



**Economic study of Integrated Family Support
Programme (IFS)
2012**

Title	Economic study of Integrated Family Support Programme (IFS)
Client	Pact
Client contact (name, title)	Angus Mulready-Jones, Director of Integrated Family Support
Confidentiality, copyright and reproduction	Copyright nef consulting ltd
Reference	CON C43
Author(s)	Ben Estep Natalie Nicholles nef consulting limited nef (new economics foundation) 3 Jonathan Street London SE11 5NH

nef consulting is the consultancy arm of UK think tank **nef** (the new economics foundation). We put **nef**'s ideas into practice by placing people and the planet at the heart of decision making.

Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Introduction & Approach	6
Approach	7
3. Support offered by IFS	8
Introduction	8
Prisoner characteristics and challenges	8
IFS Support	9
4. Evidence of economic impact	11
4.1 Prison Visits	11
IFS Contribution	11
The Evidence	12
Judgement of Impact	13
4.2 Support to Families	16
IFS Contribution	16
The Evidence	16
Judgement of Impact	17
4.3 Resettlement	21
IFS Contribution	21
The Evidence	21
Judgement of Impact	21
4.4 Cost Benefit Ratio and High/Low Scenarios	24
5. Conclusion	25
Appendix: Results by Prison	25
Endnotes	25

1. Executive Summary

This study demonstrates that IFS's services are cost effective.

We estimate that IFS delivers potential benefits to the State of between £500,000 and £3.4m over a one year period.

This represents a return of £11.41 for every £1 invested.

nef consulting (the consultancy arm of UK think tank the new economics foundation) was asked in March 2012 to assess the potential socio-economic impact of the Prison Advice and Care Trust's Integrated Family Support (IFS) programme. This assessment focuses on the economic impact of the work carried out by the programme on behalf of prisoners and their families. Our research is based on case studies, administrative data provided by the programme and interviews with programme staff.

There is a sizeable body of literature on the varied needs of prisoners and their families and a growing recognition that these needs, particularly those related to the maintenance of productive family ties, are closely associated with successful resettlement. The importance of prisoner and family support work is underscored by the rapidly growing prison population. At the time of writing, there are just under 87,000 people in prison in England and Wales, an increase of 23 per cent over the last ten years and a population that has nearly doubled over the last two decades.

Whilst delivering economic savings is not the primary motivation of IFS, in a climate of both reduced social spending and increasing prison populations this is an important and under-evidenced question to consider. For purposes of this analysis, we focus on IFS work in three prisons: HMP Swansea, HMP Wandsworth, and HMP Eastwood Park, and in three different areas: visits (including help arranging and supporting visits between offenders and their families and intermediary work between offenders and families); support to families (including provision of information, emotional support, referral to services and interfacing with social services); and resettlement-focused help (including housing and employment support, and benefits and debt advice).

Based on our review of the support that IFS offers and accounting for multiple scenarios, we estimate that IFS delivers potential benefits to the State of **between £515,465 and £3,479,294 over a one year period**. Based on an annual cost per programme site of £40,368 in London and £35,972 elsewhere, and using our middle estimate, this represents **a value of £1,281,240 or return of £11.41 for every £1 invested**.

The predominant source of this impact is in cost savings from reductions in reoffending due to IFS work toward the encouragement and supporting of visits, and the consequent maintenance of family ties. Potential social and health care savings related to prisoner's families have also been identified, as well as cost avoidance based on resettlement-focused planning. It is worth noting that there are a number of other probable impacts connected to IFS that are beyond

the scope of this study, and the existing literature, to capture. This includes the future potential positive impacts on children and their life chances, amongst others.

This assessment demonstrates that IFS provides good value for money for the taxpayer. As IFS's work continues, we would encourage recording client outcomes systematically and longitudinally in order to evidence the socio-economic impact of the programme. The way in which the support offered contributes separately and collectively to changes for offenders and families is in need of deeper investigation. A better understanding of the way in which individual IFS sites are developing their model to create change will both contribute to the on-going development of the programme and help its wider impact.

This conservative assessment has been prepared using a portfolio analysis approach informed by Social Return on Investment (SROI) principles and cost-benefit analysis. Beyond the areas of support on which we focus here, case studies and conversations with IFS staff, as well as evidence in the research literature, suggests that IFS's work also has a material impact on the well-being of prisoners and families. Moving forward, IFS may consider adopting a full social value analysis which could help evidence and value these additional benefits.

2. Introduction & Approach

IFS operates in ten prisons in England and Wales and aims to improve outcomes for prisoners, their families and children by helping them gain better and faster access to supports and local resources within their communities.

nef consulting (the consultancy arm of the new economics foundation) was asked in March 2012 to prepare a socio-economic assessment of the Prison Advice and Care Trust's (pact) Integrated Family Support programme (IFS). This assessment focuses on the economic impact of the work carried out by the programme on behalf of prisoners and their families. Our research is based on case studies, administrative data provided by the programme, interviews with programme staff and evidence from secondary literature

IFS operates in ten prisons in England and Wales and aims to improve outcomes for prisoners, their families and children by helping them gain better and faster access to supports and local resources within their communities. The programme is delivered by pact in partnership with North East Prison After Care Society (NEPACS). IFS workers, who are professional practitioners supported by volunteers in some settings, act as a bridge between prisons and communities and offer flexible support intended to meet a wide range of needs. This includes linking effectively with both prison-based and community-based statutory and third sector agencies, including offender-management, drugs teams, chaplaincy, prison staff, relationship and parenting programmes, children's social care teams, adult social services, schools, advice and support agencies and faith organisations.

Prison-based family support has historically been driven and developed by third sector organisations. Some of these have developed and operate visitor's centres at a number of establishments and deliver a range of complementary, person-centred services (in addition to pact, examples include Ormiston Children and Families Trust, POPS, NEPACS, and HALOW). Programmes which seek to engage and actively involve key family members and partners, who are the principal source of support during custody and the hoped-for source of support following release, have historically found that prison visitors centres, which are typically under-resourced, have had to focus on processing visitors and very short-term support, and have had limited ability to engage in longer-term support interventions with prisoners or their families.

