Ministry
of Justice

The payment by results Social Impact Bond pilot at HMP Peterborough: final process evaluation report

Appendices

Emma Disley, Chris Giacomantonio, Kristy Kruithof and Megan Sim

RAND Europe

Disclaimer

Contents

List of tables

Appendix A
Interview protocols

Interview protocol 1: Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers, and partner agencies

Opening question

1. [if not interviewed before]: Could you tell me about your role?

One Service model/changes

Questions about	One Service operation and new services
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance

2. Could you give an overview of the operation of the One Service between September 2013 and until June 2014, including any major changes to the service?

3. Were there any new services commissioned under the One Service in the period we're interested in?
   - *If so, why were they commissioned?*
   - *How were they selected?*
   - *How were they funded (co-funding, up-front)?*
   - *Were there any other services you would have liked to commission but did not? If so, why not?*

Questions about	One Service model
Relevant to interviewees from	HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

4. Could you summarise the ways in which your organisation worked with the One Service up until June 2014?
   - *[if relevant]: Could you describe the services provided to One Service clients?*
   - *Could you describe the way in which you worked with the One Service?*
   - *To what degree were you involved in providing 'through the gate' service to One Service clients?*

Questions about	Changes to role of providers
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

5. Between September 2013 and June 2014, were there any changes to the roles of [organisation name] and the services provided to One Service clients?

- *Why were changes made?*
- *What were the impacts of these changes?*

Questions about	Changes to 'through the gate' work
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers

6. Were there any changes to the way in which the One Service operated 'through the gate' up to June 2014?
   - *Was any new work undertaken with clients within the prison or in the community up until June 2014?*
   - *What were the reasons for any changes?*
   - *If changes were not made, were there any particular reasons why not?*
   - *What were the impacts, if any, of these changes?*
   - *Was flexibility to tailor the One Service to individual clients' needs maintained? (Earlier findings from the evaluation suggested that flexibility enabled an individualised service – and this was central to the way in which the One Service worked).*
   - *Were there any changes that you would have liked to make but did not? If so, was anything stopping you from making those changes?*

Questions about	Good practice / lessons for 'through the gate' work
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

7. What worked well in terms of providing 'through the gate' services to One Service clients?

8. Were there any areas for improvement in providing through the gate services?

Questions about	Changes to client engagement strategies in prison
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, and staff in service providers

9. Were there any changes to the approach taken to engaging One Service clients in prison before June 2014?
   - *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made or not made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes.*
   - *What worked best/needed improvement?*

Questions about	Changes to client engagement strategies in the community
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance and staff in service providers

10. Were there any changes to the approach taken to engaging One Service clients in the community before June 2014?

- *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
- *What worked best/needed improvement?*

Questions about	Exit from the One Service
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, managers and staff in service providers

11. What were the arrangements for clients exiting the One Service?

12. Were they any changes to exit processes between September 2013 and June 2014?

- *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made or not made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
- *What worked best/needed improvement?*

Risk assessment

Questions about	Approach and changes to risk assessment
Relevant to interviewees from	HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

13. How were clients' risk of offending and risk of harm assessed by the One Service?

14. Were any changes made to the way this process operated between September 2013 and June 2014?

- *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made or not made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
- *What worked best/needed improvement?*

Questions about	Information provided to One Service for risk assessment
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers in service providers, partner agencies

15. What information does HMPP provide, relevant to risk assessment of One Service clients?

16. Where there any changes to the information provided by HMPP to the One Service to inform risk assessment?

- *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
- *What worked best/needed improvement?*

17. Did your agency receive or share any information with the One Service relevant to assessment of risk of reoffending and risk of harm?

Questions about	Good practice and areas for improvement in risk assessment
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

18. What worked well in terms of how the One Service conducted risk assessment, and what, if any, were the areas for further improvement?

Questions about	Lessons for Transforming Rehabilitation regarding risk assessment
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff

19. What lessons regarding risk assessment, if any, might apply to prisons seeking to build partnerships with service providers in the community [under Transforming Rehabilitation]?

