

# ALMOST A CENTURY OF RESIDENTIAL WORK WITH OFFENDERS: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE ROLES OF APPROVED PREMISES

***Dr Emma Wincup, Senior Lecturer in Criminology and Criminal Justice,  
Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of Leeds***

## Abstract

This article charts the development of residential work with offenders, explores its place within contemporary criminal justice and speculates upon its future role. Its starting point is the 1914 Criminal Justice Administration Act which gave the courts powers to add a condition of residence to a probation order and paved the way for the establishment of hostels for young people. Over a period of almost a century, the contribution of hostels to the delivery of criminal justice has altered significantly and hostels, known as approved premises since the implementation of the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000, are used increasingly for supervising high-risk adult male offenders following their release from prison. Approved premises were not considered in Carter's strategic review of correctional services yet they appear well-placed to support the policy aspirations it advanced. In particular, they can contribute to the end-to-end management of offenders from whom the public must be protected. However, one barrier to effective practice is that little is known about 'what works' in relation to residential work with offenders thus further research is needed to develop an evidence base.

**Key words:** Approved premises, hostels, offenders, probation, residential work

---

## Introduction

Hostels<sup>1</sup> for offenders, known as approved premises since the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000, have been in existence for almost a century. During that period they have served a range of functions, sometimes simultaneously, including providing accommodation for offenders whose home circumstances were deemed inappropriate for leading crime-free lives; supporting offenders serving community penalties; offering an alternative to remands in custody for defendants awaiting trial or sentence; protecting the public and resettling ex-prisoners released on licence. Consequently over the years they

have accommodated diverse groups of offenders: convicted and unconvicted, adults and young offenders, petty offenders and high-risk offenders and have made, albeit rather inconspicuously, a wide-ranging contribution to the criminal justice system. Based on a review of the relatively small number of studies on approved premises, Burnett and Eaton (2004) went as far as to argue that they have been under-rated in criminal justice history: at times, they had been under-used if not wasted, and had certainly not been used to their full advantage. They speculated that approved premises are 'poised to become a more prominent and recognised asset in the criminal justice system' (p.34).

Current provision stands at 104 approved premises providing 2300 beds for offenders (National Probation Directorate, 2006a). Virtually all of the 42 probation areas in England and Wales have at least one approved premise based (National Probation Directorate, 2006a) with the greatest concentrations in large metropolitan areas such as London, Greater Manchester and the West Midlands. Overall, in March 2003, ten per cent of beds were reserved for women in five women-only and 33 'mixed' approved premises (Foster, 2004). 'Mixed' in this context typically describes approved premises which accommodate predominantly men but reserve a small number of beds for women (Wincup, 1996). These are gradually being replaced because a policy decision was taken in 2004 to require regions to commence a programme of reconfiguration of resources in order to end mixed provision and create an estate of facilities with single sex admission only (National Probation Directorate, 2004a).

In this short article, we will explore the history of residential work with offenders, focusing in particular on the different roles approved premises have performed during their lifetime. The Carter review of correctional services (Carter, 2003) failed to explore the future contribution of approved premises and similarly this was not acknowledged in the government's response (Home Office, 2004). However, approved premises are well placed to contribute to the new approach outlined in these documents for managing offenders and the article ends by discussing potential roles approved premises might play to fulfil policy aspirations relating to reducing reoffending and public protection.

## A Brief History of Residential Work with Offenders

Residential work with offenders can be traced back to the Criminal Justice Administration Act 1914 which aimed to 'diminish the number of cases committed to prison, to amend the Law with respect to the treatment and punishment of young offenders, and otherwise to improve the Administration of Criminal Justice'. The Act built upon the Probation of Offenders Act 1907 and allowed a condition of residence to be attached to a probation order. In direct response, a number of charities established hostels for young people, which aimed to offer a disciplined and character building experience for young offenders whose homes were considered unsuitable for successful rehabilitation. The first hostels were small, based on an extended family model and run without the support of the Home Office. As a more professional criminal justice system emerged, the Home Office became concerned about this seemingly ad hoc and inconsistent provision and in 1927 a

Departmental Committee report recommended that that Home Office should approve (but not manage), inspect and fund hostels. These recommendations were enshrined in the 1948 Criminal Justice Act which empowered the Home Secretary to approve and regulate hostels for offenders aged between 15 and 21.

