

The Prison Entrepreneurship Programme

HMP Ranby Pilot in Evaluation

Centre for
Entrepreneurs

CFE

powered by

LETTERONE

Project funded by



National Offender
Management Service

Project delivered by



ABOUT THE CENTRE

The Centre for Entrepreneurs (CFE) is the UK's entrepreneurship think tank. It researches the economic and social value created by entrepreneurs.

The Centre was launched in 2013 by Sunday Times columnist and serial entrepreneur Luke Johnson, in partnership with the Legatum Foundation. In 2017, CFE joined forces with the New Entrepreneurs Foundation - the UK's leading youth entrepreneurship development charity - to form a unified charitable foundation to undertake research, campaigns and programmes to advance entrepreneurship across the UK. The Centre is powered by LetterOne as its cornerstone donor.

Since launch, the Centre has advocated in-prison entrepreneurship programmes, uncovered how entrepreneurs are reviving seaside towns, championed angel investors as Britain's unsung heroes and shattered negative stereotypes affecting women entrepreneurs. It has also published never-before-seen data on migrant entrepreneurs, annual company formation rates, and local authority SME spending.

In 2017, the Centre launched two best-practice networks – the Incubator and Accelerator Network, to increase at the scale and impact of business incubation; and the Prison Entrepreneurship Network, to aid the adoption of in-prison entrepreneurship programmes nationwide.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3	Contents
4	Foreword
5	Executive summary
7	Introduction
10	Design
13	Delivery
23	Evaluation
34	Conclusion
36	Appendix

FOREWORD

Following the overwhelming positive reception of our report, 'From inmates to entrepreneurs', in 2016, I felt it was time that the Centre put its words into action. We suggested that encouraging prisoners to become entrepreneurs is both achievable and cost-effective. More than that, however, we knew it would be immensely popular among prisoners.

We had a concept to prove - entrepreneurship can help reduce recidivism and transform lives - and a model to test. So we sought an opportunity to make the prison entrepreneurship programme (PEP) a reality and to build an evidence base for our proposition.

This is an evaluation of the PEP designed by CFE. The report reflects on the realities of designing, delivering and tracking a PEP. We hope this provides useful guidance to prisons and business support organisations wishing to implement similar schemes.

We were not alone, of course. Our programme was exactly delivered by NBV and hosted by HMP Ranby over the course of 2017. I would like to thank the forward-thinking governor Neil Richards for inviting

us into HMP Ranby, helping us secure MoJ funding, and working with us so closely to make the pilot a success. I would also like to thank Joanna Clarke from NBV and the two Richards that worked on the programme for making the delivery appear so seamless.

The key findings of this report are exactly what we had hoped for. We expect that this report should provide further evidence for the need of a nationwide roll-out of PEPs. The Centre's work for entrepreneurship in prisons does not end here. We hope to build upon the success of our Prison Entrepreneurship Network, which aims to increase the scale and impact of PEPs and other entrepreneur-led initiatives in prisons, and we will continue to campaign in favour of expanding prisoners' opportunities to become entrepreneurs.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matt Smith', with a stylized, flowing script.

Matt Smith

Director, Centre for Entrepreneurs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lessons from the CFE May 2016 report, 'From inmates to entrepreneurs: How prison entrepreneurship can break the cycle of reoffending'

The problem

- In the UK, recidivism is a serious problem. The reoffending rate among former prisoners is 46%. Not only is this a drain on public finances, costing £4.5 billion annually, but it is also a huge waste of talent.
- A move away from rehabilitation efforts since 2010 has made it harder to engage prisoners in productive activities.
- Employment is one of the most important factors in reducing recidivism. Employers, however, are reluctant to hire those with criminal records, and two years after release, only a third manage to find formal work.

The solution

- Entrepreneurship is unlike traditional employment because it does not discriminate against those with criminal records. No application process is required to becoming an entrepreneur.
- 59% of prisoners would like to take an entrepreneurship course in prison, while 79% are interested in starting a business, compared to around 40% of the UK population.
- Pilot schemes of the prison entrepreneurship have demonstrated massive success. The most well-known of these is the Texas based Prison Entrepreneurship Programme (PEP), which reports a three year recidivism rate of under 7%, compared to a US national average of 60%. In Germany, a similar programme has seen a four year reoffending rate of 11%, compared to a national average of 46%.