Needs assessment

Questions about	Approach and changes to needs assessment
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

20. How were clients' needs assessed by the One Service?

21. Did your agency receive or share any information with the One Service relevant to assessment of risk of clients' needs?

22. Were any changes made to the way this process operated between September 2013 and June 2014?
    - *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made or not made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
    - *What worked best/needed improvement?*

Questions about	Good practice and areas for improvement in needs assessment
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

23. What worked well in terms of how the One Service conducted needs assessment, and what were the areas for further improvement?

Questions about	Lessons for Transforming Rehabilitation regarding needs

	assessment
Relevant to interviewees from	**Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff**

24. What lessons regarding needs assessment and information sharing, if any, might apply to prisons seeking to build partnerships with service providers in the community [under Transforming Rehabilitation]?

Contracts and performance monitoring

Questions about	**Change in nature of contractual relationships**
Relevant to interviewees from	**Social Finance, managers in service providers**

25. Between September 2013 and June 2014 were there any changes in the nature of the contractual relationships between the One Service and [organisation]?
   - *Was [the organisation] still paid up-front/ per client, rather than being paid for outcomes?*
   - *Probe to understand why any changes were made, what their impact was*

Questions about	**Change in performance monitoring**
Relevant to interviewees from	**Social Finance, managers in service providers**

26. Was the way in which Social Finance monitored the performance of [organisation] commissioned under the One Service subject to any change during the period of interest?
   - *Earlier in the evaluation we heard that the performance monitoring was fairly detailed - what were the advantages and disadvantages of the approach taken to performance monitoring?*

Questions about	**Good practice in performance monitoring**
Relevant to interviewees from	**Social Finance, managers in service providers**

27. Are there any lessons from the One Service for:
   - *CRCs managing tier 2 and 3 providers?*
   - *Providers working for CRCs as part of TR?*

Volunteers and case workers

Questions about	**Role of volunteers**
Relevant to interviewees from	**Social Finance**

28. We have discussed this before, but could you provide a brief overview of how the One Service uses volunteers: in the prison; from Sova and from St Giles Trust?

Questions about	Link workers in HMPP
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff

29. Were there any changes to the way in which the link workers in the prison were used in the One Service in the period of interest?
    - *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made or not made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
    - *What worked best/needed improvement?*

Questions about	Sova volunteers, St Giles Trust volunteers and case workers
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, managers in service providers

30. [Social Finance and Sova manager] Were there any changes to the way in which Sova volunteers were used in the One Service in the period of interest?
    - *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made or not made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
    - *What worked best/needed improvement?*

31. [Social Finance and St Giles Trust] Were there any changes made to the way in which St Giles Trust case workers were used in the One Service in the period of interest?
    - *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made or not made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
    - *What worked best/needed improvement?*

32. [Social Finance and St Giles Trust] Were there any changes to the way in which St Giles Trust volunteers were used in the One Service during the period of interest?
    - *Prompt to describe changes, why they were made or not made, whether they had any impact; also ask about desired changes not made and any impediments to changes*
    - *What worked best/needed improvement?*

33. [Social Finance and St Giles Trust] We last heard that a new training programme was being established for volunteers. Can you tell us more about that, and what impact it had?

Questions about	Best practice / lessons in use of volunteers
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, managers and staff in service providers

34. What was been your experience of working with the different types of volunteers involved in the One Service? What worked well, and where were there areas for improvement?

35. What is the best role, in your view, for volunteers who have personal experience of offending?

36. What are the lessons, if any, for wider roll-out of the use of volunteers for short-sentenced prisoners?

Partnership working

Questions about	Overview of partnership working, new partnerships
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, managers and staff in service providers

37. We have discussed partnership working in previous interviews, but could you summarise how the One Service worked in partnership with other agencies up until June 2014?
    - *In earlier stages of the evaluation one way in which the One Service was thought to be effective was that it coordinated support from a range of agencies and filled gaps in existing services. What is your view on this?*

38. Were any new partnerships added in the months leading up to June 2014?
    - *Probe to describe new partnerships, how they were formed, why they were formed, what impact they have had, whether there were partnerships interviewee would like to have formed but did not.*

39. In earlier stages of the evaluation one way in which the One Service was thought to be effective was that it coordinated support from a range of agencies and filled gaps in existing services. What is your view on this?

