



the **Howard League** for **Penal Reform**

Professionalising the probation service: Why university institutes would transform rehabilitation

What if...? Series of challenging pamphlets



Mannheim Centre for
CRIMINOLOGY

Professionalising the probation service: Why university institutes would transform rehabilitation

A pamphlet for the Howard League for Penal Reform by
Professor Jonathan Shepherd, Cardiff University

the Howard League for Penal Reform

Foreword

The Howard League for Penal Reform and the Mannheim Centre at the London School of Economics are working in partnership on the ‘What if?’ pamphlet series with the aim of challenging conventional thinking on penal and criminal justice issues. We have been working with established thinkers, academics and practitioners to develop innovative, and perhaps controversial, ideas that can work as a stimulus to new policy initiatives and ultimately achieve change. In this edition of the series, Professor Jonathan Shepherd proposes major steps to professionalise the probation service in order to develop more effective programmes and initiatives to support rehabilitation.

Professor Shepherd argues that his proposed reforms would facilitate innovation, transform the everyday work of probation, increase the probation service’s standing and credibility and improve recruitment standards. His vision is one in which there is collaborative working by probation practitioners and researchers and a determined effort to generate evidence-based solutions to reoffending which together will have a transformative effect on service provision. In order to bring these changes about, it is necessary to ‘professionalise’ the probation service, by developing probation institutes within research intensive universities, and establishing a professional body to provide probation with a national voice.

In making his proposals, Professor Shepherd draws upon extensive experience working as a surgeon in the health sector, where research, practice and practitioner training are integrated in the same institution, and partnership working is commonplace. Here, treatments are tested for their efficacy by those working directly with patients, and research directly and continuously informs and improves service provision.

Professor Shepherd’s ideas for professionalising probation come at a key time, as the Coalition Government consults stakeholders ahead of their planned ‘rehabilitation revolution’. His proposals are fundamentally concerned with finding and implementing the most effective methods of rehabilitation. This reflects the Howard League’s work towards less crime and safer communities, and supports the Howard League’s commitment to reducing the flow of people into the penal system as a whole. This objective is currently being developed through our symposium ‘What is justice? Re-imagining penal policy’ (<http://www.howardleague.org/what-is-justice/>) which we hope will become a vehicle to influence the underpinning beliefs, ethics, and shape of the future criminal justice system.

We would like to thank all those who attended the seminar on 29 November 2012 that preceded this pamphlet where Professor Shepherd expounded his ideas. In particular we would like to acknowledge the contribution of Heather Munro, Chief Executive of the London Probation Trust for her appraisal of the proposals contained in this pamphlet.

Anita Dockley, Research Director
Howard League for Penal Reform

Professor Jennifer Brown
Mannheim Centre
London School of Economics

Professionalising the probation service: Why university institutes would transform rehabilitation

Summary

Offending imposes huge costs on tax payers which are especially burdensome in the prevailing economic conditions. Never before has there been such a need for effective and cost-effective rehabilitation of those who offend. But compared to other public services such as the NHS, there is little reliable evidence about what works in this area, and therefore relatively few effective interventions can be implemented to tackle the problem. Comparison across public services of evidence generation and the subsequent development of effective interventions demonstrates that arrangements which integrate research, practitioner training and services are most beneficial; both for society and for economic growth. These arrangements have not been established in probation.

This pamphlet advocates the development of probation institutes in research-intensive universities to innovate and evaluate interventions with and in probation services. It also proposes the development of a new professional body (with no trade union functions) to provide probation with a mechanism to advance practice standards and an independent national voice. Similar steps are being taken in policing and in primary and secondary education. These professionalisation reforms in probation are overdue, and are particularly important in the context of proposed reforms designed to diversify rehabilitation services.

Introduction

Never before has there been such a need for effective and cost-effective interventions and programmes to reduce reoffending. Not only are the numbers of people who reoffend at record levels and the consequential cost to society higher than ever before, but economic conditions for the foreseeable future necessitate investing only in interventions that have been tried and tested and found to be more cost-effective than alternatives.

This need is obvious not only in crime and justice but also in the health sector. In 2011, 308,000 people injured in violence attended accident and emergency departments in England and Wales, 40 per cent of whom had previously been injured in violence. The most common injuries are cuts – many of which are seen in the practice of the author and by his surgeon colleagues across the UK – which, though rarely fatal, often lead to noticeable scarring and major impacts on social and employment prospects. This also results in payouts to victims through the criminal injury compensation scheme. More, and more effective rehabilitation solutions will therefore decrease the burden on the health service as well as on the criminal justice system.