In response to this, IFS seeks to provide sustained support to people affected by imprisonment. This includes both prisoners themselves and families and partners or other supporters of offenders. Specifically, the programme focuses on supporting positive family and social relationships throughout custody as a means to increase and sustain the frequency of visits and other forms of contact, and to enable that contact to be as positive and meaningful as possible. There is a widely agreed consensus among the National Offender Management Service (NOMS), the third sector, and academic

This study has been prepared using a portfolio analysis approach informed by Social Return on Investment (SROI) principles and cost-benefit analysis.

researchers that regular positive visits during custody, and the active engagement and support of families, has a significant positive impact on outcomes for resettlement and reduced reoffending.

Approach

This study adopts a portfolio analysis approach to estimating the socio-economic impact of IFS services. We focus on the avoided costs to the State (defined as government departments and used as a proxy for wider society) generated by IFS's work in three areas identified through a review of thirty-six case studies across five prisons. IFS staff provided a determination of the proportion of their support work distributed across these areas, as described in the table below. These proportions are used to estimate a number of support beneficiaries per support for each of three prisons. The levels of deadweight (outcomes that would have happened even without IFS support) and attribution (how much a particular outcome was also caused by the contribution of other organisations or people) are largely assumptions-based.

Given the lack of empirical research and the quantity of unknown impacts we undertake a significant sensitivity analysis, wherein we explore changes to the cost-benefit ratio triggered by varying upper- and lower-band assumptions related to cost estimates and discount levels. A highly conservative approach is employed throughout this assessment.

Table 1: Reckoning of distribution of supports at three IFS prisons¹

Prison	HMP Eastwood park	HMP Swansea	HMP Wandsworth
Description	Female local prison	Male local prison	Male local prison
Operational capacity	362	445	1,665
Visits	72%	85%	49%
Family support	19%	8%	56%
Resettlement	11%	7%	25%

3. Support offered by IFS

This assessment focuses on the economic impacts of support provided in three broad areas: visits, support to families and resettlement-focused help.

Delivering economic savings is not the prime motivation for IFS, but in a climate of widespread reductions in public expenditure this is an important question to consider.

Introduction

This assessment focuses on the economic impacts of the support provided by IFS in three broad areas: visits (including help arranging and supporting visits between offenders and their families, and intermediary work between offenders and families); support to families (including provision of information, emotional support, referral to services, and interfacing with social services); and resettlement-focused help (including housing and employment support, and benefits and debt advice). This section provides an overview of the rationale and objectives for support of this nature, the challenges typically faced by those that access the service and a description of how supports are delivered.

While there is a growing body of research that analyses the social service needs, and other needs of prisoners and their families, as well as how these are associated with successful resettlement, the body of research that attempts to define the economics of supporting these needs is much smaller. Delivering economic savings is not the prime motivation for IFS, but in a climate of widespread reductions in public expenditure this is an important and only partially evidenced question to consider.

This research is intended to progress that question with specific reference to IFS, though the findings may also apply more generally. The nature, type, and extent of unmet needs among prisoners and their families that lead them to seeking support of this kind and their experiences of the programme are diverse. So too are the changes that may occur as a result of the programme: how they manifest themselves, at what point, and for what duration. On this basis, we do not attempt to draw sweeping conclusions, but rather more specific observations of how IFS may deliver savings and avoid costs in the above three monetizable areas.

This typology of support does not reflect the totality of the work that IFS does, nor does our estimation of the economic benefits of this support reflect all of the benefits that IFS generates. There are a number of additional potential impacts and ripple effects from IFS that are beyond the scope of this study, and the existing literature, to capture. These might notably include benefits related to a calmer prison population, less stress among prison staff, and more composed visitors.

Prisoner characteristics and challenges

Research on prisoners and their families in England and Wales has consistently identified a range of needs far in excess of those found in the general adult population.² For example, the Ministry of Justice's longitudinal survey of prisoners has found the following:

Prisons receive only limited funding to meet the costs of family support work, parenting or relationship courses, providing family visitor centres, supervise play areas or resettlement support for families.

- Fifteen per cent of prisoners reported being homeless prior to being in custody (three and a half per cent of the general population report having ever been homeless);³
- Forty-six per cent of prisoners reported having no academic or vocational qualifications;⁴
- Thirty-two per cent of prisoners reported being in paid employment in the month prior to custody; thirteen per cent reported never having had a job;⁵
- Sixty-two per cent of prisoners reported claiming benefits during the year prior to custody;⁶

In addition to their varied association with reoffending, these needs also present a challenge to those within the prison estate involved in the provision of support services and resettlement planning. Further, with an annual total of approximately 60,000 adults receiving sentences of less than a year (the majority of these serving for less than three months), there is an additional challenge in both identifying and addressing needs before the end of a sentence.⁷

An overwhelming majority of prisoners report being close to their families (74 per cent) and wanting their families involved in their lives (88 per cent), and many see the support of their families as being important in helping them stop reoffending in the future (40 per cent).⁸ However, prisons receive no specific funding to meet the costs of family support work, or parenting and relationship courses, beyond the basic provision of services for visitors based on a minimum NOMS specification introduced in 2011. Provision of these services must come either from a prison's general budget or, more commonly, via partnership with third sector organisations.

There is a developed evidence base on the positive impact that maintaining family ties can have on reducing the likelihood of an ex-prisoner reoffending and on the reduced risk of anti-social behaviour among the children of prisoners. Recognition of these issues is reflected in recent government policy papers on "breaking the cycle" of intergenerational crime, delivering services to "troubled families," and improving the outcomes of children.^{9,10}

IFS Support

Word of the availability of IFS supports can reach prisoners and their families through materials posted in visitors centres, in information packets included in prisoner's induction materials, and, possibly most frequently cited in conversations with staff, through word-of-mouth referrals.

In a review of thirty-six case studies of IFS's work with offenders and their families in five different prisons, we identified sixty-five instances of support. These included most commonly the provision of information regarding a prisoner to the family, work directly aimed at facilitating visits between prisoners and families, family referrals to supportive services, and interfacing with social services (often relating to a prisoner's child).

Although presented in discrete sections, in reality many of these supports overlap: for example, visits (section 4.1) may be made possible through IFS support with financial advice (section 4.3) that may have a further effect on resettlement outcomes. Underlying this is the case worker-like role played by IFS workers, in which multiple concurrent issues may be addressed over a sustained period of time and across several different sessions.

4. Evidence of economic impact

A causal relationship between IFS's work and improved outcomes is inferred throughout this analysis.

Impact has been assessed conservatively and on a one year period of the intervention only.

This section presents our analysis of IFS case studies and our estimation of a selective portfolio of economic impacts based on our review of these case studies, IFS administrative data and secondary research.