The Prison Entrepreneurship Programme at HMP Ranby

The pilot

- As one of six reform prisons, HMP Ranby was given unprecedented freedoms to introduce new structures and programmes to improve the performance outcomes on a whole range of issues, including security, health and recidivism.
- The new senior leadership seized the opportunity to work with CFE to implement a prison entrepreneurship programme (PEP) pilot with the aim of proving the model and developing a comprehensive guide and resource pack to aid wider adoption of prison entrepreneurship programmes (PEPs).
- NBV - the East Midlands enterprise agency - was willing to share its expertise and manage the delivery of the programme. This included working with CFE in the design phase, sourcing two accredited mentors and providing ongoing assistance to participants upon release.

Key outcomes

- Over five cohorts, the PEP achieved a satisfaction rate of 94.3%.
- Qualitative evidence shows that the pilot had a positive effect on the character development of the participants.
- With the pilot successfully implemented, the programme's impact on recidivism can be measured in the first two years after its completion.

Key considerations for future programmes

- There is no 'one size fits all' policy. Each prison must adapt the model of the PEP according to their own needs.
- The prison's leadership must be entrepreneurially-minded to recognise the value of the programme and help to successfully implement it.
- Those designing new PEPs must conduct a full scope of the prison to identify how all relevant departments and staff can support the programme. This must take place before delivery begins. Efforts to make those connections in the months before the start of the PEP are vital.
- More time should be allocated to the delivery of the programme. There should be no overlap between cohorts and two weeks should be assigned to the recruitment and selection of new participants.
- A tailored action pack for each of the participants to assist in 'through the gate' support should be provided for the benefit of participants, parole officers and the delivery group.
- The delivery group should be local to the region of the prison's catchment area in order to be more effective at delivering the programme inside the prison and providing localised 'through the gate' support.
- All future evaluations must get approval from the prison's Ethics Committee, or equivalent body, to analyse data and survey information in its entirety.

INTRODUCTION

Context

Entrepreneurship works. This was the conclusion of the Centre's 2016 paper *'From inmates to entrepreneurs: How prison entrepreneurship can break the cycle of reoffending'*.

The report suggested that encouraging prisoners to become entrepreneurs is not only achievable and cost-effective but is an immensely popular idea among prisoners themselves. We calculated that the introduction of Prison Entrepreneurship Programmes (PEPs) with 'through-the-gate' support for all interested pre-release prisoners could save the government up to £1.4 billion annually on the cost of ex-prisoner reoffending, at a cost of £82 million - providing a 17x return on investment.

Having been well-received by the government, the criminal justice sector and entrepreneurs more broadly, it was clear we needed to expand the evidence base and produce a replicable model for prison entrepreneurship programmes. Consequently, CFE sought to cooperate with enterprise agencies and prisons to design, deliver and evaluate a pilot.

The opportunity

Following the Queen's Speech in 2016, six prisons were given new 'reform' status. These prisons were given unprecedented powers over financial and legal matters, including the ability to opt-out of national contracts, operational freedoms over education, regime structure, family visits and rehabilitation programmes.

HMP Ranby was one such prison. Within this newly reformed institution, Neil Richards, the executive governor at the time, responded to the Centre's call for a pilot PEP. The executive committee of HMP Ranby was impressed by the programme's 'through the gate' component, and an innovation grant pot provided by the Ministry of Justice to reform prisons made the intervention's adoption possible.

From the Centre's perspective, HMP Ranby had certain strengths that made it a well-suited test environment. It had a large population that, according to prison staff, would be receptive to the idea of the PEP. Its catchment area was highly localised, meaning the participants would be easier to track and support once released. The prison also had extensive manufacturing and training facilities, increasing the likelihood of skills-based business ideas among the prisoners.

Of the various initiatives Richards could fund, entrepreneurship was an area he was particularly interested in, and while there were business qualifications available from the education department, he recognised that a PEP would be more practical and hands-on. Soon after initial discussions, Richards committed the prison to work with CFE to secure MoJ grant funding and deliver the PEP.