Joined-up thinking and practice

Pioneering legislation has made tackling crime the responsibility not only of the police but also of local government and the NHS. Prototype crime reduction partnerships such as the Cardiff Violence Prevention Group, formed by the author in 1996, paved the way for one of the central provisions of the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act, which mandated the partnership approach and resulted in the formation of 373 Crime And Disorder Reduction (now Community Safety) Partnerships (CSPs) across Britain. While some of the provisions of this legislation have been controversial, few dispute the sense and impact of this joined-up approach to crime reduction. One example of its effectiveness has been information sharing, underpinned by ethical guidance, between accident and emergency departments and community safety partnership crime analysts. This has resulted in up to 40 per cent reductions in rates of hospital admissions and woundings recorded by the police in cities where it has been implemented compared to those where it has not.

Chairmanship by the author of the prototype CSP in Cardiff has resulted in new insights and opportunities for sharing expertise across public services. It is clear, for example, that research arrangements in health and medical science which promote continuous innovation and effective service improvement could benefit the crime and justice sector. The NHS consultants involved in many CSPs were all trained in clinical schools in research-intensive universities where high grade research

and innovation led by practitioner academics has revolutionised healthcare. These research and training arrangements are not available to police and probation officers simply because there are almost no university police or probation institutes or schools. This explains the relative lack of tried and tested innovation in crime and justice. In 2008 Jonathan Allen, a National Offender Management Service researcher, told a national conference of local crime and justice boards that there was a dearth of evaluations of rehabilitation interventions, that implementation of findings was poor, that there was a lack of high quality UK research and that the research that was available was often unsound.

The need for evidence

A comparison of numbers of rigorous experiments in medicine and in crime and justice, education and social welfare found that while the 20th century had seen an exponential growth in numbers of such evaluations in medicine, such growth had not occurred in any of the applied social sciences. Indeed, only 85 randomised field experiments of any size were identified in the whole of crime and justice worldwide between 1982 and 2004. Although randomised trials are not the only source of reliable evidence of what works and what does not, this stark contrast exemplifies the major disparity in evidence generation between medicine and crime and justice, which the proposals set out in this pamphlet are designed to tackle.

This is not to say, however, that knowledge of effectiveness is entirely absent when it comes to the rehabilitation of those who offend. It is known, for example, on the basis of rigorous reviews of evidence carried out by the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group (this international collaboration of academics has published more than 30 authoritative reviews on a range of interventions such as CCTV and early family support), that cognitive behavioural therapy, therapeutic communities and drug courts are effective, and that augmentation of educational and job skills hold promise. It is also known that 'boot camp' approaches and 'Scared Straight' programmes (taking at risk youth to prisons with the intention of dissuading them from offending) not only do not work but actually increase offending, showing that interventions and programmes can do more harm than good. It is important to note, however, that awareness of such knowledge appears to be very limited among practitioners; for example, at a 2012 Association of Police and Crime Commissioners event, a prospective commissioner proudly announced his intention, if elected, to implement the 'Scared Straight' approach in his police area.

Overall, arrangements for innovation and careful testing of interventions designed to reduce reoffending are lacking. This gap in provision is nowhere more obvious than in modern partnership work which brings together professionals from different public services. The most obvious gap is lack of organisation and strategic direction for generating evidence about what is effective.

Arrangements continue to be made, however, to synthesise what little evidence there is. The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (CSAP) at the Ministry of Justice identifies and accredits effective interventions. The Cabinet Office, prompted by the open public services white paper, announced in March 2013 the 'What Works Centre for Crime Reduction', based within the College of Policing, to function in the same way as the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). It goes without saying, however, that such arrangements to synthesise evidence will not deliver intended outcomes without evidence from which to derive practice and policy guidelines. As has been seen, this evidence is largely lacking, particularly when quality standards are applied.

Some criminologists and other social scientists have an interest in this area, for example academics at Birmingham, Cambridge, Cardiff and Leicester universities and at the London School of Economics; but there is more focus on theoretical considerations than there is on intervention evaluation. However, in the same way that few scientists located in schools of bioscience far from university hospitals are interested in evaluating medical treatments, social scientists far away from probation services are unlikely to be interested in or committed to finding out what works in probation.

