



Turning Point Project: Learning by testing

*Peter Neyroud, Institute of Criminology, University of
Cambridge
And Molly Slothower, University of Maryland*

- ◎ Overview of Turning Point
 - ◎ Turning Point outline
 - ◎ 6 sets of early facts
 - ◎ 5 innovative approaches
 - ◎ What's Next...

Deterrence and Desistance: Operation Turning Point Overview


- ◎ **Hypothesis** is that police can prevent crime by a combined treatment
 - Holding a prosecution over the offender (Deterrence)
 - Agreeing a contract to support the offender to stop offending (Desistance)
 - But insisting on compliance in return for non-prosecution (Deterrence)
- ◎ **Treatment** is a deferred prosecution with conditions, targeted at the 60+% of offenders who can be assessed as a “low risk of serious harm”
- ◎ **Method** is an Randomised Controlled Trial

Operation 'Turning Point'

- **Sample**: offenders whom the police have decided to prosecute, who are:
- Low risk offenders
 - Who have no previous conviction (they may have previous cautions or other diversions)
 - or one prior conviction (more than 5 years ago if an adult and 2 years ago if juvenile).
 - And offence is not likely to result in instant prison sentence
- **Randomly assigning them to prosecution or police offender management**
- Developing and testing a standard protocol of tactics for police offender management

The Turning Point Experiment


Sample of offenders whom the police have decided to prosecute.



Comparing like with like:

Measure reoffending, cost, victim satisfaction

Turning Point Phases



Phase 1 – Court only

Phase 2 – TPP only

**Phase 3 – Randomised:
Low Treatment as Assigned**

**Phase 4 – Randomised:
High Treatment as Assigned**

Turning Point: a complex RCT

- ◎ A lot of “moving parts” are inevitable in a pipeline experiment testing treatments for offenders
- ◎ Data is complex, processes are complex and journey is extended and bumpy
- ◎ This type of experiment requires:
 - Embedded researcher model
 - Academic-Police partnership
 - A “coalition” of effort


6 Early facts

- ◎ Final sample
- ◎ Crimes and Gender
- ◎ Employment status
- ◎ Ethnicity
- ◎ Court Results
- ◎ Turning Point Conditions


Early fact 1: final sample

	Adult (337)	Juvenile (87)
Personal Victim (260)	200	60
No Personal Victim (164)	137	27

Early fact 2: Crimes and Gender




Early fact 3: Employment status




Early fact 4: Ethnicity


**Turning Point
*Ethnicity***



**Turning Point
*Ethnicity by Treatment Group***



Early fact 5: Court results



Court appearances

Of the 210 cases that have gone to court (21% not yet completed), 438 court appearances and counting:

- 95 Youth Court appearances
- 310 Magistrate Court appearances
- 33 Crown Court appearances

Early fact 6: Turning Point Conditions

⦿ **Restoration/Reparation 65%**

- Compensation 40%
- Community Payback 36%
- Letter of Apology 20%

⦿ **Rehabilitation 58%**

- SMART Team 36%
- Employment 16%
- Mental Health 11%
- Housing 5%
- Anger management 2%
- Debt 2%
- Drug Search 2%

⦿ **Movement Constraint 33%**

- Exclusion Zone 27%
- Not to Contact Victim 15%

⦿ **Requirement to comply with contract and stop offending under threat of prosecution**

Desistance

Deterrence

TPP Non-compliance (1st half of sample):

Approximately comparable to court

- ◎ 22 breached

- 10 due to failure to appear at initial appt
 - *(Court: 7 offences resulted in FTA warrants)*
- 7 due to rearrests
- 5 later non-compliance

- ◎ 8 Declined

- Equal parts guilty and not guilty

5 Innovations

- ◎ Deferred Prosecution
- ◎ Algorithmic policing
- ◎ Practitioner Randomization
- ◎ Guided Discretion
- ◎ Victims team and the victim's script

Innovation no 1: Deferred prosecution

- ◎ Using a deferred prosecution rather than a caution
- ◎ Advantages:
 - Does not require admission of guilt
 - Clear that you are not “letting someone off with a caution”
 - But expecting compliance and good behaviour in return for no conviction
 - Relatively high levels of attendance at treatments

Innovation No 2: Algorithmic policing

- ◎ Using a computer based triage algorithm to guide discretion
- ◎ Cambridge Gateway has been developed to be a triage tool to sort offenders suitable for Turning Point Treatment.
- ◎ 17000+ cases to be analysed
- ◎ Question 14/17 allows analysis of discretion decisions

Question 17:

17. Is there any other **EXCEPTIONAL** reason to exclude this case from Turning Point? Yes No

If yes please explain in the box below:

Innovation No 3: Practitioner randomisation


- ◎ Cambridge Gateway has been expanded to be a user tool for randomisation
- ◎ Advantages: practitioners owning the randomisation process
- ◎ Disadvantages: maintaining consistency

Innovation No. 4: Guided Discretion

- ◎ Finding a “professional” balance between two traditional models of discretion and control:
 - Field discretion fettered only by principles and training
 - Standing Operating procedure model in which discretion is fettered by detailed procedures


Decision-Making: A Third Way

Question 17, Portal, LS-CMI



Early Rehabilitative Conditions

40% of cases 3 for 3 (n=155)



Professional Decision Support IT

TURNING POINT PLAN

Inputter SLOTHOWER_N3602

ID 245

Trigger

Activity / Condition

Completion Date

Evidence

Document List

You may select a recommended condition/trigger or add your own.
To add your own:

- select trigger/condition
- select "other" instead of standard conditions:
- enter condition into the "describe condition here"

NOTE: You can edit recommended conditions (eg. change curfew hours) in the "Step 2 create plan" page

Innovation No 5: The Victims team

- ◎ Experimenting with how to overcome the service gap between organisational intent and victim experience
- ◎ Using the lessons from Restorative Justice research
 - To create a 'victim's script' to engage and encourage participation
 - Training a small cadre of officers to deliver
 - Testing with an RCT within an RCT.

Victims RCT: results to come

- ◎ Randomised controlled trial
- ◎ TPP Victims significantly more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied
 - 71% TPP vs. 51% Court
 - TPP victims more likely to think outcome will work to stop offender from reoffending
 - 62% Court – preferred TPP conditions even if diverted from court
- ◎ Dramatic improvement from early sample
- ◎ Full results to follow

Turning Point Timetable

- ◎ June 2014: data collection complete
- ◎ July 2014: Initial Victim RCT data complete and detailed analysis at ASC in November after presentation to WMP
- ◎ September 2014: Survival analysis – time to failure
- ◎ June 2015: first year reoffending data
- ◎ June 2016: 2nd year reoffending data