While a causal relationship between IFS's work and improved outcomes is inferred throughout this analysis, we have been conservative and have applied the impact considerations of deadweight (outcomes that would have happened even without IFS's work) and attribution (the amount of credit that IFS can take) for each outcome. The estimates presented in this section contain these assumptions.

A recent survey of the prison estate found that prisons work with, on average, twenty third sector organisations, though prisoners themselves reported being aware of only four organisations on average, and engaging with only one.¹¹ Our baseline assumption of attribution, at twenty per cent, is comparatively modest.

We have also applied a baseline assumption of twenty per cent deadweight in consideration of improved outcomes that would have happened in the absence of IFS. Without a comparison group, this is clearly an estimate, but it is arrived at in light of the documented difficulties faced by this population which are assumed to lower the likelihood of positive outcomes occurring without support.¹²

Impact has been assessed, conservatively and on a one year period of the intervention only. While there is reason to believe that the effect of some, or even most, of the valued outcomes will persist at some level for much longer, estimating this drop-off is beyond the scope of this report.

We recognize that prisoner and family needs, and consequently the IFS work undertaken to support them, may vary considerably from prison to prison. This has been reflected in the case studies and also in our conversation with IFS staff. For this reason and to avoid false aggregation, our economic impact estimates are drawn for three individual prisons (HMP Wandsworth, HMP Swansea, and HMP Eastwood Park) and are based on a representation of the mix of supports offered in each. An individualized economic summary for each prison is found in the appendices.

4.1 Prison Visits

IFS Contribution

Much of IFS's work, at the behest of both prisoners and their families, is directed toward planning, supporting and facilitating visits. Although

Case Study Excerpt:

*“I received a call from a social worker...working with a mother and child [wishing to visit a partner in prison]. I contacted the mother initially to see if she had any queries. She was particularly concerned because she didn’t think she would be able to afford to come and visit him. I told her about the Assisted Prison Visits Scheme through which she could get financial help to support her visit but she told me that she had tried to fill [an application] out before but she couldn’t understand it and so threw it away. I arranged to meet her...and go through the forms with her and she was very keen for me to help her with this. She is now in receipt of financial support...I plan to meet with the mother every visit for the next month to check if there are further needs I can support with.” --
HMP Wandsworth*

all prisoners are entitled by law to visits, in practice significant barriers exist, including difficulties related to information disclosure, the visit booking procedure and the distance from home to the facility.¹³

Staff estimates of the proportion of their work directly related to encouraging and supporting contact and visits ranged from 49 per cent at the low end to 72 per cent at the high end, making it the most common support type across the IFS sites that took part in this research.

Visit-related support detailed in case studies ranged from providing explanations and walk-throughs of the process to anxious visitors, to helping prisoners prepare for visits and talking through issues that may come up beforehand. While many (though by no means all) visits may have gone ahead even without IFS intervention, this preparatory work importantly also serves to improve the quality, not just quantity, of visits.

The Evidence

Despite a growing recognition of the importance of visits, and, more broadly, the maintenance of family connections, this is not an area well supported by the standard prison estate. Prison governors receive no specific funding to meet the costs of family support work, beyond the basic provision of services for visitors based on a minimum NOMS specification introduced in 2011. This means that any further family provision must come from a governor’s already stretched general prison budget.¹⁴

With documented difficulties navigating the system by which visiting orders are issued, in addition to difficulties making and receiving phone calls as well as the frequently substantial distance from an offender’s home area to the prison, approximately 40 per cent of surveyed ex-prisoners reported finding it “fairly difficult” to “very difficult” to organize visits.¹⁵ A separate study found that 62 per cent of prisoners not receiving visits said that someone probably would visit if travelling to the prison were easier.¹⁶

The Home Office found that nearly one-third of prisoners received no visits during their sentence, and that this population was significantly less likely to have jobs or accommodation arranged on release from prison.¹⁷ Further, the frequency of visits received increased the likelihood of effective resettlement.

Here, as elsewhere, visits may be understood as a proxy for family and community ties, rather than as a panacea in themselves. But it is exactly these ties that custody threatens to break - the Social

Exclusion Unit reported that 43 per cent of sentenced prisoners lose touch with their families.¹⁸

Judgement of Impact

Visits, and the associated maintenance of ties between prisoners and their families, have several potentially monetizable outcomes. Here, we focus on where the evidence is the strongest: reoffending and its associated costs. A Ministry of Justice analysis found that the odds of reoffending within one year of release from prison were 39 per cent higher for prisoners who had not received visits from a partner or family member while in prison compared to those who had.¹⁹

Table 2: Estimating the Direct Annual Cost of One Reoffending Ex-Prisoner²⁰

Cost Type	Cost Estimate	Notes
Criminal Justice Costs - Low	£17,352	SEU (2002) estimate of cost of each offence leading to reconviction, inflation adjusted.
Criminal Justice Costs - High	£86,760	As above, but taking into consideration SEU approximation that five recorded offences are committed prior to each reconviction.
Custodial Sentencing	£11,790	Average crown court cost of imposing a prison sentence (£30,500, made up of court and legal costs) adjusted by 33% probability of ex-prisoner being re-incarcerated every year.
Prison Cost - Overall	£13,191	Average cost per place in prison (£39,573, MOJ (2011)), adjusted by 33% probability of ex-prisoner being re-incarcerated every year.
Prison Cost - Male	£13,240	Average annual cost per male prison place (£39,719, Hansard: HC Deb, 4 April 2011, c642W) adjusted by 33% probability of ex-prisoner being re-incarcerated every year.
Prison Cost - Female	£18,805	Average annual cost per female prison place (£56,415, Hansard: HC Deb, 4 April 2011, c642W) adjusted by 33% probability of ex-prisoner being re-incarcerated every year.
Non-Criminal Justice Direct Costs	£41,378	SEU (2002) minimum estimate of cost savings of preventing one re-offence, inflation adjusted; includes hospital treatment for victims, repairing property damage, etc.
TOTAL - low (male)	£83,760	Assuming low criminal justice cost estimate for male re-offender.
TOTAL - low (female)	£89,325	Assuming low criminal justice cost estimate for female re-offender.
TOTAL - high (male)	£153,168	Assuming high criminal justice cost estimate (5 recorded offences) for male reoffender.