This lack of integration of probation services and universities is a problem for both parties; probation services are far removed from researchers who could evaluate existing or innovative rehabilitation methods, and almost no social scientists are probation practitioner-academics (equivalent of professors of general practice or public health) with first-hand knowledge of or the motivation to evaluate services. Establishing probation institutes would foster integration. Though government can facilitate the process, this reform needs to be driven by probation professionals and by social scientists. At present, compared with other public services, there is too much reliance by both parties on government to act as a bridge. This is starkly obvious from the perspective of medicine where it would be seen as nonsensical for the NHS to rely on the Department of Health to produce evidence of effectiveness of any therapy; this is the function of university clinical schools, successfully fought for by doctors and dentists faced with uncertainty about the efficacy of treatments, armed with sure knowledge that most treatments proposed with the best of intentions do more harm than good. In the same way, probation services depend on the generation, distribution and application of evidence of effectiveness. Hence the proposition that probation institutes are needed in UK research-intensive universities.

Public policy context

In 2004, HM Treasury published a framework for science based innovation to drive public service reform. This ambition is laudable but almost nothing has been done to make it a reality in the crime and justice arena. Using research funding arrangements as an example; though there is an established Medical Research Council and an Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council which provide public funding for applied research relevant to medicine and engineering respectively, there is no crime and justice research council. The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), the government body responsible for funding crime and justice research, does make important contributions to the new What Works Centres, but there are no crime and justice practitioners on its board. Compared with Medical Research Council arrangements, ESRC has very few contact points for police, probation, prison, victim support and crime analysis practitioners to access research relevant to their roles. This anomaly demonstrates the gulf between current government ambition for a 'rehabilitation revolution' and a 'tough but intelligent' approach; and the current arrangements in place to make this happen. The gulf means that probation services continue to be overly vulnerable to whim and fashion.

It is clear, therefore, that a culture shift is necessary to the point where criminal justice system evaluation is recognised as a fundamental societal need and funded in the same way (though not necessarily at the same levels) as research underpinning other public services. Usefully, recent progress in other services suggests how this might be done. In education, for example, the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) is an independent grant-making charity dedicated to finding out what works, sharing evidence and thereby raising the attainment of disadvantaged pupils in primary and secondary schools. Founded by the education charity the Sutton Trust, the EEF is funded by a £125m grant from the Department of Education. With investment and fundraising income, the EEF plans to award as much as £200m over its 15-year life. The EEF's vision is to break the link between family background and educational achievement, ensuring that pupils from all backgrounds have the opportunity to make the most of their talents. EEF shares independent and accessible evidence with teachers and promotes evidence-based practice in all schools in England. A similar foundation, funded by the Ministry of Justice, could be one solution to the lack of organised research in and for probation, although further steps would also be needed.

In this context, appreciation of the evaluation ecosystem is valuable. Evidence of effectiveness and cost-benefit has to be produced using rigorous evaluation and economic methods, then synthesised using systematic review and meta-analytical approaches, interpreted and converted into policy and practice guidelines, then distributed, and, finally, implemented by service commissioners, managers and

practitioners. Integration of this applied research with professional practice helps to ensure that practice innovation and observation prompts further careful testing through this evidence cycle. As medicine and engineering demonstrate, innovation comes not only from fundamental theoretical developments but also from practice observation – as the example of the prototype community safety partnership given above shows.

Analysis of the reasons for the greater productivity and impact of research in healthcare compared to crime and justice suggests that the arrangements incorporated into the modern medical school are largely responsible. Here research, practice and practitioner training are integrated in the same institution and led by practitioner academics such as professors of surgery and public health. In this model, the problems of day-to-day practice constantly inform the research agenda and the products of this research are constantly fed into practice. Furthermore, since the clinical school is also the centre for practitioner training, new findings constantly update undergraduate and postgraduate practitioner programmes and infuse healthcare with a culture of evidence-informed practice.

Often, of course, researchers, practitioners and educators are the same people, employed by research-intensive universities in their medical and dental schools and holding honorary practitioner contracts at NHS consultant level. This arrangement sounds complex but is taken for granted in the 30 UK medical schools and twelve dental schools. This integration of roles explains the far greater take-up and application of the randomised evaluation method and the explosion of randomised trials in medicine in the 20th century. Reports of milestone randomised trials, such as those which established the efficacy of blood thinning agents to prevent potentially fatal lung blood clots, have led to the conclusion that clinician-academics (practitioner academics) were motivated to mount these trials because of concerns for their own patients, because revered medical pioneers who changed practice often did so on the basis of these experiments, and because so much reliable knowledge has been generated in this way.