Following the prohibition of probation orders for those under 17 in the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act, hostels lost their original rationale of providing temporary accommodation for young petty offenders who went out to work during the day. As a consequence they established themselves as a resource the courts could draw upon to accommodate defendants awaiting trial and, to a lesser extent, offenders on probation orders. The practice of providing hostel accommodation for bailees began in 1971 when one wing of a Salvation Army hostel was designated as an experimental project. The Home Office evaluation of the first nine months revealed some difficulties, mainly relating to tensions between the various voluntary and statutory sector stakeholders but also pointed to low rates of reoffending, high levels of successful completions and positive feedback from residents (Simon and Wilson, 1975). The Criminal Justice Act 1972 allowed for public funds to be used to develop and manage bail hostels and by 1973 the Home Secretary was allowed to approve and regulate them. A year later, probation hostels were permitted to accommodate bailees which paved the way for the development of generic provision. By 1992 just over a quarter of approved premises were solely for bailees (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 1993) and this proportion had dropped to one-tenth by 1998 (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 1998).

During the 1970s and 1980s, the approved premises estate grew gradually despite an explicit recommendation in 1978 by the House of Commons Expenditure Committee to increase provision, especially for bailees, to reduce pressure on the prison system. The slow rate of growth was largely due to public resistance at a local level to opening new approved premises. In response to prison overcrowding in the late 1980s and 1990s, an expansion programme was put in motion with promises of an additional 1,800 beds. Before these could be made available, a policy 'U' turn was taken with an announcement that some approved premises would be closed. Managerialism, with its emphasis on economy, efficiency and effectiveness, began to have an impact on the approved premises estate by introducing occupancy targets (Home Office, 1994). Between 1993 and 1997 15 approved premises closed, despite a rising prison population, on the grounds of low levels of occupancy, lack of economic viability and unsuitability. The new targets encouraged the criminal justice system to make greater use of the remaining provision to offset partially the reduced number of beds.

The introduction of *National Standards for the Supervision of Offenders in the Community* in 1992 (Home Office, 1992) can be viewed as a further manifestation of managerialism. These offered an opportunity to clarify the role of approved premises. Lack of space precludes a detailed consideration of the key differences between the editions. In brief, the notion of approved premises providing an 'enhanced level of supervision' was a recurring theme in the first four editions but combined with an explicit commitment to public

protection in the 2000 and 2002 versions (Home Office, 2000; Home Office, 2002). In the latest version, the aim of protecting the public from offenders or bailees posing a high or very high-risk of harm is emphasised but the reference to an 'enhanced level of supervision' has disappeared (National Offender Management Service, 2005), although enhanced supervision was referred to and defined in a probation circular on the role and purpose of approved premises issued in the same year (National Probation Directorate, 2005).

The amendment to *National Standards* is the outcome of a series of reviews which took place following a proposal in *Making Punishments Work: Report of a Review of the Sentencing Framework for England and Wales* (Halliday, 2001) to review the 'intermediate estate' (which includes approved premises) with the aim of developing a strategic plan for its future use, staffing management and development. In response, an approved premises and offender housing strategy for higher risk offenders was published in 2004 (National Probation Directorate, 2004b), and this clarified the role of approved premises. This strategy noted the need to ensure that, in the interests of public protection, approved premises are predominantly used for offenders assessed as very high and high risk of harm. Additionally, a resources review was commissioned to determine what resources (financial, staff and other) are needed to fulfil the stated purpose of approved premises. This involved making recommendations for changes to the staffing structure of approved premises, funding arrangements, performance indicators and the collection of information and information technology. With the exception of introducing double waking cover (having two members of staff awake rather than one on duty and one asleep in the approved premises but on call) during the night to protect further the public, staff and residents and to ensure curfews were monitored rigorously, none of the other recommendations have been implemented because of the uncertainty created by the development of the National Offender Management Service (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 2007).