Questions about	Working with courts
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

40. One area which we have not covered in detail in previous discussions is whether the One Service works with the Court Service. To what extent, if at all, is there partnership working with the courts?

- *Probe to understand the nature of the partnership; barriers and facilitators to working in partnership with the courts; whether there have been attempts to change the relationship*

41. Has working with the One Service had any impact on this work?
    - *Probe to understand the nature of the partnership, and what this has meant for the way in which the respondent agency works with the courts.*

42. What lessons, if any, are there for others seeking to build partnerships with local agencies to support those leaving prison / offenders?

43. What has worked well and what areas are there for improvement in the way in which the One Service worked with local partner agencies, up until June 2014?

Capacity building / wider benefits / good practice for work with clients

Questions about	Capacity building for providers
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers in service providers

44. To what extent do you feel that involvement on the One Service constituted a form of capacity building for commissioned providers / your organisation?
    - *Probe to understand how this was achieved and the impacts*
    - *Did [organisation] learn any new approaches to performance monitoring or use of data?*
    - *What were the downsides to being commissioned under the One Service?*

Questions about	Spill-over effects for other agencies
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers in service providers, partner agencies

45. To what extent did [HMPP, other local agencies] benefit from the existence of the One Service in the area?
    - *Probe to understand what the benefits/ costs were, their impact.*
    - *In Phase 2 interviews we heard that some of the One Service practices were being applied in the women's side of HMPP. We also heard about the creation of a link centre outside the prison gates. These were given as examples of learning and applying good practice from the One Service. Could you provide an update on these developments? What impact have they had?*
    - *Are there any other examples where One Service practice has been applied by HMPP to prisoner who are not One Service clients?*

46. Were there any disadvantages or advantages to [organisation] as a result of the One Service operating in the area?
    - *Probe to understand what the benefits/ costs were, their impact.*
    - *Did the One Service have any impact on One Service clients' engagements with [organisation] (e.g. accompanying them to appointments, liaising on their behalf)?*

Questions about	Best practice in working with offenders
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, partner agencies

47. To what extent did the One Service exemplify good practice in working with clients to reduce reoffending that might be adopted by other agencies?
    - *Earlier stages of the evaluation identified potential spill-over effects of the One Service – for example, trialling good practice, co-commissioning or testing ideas that might be rolled-out by other agencies. Are there any examples of this in the time period between September 2013 and June 2014?*
    - *If so, what were they, did any agencies adopt the practices locally?*
    - *Can you think of any recent examples?*

Questions about	Overall strengths, challenges, impacts, concluding questions
Relevant to interviewees from	Social Finance, HMPP Director and staff, managers and staff in service providers, partner agencies

48. What do you think the strengths and challenges of the SIB pilot at Peterborough have been?
    - *To what extent has the way in which the One Service was funded (through a SIB) impacted how the Service was delivered?*

49. What impact, if any, do you think the pilot made?
    - *Either for One Service clients or more widely on partnership working in the area?*

50. Have you any other observations to make about the SIB that have not yet been mentioned in our discussion?

Interview protocol 2: Investors

1. What do you think have been the main benefits that have emerged from the Peterborough SIB?
   - *Prompt to explore benefits for different groups: for investors in the Peterborough SIB, for social investors more broadly/ for clients and service users/ for agencies in Peterborough?*

2. What would you say have been the main weaknesses or challenges?
   - *Similarly, prompt to understand weaknesses/ challenges for different groups.*

3. Do the reasons you initially invested still apply?

4. What ongoing role, if any, have investors played in the Peterborough SIB?
   - *How much on-going information is provided to investors?*
   - *Do investors have any role in overseeing the services delivered to One Service clients?*