TOTAL - high (female)	£158,733	Assuming high criminal justice cost estimate (5 recorded offences) for female reoffender.
------------------------------	-----------------	---

Table 2 above breaks down the component parts of a cost estimate for the annual direct cost to the State of one re-offending ex-prisoner. Notably, the “low” estimate assumes only one crime leading to reconviction. The Social Exclusion Unit estimated that, in practice, reoffenders commit five recorded offences prior to a reconviction. This approach yields a significantly higher cost estimate.²¹ In order to remain conservative, the model below adopts the “low” estimate. The “high” estimate is included in a sensitivity analysis.

Table 3: Estimated one-year economic benefit of IFS work on prison Visits

Prison	HMP Swansea	HMP Wandsworth	HMP Eastwood Park
Total # of IFS beneficiaries	284	210	300
Intermediary outcome	Visits/Family Ties	Visits/Family Ties	Visits/Family Ties
Final outcome	Reduced Reoffending	Reduced Reoffending	Reduced Reoffending
Outcome incidence (amount of change)	0.39	0.39	0.39
Proxy (£) Unit cost	£83,760	£83,760	£89,325
Total economic value per person	£32,666.40	£32,666.40	£34,836.75
Deadweight % (keep amount)	20%	20%	20%
Attribution % (keep amount)	20%	20%	20%
Value after impact (£)	£371,090.30	£274,397.76	£418,041.00
Total one year	£1,063,529		

economic impact

The above model includes an estimated outcome incidence (the reduction in reoffending associated with prisoners receiving a visit) of 39 per cent. After adjusting for deadweight and attribution, the estimated number of beneficiaries, and the estimated one-year cost to the State of a reoffending ex-prisoner, this results in a one-year economic impact of £1,063,529.

Table 4: Sensitivity analysis for one year economic benefit of IFS work on prison visits

Variables	Sensitivities / Assumptions	Results range (£s)
Deadweight %	10%	531,765
	20%	1,063,529
	50%	2,658,823
Attribution %	10%	531,765
	20%	1,063,529
	50%	2,658,823
Outcome Incidence (Change in Reoffending)	17% (lower bound, 95% CI)	463,590
	39% (MOJ estimate)	1,063,529
	65% (upper bound, 95% CI)	1,772,548
Cost Estimate	"Low" CJ cost	1,063,529
	"High" CJ cost	1,923,244

The table above presents a range of estimated economic impacts connected to visits through varying assumptions related to the amount of deadweight and attribution applied (at ten per cent, twenty per cent, and fifty per cent), the outcome incidence (in this case, the percentage change in reoffending, where we consider both the lower and upper bound of the Ministry of Justice’s 95 per cent confidence interval), and the criminal justice costs used (both the “low” cost, assuming only one recorded crime leading to a reconviction, and the

Case Study Excerpt:

"I began talking to a woman who was currently supporting her husband. She had recently given birth and it was her first child. Initially she was very quiet and apprehensive to talk to me. However after seeing her a few times during the course of sessions we spoke further and she began to share more with me. She explained that she didn't have a huge network of people around her to support her or talk to about her husband being in prison...and that it became difficult at times when she wanted to talk frankly about what was happening to her husband without judgement being made...We linked her up with a Befriender from the Prisoners Families and Friends Service which she then met with once a week. She said that this made her feel less isolated and less anxious and that it was good to speak to someone who she didn't feel was judging her about the situation she was in. -- HMP Wandsworth

"high" cost, using the Social Exclusion Unit's estimate of five recorded offences prior to a reconviction).

Using the lowest end of the estimate (applying the "low" criminal justice cost, using the lower bound MOJ estimate of the reduction in reoffending and applying twenty per cent deadweight and attribution) results in a projected annual savings of £463,590. This is more than four times the annual cost of the service at the three participating sites. This represents £4.13 for every £1 invested, taking into account support work related to visits only.

4.2 Support to Families

IFS Contribution

IFS provides various supports to the families of prisoners, from simply providing information on prisoners to families, to offering emotional support, to referring to outside services and interfacing with social services (especially with regard to the children of prisoners).

IFS staff at the sites we focused on estimated that this broad category accounted for between one-fifth and more than one-half of their work. Support in this area typically requires longer-term engagement with clients, as well as broad knowledge of available outside services, both in the local area, and across the country in the home communities of prisoners and their families.

The Evidence

Families of prisoners can be exposed to a range of hardships due to a custodial sentence from social stigma to economic difficulties compounded by a loss of income. While many prisoners' families already come from disadvantaged circumstances, the sentence can add additional burdens including transport costs for visits, the provision of clothing, money, or other personal items for the prisoner, as well as increased stress.²²

As with visits, prisons receive no specific funding to meet the costs of family support work other than the basic provision of services for visitors. This is perhaps most glaring with regard to children. Fifty-four per cent of surveyed prisoners had children under 18 when they entered prison.²³ The Ministry of Justice estimates that 200,000 children had a parent in custody during some part of 2009.²⁴

IFS staff at HMP Eastwood Park and HMP Swansea report that nearly 90 per cent of their casework with families involves children. This ranges from facilitating communications between prisoners and social services regarding planning arrangements for children to offering communication advice on how to discuss imprisonment with children.

Case Study Excerpt:

“Prisoner was having supervised contact with his children before coming in to custody, but had not been able to see his children in prison. Social services team were contacted to explain procedures for booking a contact visit in the prison and to answer questions about this. A legal visit was arranged where his social worker and solicitor met with him to discuss the request...Following a family court hearing where this information was presented, it was agreed to allow him contact within the prison. This had a big impact on the prisoner’s well-being and general demeanour, and his relationship with his children. Regular monthly contact is now held at the prison, which children and prisoner look forward to. They have been supported to keep in touch with letters and phone calls and are steadily building stronger family bonds. He is making plans for release which focus on his family. -- HMP Swansea

Children of prisoners face a range of challenges. A comprehensive review of studies investigating the causal effects of parental imprisonment on children found that on average a history of parental imprisonment approximately trebles the risk of antisocial-delinquent behaviour of children and at least doubles their risk for mental health problems.²⁵ This finding underscores the importance of family-friendly prison policies that may help ameliorate these harms.