These developments ran parallel to the development and implementation of an Approved Premises Pathfinder. In the conclusion to the 1998 thematic inspection report (HM Inspectorate of Probation), the inspectors commented on their repeated use of the terms 'varied', 'ranging between' and 'inconsistent' to describe service provision and recommended that the Home Office took steps to address this inequitable provision. The Approved Premises Pathfinder was part of this process. It was neither an attempt to standardise practice nor to stifle innovation. Instead, its role was to identify best practice and disseminate it widely. The main components of the Pathfinder were pro-social modelling, motivational work and a groupwork programme entitled *Living Here: Moving On* (LiHMO), backed up by rigorous quality assurance procedures. Together they aimed to enhance the impact of accredited programmes and support community reintegration, targeted at offenders who were at high-risk of reoffending and/or harm. The Pathfinder ran in eight approved premises from October 2001 and was evaluated over the first eighteen months (Wincup et al, 2004). Overall the findings of the evaluation did not indicate that the Pathfinder has been unequivocally successful, which is unsurprising given that the project team continued to design the Pathfinder during the course of the

evaluation. The report remains unpublished but we will draw upon some of the findings later in the article. In 2004, the National Probation Directorate (NPD) made the decision not to roll-out the Approved Premises Pathfinder. However, individual premises do use some components when conducting residential work with offenders. For example, LiHMO is now running in nearly 20 approved premises in addition to the eight Pathfinder ones (Cherry and Cheston, 2006).

## The Changing Nature of Residential Work with Offenders

Before moving on to discuss the future contribution of approved premises to criminal justice, it is worth emphasising four main changes which have taken place during the lifetime of approved premises.

Firstly, responsibility for the management of residential work with offenders no longer rests solely with charitable bodies. The implications of the changes which took place in the later 1940s and the early 1970s were to shift responsibility for provision of residential work with offenders from the voluntary to the statutory sector. Although a 'mixed economy' still exists, a survey conducted by the NPD in March 2003 found that only 12 of the 100 approved premises in operation at the time were owned and managed by the voluntary sector: the vast majority were managed by probation boards (Foster, 2004). However, the situation may come full circle because the Offender Management Bill 2006, now progressing through the House of Lords, will almost certainly alter the way approved premises are funded and managed. In the new era of contestability, contractors from the voluntary and private sector will be allowed to develop and manage approved premises. The facilities management functions of approved premises (catering, cleaning, maintenance etc) were contracted out in 2002.

Secondly, there has been a growth in the proportion of approved premises willing to accommodate a wide range of offenders. Approved premises can now be divided into three main types: generalised, which accommodate all categories of offenders; specialist, which also take all groups but specialise in accommodating particular groups such as sex offenders; and approved premises which restrict admission to certain categories of offenders (Burnett and Eaton, 2004). Examples of the latter include approved premises solely for mentally disordered offenders and the new PROSPECTS premises which accommodate problem drug users who have served a short prison sentence. Most approved premises are generalist although approximately two-thirds restrict admission to male offenders (Foster, 2004) and those located near schools are unable to house child sex offenders (National Probation Directorate, 2006b).

Thirdly, approved premises now accommodate a resident group whose characteristics stand in stark contrast to those they were originally set up to accommodate. The absence of detailed information at a national level has made it difficult to chart accurately changes in the resident group now accommodated in approved premises. At the time of the 1993 thematic inspection (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 1993) 69 per cent of the residents

were bailees and this proportion had dropped to 62 per cent by the time of the 1998 inspection (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 1998). Similarly the proportion of residents serving community orders fell from 25 per cent to 20 per cent but the proportion subject to post-release supervision increased from six per cent to 13 per cent. In March 2003 when the NPD snapshot survey was conducted (Foster, 2004), the proportion of residents on licence had increased dramatically to 47 per cent and the proportion on bail and serving community orders to 33 per cent and 17 per cent respectively. In general terms, the resident group is also older, typically aged between 22 and 41, and assessed as medium or high-risk of harm (Foster, 2004). The NPD snapshot survey (Foster, 2004) found that almost three-quarters of male residents (72 per cent) had been placed in these two categories and similarly, almost half (49 per cent) of female residents.

