

# HMPPS: Co-Financing Organisation

An investigation into the Effectiveness of supportive measures, short courses (SC) and vocational educational training courses (VETs).

Kasey Lee, BA (Joint Honours) Linguistics and Sociology

## Objectives

The project aimed to identify the effectiveness of supportive measures, SC and VETs offered and delivered to offenders on the CFO3 programme. Issues within these areas have been highlighted in the initial assessment for resettlement needs. Employment achievement was used to measure effectiveness. The data used was sourced for CATS+, CFO3s personal database.

The central aims of the project was to use quantitative data to explore the effectiveness of supportive measures, SC and VETs offered to participants within the HMPPS CFO3 programme, discuss areas for development and their effect on employment success of participant.

This aim will be used to highlight the differences or similarities between male and female participants throughout the programme.



## Method

The quantitative data used in this report was sourced from CATS+. This provides up to date statistics on participant numbers, issues, resettlement needs and achievements claimed. The data was split up into gender, in order to make comparisons between male and female participants. Supportive measures was divided up into eight categories in line with the eight pathways used in the assessment, related to the assessed resettlement needs, these being: accommodation, attitude and life skills, education, employment, finance, health, substance misuse and relationships. Education was removed from the report as there were no significant results.

This data was first collated in excel in order to recode the data, as the original data was recieved containing a lot of free text, therefore, data had to be recoded first into categories then into correlating numbers in order to be suitable for SPSS. Transferring the data onto SPSS allowed me to create cross tabulations and conduct Pearson's chi-square test to determine the significance of all cross tabulations created. This method ensured that data analysis was easier and simple to conduct.

Table 1.2

	Need Accommodation Support	Received Accommodation Support	Employment achieved	Number	%
Male	Severe need	Yes	Y	95	12.9
			N	644	87.1
	No	No	Y	833	8.7
			N	8786	91.3
	No and Moderate need	Yes	Y	43	11.9
			N	319	88.1
No	No	Y	1071	12.1	
		N	7812	87.9	
Female	Severe need	Yes	Y	6	3.6
			N	162	96.4
	No	No	Y	34	3.1
			N	1046	96.9
	No and Moderate need	Yes	Y	6	3.4
			N	106	94.6
No	No	Y	96	7.3	
		N	1219	92.7	

Table 1.2 shows gender differences and similarities within accommodation supportive measure.

## Results and Conclusion

As table 1.1 demonstrates, participants who didn't have a severe accommodation resettlement need and didn't receive support are more likely to achieve employment than participants who didn't have accommodation and needs however did receive support. It is likely that this is due to these participants being closer to the labour market as they have a lesser need for accommodation. The chi-square test conducted found that the likelihood of getting employment is not reliant on the participant's needs for accommodation support nor the accommodation support

Table 1.1

Need accommodation Support	Received Accommodation support	Employment Achieved	Number of participants	% of Participants
Severe need	Yes	Yes	101	11.1
		No	806	88.9
	No	Yes	867	8.1
		No	9832	91.9
No or Moderate need	Yes	Yes	49	10.3
		No	425	89.7
	No	Yes	1167	11.4
		No	9032	88.6

Table 1.1 demonstrates whether accommodation support was identified as a need, whether the participants received support and the success of the support (using employment achievement as the indicator)

received. Overall, receiving accommodation support does make a difference to participants achieving employment as 8.1% of participants who didn't receive accommodation support, achieved employment, compared to 11.1% of participants who did receive support. This is likely to be due to the levels and types of accommodation needs of the participants.

When gender was added to table 1.1, there was no change to the outcome previously stated. However, one notable difference between male and females is that the percentage of females who need support, received support and achieved employment is 3.6% compared to 12.9% of males who have received support and achieved employment. This is likely due to the fact that accommodation support can be received from core activities, DAF measures or other agencies such as the council. Also, females are less likely to need accommodation support from the CFO3 programme as females are more likely to be single parents compared to males. Therefore, they have other support networks available to them such as supported housing. Males are more likely to be homeless and needing accommodation support as they are less likely to ask for help due to the male ego which deems them as weak if they ask for help.

The chi-square test completed for this model resulted in the same outcome as previously mentioned. Therefore, further investigation into the types of support needed and received by participants is likely to aid in improving the service provided to participants.