2)
offenders. The Ministry of Justice report\textsuperscript{17} highlighted in the literature review found that programmes lasting over ten months tend to be the most successful, so this finding is particularly significant;

- Effective communications – the system of mentors working with offender managers went extremely well. The mentor could get offenders motivated for the other interventions on the IAC; and
- The informal feedback mechanism – allowing for any problems that offenders may have had to be identified and addressed. For example, one of the stakeholders cited the example of an offender being barred by their family from their home. In this instance, once a mentor was made aware of this circumstance they could act quickly and find alternative accommodation for the offender.

4.8 When asked to identify areas in which delivery of the IAC could be improved, stakeholder responses tended to focus on increasing awareness of the IAC order and its different components – both for magistrates and judges, and for the offenders themselves. This could help to boost attendance at meetings and also reduces the chances of offenders experiencing a culture shock when first coming on to the order.

Progress since pilot ended

4.9 The pilot ran until the end of March 2011, however the IAC has continued to run in GM. Money was originally secured for a further 12 months, although the number of mentors was reduced from five FTE positions to three FTE’s and the budget has been reduced accordingly. However, the impact of the IAC remains positive and the proportion of people on the order moving into employment has been reported to have risen to around 50%. In part, this is likely to be because the mentors now take on a far more traditional ETE focused role. In the IAC pilot they were first and foremost offender supervisors, which was a broader role and involved a number of duties being undertaken in support of offender managers. While ETE was still an important part of the IAC order when it was run as a pilot, the fact that mentors had additional responsibilities meant that there was slightly less focus on ETE compared with the current method of delivery.

4.10 In a further development, the end of 2011 saw a new scheme, IAC Youth Offending Service, developed. This is also based at the centre in Shudehill and is aimed at supporting people aged 14-17.

OFFENDER VIEWS ON THE IAC

4.11 In addition to the stakeholder consultation programme, as part of a forthcoming evaluation of the IAC, Greater Manchester Probation Trust undertook a series of interviews undertaken with offenders on the IAC order\textsuperscript{18}.

\textsuperscript{17} Ministry of Justice, July 2008: “A Scoping Exercise of Offender Mentoring Schemes in the South West”
4.12 Looking specifically at the views of offenders on the mentoring/ETE element of the IAC, securing work was one of the key outcomes that offenders hoped to achieve as a result of being on the IAC. One of the offenders in year two of pilot who spoke to the evaluators commented that:

“Getting a decent, just like normal, future sorted. I wanted a job and money and to have a house and a family…I want these things but I just need a job and to leave my mums.”

4.13 The evaluation also revealed that offenders who had attained employment through the IAC mentoring service highlighted how getting a job had made a significant impact on their lives. This was not just from a financial perspective – the other main enjoyment of employment was being “kept busy”.

Feedback on the IAC as whole was largely positive and the multi-agency delivery process was reflected in many of the comments received. For example, the evaluation noted that offenders cited a number of benefits arising from the order such as being more active; attaining employment and undertaking training; feeling more confident and positive; and getting help with a variety of problems, such as finding accommodation and getting assistance in registering for benefits and grants.
5 Conclusions

5.1 This report provides a cost benefit analysis (CBA) of the Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC) Pilot, which began in April 2009 and ran for two years until the end of March 2011. The main focus of the research is on the impact of the mentoring/ETE services delivered by Work Solutions. There are other outcomes which have not been quantified – for example, impacts on reoffending and health. This is because these outcomes are associated with the entire IAC pilot in GM and all project partners.

5.2 Supporting the CBA analysis, the report provides additional qualitative analysis in the form of a literature review of mentoring programs elsewhere and the characteristics of successful interventions. It also summarises the main findings of a consultation programme with IAC stakeholders and from a separate IAC evaluation undertaken by the Greater Manchester Probation Trust. The main findings from each element of the research are discussed below.

CBA Conclusions

5.3 Taking into account the employment impact of the mentoring/ETE services delivered by Work Solutions and the subsequent impact on reducing reoffending, the key financial benefits of the IAC are as follows:

- The overall benefit-cost ratio for the IAC pilot is 1.2\(^{19}\) which means that for every £1 put into the mentoring element of the IAC, £1.20 is paid back in benefits; and

- The payback period for the IAC period is five years – that is, after five years the project will have paid for itself as a result of the benefits it creates.

Conclusions from Literature Review

5.4 The literature review of broader mentoring interventions highlights that programmes are likely to display a number of characteristics in order for them to be effective and successfully impact on offenders’ lives. For example, evidence suggests that mentoring works best when delivered in conjunction with other interventions, as is the case with the Alternative Measures Program in Canada and Community Correction Programs in Ohio in the United States. Similar characteristics are evident at a UK level, as evidenced by the Ministry of Justice report on mentoring schemes in the South West.