Fourthly, the aims of approved premises have moved from providing supported accommodation on to serving as an alternative to custody, on again to offering an enhanced level of supervision and ending with a focus on public protection. These shifts have mirrored broader changes in the work of the Probation Service.

## Looking Towards the Future: What Role Might Approved Premises Play in the Criminal Justice System?

In this section, we will explore four possible roles for approved premises: diverting offenders from custody, reducing reoffending, resettling ex-prisoners and protecting the public. We will draw upon the available, albeit limited, research evidence to evaluate how effectively approved premises have performed these roles in the past and identify gaps in the evidence base for developing residential work with offenders.

### Diverting Offenders from Custody

As the prison population reaches 80,000 (National Offender Management Service, 2007), any contribution made by the approved premises estate to divert offenders from custody is welcomed. Approved premises, at least in theory, have always served as an alternative to custody. In the 1970s, approved premises established themselves as resource for adult offenders who would not be granted bail or a community penalty without a condition of residence. However, the research evidence on whether they were successfully offering an alternative to prison is equivocal. A small number of studies have questioned whether approved premises do actually offer an alternative to custodial remands. Whilst some research studies were able to state with confidence that approved premises were accommodating offenders at grave risk of being remanded in custody (White and Brody, 1980), others found evidence of net-widening (Pratt and Bray; 1985; Lewis and Mair, 1989); in other words, hostels were accommodating those who would previously have been allowed to remain in their own accommodation rather than diverting offenders from custody. These studies found that in some cases – described by Pratt and Bray (1985: 171) as ‘significant’ and Lewis and Mair (1989: 4) as ‘many’ – offenders were referred unnecessarily to hostels and that they were being used to provide support for offenders

with serious social problems (Lewis and Mair, 1980). Approved premises today accommodate a different group to the past and their main role in diverting offenders from custody is facilitating the release of prisoners on licence. Replicating the earlier studies to explore whether any evidence of net-widening can be found would be fruitful, particularly in light of the stated desire to limit an expensive and scarce resource to high-risk of harm offenders.

### Reducing Reoffending

It has been argued elsewhere that the limited number of studies of approved premises have been concerned with their role as an alternative to custody rather than a resource to promote desistance from crime (Wincup, 2002). There is, however, a limited amount of data which suggest that reoffending rates during the period of residence are low. These data are not routinely available. However, the most recent thematic inspection of 17 approved premises (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 1998) found that less than four per cent of residents were known to have been charged with or convicted of an offence committed during their period of residence. In 2004, the HM Inspectorate of Probation’s review of eight approved premises calculated a reconviction rate of three per cent (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 2004). In a recent report, the inspectors also note that the rate of serious further offences notified to the Home Office Public Protection Unit was significantly lower than for offenders not resident in an approved premise (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 2007). It would be useful to conduct a reconviction study involving a larger sample of approved premises and use Police National Computer data to analyse reconviction data for residents during their stay and following their release.

Whilst the work of approved premises appears to be effective in terms of reducing reoffending, on a temporary basis at least, little is known about the work undertaken in approved premises to achieve this goal. The evaluation of the Approved Premises Pathfinder collected data on the main interventions residents were participating in across eight Pathfinder and eight comparison approved premises. This revealed that far fewer residents than expected were attending offending behaviour programmes. Across the eight Pathfinder premises, out of a total of 372 residents only 15 per cent were attending a programme, mostly accredited substance misuse programmes. A higher proportion had attended a prison-based programme, especially Enhanced Thinking Skills, in the previous two years (33 per cent) and five per cent had attended a community-based programme during the same period. Whilst participation rates were lower than anticipated, completion rates were encouraging. It was reported that 57 residents from Pathfinder approved premises attended programmes while they were living in an approved premises and 29 of these completed the programme during their period of residence. Periods of residence do not always allow sufficient time for residents to complete an offending behaviour programme, particularly those that comprise a large number of sessions, for example sex offender programmes. Consequently, the completion rate of 51 per cent is likely to be an under-estimate. Data gathered from the eight comparison approved premises similarly revealed low levels of participation in programmes during the period of residence but encouraging completion rates (Wincup et al, 2004).