5. What was your reaction to the outcomes from the first cohort, and the fact that no outcome payment was triggered?

6. As an investor, what, if anything have you learned from your experience of Peterborough?

7. Have you invested or would you consider investing in other SIBs?
   - *What, if anything have you learned from investing in the Peterborough SIB that might inform your decision as to whether to invest in another SIB?*

8. How do you feel about your decision to invest in the SIB at Peterborough?

9. Do you have anything else you would like to add?

1. How long have you been a volunteer with the One Service?
   - *Why did you volunteer?*

2. What's your role as a volunteer with the One Service?
   - *Could you describe how you would work with a typical client?*
   - *How do you provide support to One Service clients?*
   - *How do you build relationship with a client?*
   - *How often would you meet with a client?*
   - *For how long do you tend to work with a client?*

3. How do you think you can help the clients?
   - *Do you think there is anything you can do for clients which might not be done so well by a paid staff member?*

4. We understand that some volunteers have themselves had experience of leaving prison or being on probation (this might help respondents focus more on what's of interest). Do you think that has any advantages or disadvantages in terms of being able to help clients?

5. Did you receive any training for being a volunteer?
   - *What did you think of the training? Probe to understand any issues not covered.*

6. When you're working with a client what do you do if you are unsure about something?
   - *Probe about support – who do you look to? Have you done this? Is it easy to do this? Why not, if not? Is there anything in particular that helps them in terms of support?*

7. To what extent do you work with other staff on the One Service [as appropriate mention Sova/ Ormiston/ St Giles Trust/ John Laing/ Mind] when you are working with a client?

8. To what extent do you interact with other agencies when you are working with a client?

9. What is most difficult about being a volunteer?

10. What works well? / What could work better?

11. What have you learned / gained from the experience?

12. Do you have anything else to add about your experience of being a volunteer?

Interview protocol 4: One Service clients

Engagers in community and in HMPP

Opening questions

1. I've asked to speak with you because you're on the One Service – is that right?

2. How long have you been working with the One Service?
   - *[Clients in the community] When were you released?*

3. For those in cohort 1 and 2: I think you've also worked with the One Service before, is that right?

Initial involvement with the One Service

4. How did you first hear about the One Service?

5. When you first heard about the One Service, what did you think was the purpose of the service? Did it sound useful to you?

6. In HMPP only: What are the biggest challenges you expect to face upon release?
   - *Drugs or alcohol issues, health problems, finding work or training, family issues, social support*

7. Why did you work with the One Service? What did/do you hope would/will happen from working with them?

Description of the One Service

8. Could you tell me what it's like being on the One Service?

9. When you met/meet with the person from the One Service in the prison, what did/do you talk about?
   - *Did/do you talk about getting ready to be released?*
   - *Did/do you talk about any problems or issues you had? Probe about what they were.*

10. [In HMPP only] Has the One Service helped you to prepare for release? In what ways?
    - *Did the volunteer/St Giles Trust help you make appointments, find a place to live, organise benefits, etc.*
    - *How did the One Service work with you to identify what you needed help with? E.g. screening / needs assessment*

11. [Community only] Can you walk us through the days leading up to and just after your release from Peterborough prison? Did you receive support from the One Service on those days?

    - *Did anyone meet you at the gate? Who? Were any appointments or services arranged for you on release? Was there anything that would have been useful that wasn't arranged?*

    - *If released from prison before: how does that compare to the last time you were released?*

    - *How did the One Service work with you to identify what you needed help with? E.g. screening / needs assessment*

    - *Can you tell us about the sorts of things the One Service has helped with since then? Did the One Service help put you in touch with other services? Was this useful?*

12. Can you tell us about the best thing that the One Service has done to help you address the challenges you will face upon / have faced since release?

Relationships with One Service staff and volunteers

13. Could you tell me about how you get on with [key worker]?

    - *What is your relationship like? How often do you see him/her? What are the most useful things s/he does for you? What could be done better?*

14. Have you worked with any peer advisors [volunteers on the One Service who have been in prison or on a community sentence themselves]?