Selecting the delivery agency

In line with our own recommendations in the May 2016 report, CFE sought a business support organisation with a long-standing and sustainable presence in the local community to deliver the PEP. This would ensure ease of access to the prison, and through the gate support for participants.

The local enterprise agency, NBV (previously Nottingham Business Ventures) was well-suited. The not-for-profit enterprise agency had been delivering business support across the East Midlands for over 30 years and had experience engaging marginalised communities in deprived areas. It had also undertaken several prison entrepreneurship initiatives in the past, including the Business in Prisons Programme via Nottinghamshire Probation Service and Dukeries Training Agency.

Report format

The report is set out in three sections each covering a separate phase of the programme: design, delivery and evaluation. The relevant experiences of each phase are discussed, presenting the outcomes and challenges discovered. Following this, each phase is assessed, with recommendations for how to improve the performance outcomes of those involved in the programme.

- In the first section, the process of structuring and designing the PEP is explained, shedding light on the various questions asked to shape the intervention and key points to consider when setting up, advertising and selecting mentors for an entrepreneurship programme inside a prison.
- The second section focuses on the experiences of implementing the programme: the time allocated to building relationships inside the prison, the process of recruiting and selecting participants, delivering the workshops and one-to-one sessions to the prisoners, the graduation ceremony and the 'through the gate' support offered to the prisoners after release.
- In the third section, the PEP is evaluated. The evaluation plan and methodology are presented alongside the various challenges experienced in implementing the planned evaluation. NBV workshop feedback surveys offer a qualitative analysis and the PEP teaching assessment presents another layer of qualitative scrutiny. Finally, the costs of the programme are discussed in the context of the potential financial benefits of the PEP in nationwide prison reform.
- Following the conclusion, which summarises our key findings and recommendations, this report includes an appendix that include all the resources used in this programme. This comprises the original bid to the Ministry of Justice, the evaluation strategy, in-prison PEP advertisement posters, the PEP promotional leaflet and application form, the past experience survey and NBV feedback survey.

The Stakeholders

- **The Centre for Entrepreneurs (CFE)** was the contract manager and lead bidder for the pilot PEP at HMP Ranby. The team comprised **Matt Smith**, director of Centre for Entrepreneurs and project manager of the pilot; **Maximilian Yoshioka**, (then) lead researcher and **Roland Mortimer**, (then) research assistant.

Matt Smith was a member of the project board, which met monthly to discuss the pilot progress. The Centre also established a national expert steering group, a committee of national experts who oversaw the design and delivery of the pilot. The committee included individuals and organisations with prior experience of prison programmes, representatives from the business community, as well as criminal justice experts. As contract manager, the Centre was responsible for producing an evaluation of the programme, which it has done in the form of this report.

The national expert steering group consisted of: **Chris Stacey**, co-director, Unlock; **Rod Clark**, chief executive, Prisoners' Education Trust; **Phil Ashford**, co-founder, Enterprise Exchange (prison entrepreneurship programme); **Sheena Leaf**, founder, The Entrepreneur Inside (prison entrepreneurship programme); **Duane Jackson**, founder, Kashflow and Supdate (ex-offender entrepreneur); and **Jacob Hill**, founder, Lazy Camper and Offploy (ex-offender entrepreneur).

- **NBV Enterprise Solutions (NBV)** was the supporting bidder for the pilot. NBV is a non-for-profit enterprise agency that has been delivering business support across the East Midlands for over 30 years. It provided accredited business coaches to deliver the weekly workshops and provide ongoing mentoring to participants upon release. NBV is highly experienced in providing support for marginalised individuals and used its connections with the business community and knowledge of local institutions to provide prisoners with the best possible support both inside and outside of prison.

Joanna Clarke, deputy chief executive, led the project within NBV and was also a member of the project board. The two selected coaches for the programme were **Richard Crowden** and **Richard Fairclough**. They are both former entrepreneurs, with several businesses between them. They have wide experience of helping people from different backgrounds developing their businesses.