Residents from the Pathfinder approved premises were participating in a range of partnership activities (Wincup et al, 2004). Staff did not have, nor could they be expected to have, the range of specialist knowledge or resources which would enable them to provide the specific interventions needed to meet residents' assessed criminogenic and other needs in relation to health and well-being, employability and accommodation. Consequently, they acted as brokers, linking residents with individuals and organisations that could offer specialist help. As one resident put it: 'if the staff here don't know the answer, they know someone who does'. Addressing residents' needs in relation to health and well-being, accommodation and employability was common to all approved premises. However, variations in the ways in which staff accessed these interventions, and how they were financed, may owe more to geographic location than differences in residents' needs between approved premises. Almost half of the 372 residents (48 per cent) had participated in at least one intervention: the most popular were employment, education and training (32 per cent); housing (25 per cent); drug services (20 per cent); and basic skills (19 per cent). Participation rates from the eight comparison approved premises were higher (approximately two-thirds of residents) but revealed that residents were accessing similar services (Wincup et al, 2004).

A recent literature review attempted to piece together the available evidence in terms of the factors associated with effective practice but concluded that 'it is not yet possible to claim knowledge of what works in Approved Premises' and it is not appropriate to translate effective practice in the field to residential settings (Burnett and Eaton, 2004: 26). The Approved Premises Pathfinder was an attempt to rectify this. Two of the project developers have drawn upon the lessons learnt from the Pathfinder and similar initiatives in North America and proposed a model regime (Cherry and Cheston, 2006). Whilst this is a welcome contribution to the development of effective practice, it needs to be supplemented by two important pieces of work identified in the Pathfinder evaluation (Wincup et al, 2004). The first is to take stock of existing work in approved premises to address the criminogenic needs of residents to ensure best practice is shared across the estate. The second is to explore how work undertaken with residents in approved premises can be integrated into work undertaken by the supervising officer (typically not based in an approved premise). The development of the offender management model provides an opportunity to review existing arrangements which have been characterised by approved premises working with offenders in isolation.

### **Resettlement of ex-Prisoners**

Given that approximately half of residents living in approved premises are subject to post-release licence, approved premises clearly have a role in terms of resettling ex-prisoners. The Approved Premises Pathfinder included a groupwork programme (Living Here: Moving On, abbreviated to LiHMO). It was specifically devised for residents in approved premises and consisted of nine modules. LiHMO focuses on behaviour occurring daily in approved premises, aims to support and develop pro-social behaviours, and attempts to transfer learning from this to life outside the approved premises. LiHMO takes a cognitive behavioural approach, which aims to change offender thinking and therefore behaviour

from anti-social to pro-social. LiHMO also uses problem-solving models to enable offenders to develop their cognitive skills. The final evaluation report recommended that the programme should be developed further, despite mixed feedback from residents, because participation in the programme appeared to have a positive impact on the likelihood of successfully completing a period of residence in an approved premise. Given the relatively small number of residents who attended the programme (n=47), this should not be interpreted as providing unequivocal evidence of the effectiveness of LiHMO (Wincup et al, 2004).

The evaluation of the Approved Premises Pathfinder (Wincup et al, 2004) included a follow-up study to explore the transitions residents made from an approved premise to the community. A survey approach was adopted using a postal questionnaire, achieving a response rate of 64 per cent. The achieved sample consisted of 46 ex-residents: 17 from Pathfinder approved premises and 29 from comparison approved premises. The small sample size precluded reliable differentiation between the experiences of ex-residents from Pathfinder and comparison approved premises and inevitably comprises of ex-residents with relatively settled living arrangements. However, the findings provide some original insight into the range of experiences residents face after leaving an approved premise, revealing that approved premises can play a key role in terms of providing residents with the skills needed to access support with problems they encounter.

All ex-residents had successfully completed their period of residence. Almost all were men (n=43) who has been admitted to an approved premise on licence (n=41). The age of respondents ranged from 24 to 73: the mean age was 44. The length of time they had spent in an approved premise varied from 27 to 433 days: the median was 132 days. The follow-up study revealed that some ex-residents were still experiencing considerable problems finding and/or keeping a job and accessing permanent accommodation. Ex-residents were still able to identify a range of unmet resettlement needs relating to housing, employment, health and finance. More positively, the majority were aware of sources of help for the difficulties they were experiencing and levels of contact with services were high, particularly the Probation Service and Jobcentre Plus.