    - *[If yes] Has this been helpful? In what ways?*

    - *Was it important that the peer advisor had also been an offender? Has this had an impact on your relationship?*

Perceived effectiveness of the One Service

15. Overall, what do you think about / how do you feel about the support you've received from the One Service?

    - *Are you able to get support when you need it? Was this particular type of support helpful and if so, why? Are there any times when this type of support is particularly useful / not useful?*

    - *Were there challenges you were facing that the One Service did not help you address? What were these?*

16. Do you think the One Service can help other people in your situation to stop offending?
    - *Why/ why not?*
    - *How best do you think the one Service can best help people stop offending? What else could the one service do to help people in your situation stop offending?*
    - *Has the One Service helped you in avoiding reoffending? [if yes] What kinds of support have been most important?*

17. Have you ever been involved in a service similar to the One Service? Can you tell me about it? [For those in cohort 1 and 2: what happened last time you were working with the One Service?]
    - *Were there any differences between previous experiences and this one? If so, what were the differences?*

Leaving / ending the One Service, concluding question

18. You said earlier that you've been working with the One Service for [timeframe]. How long do you think you'll keep working with them for?

19. How do you feel about stopping working with the One Service?
    - *What will be good about not working with the One Service anymore?*
    - *What will you miss about the One Service?*
    - *Is there anything you worry about when you think about not working with the One Service anymore? Or do you feel ok about it?*

20. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experience leaving prison or working with the One Service?

Non-engagers in in HMPP and community

Establishing memory of the One Service

1. Do you remember hearing about the One Service when you were in HMP Peterborough?
   - *[If not] Remind them about who they might have heard about it from.*
2. What did you think about the One Service?

Reasons for refusal

3. You didn't work with the One Service – is that right?
   - *Why was that?*
   - *Was the One Service offered to you?*
   - *Did you understand what the One Service was about?*
   - *Did you feel you didn't need any help?*
   - *Did you feel the One Service would not be able to help you?*
   - *Did you feel that you could get help elsewhere?*
   - *Any other reasons?*
4. If you were offered the One Service now, would you want it?
   - *[If yes] Would you like to get back in touch with the One Service now?*

[Clients in the community] Probation

5. Are you on probation now? Could you tell me what it's like being on probation?
   - *How often do you see your probation officer?*
   - *Have you been offered help? With what kinds of problems?*
   - *Could you give me an example of something that probation has helped you with?*

Other services in HMP Peterborough and the community

6. While you [are / were] in Peterborough prison, can / could you get help from anywhere else with any problems that you have?
   - *E.g. drugs or alcohol problems, finding somewhere to live*
7. [Clients in the community] Since you've been released, have you been able to get help with any problems that you have?
   - *E.g. drugs or alcohol, health problems, finding somewhere to live, finding work or training*
8. [Clients in the community] Was it difficult or easy to get help with these problems?
   - *Why?*
   - *Do you think the One Service could have helped you?*

Reoffending and concluding question

9. What sort of help do you think people leaving prison should be given in order to help them stop offending?

    -   *Do you believe the necessary help is available?*
    -   *Have you been able to get the support that you need to stop offending?*

10. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix B
Case file review template[1]

1: General information

Client number	X
Cohort (1, 2, 3 or several cohorts)	X
Total number of notes recorded in case file by type of need *(amount of notes may be an indicator of complexity of case. If it is not possible to record number of notes per type of need, please include total number of notes)*	X
Met at the gate (yes, no, not stated)	X
Any other notes with regard to case file (e.g. long and complex versus short and straightforward, etc.) include any reflections of the quality of the data in the case file (how detailed, precise etc.)	X

2: Case summary

Narrative summary of intervention with the client, needs identified, how these were addressed (or not) and what type of agencies were involved	X
Role of case worker/volunteers and other one service staff (includes coordinating role)	X
Any indication of money spent as part of intervention	X
Any other relevant information	X
Comparison with interview	X

3: Case timeline (include if possible, depending on amount of case notes and level of detail)

---

[1] Information was taken both from the needs assessment section and the other parts of the case files.