Judgement of Impact

The wide range of supports provided under the rubric of support to families generates many potential benefits. Families of prisoners face financial difficulties related to loss of work and reduction in income, heightened incidence of physical and mental health problems, as well as increased reliance on welfare benefits. An ethnographic study of the finances of prisoners’ families found an indicative average total cost of £11,720 a year per family, including £4,690 in annual costs to the NHS and £4,930 in costs to social services.²⁶

The families of prisoners are disproportionately disadvantaged and there is a growing body of evidence that support for families with multiple and complex needs can deliver marked improvements in outcomes for individuals, families, communities, and the public purse.^{27,28}

The Howard League estimated that 17,240 children under 18 were separated from their mothers by prison in 2010.²⁹ Only 9 per cent of children whose mothers are in prison are cared for by their fathers in their mothers’ absence.³⁰

Table 5: Estimating the Annual Social Service and Health Costs for Prisoners’ Families

Cost Type	Cost Estimate	Notes
Social service costs	£5,612	Indicative costs from Smith (2007), annualized based on 6-month average, inflation adjusted
NHS costs	£5,339	Indicative costs from Smith (2007), annualized based on 6-month average, inflation adjusted
TOTAL	£10,951	

Table 6: Estimating the Annual Cost of Child Taken into Care³⁷

Cost Type	Cost Estimate	Notes
Child being taken into local authority foster care	£27,993	Family Savings Calculator (2011), £5,865, plus £1,844 per month
Child being taken into local authority residential care	£181,499	Family Savings Calculator (2011), £6,011, plus £14,624 per month

Table 7: Estimated One Year Economic Benefit of IFS Support to Families

Prison	HMP Swansea	HMP Wandsworth	HMP Eastwood Park	HMP Eastwood Park
Total # of IFS beneficiaries	26	244	79	69
Intermediary outcome	Family Support	Family Support	Family Support	Family Support
Final outcome	Avoided social service and health costs	Avoided social service and health costs	Avoided social service and health costs	Avoided costs of taking a child into residential care
Outcome incidence (amount of change)	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.25
Proxy (£) Unit cost	£10,951	£10,951	£10,951	£181,499
Total economic value per person	£4,270.89	£4,270.89	£4,270.89	£45,374.75
Deadweight % (keep amount)	20%	20%	20%	20%
Attribution % (keep amount)	20%	20%	20%	20%
Value after impact (£)	£4,441.73	£41,683.89	£13,496.01	£125,234.31
Total one year economic impact	£184,856			

Table 7 applies an estimated amount of change, referred to as the outcome incidence, of 39 per cent to the one-year social service and health cost estimates associated with the families of prisoners. This is taken from the reduction in reoffending associated with prisoners receiving visits. The benefit of family support directed at children, through the avoided cost of a child taken into care, is applied only to HMP Eastwood Park, and only to the estimated 87 per cent of beneficiaries in this category who have children, further applying an outcome incidence of 25 per cent. After adjusting for deadweight and

attribution and the estimated number of beneficiaries, this results in a one-year economic impact of £184,856 for the full category.

Table 8: Sensitivity Analysis for One Year Economic Benefit of IFS Work on Family Supports

Variables	Sensitivities / Assumptions	Results range (£s)
Deadweight %	10%	92,428
	20%	184,856
	50%	462,140
Attribution %	10%	92,428
	20%	184,856
	50%	462,140
Outcome Incidence (Change in Reoffending)	17% (lower bound, 95% CI)	111,148
	39% (MOJ estimate)	184,856
	65% (upper bound, 95% CI)	424,979
Cost Estimate	Residential care cost	184,856
	Foster care cost	78,937
Outcome Incidence on Residential Care	10%	109,715
	25%	184,856
	40%	259,997

Table 8 presents a range of estimated economic impacts connected to family supports through varying assumptions related to the amount of deadweight and attribution applied (at ten per cent, twenty per cent, and fifty per cent), the outcome incidence (in this case, the percentage change in reoffending, where we consider both the lower and upper bound of the Ministry of Justice’s 95 per cent confidence interval), the cost associated with a child being taken into care (both the cost of residential care and foster care), and, separately, the outcome incidence on residential care (at ten per cent, twenty-five per cent, and forty per cent).

Case Study

Excerpts:

“[Prisoner] had not informed anyone that she was going to prison...everyone assumed [she] would get tagging...but this was refused due to the partner saying he was going to leave and that the bailiffs had been in and taken everything...She received an eviction notice as he hadn’t been paying the rent. I informed housing who were unaware of the situation, and they managed to sort things out so she didn’t lose the house. –HMP Eastwood Park

“As I spoke with [prisoner] various themes came up which we addressed, and used these points to make plans for when he was to be released. One of his concerns was employment. As well as putting him in contact with Job Club within the prison, I contacted two organisations in the community who run intensive programmes for young people specifically around gaining new skills for potential employment.” – HMP Wandsworth

4.3 Resettlement

IFS Contribution

Through a review of case studies and conversations with staff, we identified an outcome of IFS supports that is explicitly related to smoothing the pathway to resettlement for prisoners and their families. This work includes housing and employment support, and benefits, finance and debt advice. Estimates of the proportion of their support work spent in these areas ranged between seven and 25 per cent in the three facilities on which we focus.

The Evidence

The Social Exclusion Unit estimated that stable accommodation can reduce recidivism by more than 20 per cent.³² But prisoner surveys suggest more than 30 per cent do not have post-release accommodation arranged, and only 19 per cent reported receiving help with this.³³ A recent report found that 37 per cent of prisoners stated that they would need help finding a place to live on release (of these, 84 per cent reported needing a lot of help), and 60 per cent felt that having a place to live would help them stop reoffending.³⁴

One-third of prisoners lose their house while in prison, and two-thirds lose their job.³⁵ Housing and employment are clearly interrelated: having an address on release meant ex-prisoners were three times more likely to be in paid employment than those without an address.³⁶ Prisoners experiencing co-occurring problems with employment and accommodation on release had a one-year reoffending rate 43 per cent higher than prisoners released with neither problem.³⁷ As well as facing employers reluctant to hire workers with criminal records, job prospects for many prisoners can be additionally reduced by low levels of education and a lack of work experience.

The prison inspectorate found that between one-fifth and one-third of prisoners thought they would experience difficulties with their finances and claiming benefits after release, and recognized that in-prison services addressing finance, benefits and debt needs were “too often absent or limited.”³⁸

Judgement of Impact

Table 9 estimates annual costs for the three resettlement areas on which we focus: housing, through an estimate of the annual cost of “approved premises” where released prisoners with no settled housing plans may stay at State expense; unemployment, through the cost of one year of Jobseeker’s Allowance; and finance, benefits, and debt, though a minimal projection of the cost of consulting with a benefits adviser.