- **Phil Ashford**, co-founder of Enterprise Exchange, a non-profit organisation that delivers various prison entrepreneurship programmes across the UK, played several important roles in the pilot. He was a member of the steering group and was also retained at the beginning of the project to co-create the curriculum with NBV, CFE and the prison. In this way, he was enlisted as an external expert, providing impartial insight in the design phase.
- **HMP Ranby** hosted the pilot. The key project team members included **Neil Richards** (then) governor (now executive director, East Midlands Reform Group), **Nigel Hirst**, (then) director (now governor), **Janet Beckett**, finance and commercial director who attended the discussion stages of the programme, and **Pauline Womack**, head of business development who project managed the PEP on behalf of the prison.

DESIGN

1. Structuring the pilot

- 1.1. CFE, NBV and the prison were all involved in the programme's design.
- 1.2. Phil Ashford from the steering group was invited to provide impartial expertise in structuring the programme. Ashford was selected as an independent expert consultant on the basis of his skills, knowledge and prior experience as co-founder of Enterprise Exchange, which conducts various prison entrepreneurship programmes.
- 1.3. Ashford was already familiar with the prison system and was able to ensure that the PEP was designed in compliance with the various security and prison scheduling considerations. As an experienced external advisor, he provided a further degree of credibility to the programme structure, unbiased by any internal pressures or desired outcomes. He was able to provide critique and double-check internal processes and audits of the PEP by the Centre and NBV, making recommendations where needed.
- 1.4. Guided by his expertise, every aspect was designed to ensure the best possible delivery of the programme and evaluation. Joanna Clarke said, "He was phenomenal in sharing the experience he had." As one example, he knew that if the participants critiqued each other's business plans, this could lead to conflict. In its place, Ashford suggested a case study approach in which participants critiqued a hypothetical business plan.
- 1.5. The PEP needed to be worked into the daily schedule of the prison. The availability of the prisoners' free time and work time, workshop space and event space, and the number and the lengths of breaks in the workshops all had to be taken into account.
- 1.6. Finding an optimal cohort size raised questions of both security and efficacy. The CFE model wanted to demonstrate that it could graduate a relatively high number of participants in a sustainable manner. This needed to be balanced against concerns over how many prisoners could be congregated in one space without posing a risk to safety. Furthermore, too large a cohort size would oppose the aim of creating more intimate workshops.
- 1.7. Before the programme could begin all necessary vetting needed to be completed. Security clearance can take months to be approved. Fortunately, Richard Fairclough had already been vetted in his previous employment. Freedom of movement within the prison and the use of prison keys for the mentors also needed to be decided by the prison leadership.
- 1.8. Discussions about how to advertise the programme in the prison included considering the use of formal newsletters, magazines, radio announcements, flyers and posters.

2. Designing the PEP

- 2.1. Prisoners only have a restricted amount of free time each day and it was imperative that the programme fit within the existing prison schedule. Delivery within the prison was split in two parts: full-day group workshops, and one-to-one mentoring sessions, both of which were conducted once a week for three weeks.
- 2.2. Workshops began in the morning, with a long lunch break halfway through and ended in the afternoon. The schedule was devised to ensure there were no conflicts with prison activities.
- 2.3. The desired number of participants in each cohort was 15. In order to meet this target in a very short time and with a limited budget, the programme was implemented with rolling, overlapping cohorts: once the mentoring sessions of one cohort began, a new cohort started the workshops.
- 2.4. During the workshops, it was recommended that Grace Goodwin, a representative of Department for Work and Pensions inside HMP Ranby, should be present. Goodwin played an important role not only in the recruitment process but also in the workshops. Here, she gave advice to the participants, addressing any questions regarding tax issues and welfare benefits to which they may be entitled.
- 2.5. The general format of the programme was decided in a meeting between the prison and NBV. NBV and Phil Ashford were then tasked with designing the curriculum, fleshing out the learning outcomes and content, and finally received comments from the steering group. NBV was finally responsible for briefing the mentors on the curriculum.
- 2.6. Completion of the programme did not result in a qualification, as that would require a more theoretical study of business, according to Ashford and NBV. This would have gone against the engaging, non-classroom style purposefully designed to appeal to prisoners.
- 2.7. A graduation ceremony was organised for participants who completed the PEP. It was intended to be a conclusion to the PEP, and a formal recognition of their efforts. Participants were allowed to invite family and friends, which was designed to give them extra confidence and motivation.