Appendix C

Interviewees

Table B.1: List of stakeholder interviewees

Number	Role and Organisation
1	One Service Director
2	Manager, St Giles Trust
3	CEO, YMCA Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
4	Partnership manager, Jobcentre Plus
5	Manager, HMP Peterborough
6	Director, HMP Peterborough
7	Area Commander, Cambridgeshire Police
8	Senior SGT manager, St Giles Trust
9	Senior manager, St Giles Trust
10	Chief Executive, Peterborough and Fenland Mind
11	Manager, CRI
12	Caseworker, St Giles Trust
13	Local manager, Mind
14	Project manager, Job Deal
15	Employee, Hope into Action
16	Employee, St Giles Trust
17	Caseworker, St Giles Trust
18	Area manager, Sova
19	Member of staff, Sova
20	Senior manager, Social Finance
21	IOM Team, Cambridgeshire Police
22	Investor
23	Regional director, Ormiston
24	Manager, charitable foundation investor
25	Manager, Peterborough City Council
26	Operational Director, CRC
27	Landlord liaison caseworker, Sova
28	Volunteer, Sova
29	Volunteer, Sova

Table B.2: Offender interviewees

Number	In HMP Peterborough or community	Engaged in Cohort 1	Engaged in Cohort 2
1	HMP Peterborough	Yes	Yes
2	HMP Peterborough	Yes	Yes
3	HMP Peterborough	Yes	Yes
4	Community	No	Yes
5	Community	No	Yes
6	Community	No	Yes
7	Community	No	Yes
8	Community	Yes	Yes
9	Community	No	Yes
10	Community	No	Yes
11	Community	No	Yes
12	Community	No	Yes
13	Community	No	Yes
14	Community	No	Yes
15	Community	No	Yes

Appendix D
Sampling and ethical approach for offender interviews

Sampling approach

Identifying offenders for interviews

The sampling frame (the population from which we identified interviewees) was all offenders eligible for Cohort 2 at the time of the interviews (November and December 2014), including some who were also in Cohort 1. Social Finance provided an anonymised list of 225 members of Cohort 2. The list included information on cohort members' risk of harm, and whether cohort members had previously engaged with the One Service (at least 5 direct activities between 1 May 2014 and 31 October 2014), were currently engaged (at least 1 direct activity in October 2014), had never engaged, and whether they were currently in custody in HMP Peterborough. One cohort member was subsequently excluded from the list as he was in custody in another prison outside of the area.

Interviews in HMP Peterborough

The list provided by Social Finance included eleven offenders who were in custody in HMP Peterborough as of 1 November 2014. However, four of these offenders were released prior to the interview date. The remaining seven offenders were invited to be interviewed by RAND researchers in 'the Link' of the prison (an area where prisoners can meet staff from key agencies); interviews were arranged through the One Service with support from prison staff. An information sheet was provided with more information about the study. RAND researchers then visited HMP Peterborough on two separate occasions during timeslots scheduled by prison staff. The researchers met with those offenders that showed up at the Link and went through the information sheet prior to the interview to ensure that all invited offenders were informed about the details of the study. Subsequently, the researchers sought the offender's written consent to be interviewed, and for the interview to be audio-recorded as well as for their case file to be reviewed. In total, three offenders agreed to be interviewed and four declined to take part.

Interviews in the community

The list provided by Social Finance included 213 cohort members who were in the community (i.e. not in HMP Peterborough as of 1 November 2014), classified according to whether they had previously engaged with the One Service, were currently engaged or had

never engaged. From each of these groups, a number of cohort members were randomly selected to be approached to be interviewed. Social Finance provided contact information (names and telephone numbers) for all cohort members who had been randomly selected. As Social Finance were not able to share this contact information with the research team (consent for this had not been given by cohort members), the team secured support from four Sova volunteers (who are able to access cohort members' contact details). Between 2 December 2014 and 11 December 2014, the volunteers made initial contact with each offender on the list to invite them to be interviewed about their experience (or lack thereof) of engaging with the One Service.