5.5 The longevity of mentoring programmes is also likely to influence their degree of success, while mentors need to meet with offenders on a regular basis in order to produce the best possible outcomes. If mentoring schemes can display characteristics such as this, the literature suggests that levels of reoffending may be reduced.

\(^{19}\) £740,000 divided by £617,512.
5.6 The literature also highlights that people ‘at risk’ rather than people who are already demonstrating significant personal problems are more likely to have a successful outcome from taking part in a mentoring scheme. This suggests the possibility may exist to extend the IAC order to other groups of offenders, which in effect could act in a pre-emptive way to reduce re-offending.

Conclusions from Stakeholder Consultation and Offender Interviews

5.7 From both a stakeholder and offender perspective, the IAC has been well received. Stakeholders consistently championed the multi-agency approach used during the pilot and the fact that more than 20% of people who completed their order subsequently found employment is extremely encouraging.

5.8 The role of the mentors was seen as key in helping to deliver the IAC pilot and good relationships were developed with the offenders during their 12 month orders. Moreover, the characteristics associated with successful mentoring programmes are evident within the Work Solutions delivered element of the IAC, including:

- Mentors having regular meetings with offenders over a prolonged period of time;
- The Work Solutions mentoring was part of a wider suite of interventions, such as family support and curfews; and
- There was a clear distinction between the role of the offender manager and that of the mentor, with the mentor generally seen as being separate from the criminal justice system.

5.9 The GM Probation Trust evaluation of the IAC indicates that the chance of obtaining employment was one of the key outcomes that offenders hoped to achieve. In addition to the benefit of securing a job, offenders who completed their order while on the pilot have highlighted a number of other important benefits – from simply feeling more confident and positive, right through to the support provided in helping to secure new accommodation or registering for benefits, for example.

5.10 The success of the initial two year pilot has led to the GM IAC continuing and the most recent monitoring data suggests it is continuing to have a significant impact – in particular, the proportion of offenders successfully securing employment has risen to around 50%.
Appendix A - Monetisation of employment outcomes

The assumptions and valuations used for the monetisation of employment outcomes have been based on the DWP Total Place Cost Benefit Framework guidance\(^\text{20}\).

The monetisation values per individual finding employment are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of claimant</th>
<th>Fiscal benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced benefits payments</td>
<td>£7800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health – savings to NHS</td>
<td>£508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced crime 17-24 Male</td>
<td>£235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benefits payments* - Reduced benefits claimants will result in savings to the exchequer related to employment benefits, housing benefit and council tax benefit.

*Health* - The calculation to determine the impact on health service costs is based on a reduction in NHS services of 33 percent as outlined in the DWP guidance document. These savings will fall to the NHS. However, decommissioning of services is also necessary in order to cash these savings. These costs relate to general NHS costs, and are not broken down to include acute issues such as teenage pregnancy, drink and substance misuse.

*Crime* - For the reduced crime impact of employment, we have assumed that employment provides a 48% increase in income compared to benefits. This is based on analysis across Greater Manchester of off flows from benefits into different job types, assuming beneficiaries earn 75% of the average net wage for these job types.

The DWP guidance is based on studies considering the impact of income on the propensity to commit property crime. The recommendation in the guidance is to assume a 0.6% reduction in property crime for each 1% increase in income. Using this approach results in a 29% reduction in the cost of crime committed by the individual on average. A detailed summary of the DWP approach, including references to studies into the link between crime and income, can be found in the DWP Social Cost-Benefit Analysis Framework.\(^\text{21}\) N.B. This analysis is based on all 17-24 year old males, and as such will underestimate the potential savings for offenders.

Cost of crime figures have been reassessed using the DWP framework approach, splitting the costs down into fiscal, economic and non-economic benefits.

Apart from policing, all other Criminal Justice System costs (e.g. courts, prisons, probation, legal aid) have been excluded from the analysis. Most of these costs will be related to reoffending and will be included in the proposed future analysis of the wider outcomes of the IAC programme.

\(^{20}\) Total Place Cost Benefit Framework - Adam Robinson, EG Partnerships Division, DWP 2010
## Benefit Cost Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Fiscal CBA</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Net Present Value (NPV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual costs</strong></td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>273,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>78,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discounted costs</strong></td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>273,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>78,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall Fiscal benefit - cost ratio | 1.199256594 |
| Payback period | 5 years |
## IAC Costs