Reproducing and applying these arrangements in crime and justice needs determined organisation. Closer partnerships between practitioners and social scientists will not happen by accident. Cadres of probation and policing practitioner academics will require specific training programmes which incorporate training in research as well as the apprenticeship elements essential to the acquisition of the skills of professional practice.

Practitioner academics in universities provide an evidence conscience for their professions and could contribute a great deal in probation, and not only because of increasing reliance on (and public funding going into) the private and third sectors. As will be seen, many expensive sacred cows in healthcare have been slaughtered by the evidence they produce, accumulate and act on. Above all, research,

services, education and training need to be integrated, as in medical schools, to form communities which produce, distribute and apply evidence.

The social benefit of this approach is nowhere more obvious than in the identification and therapeutic application of penicillin. Discovered at St Mary's Hospital Paddington by a practitioner academic, Alexander Fleming, the nature of this new therapeutic agent was subsequently unravelled by a biochemist, Ernst Chain, and then converted into an effective drug through the leadership of Howard Florey, also a practitioner. This example shows how the 'knowing-doing gap' needs to be closed and why probation professionals, probation practitioner academics and social scientists need to work together. There are thousands of other examples of the products of such integration in medicine and many where this research ecosystem has led to substantial cost reduction. For example, as a result of careful experiment and economic analysis which demonstrated better outcomes for patients as well as lower costs, many operations once carried out at great expense on a hospital in-patient basis are now carried out on a day basis. It is hard however, to think of examples of science based cost reduction in probation services. The Coalition Government have signalled a shift towards much greater private and third sector provision, to be managed on a payment by results basis, yet the same lack of applied knowledge in service effectiveness – and what secures a result in the first place – remains.

Professionalisation

As stated, solutions to what can only be described as an evidence or research crisis in probation are more the responsibility of the probation profession than of non-practitioner social scientists, though the academy has an important opportunity and responsibility here too.

Debates about useful evidence usually focus on important supply side questions: how to increase evidence production, synthesis, translation into guidelines and implementation. But this is only half the problem. Without addressing demand, supply solutions such as NICE equivalents for crime and justice will not fulfill their potential.

Many of the most powerful motivators to demand evidence are manifest locally in public services. Chief constables and police commanders are scouring the criminology literature and quizzing academics about evidence they can apply to reduce crime and thereby get to the top of the informal league tables represented by Home Office iQuanta charts, which rank cities, communities and community safety partnerships according to crime rates.

The underlying motivation at this practice level is the instinctive drive by professionals to raise service standards. Indeed, a profession can be defined as such according to the presence or absence of this impetus to improve. The medical Royal Colleges,

the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Royal Institute of British Architects all capitalise on and magnify this drive, focusing sharply and continuously on self-improvement, and have no interest in terms and conditions of employment or any other trades union functions. This thirst for useful knowledge to improve practice provided the drive for the development and maintenance of medical and engineering schools in universities. In these professions, national institutions generally came before university schools and institutes, but there seems little reason not to develop both of these foundations for probation at the same time.

The benefits of professionalisation include the generation of effective new interventions and the creation of distinct bodies of knowledge, skill sets and practice acumen unique to each profession. These have increased the confidence, credibility and recruitment standards of professions beyond recognition. Most importantly, service standards have been transformed. The probation service needs to recognise and capitalise on the benefits of professionalisation. A new national professional body is needed to provide probation with a rudder through constantly changing political and managerial cross-currents and a headquarters from which to drive improvement.

Here, as for university foundations of professions, there are models on which to draw, such as those provided by the medical Royal Colleges. As in medicine, probation officers gather information relevant to each case, lead investigations, apply relevant tests, define the problem and manage solutions in the context of social and environmental circumstances, knowledge of what is effective, and ethical and legal frameworks.

Most importantly, a professional body, a Royal College of Probation, would offer a way in which the profession can establish, stabilise and sustain its national identity, values and high purpose, and lead the advancement of practice standards. It could set and maintain national training standards through assessments and the provision of education to prepare trainees for success in these assessments.