Table 9: Estimating Annual Resettlement Costs

Cost Type	Cost Estimate	Notes
Housing: Average annual cost of "approved premises"/hostel	£5,444	Hansard: HC Deb, 23 February 2010, c498W, average annual cost £26,660, adjusted by average stay per resident of 74.7 days.
Employment: Annual Jobseeker's Allowance	£3,692	DWP: £71 per week for over-25s, annualized
Finance & Debt: Benefits adviser consultation	£93	Family Savings Calculator (2011): £31 per hour, 3 hours over year
TOTAL	£9,229	

Table 10 includes an estimated outcome incidence (the amount of positive change assumed in the categories of housing, unemployment, and benefits advice costs) of 50 per cent. After adjusting for deadweight and attribution, and the estimated number of beneficiaries, this results in a one-year economic impact of £32,855.

Table 10: Estimated One Year Economic Benefit of IFS Resettlement Support

Prison	Total # of IFS beneficiaries	Intermediary outcome	Final outcome	Outcome incidence (amount of change)	Proxy (£) Unit cost	Total economic value per person	Deadweight %	Attribution %	Value after impact (£)
HMP Swansea	24	Resettlement Support	Avoided housing costs	0.5	£5,444	£2,722.00	20%	20%	£2,613.12
HMP Swansea	24	Resettlement Support	Avoided unemployment costs	0.5	£3,692	£1,846.00	20%	20%	£1,772.16
HMP Swansea	24	Resettlement Support	Avoided benefits counselling	0.5	£93	£46.50	20%	20%	£44.64
HMP Wandsworth	108	Resettlement Support	Avoided housing costs	0.5	£5,444	£2,722.00	20%	20%	£11,759.04
HMP Wandsworth	108	Resettlement Support	Avoided unemployment costs	0.5	£3,692	£1,846.00	20%	20%	£7,974.72
HMP Wandsworth	108	Resettlement Support	Avoided benefits counselling	0.5	£93	£46.50	20%	20%	£200.88
HMP Eastwood Park	46	Resettlement Support	Avoided housing costs	0.5	£5,444	£2,722.00	20%	20%	£5,008.48
HMP Eastwood Park	46	Resettlement Support	Avoided unemployment costs	0.5	£3,692	£1,846.00	20%	20%	£3,396.64
HMP Eastwood Park	46	Resettlement Support	Avoided benefits counselling	0.5	£93	£46.50	20%	20%	£85.56
Total one year economic impact									£32,855

Table 11 presents a range of estimated economic impacts connected to resettlement supports through varying assumptions related to the amount of deadweight and attribution applied (at ten per cent, twenty per cent, and fifty per cent), and the outcome incidence (in this case, the percentage change in avoidance of state-funded housing, unemployment benefits, and benefits counselling costs at ten per cent, twenty per cent, and fifty per cent).

Table 11: Sensitivity Analysis for One Year Economic Benefit of IFS Work on Resettlement Supports

Variables	Sensitivities / Assumptions	Results range (£s)
Deadweight %	10%	16,428
	20%	32,855
	50%	82,138
Attribution %	10%	16,428
	20%	32,855
	50%	82,138
Amount of Change (Avoidance of extra housing, employment, benefits costs)	10%	6,571
	20%	13,142
	50%	32,855

4.4 Cost Benefit Ratio and High/Low Scenarios

In this section we consider the cross-facility value generated by IFS support in low, estimated and high scenarios.

Table 12: Scenario Estimates

IFS Support and Outcome	Scenario	Combined # of IFS Beneficiaries	Outcome incidence (amount of change)	Combined unit costs (weighted average)	Combined economic value per person (weighted average)	Dead-weight %	Attribution %	Combined Value after impact (£)
Visits/Family Ties → Reduced Reoffending	Low - assuming low criminal justice cost estimate and the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for reduced reoffending	794	0.17	£85,863	£14,596.65	20%	20%	£463,590
	Estimated - assuming low criminal justice cost estimate and MOJ finding for reduced reoffending	794	0.39	£85,863	£33,486	20%	20%	£1,063,529
	High - assuming high criminal justice cost estimate and the top bound of the 95% confidence interval for reduced reoffending	794	0.65	£155,271	£100,926	20%	20%	£3,205,407
Family Support → Avoided Health and Social Service Costs; Avoided Costs of Child in Care	Low - assuming lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for reduced reoffending; foster care cost	349	0.17	£10,951	£1,861.67	20%	20%	£45,304
	- annual foster care cost at 25% incidence (HMP Eastwood Park only)	69	0.25	£27,993	£6,998.25	20%	20%	
	Estimated - assuming MOJ finding for reduced reoffending; residential care cost	349	0.39	£10,951	£4,270.89	20%	20%	£184,856
	- annual residential care cost at 25% incidence (HMP Eastwood Park only)	69	0.25	£181,499	£45,374.75	20%	20%	
	High - assuming top bound of the 95% confidence interval for reduced reoffending; residential care cost	349	0.65	£10,951	£7,118	20%	20%	£224,604
	- annual residential care cost at 25% incidence (HMP Eastwood Park only)	69	0.25	£181,499	£45,374.75	20%	20%	
Resettlement Support → Avoided Housing, Unemployment, Benefits Advice Costs	Low - outcome incidence (amount of change) at 10% across unemployment, housing, and benefits advice	178	0.1	£9,229	£923	20%	20%	£6,571
	Estimated - outcome incidence (amount of change) at 50% across unemployment, housing, and benefits advice	178	0.5	£9,229	£4,615	20%	20%	£32,855
	High - outcome incidence (amount of change) at 75% across unemployment, housing, and benefits advice	178	0.75	£9,229	£6,921.75	20%	20%	£49,283

For visits the scenario breakdown is as follows:

- The *low scenario* assumes a “low” criminal justice cost estimate (£85,863: a weighted average of the separate male and female costs broken down in Table 2) and the lower bound of the estimated reduction in reoffending (seventeen per cent, the bottom of the ninety-five per cent confidence interval);
- The *estimated scenario* assumes the “low” criminal justice cost (£85,863) and the MOJ’s stated estimate for reduction in reoffending (thirty-nine per cent);
- The *high scenario* assumes “high” criminal justice costs (£155,271, again a weighted average of the separate male and female costs reflected in Table 2) and the upper bound of the estimated reduction in reoffending (sixty-five per cent).