3. Selecting the mentors

- 3.1. The original format only included one mentor. Richard Fairclough previously worked with the Prince's Trust at HMP North Sea Camp and at HMP Lincoln and has been a business mentor with NBV for around 10 years. Fairclough became the preferred candidate because there were no other certified NBV trainers that had existing prison security clearance.

- 3.2. With overlapping cohorts, however, Fairclough would be unable to manage his time with each participant effectively. NBV noticed this problem very early on and were quick to find another mentor to help administer the programme. The second mentor selected was Richard Crowden.
- 3.3. Both Crowden and Fairclough fulfilled the desired profile: they are both entrepreneurs, with several businesses between them, and are also professional business coaches. Subsequently, they have wide experience of helping people from different backgrounds developing their businesses. Crucially, they are very friendly, informal and approachable. Their character and demeanour enabled them to interact easily with the participants, to hold their attention and gain their respect.

4. Improvements and recommendations: The structure

- 4.1. When liberated from time constraints, the workshops should be spread out so that they do not overlap with mentoring sessions. There should also be a gap between cohorts of two weeks dedicated to the recruitment of the next group of participants.
- 4.2. Although the mentors had enough time to cover all of the content of the curriculum in three all-day sessions, many participants believed that the demand for more information warranted a fourth session.
- 4.3. One concern was that the PEP did not offer any qualifications upon completion. However, a recent review of the curriculum content by Ashford and Clarke has highlighted areas in which qualifications may be embedded without harming the relaxed and responsive workshop style.
- 4.4. The short timeframe of the intervention meant that the steering group was underutilised. The expertise of its members could have benefitted all aspects of the intervention with longer periods of consultation.
- 4.5. As a pilot it was important to be able to shift the emphasis of the programme if necessary during the course of the delivery. The structure should not be so rigid that it cannot react to unforeseen scenarios but not be so flexible that it cannot deliver a consistent and coherent programme.
- 4.6. Security clearance for the mentors can take months to approve and this matter should not be underestimated. However, this is not a recommendation to simply assign mentors who already have clearance for the sake of convenience. Joanna Clarke gives her advice: "it is better to pick a mentor who has a passion about working in prison rehabilitation than picking someone just because they've been in prisons before and have clearance."

DELIVERY

5. Building rapport

- 5.1. It became immediately obvious that connections with various prison departments would be necessary if the PEP were to be implemented successfully. Three months prior to the first scheduled cohort in February 2017, Richard Fairclough established himself within the prison in order to develop such relationships.
- 5.2. Those connections were essential to the recruitment process. It became evident very quickly that the posters and leaflets distributed in the prison attracted little attention. Assisted by Pauline Womack, Fairclough convinced many staff members to cooperate and identify potential candidates for the PEP.
- 5.3. In place of a formal application, staff members from various departments acted as intermediaries, identifying potential candidates, then registered their interest with Fairclough. This informal application process proved much faster and succeeded in encouraging prisoners that might have otherwise been deterred.
- 5.4. The importance of building these relationships early on will become more evident in the discussion of 'through the gate' support. Fairclough was able to develop a high level of trust with the prison staff that was a necessary condition for the success of the delivery.

6. Recruiting the participants

- 6.1. It was agreed that the programme would be advertised to all prisoners at Ranby. In this vein, the prison circulated posters and leaflets, written in very clear messaging to ensure they could be read by all prisoners. However, as already noted, these did not prove to be effective forms of advertisement.
- 6.2. The most effective means of recruitment was through personal conversations with the prisoners. The promotional material was unable to convince prisoners of the programme's value as it did not stand out from other interventions. This reflects a broader scepticism towards the prison's services. The only way the PEP was able to encourage participation was through face-to-face encouragement. Most prisoners who applied for the programme were referred by a department.
- 6.3. Prison staff were able to use their relationships with prisoners to encourage participation in the PEP. Tony Hancock, the woodmill instructor, spoke of this: "The woodmill offers a change from prison life and that's earned me their trust. They'll tell me things they'd never dream of telling a

‘white shirt’ (prison officer).” Hancock was one member of staff able to identify prisoners who had a strong interest in self-employment.