### **Protecting the Public**

During the 1990s, a number of agencies (especially police and probation) began to work together to manage high-risk offenders. Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) were introduced formally in 2001 following the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000 and involve joint working between criminal justice and social care agencies (health, social services, housing) in all 42 probation areas. While not all approved premises residents are subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs), approved premises are central to these arrangements because they offer an intensive regime, monitoring and surveillance, and accommodation for offenders who pose a sufficiently high-risk of harm to the community.

It has been argued that the introduction of Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements in 2001 might explain the increased in the proportion of sex offenders

living in approved premises (Foster, 2004). At the time of the 1998 thematic inspection only 25 per cent of residents had been charged with or found guilty of a sexual offence (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 1998), a proportion which had risen to 41 per cent when the NPD snapshot survey was conducted in March 2003 (Foster, 2004). The majority of these (84 per cent) were Schedule One offenders who had committed offences against children (Foster, 2004).

The data gathered via the NPD snapshot survey suggest that whilst approved premises are now defined as a resource for high-risk of harm offenders or bailees (National Offender Management Service, 2005), significant proportions of residents do not fall into these categories. The NPD snapshot survey (Foster, 2004) used a three-fold categorisation of risk of harm (low, medium and high) rather than the four-fold one (low, medium, high and very high) calculated using the Offender Assessment System (OASys) and the tools used to calculate risk of harm are not specified. Whilst not directly comparable the data can still be used to identify that 61 per cent of males and 70 per cent of females fall outside the target group (i.e. they were assessed as either low or medium risk of harm) specified in *National Standards 2005* (National Offender Management Service, 2005). Women, in particular, are unlikely to fit into the new target group. The NPD snapshot survey (Foster, 2004) illustrated clearly the different profile of female and male residents. On average, female residents were younger, more likely to be living in an approved premises because of a condition of residence attached to bail or a community order and judged to present a lesser risk of harm (Foster, 2004). They were also more likely to be defined as mentally disordered and experiencing drug/alcohol problems and psychological emotional problems (Foster, 2004). The NPD strategy (NPD, 2004a) fails to explore the gendered implications of the proposed reconfiguration of the estate in any detail but implies that for women assessed as low and medium risk of harm, alternatives to approved premises should be developed.

Whilst approved premises perform a key role in terms of public protection and will be expected to do so in the future, care should be taken not to gloss over their other functions. As Cherry and Cheston (2006) argue, effective risk management involves more than monitoring and surveillance and instead requires trained staff to engage in face-to-face rehabilitative work with residents. They note that balancing these potentially contradictory demands is challenging, particularly given the current level of media scrutiny. Examples include a television documentary (Panorama, broadcast on 8.11.06) exposing apparent shortcomings in the supervision of sex offenders and a tabloid newspaper campaign against the use of approved premises to house child sex offenders (News of the World, commencing in March 2006). In the past, approved premises have undertaken their public protection role anonymously (Wincup, 2002) but find it increasingly hard to do so.

## Concluding Comments

In this article we have argued that approved premises have played multiple roles in the criminal justice system since they were developed at the beginning of the twentieth century. Today they have established themselves as a resource for protecting the public from high-risk of harm offenders. Whilst some approved premises have been able to be selective about the types of residents admitted, others continue to admit a diverse group and face the challenge of providing a regime which is suitable for both convicted and unconvicted residents, assessed as posing different levels of risk. The danger is that a regime will either cater for the needs of the majority thus excluding smaller groups such as bailees and/or be focused on those who place the greatest demand on resources such as very high-risk offenders. For Burnett and Eaton (2004: 27) 'approved premises could be at the fulcrum of the management of high-risk offenders and effective practice in the community'. To maximise their potential contribution to criminal justice, it is important to draw upon the lessons learnt from the Pathfinder to develop and evaluate a model regime which balances the tensions between public protection and reducing reoffending, which builds upon existing good practice in approved premises and occupies a clearly defined place within the offender management model. Alongside this, there is an urgent need to explore alternative provision for offenders who are no longer deemed appropriate for referral to approved premises. Only then will we be able to define what constitutes effective practice when conducting residential work with offenders and be confident that reconfiguring the approved premises estate has not led to increased provision for high-risk of harm offenders and bailees at the expense of other groups.