For family supports, avoided health and social service costs are estimated for all three prisons, but avoided costs of a child taken into care are only calculated for HMP Eastwood Park on the conservative assumption that supports involving child custody are most representative at this women’s prison (beneficiaries are further adjusted to only include the eighty-seven per cent of family support recipients at this prison who have children). The scenario breakdown is as follows:

- The *low scenario* assumes the lower bound of the estimated reduction in reoffending (seventeen per cent, as above), and estimates the cost of children taken into care as the annual cost of foster care (£27,993, as in Table 6).
- The *estimated scenario* assumes the MOJ’s stated estimate for reduction in reoffending for prisoners receiving visits (thirty-nine per cent), and estimates the cost of children taken into care as the annual cost of residential care (£181,499, as in Table 6).
- The *high scenario* assumes the upper bound of the estimated reduction in reoffending for prisoners receiving visits (sixty-five per cent), and again assumes residential care costs (£181,499). The outcome incidence for children in care is set at twenty-five per cent in all scenarios.

For resettlement support, the *low scenario* assumes an outcome incidence (for housing, employment, and benefits advice combined) at ten per cent, the *estimated scenario* assumes fifty per cent, and the *high scenario* seventy-five per cent.

Throughout Table 12 the combined value after impact is calculated as the product of the combined number of IFS beneficiaries multiplied by

Combining these values and accounting for the annual cost of IFS at each site this study shows that IFS yields benefit-cost ratios of between £4.59 and £30.98 for every £1 invested.

the economic value per person (the unit cost less the outcome incidence), adjusted for deadweight and attribution.

Table 13: Benefit-Cost Ratios

Scenario	Combines values after impact	Benefit-cost ratio
Low	£515,465	4.59
Estimated	£1,281,240	11.41
High	£3,479,294	30.98

Combining these values, we arrive at estimated values for each scenario, as summarized in Table 13. Accounting for the annual cost of IFS at each site (£112,312 total for the three facilities), these yield benefit-cost ratios of between £4.59 and £30.98 for every £1 invested.

5. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that IFS's services are cost effective.

IFS delivers a return to society of approximately eleven times the investment.

This report has analysed the economic (State) impact generated by IFS work in three prisons specific to three areas: visits, support to families, and support toward resettlement. Our research is based on an analysis of case studies provided by IFS staff, interviews with staff members, and secondary research on prisoner needs, the provision of supports, and associated outcomes.

This study demonstrates that IFS's services are cost effective. Specific only to the three prisons on which we focus here, we estimate they deliver savings to the state of around £1,281,240 over only a one year period. Based on the annual cost of delivering the services at these sites, this represents a value of approximately eleven times the investment of £112,312 or £11.41 for every £1 invested.

The source of the impact is predominantly in cost savings from reductions in reoffending due to IFS work toward the encouragement and supporting of visits, resulting in the maintenance of family ties. Potential social and health care savings related to the families of prisoners have also been identified, as have modest cost avoidances accruing from work toward smoothing prisoners' resettlement.

Given the lack of systematic outcomes data collected on the three areas on which we focus, as well as the other probable impacts connected to IFS support, and in consideration of the strength of the secondary research literature on prisoner needs, we find it reasonable to assume that the impact of IFS's work is potentially being under-claimed here. Further research into the link between the provision of supports and reductions in reoffending, reduced social service and health costs, and smoother resettlement is needed to effectively model IFS's impact. Additional impacts, not least including the future potential positive impacts on the children of prisoners, should also be explored.

Toward this, IFS should consider, to the extent possible and practicable, recording outcomes systematically and longitudinally. While IFS staff do collect valuable evidence, in the form of administrative tracking of session numbers, types, sources, duration, etc., this could be helpfully supplemented by directly asking IFS clients about their experience of the service and the impacts it generated for them. Doing so would make the analysis more empirical and potentially enable IFS to identify further value.

This analysis has been prepared using Social Return on Investment (SROI) principles, but we have focused solely on the economic impacts of IFS's work. Beyond this, the case study evidence and secondary research literature suggests that the supports provided also generate social impacts, including a material impact on the well-

being of prisoners and their families. Moving forward, IFS may consider adopting a full SROI analysis which would place a value on these improvements, bringing this social value onto the balance sheet alongside its economic role.

Appendix: Results by Prison

Results for HMS Swansea

Population Affected		Notes
Total # of prisoners/families supported by IFS in 1 year	334	Includes both prisoners and families
# case studies in research	6	Source: IFS staff
Annual cost of IFS at HMP Swansea	£35,972	Source: IFS staff
Cost per prisoner/family supported	£108	
% representation of IFS work:		
Visits	85%	Source: IFS staff
Support to Families	8%	Source: IFS staff
Resettlement	7%	Source: IFS staff

Impact Findings

Visits: Economic impact		
Reduced Reoffending	£371,090	
Support to Families: Economic impact		
Avoided social service and health costs	£4,442	
Resettlement Support: Economic impact		
Avoided housing costs	£2,613	
Avoided unemployment costs	£1,772	
Avoided benefits counselling	£45	
Total Economic impact		
Total One Year Economic Impact	£379,962	
Cost Benefit Ratio	10.56	

Sensitivity Analysis	Economic Impact	Cost Benefit Ratio
Low Scenario: Total	£164,578	4.58
Visits	£161,757	
Support to Families	£1,936	
Resettlement Support	£885	
Estimated Scenario: Total	£379,962	10.56
Visits	£371,090	
Support to Families	£4,442	
Resettlement Support	£4,430	
High Scenario: Total	£1,145,041	31.83
Visits	£1,130,993	
Support to Families	£7,403	
Resettlement Support	£6,645	

Results for HMS Wandsworth

Total population affected		Source/notes
Total # of prisoners/families supported by IFS in 1 year	562	Includes both prisoners and families; projected from 6 month figures
# case studies in research	8	
Annual cost of IFS at HMP Wandsworth	£40,368	Source: IFS staff
Cost per prisoner/family supported	£72	
% representation of IFS work:		
Visits	49%	Source: IFS staff
Support to Families	56%	Source: IFS staff
Resettlement	25%	Source: IFS staff