The establishment of a College fellowship assessed by a high-level probation qualification essential for progression to senior ranks would reproduce arrangements that work well for medicine, engineering and town planning. College fellowship acquired in this way would also provide a single national electorate from which a college council, officers and trustees could be elected, including from the ranks of probation qualified academics in universities. This would be a solution to concerns about the variable quality of the many different routes into probation. Such a College might develop a qualifying examination suitable for probation professionals from outside the European Union.

This model also offers a self-funded advisory mechanism: nationally for government; regionally; and by specialty comprising appointed advisors who could advise probation trusts on appointments and job plans. In time, the history of established

professional bodies suggests that a College would develop international standing and become a source of advice on professional practice and training.

A College of Probation would, if this model is applied, have an important role in managing the transition of aspiring and trainee probation professionals from university to the service, and in ensuring that probation academics continue to practice – an important safeguard against research losing touch with the realities of rehabilitation. In medicine, full time apprenticeship with practising trainers in clinics and the operating theatre after the end of foundation training, itself a full time apprenticeship across a wide range of specialties and general practice, is fundamental to learning the art, craft and science of practice.

If this model is applied, a College would have important policy and communication roles free from any trades union functions. This separation of functions would help both the College and probation unions to discharge their responsibilities more effectively and transparently. The College would not carry out research itself but would, through scholarships, bursaries and grants, promote research of direct relevance to the rehabilitation of those who offend. Very importantly the new professional body would, from its independent position, forge a relationship with the higher education sector to develop probation institutes in which research, training and services are integrated.

The probation service is not alone at this formative juncture. In 2012, the police service together with the Home Office established a new College of Policing to provide an independent national policing voice and identity. A first chief executive, Alex Marshall, has been appointed from the ranks of chief constables and the College is being formalised through primary legislation. The College will be the home of the new What Works Centre for Crime Reduction. In 2012, discussions preliminary to setting up a College of Teaching to provide primary, middle and secondary school teachers with a professional home also took place, initiated by a group of head teachers and also proposed by the House of Commons education select committee. A commission has been set up to take this further. One of the major themes in the proposals for both policing and teaching has been the role of the new institutions in promoting practice and policy based on reliable evidence of effectiveness. Therefore, proposals in both professions include the development of improved profession-specific research arrangements in suitable universities, as proposed here for probation.

Professional development has increasingly exercised minds within probation. For example, the idea of a practitioner registration scheme, particularly in light of the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms, has gained currency. Laudable though this intention may be, the history of such an enterprise in education is relevant. Here, the General Teaching Council (GTC) was established across England and Wales by the 1998 Teaching and Higher Education Act following a long campaign to create an

independent professional body for teaching. The result was a body whose statutory functions were largely regulatory in nature and with which all teachers were required to register. It never fully won the confidence of teachers, unions or politicians. It was scrapped by the 2011 Education Act and closed in 2012, though a GTC continues in Wales and a GTC with a much longer history continues in Scotland. This experience, and experience from other professions, suggests that a new national College offering a wide range of powerful incentives to join, belong and contribute to the profession as well as some regulatory functions (such as the requirement for aspiring College members to demonstrate in formal assessments knowledge, skills and experience according to standards set by the College) is more likely to succeed than a purely regulatory body.

Probation Research Institutes

Probation institutes are needed in research-intensive universities in order to deliver more effective and efficient interventions through strong research, training and service collaborations. Such new institutes need to be multi-disciplinary, incorporating, for example, psychology, health, and education. These new institutes would provide a suitable environment in which to train a cadre of practitioner academics committed to the production and implementation of reliable evidence for probation services more widely.

These new institutes would focus on applied research and would drive the evidence process already summarised. They would become international research hubs, would be fully integrated with probation trusts and co-led by practitioners and social scientists – and in time, by probation practitioner academics. These institutes should incorporate strong links with government and with professional training and should be focused on those who offend. As with medical and engineering schools, each new institute would develop its own particular research area and these areas would complement each other. Research quality would be assured by host universities and through strong links with local probation services. This approach, promoting public service innovation, encompassing a new discipline and a new sector, will help to ensure that UK probation services are the most innovative in the world. This fits with the principles outlined in the 2008 government white paper ‘Innovation Nation’.