## End Note

<sup>1</sup> The Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000 introduced the term 'approved premises' to describe hostels for offenders. In this article, the two terms are used interchangeably.

## References

- Burnett, R. and Eaton, G. (2004) *Factors Associated with Effective Practice in Approved Premises: A Literature Review*. Home Office Online Report 65/04. London: Home Office.
- Carter, P. (2003) *Managing Offenders: Reducing Crime: A New Approach*. London: Strategy Unit.
- Cherry, S. and Cheston, L. (2006) 'Towards a Model Regime for Approved Premises', *Probation Journal* 53(3): 248-264.
- Foster, S. (2004) *Approved Premises: Results of a Snapshot Survey, 2003*. Findings 230. London: Home Office.
- Halliday, J. (2001) *Making Punishments Work: Report of a Review of the Sentencing Framework in England and Wales*. London: Home Office.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation (1993) *Approved Probation and Bail Hostels: Report of a Thematic Inspection*. London: Home Office.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation (1998) *Delivering and Enhanced Level of Community Supervision: Report of a Thematic Inspection on the Work of Approved Probation and Bail Hostels*. London: Home Office.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation (2004) *An Essential Element of the Effective Practice: An Inspection of the National Probation Service Work on Offender Accommodation*. London: Home Office.
- HM Inspectorate of Probation (2007) 'Not Locked up but Subject to Rules': *An Inquiry into Managing Offenders in Approved Premises (Hostels) following the Panorama Programme Broadcast on 8 November 2006*. London: Home Office.

- Home Office (1992) *National Standards for the Supervision of Offenders in the Community*. London: Home Office.
- Home Office (1994) *Three Year Plan for the Probation Service*. London: Home Office.
- Home Office (2000) *National Standards for the Supervision of Offenders in the Community*. London: Home Office.
- Home Office (2002) *National Standards for the Supervision of Offenders in the Community*. London: Home Office.
- Lewis, H. and Mair, G. (1989) *Bail and Probation Work II: The Use of London Probation/Bail Hostels for Bailees*. Home Office Research and Planning Unit Paper 50. London: Home Office.
- National Offender Management Service (2005) *National Standards 2005*. London: National Probation Directorate.
- National Offender Management Service (2007) *Prison Population and Accommodation Briefing for 27th April 2007*. <http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk> (accessed 7th May 2007)
- National Probation Directorate (2004a) *Approved Premises - Resources Review*. London: National Probation Directorate.
- National Probation Directorate (2004b) *Public Protection and Community Safety: Approved Premises and Offender Housing Strategy for Higher Risk Offenders*. London: National Probation Directorate.
- National Probation Directorate (2005) *The Role and Purposes of Approved Premises*. Probation Circular 37/2005. London: National Probation Directorate.
- National Probation Directorate (2006a) *National Probation Service Approved Premises (Hostels): Frequently Asked Questions*. <http://www.probation.homeoffice.gov.uk/files/pdf/Approved%20Premises%20FAQ.pdf> (accessed 29th April 2007)
- National Probation Directorate (2006b) *Changes to Admissions Policy for Approved Premises*. Probation Circular 19/2006. London: National Probation Directorate.
- Pratt, J. and Bray, K. (1985) 'Bail Hostels: Alternatives to Custody?', *British Journal of Criminology* 25(2) 160-171.
- White, K. and Brody, S. (1980) 'The Use of Bail Hostels', *Criminal Law Review* 420-425.
- Wincup, E. (1996) 'Mixed Hostels: Staff and Resident Perspectives', *Probation Journal* 43(3): 147-151.
- Wincup, E. (2002) *Residential Work with Offenders: Reflexive Accounts of Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Wincup, E., Oldfield, M., Netten, A., Buckland, G., Saunders, R., Cockcroft, T. and Fenyo, A. (2004) *Evaluation of the Approved Premises Pathfinder: Final Report*; unpublished.