Impact Findings

Visits: Economic impact

Reduced Reoffending £274,398

Support to Families: Economic impact

Avoided social service and health costs £41,684

Resettlement Support: Economic impact

Avoided housing costs £11,759

Avoided unemployment costs £7,975

Avoided benefits counselling £201

Total Economic impact

Total One Year Economic Impact £336,016

Cost Benefit Ratio 8.32

Sensitivity Analysis

	Economic Impact	Cost Benefit Ratio
Low Scenario: Total	£141,766	3.51
Visits	£119,609	
Support to Families	£18,170	
Resettlement Support	£3,987	
Estimated Scenario: Total	£336,016	8.32
Visits	£274,398	
Support to Families	£41,684	
Resettlement Support	£19,935	
High Scenario: Total	£935,672	23.18
Visits	£836,297	
Support to Families	£69,473	
Resettlement Support	£29,902	

Results for HMS Eastwood Park

Total population affected		Source/notes
Total # of prisoners/families supported by IFS in 1 year	416	Includes both prisoners and families
# case studies in research	6	
Annual cost of IFS at HMP Eastwood Park	35,972	Source: IFS staff
Cost per family of IFS?	£86	
% representation of IFS work:		
Visits	72%	Source: IFS staff
Support to Families	19%	Source: IFS staff
Resettlement	11%	Source: IFS staff

Impact Findings

Visits: Economic impact

Reduced Reoffending £418,041

Support to Families: Economic impact

Avoided social service and health costs £13,496

Avoided costs of child in care £125,234

Resettlement Support: Economic impact

Avoided housing costs £5,008

Avoided unemployment costs £3,397

Avoided benefits counselling £86

Total Economic impact

Total One Year Economic Impact £565,262

Cost Benefit Ratio 15.71

Sensitivity Analysis

	Economic Impact	Cost Benefit Ratio
Low Scenario: Total	£209,119	5.81
Visits	£182,223	
Support to Families	£25,198	
Resettlement Support	£1,698	
Estimated Scenario: Total	£565,262	15.71
Visits	£418,041	
Support to Families	£138,730	
Resettlement Support	£8,491	
High Scenario: Total	£1,398,581	38.88
Visits	£1,238,117	
Support to Families	£147,728	
Resettlement Support	£12,736	

Endnotes

- ¹ Reckoning of support percentages may not sum to one hundred per cent due to beneficiaries receiving more than one area of IFS support.
- ² Stewart, D. (2008). The problems and needs of newly sentenced prisoners: results from a national survey. *Ministry of Justice Research Series 16/08*.
- ³ Williams, K., Poyser, J., Hopkins, K. (2012). Accommodation, homelessness and reoffending of prisoners: Results from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) survey. *Ministry of Justice Research Summary 3/12*.
- ⁴ Stewart, D. (2008). The problems and needs of newly sentenced prisoners: results from a national survey. *Ministry of Justice Research Series 16/08*.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁷ National Audit Office (2010). Managing offenders on short custodial sentences.
- ⁸ Williams, K., Papadopoulou, V., Booth, N. (2012). Prisoners' childhood and family backgrounds: Results from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) longitudinal cohort study of prisoners. *Ministry of Justice Research Series 4/12*.
- ⁹ Ministry of Justice (2010). Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders.
- ¹⁰ Department for Work and Pensions (2012). Social Justice: transforming lives.
- ¹¹ Gojkovic, D., Meek, R., Mills, A. (2011). Offender engagement with third sector organisations: a national prison-based survey. *Third Sector Research Centre: Working Paper 61*.
- ¹² Stewart, D. (2008). The problems and needs of newly sentenced prisoners: results from a national survey. *Ministry of Justice Research Series 16/08*.
- ¹³ The Centre for Social Justice. (2009). Breakthrough Britain: Locked Up Potential.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶ Farrant, F. (2001) Waiting for no-one. *Prison Report 55, 7-8*. referenced in Loucks, N. (2005). Keeping in touch: the case for family support work in prison. *Prison Reform Trust*.
- ¹⁷ Niven, S, Stewart, D. (2005). Resettlement outcomes on release from prison in 2003. *Home Office Findings 248*.
- ¹⁸ The Social Exclusion Unit (2002). Reducing reoffending by ex-prisoners. *Office of the Deputy Prime Minister*.
- ¹⁹ May, C., Sharma, N., Stewart, D. (2008). Factors linked to reoffending: a one-year follow-up of prisoners who took part in the Resettlement Surveys 2001, 2003 and 2004. *Ministry of Justice Research Summary 5*. Logistic regression determined the odds-ratio

for one-year reoffending to be 1.39 (between 1.17 and 1.64 at a 95% confidence interval).

²⁰ Approach informed by Frontier Economics (2008). St. Giles Trust's Through the Gates: An analysis of economic impact.

²¹ This is the approach adopted by New Philanthropy Capital (2005). Investing in Family Ties.

²² Barry, M. (2009). Good Practice in Projects Working with Prisoners' Families. *The Robertson Trust*.

²³ Williams, K., Papadopoulou, V., Booth, N. (2012). Prisoners' childhood and family backgrounds: Results from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) longitudinal cohort study of prisoners. *Ministry of Justice Research Series 4/12*.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Murray, J., Farrington, D. (2008). The effects of parental imprisonment on children. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (Vol. 37, pp. 133-206). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

²⁶ Smith, R., Grimshaw, R., Romeo, R., Knapp, M. (2007). Poverty and disadvantage among prisoners' families. *Joseph Rowntree Foundation*.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Department for Education (2010). Evidence for Think Family: Guidance Note 03.

²⁹ Howard League (2011). The Voice of a Child.

³⁰ Baroness Corston (2007). A Review of Women with Particular Vulnerabilities in the Criminal Justice System. London: Home Office.

³¹ Department for Education (2011). The Family Savings Calculator.

³² The Social Exclusion Unit (2002). Reducing reoffending by ex-prisoners. *Office of the Deputy Prime Minister*.

³³ Niven, S, Stewart, D. (2005). Resettlement outcomes on release from prison in 2003. *Home Office Findings 248*.

³⁴ Williams, K., Poyser, J., Hopkins, K. (2012). Accommodation, homelessness and reoffending of prisoners: Results from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) survey. *Ministry of Justice Research Summary 3/12*.

³⁵ The Social Exclusion Unit (2002). Reducing reoffending by ex-prisoners. *Office of the Deputy Prime Minister*.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ May, C., Sharma, N., Stewart, D. (2008). Factors linked to reoffending: a one-year follow-up of prisoners who took part in the Resettlement Surveys 2001, 2003 and 2004. *Ministry of Justice Research Summary 5*.

³⁸ HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales. (2011). Annual Report 2010-11. *The Stationery Office*.

Cover Image: Khalid Almasoud, via Flickr