The proposed overall objectives of probation institutes fit well with the aims of Russell Group universities ‘to maintain the highest standards of research, education and knowledge transfer to create innovators, leaders and professionals to serve society’; and those of the National Offender Management Service ‘to draw on the knowledge and expertise of the public, private and third sectors to provide more innovative solutions to reduce offending behaviour and to provide the highest quality services and interventions to protect the public’. Given the probation

landscape described here, it is difficult to think of a public service with greater need, or of a greater opportunity for universities to contribute. There are, furthermore, opportunities here for universities to develop new vocational degree courses which would offer graduates much better employment prospects compared with, for example, graduates in criminology or sociology.

With these principles in mind in the context of policing, Cardiff University launched its Universities' Police Science Institute in 2007, in collaboration with and funded jointly by South Wales Police. It attracts substantial external research funding, particularly from Europe and the Economic and Social Research Council. Research coming out of the Institute has already had a substantial impact on policing nationally. Knowledge transfer is achieved through a programme of master classes for South Wales Police led by the Chief Constable and other police senior management teams.

Potential benefits for economic growth

Another major potential benefit is to economic growth. Al Blumstein, the distinguished American criminologist, once ruefully observed that investment in crime research does not come close to investment in dental research. Both sectors depend on behavioural as well as technical solutions. The explanation is that dental research and services are integrated in well-funded dental schools in research-intensive universities whereas criminology research is led and largely carried out far from front line probation work and policing and far from practitioner training.

The report 'Medical Research: What's it worth?', commissioned by the Academy of Medical Sciences, the Medical Research Council and the Wellcome Trust concluded that the health and GDP gains from public and third sector investment in health research had benefits far beyond those accruing to organisations in receipt of these funds, thus explaining the GDP gains. These wider 'spillover' benefits are generated by skilled graduates, from increased capacity to exploit discoveries, from entrepreneurial opportunities – including the private sector; and from international trade. Investment in probation institutes co-led by practitioners and researchers, located with police equivalents within research-intensive universities would provide the same opportunities in crime and justice.

Conclusion

If university probation research institutes which are integrated with probation trusts become the research and training foundations of probation services, evidence from other public service sectors strongly suggests that the impact of their research would be clear and that rehabilitation would be transformed as a result. Their development, together with a national professional body for probation which aspires to Royal College status, is an essential step in the context of the development by government of a What Works Centre to synthesise evidence of effectiveness of interventions designed to reduce crime. The steps set out here are particularly relevant in the context of 2013 UK government proposals to transform rehabilitation. Exemplars from other services suggest that a probation endowment fund, set up competitively by the Ministry of Justice could, following the Education Endowment model, do much to galvanise rehabilitation research. Establishing research institutes in universities would ensure that independent, non-government funded research is also undertaken. The development of these foundations for probation services would increase the standing, credibility and recruitment standards of the profession, and through this would improve the effectiveness and cost-benefit of services.

Bibliography

- Cabinet Office (2012) *Open Public Services*. Available at: http://files.openpublicservices.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/HMG_OpenPublicServices_web.pdf [accessed January 2013].
- Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group, www.campbellcollaboration.org/crime_and_justice/index.php.
- Crime and Disorder Act 1998, available at: www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/37/contents [accessed January 2013].
- Education Endowment Foundation (EEF), educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk.
- Health Economics Research Group (HERG), Brunel University, Office of Health Economics (OHE), RAND Europe (2008) *Medical Research: What's it worth? For the Medical Research Council, the Wellcome Trust and the Academy of Medical Sciences*. Available at: www.acmedsci.ac.uk/p99puid137.html [accessed January 2013].
- Ministry of Justice (2012) *Rehabilitation revolution - the next steps*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/news/press-releases/moj/rehabilitation-revolution-the-next-steps> [accessed January 2013].
- Ministry of Justice (2013) *Transforming Rehabilitation: A revolution in the way we manage offenders*. London: Ministry of Justice.
- Ministry of Justice (2013) *Proven Re-offending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin: April 2010 to March 2011, England and Wales*. London: Ministry of Justice. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/172356/proven-reoffending-apr10-mar11.pdf [accessed April 2013].
- Pfeffer J., and Sutton R. I. (2001) *The Knowing-Doing Gap*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Shepherd, J. P. (2003) 'Explaining feast or famine in randomised field trials: medical science and criminology compared'. *Evaluation Review*, 27, pp. 290–315.
- Shepherd, J. P. (2007) 'The production and management of evidence for public service reform'. *Evidence and Policy*, 3, pp. 231–251.
- Shepherd, J. P., and Shepherd, I. (2008) 'Shouldn't psychologists do more to solve the reoffending crisis?' *The Psychologist*, 21, pp. 447–449.
- Shepherd, J. P., and Shepherd, I. (2008) 'Solving the R&D crisis' *National Association of Probation Officers News*, May, issue 119, p. 13.
- Shepherd, J. P. (2011) *Increasing Evidence Demand*. Available at: http://www.nesta.org.uk/blogs/policy_innovation_blog/increasing_evidence_demand.