**Project title:** IAC - Employment Mentoring

### Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Cost category</th>
<th>Predicted costs (£)</th>
<th>Who pays?</th>
<th>Optimism bias correction</th>
<th>Total costs (£)</th>
<th>% Costs Yr1</th>
<th>% Costs Yr2</th>
<th>% Costs Yr3</th>
<th>% Costs Yr4</th>
<th>% Costs Yr5</th>
<th>Costs Yr1</th>
<th>Costs Yr2</th>
<th>Costs Yr3</th>
<th>Costs Yr4</th>
<th>Costs Yr5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>IT &amp; office equipment</td>
<td>£ 17,360</td>
<td>GMPT Revenue</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>£ 17,360</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>£ 8,073</td>
<td>£ 6,154</td>
<td>£ 3,133</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>£ 486,276</td>
<td>GMPT Revenue</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>£ 486,276</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£ 212,559</td>
<td>£ 206,559</td>
<td>£ 67,158</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>£ 108,167</td>
<td>GMPT Revenue</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>£ 108,167</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>£ 43,055</td>
<td>£ 48,222</td>
<td>£ 16,890</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Rent (including IAC contribution)</td>
<td>£ 21,381</td>
<td>GMPT Revenue</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>£ 21,381</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>£ 9,338</td>
<td>£ 8,444</td>
<td>£ 3,600</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 633,184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 273,024</td>
<td>£ 269,380</td>
<td>£ 96,780</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Economy
# IAC Benefits

## IAC - Employment Mentoring

### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1a</td>
<td>Reduction in % WAP receiving benefits (all figures)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1) Fiscal benefit of moving people off benefits and into work 2) Increased health outcomes 3) Increased income</td>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions</td>
<td>£ 8,308</td>
<td>£ -15%</td>
<td>£ 76,301</td>
<td>£ 171,677</td>
<td>£ 186,937</td>
<td>£ 177,400</td>
<td>£ 167,862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1b</td>
<td>Reduction in % WAP receiving benefits (all figures)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1) Fiscal benefit of moving people off benefits and into work 2) Increased health outcomes 3) Increased income</td>
<td>IB/ESA</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions</td>
<td>£ 9,176</td>
<td>£ -15%</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1c</td>
<td>Reduction in % WAP receiving benefits (all figures)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1) Fiscal benefit of moving people off benefits and into work 2) Increased health outcomes 3) Increased income</td>
<td>LPIS</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions</td>
<td>£ 6,888</td>
<td>£ -15%</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B2a  | Decreased crime as people move from unemployment into employment | Yes | 16-24 year old males | JSA | 342 | 100% | 27% | Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions | 10% | Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions | £ 235 | DWP Total Place Cost Benefit guidance note - reduction in crime based on increase in income leading to a reduction in crime (2010 figures) police costs only | £ 2,066 | £ 4,648 | £ 5,061 | £ 4,803 | £ 4,545 |
| B2b  | Decreased crime as people move from unemployment into employment | Yes | 16-24 year old females | JSA | 342 | 100% | 27% | Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions | 10% | Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions | £ 57 | DWP Total Place Cost Benefit guidance note - reduction in crime based on increase in income leading to a reduction in crime (2010 figures) police costs only | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| B2c  | Decreased crime as people move from unemployment into employment | Yes | 25+ year old males | JSA | 342 | 100% | 27% | Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions | 10% | Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions | £ 118 | DWP Total Place Cost Benefit guidance note - reduction in crime based on increase in income leading to a reduction in crime (2010 figures) police costs only | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| B2d  | Decreased crime as people move from unemployment into employment | Yes | 25+ year old females | JSA | 342 | 100% | 27% | Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions | 10% | Based on data provided to New Economy by Manchester Solutions | £ 19 | DWP Total Place Cost Benefit guidance note - reduction in crime based on increase in income leading to a reduction in crime (2010 figures) police costs only | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - |

**Total** | | | | | | | | | | | | | £ 78,367 | £ 176,325 | £ 191,999 | £ 182,203 | £ 172,407 |
Appendix C - Stakeholder Consultation Themes

• Overview/background to involvement with the pilot
  o Rationale behind IAC and the various interventions
  o Role of the partner in the IAC pilot
  o Project management and governance

• The IAC Order itself
  o Selection process for the service users
  o Profile of service users – was year 2 similar to year 1?
  o Length of IAC order
  o Initial level of intensiveness
  o Service users already in employment – how easy was it to balance priorities?
  o Awareness of IAC in courts/communicating IAC to all relevant parties
  o Attendance – has it varied?
  o Breaches – were these an issue and what happened when they occurred?
  o Flexibility of IAC and how it has evolved over time. Were recommendations from the 1st year evaluation actioned?

• Mentoring, ETE delivered by Work Solutions
  o Overview of what it involved
  o Role of the mentor
  o How did it link to other parts of the IAC pilot?
  o What went well?
  o What could have been done better?
  o Impact on the service users – did they get employment? If not, what have they done since the IAC order ended?

• Impact of IAC Pilot
  o Three things that went well.
  o Three things that could be improved.

• Progress since pilot ended