Volunteers attempted to contact cohort members via telephone, voice message or text message. Up to three unsuccessful attempts to contact a cohort member were made, after which no further attempts were made. Offenders who were contacted but declined to be interviewed were not contacted again. Offenders who agreed to be interviewed were subsequently contacted by a researcher at a pre-arranged time. Offenders could request to be interviewed over the telephone or in person at the One Service office in Peterborough, although none opted for the latter. RAND researchers attempted to contact cohort members who had agreed to be interviewed up to three times, through calling and a subsequent text message. When offenders were successfully contacted, researchers provided information about the study, sought the offender's consent to be interviewed, for their interview to be audio recorded, and for the research team to review their case file. All statements of consent were audio-recorded. Through this approach, the research team conducted twelve interviews with offenders in the community.

Ethics protocol for conducting interviews with offenders

RAND Europe is fully committed to the advancement of high quality research and analysis and to ensuring that all research activities undertaken by our staff involving human participation or personal data are undertaken in line with our ethical principles. In alignment with RAND's mission, research is designed, conducted and disseminated with the aim of benefiting public good. To achieve this mission the following principles have been developed to guide RAND's work:

- Minimise harm and maximise good
- Informed consent, voluntary participation and ability to withdraw
- Respect for participants' choices with regards to anonymity and confidentiality
- Integrity, quality, transparency, accountability
- Equity of opportunity to participate in research

The research team consulted the GSR Professional Guidance Ethical Assurance for Social Research in Government,[2] which are almost identical to RAND's principles.

Protocol for conducting interviews ethically

The research team identified the following potential risks:

- The research involves vulnerable groups (ex-prisoners).

- There is a possibility that the study could induce psychological stress or anxiety in interviewees, beyond the risks encountered in normal life.

- The research will involve discussion of sensitive topics (offending and the problems associated with it).

- The research requires the co-operation of a gatekeeper (Social Finance) for initial access to the individuals to be recruited as interviewees.

- There are possible researcher safety issues (conducting research in a prison and meeting ex-prisoners in the community).

How we adhered to GSR ethics principles

Principle 1: Sound application and conduct of social research methods, and interpretation of the findings

- Offender interviews allowed information relevant to the research questions to be collected. The information could not be obtained other than through interviews with offenders.

- Burdens on interviewees were minimised by keeping the interview half an hour or less, and arranging the interview at a time convenient to the interviewee.

- Researchers received in-house training in interviewing, and were well prepared for the interviews.

- Interview data was analysed in line with the approach to analysis of qualitative data outlined in the original proposal – allowing a clear link between the data and its analysis and interpretation.

- Reporting of the interview data strove to be objective, transparent and measured in tone. The findings were reviewed in accordance with RAND's QA standards and by independent peer reviewers appointed by MOJ.

---

[2]   http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/ethics_guidance_tcm6-5782.pdf

Principle 2: Participation based on informed consent

- Interviewees were asked to provide signed consent for interviews conducted in person.

- If the interview was conducted by 'phone, interviewees were asked to confirm their informed consent on the audio recording.

- To ensure consent was informed, interviewees were provided with an information sheet, written clearly and using appropriate language. The information sheet included relevant information, but did not overwhelm the interviewee. The researcher talked through the information sheet, as it was anticipated that interviewees might have limited reading abilities. If the interview was conducted by phone, the researchers read out the information sheet.

- The interview researchers satisfied themselves that interviewees understood the information sheet, including that their participation had no consequences for their involvement in other services, and that they were free to withdraw at any time during the interview. Interviewees were also informed that they may withdraw from the study, after the interview had been conducted, up to 1 February 2015. If the researchers experienced signs that the interviewee did not understand the information or lacked the capacity to consent, the researchers would not conduct the interview.

- During the interview, consent was continually evaluated; researchers were vigilant for signs that the interviewee did not understand or may have lacked capacity to consent.

- While the researchers relied on Sova volunteers to make an initial approach to potential interviewees, the informed consent was confirmed by the researcher before each interview. Consent was not taken by a gate keeper or a proxy.

- All interviewees were over 18.

Principle 3: Enabling participation

- Interviewees had the option of conducting the interview by phone or in person. Any interviewees in the community who had wanted to meet in person would have had travel expenses covered on production of a receipt.