Shepherd, J. P. (2012) *How Evidence can help the UK's economic growth*. Available at: http://www.nesta.org.uk/blogs/alliance_for_useful_evidence/how_evidence_can_help_the_uks_economic_growth/.

Shepherd, J. P. (2013) 'Sharing expertise: What can surgery and other professions learn from each other?' *Royal College of Surgeons Bulletin*, 95, pp. 36–7 DOI: 10.1308/147363512X13448516927701.

Shepherd, J. P. (2013) 'The appliance of social science' *Times Higher Education*, 3 January. Available at: www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=422264&c=1.

Sivarajasingam, V., Wells, J. P., Moore, S., Morgan, P., and Shepherd, J. P. (2012) *Violence in England and Wales in 2011: An Accident and Emergency Perspective*. Cardiff University: Violence and Society Research Group.

Universities' Police Science Institute (UPSI), www.upsi.org.uk.

About the author

Jonathan Shepherd is professor of oral and maxillofacial surgery at Cardiff University where he directs the University's Violence and Society Research Group. On the basis of his research he developed the prototype Community Safety Partnership in Cardiff and the information sharing enterprise known as the Cardiff Model for Violence Prevention, the implementation of which is a Coalition Government programme commitment. His team's research and advocacy led to the historic first NICE guideline, and the switch to toughened glassware in the UK licensed trade. He is a campaigner for evidence led policy and practice and is a member of the What Works Group chaired by the cabinet secretary, and the Nesta-ESRC Alliance for Useful Evidence. He initiated and developed the pioneering University Police Science Institute at Cardiff University and is a member of the Home Office Science Advisory Council (HOSAC). In 2008 he won the Stockholm Criminology Prize and was appointed CBE in the New Year honours. His group's research won Cardiff University a 2009 Queens Prize in higher education.

About the Howard League for Penal Reform

The Howard League for Penal Reform is a national charity working for less crime, safer communities and fewer people in prison. It is the oldest penal reform charity in the UK. It was established in 1866 and is named after John Howard, one of the first prison reformers.

We work with parliament and the media, with criminal justice professionals, students and members of the public, influencing debate and forcing through meaningful change to create safer communities.

We campaign on a wide range of issues including short term prison sentences, real work in prison, community sentences and youth justice.

Our legal team provides free, independent and confidential advice, assistance and representation on a wide range of issues to young people under 21 who are in prisons or secure children's homes and centres.

By becoming a member you will give us a bigger voice and give vital financial support to our work. We cannot achieve real and lasting change without your help. Please visit www.howardleague.org and join today.

The Mannheim Centre for Criminology

The Mannheim Centre for Criminology was set up in 1990 at the London School of Economics. It was named in honour of Hermann Mannheim who after emigrating from Nazi Germany in 1934 did much to establish the discipline of criminology in Britain.

It is a multi-disciplinary centre incorporating staff from across the LSE. The Centre provides a forum for LSE criminology including undergraduate and postgraduate courses, funded research, and a large number of conferences, seminars and other public events including this series.

What if...? Series of challenging pamphlets

In praise of fire brigade policing: Contra common sense conceptions of the police role

Professor Robert Reiner, London School of Economics

What if imprisonment were abolished for property offences?

Professor Andrew Ashworth, University of Oxford

Forthcoming:

Why do some countries cope with fewer prisoners? How can England and Wales do the same?

Dr Tapio Lappi-Seppälä, Director-General of the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, Helsinki

the **Howard League** for **Penal Reform**

1 Ardleigh Road
London
N1 4HS

t
e
w

020 7249 7373
info@howardleague.org
www.howardleague.org

Registered charity
No. 251926
Company limited by
guarantee No. 898514

ISBN 978-1-905994-63-2



9 781905 994632 >

ISBN 978-1-905994-63-2

£5.00

2013