- 6.4. At HMP Ranby, Grace Goodwin is the DWP Officer and Gareth Clarke works as an advisor for the National Careers Service. Both were tasked with referring prisoners interested in self-employment to the PEP team. The prisoners had to display responsibility, good behaviour and have a business idea.
- 6.5. Toby Moss, the gym instructor, was a member of staff eager to engage in new programmes like the PEP. He recognised that entrepreneurship could be a viable and superior alternative to employment for some of his men. He also recognised that none of the rehabilitation programmes in the prison were offering support through the gate. Moss understood that the PEP offered an opportunity for prisoners unfulfilled by any other programme in the prison.
- 6.6. It was also desirable if the prisoners were not due to enter supported accommodation after release as it could prove a significant obstacle to setting up a business.

7. Selecting the participants

- 7.1. With a list of potential candidates, the selection process was undertaken by Pauline Womack. The primary selection criterion was based on the applicant’s ‘privilege status’. Ranby’s Incentive and Privilege Scheme places prisoners in one of three categories: basic, standard and enhanced, depending on their criminal offence and on-site behaviour.
- 7.2. Whilst most new programmes only accept men with ‘enhanced’ privileges (the most lenient category), the prison opted to open participation by welcoming men from the ‘standard’ classification.
- 7.3. Prisoners passing this selection stage were then cross-checked through two separate databases, to ensure that their current behaviour, offence history, and risk assessment made them suitable for the programme and support after release.
- 7.4. The final stage in the sifting process involved identifying applicants with an impending release date. While not a very strict precondition, prisoners on the last three to six months of their sentence were given priority. This was a way of increasing the likelihood of business start-up post-release.
- 7.5. The selection of participants proved to be a highly demanding procedure, taking up about one day of Womack’s time per week. This was necessary and worthwhile, however. The prison-led selection process proved successful, evidenced by the participants’ viable business ideas, good attendance, and limited drop-out.

8. Delivering inside the prison

- 8.1. The delivery phase of the workshops proceeded as originally designed. Participants attended workshops every Tuesday for three weeks, and under the instruction of the mentors researched their business interests, were taught how to write business plans, learned about legal and logistical considerations of self-employment and improved their communication skills. The second three weeks, timed near the end of men's sentences, involved one-to-one mentoring.
- 8.2. Of 15 participants selected for each cohort, around 10 actually attended the first workshop. Dropout was minimal after that point, with no more than one departure during the first workshop. This was a positive development as the remaining participants were those committed to the programme.
- 8.3. Most cohorts were thereby comprised of 8 to 10 dedicated participants. The attendance rate was described by Richard Crowden and prison staff as "exceptionally high".
- 8.4. Most disruptions to attendance were due to legitimate reasons, including online court appearances, scheduled drug tests and visits to the doctor. In most cases participants returned to the workshops as soon as they were available, something described as "extremely unusual" by prison staff.
- 8.5. Both the participants and mentors found the cohort size optimal: small enough to facilitate orderly discussion but large enough to bring a variety of ideas to the workshop.
- 8.6. One participant said "it was beneficial to have a lot of different input - it was diverse ideas, but small enough to keep everyone focused." This was echoed by Crowden who pointed out that "with 10 men you already have very different ideas, ambitions and abilities, from multi-million pound businesses to prospective window cleaners. A larger group would risk becoming too rowdy."
- 8.7. This cohort size also allowed for an effective dual mentor approach to the workshops. Participants who displayed a lack of engagement, distracted other participants or had difficulty keeping up were supported by one mentor, while the other continued the workshops.
- 8.8. The mentors made sure to treat participants in a trustful and respecting way. This was done through simple practices such as shaking hands, having friendly conversations, using prisoners' first names (a rare practice in prison) and encouraging them to take initiative, for example, helping themselves to confectionaries and handling class materials.
- 8.9. They introduced themselves with light-hearted anecdotes, and participants were asked to do the same. Participants were never asked why they were in prison. By treating participants as adult learners, and not as convicts, the mentors created a productive setting.

- 8.10. Establishing this trust facilitated productive discussion: with business ideas of all levels and ambitions, participants needed to feel comfortable around each other and the mentors.
- 8.11. Within the workshops only basic resources could be used. The mentors followed a standard NBV business workbook, but did not stick to a particular format, customising the content based on the inmate's' interests. They allowed conversations to digress so long as the topics remained relevant. The core material was always covered but never in the same order.
- 8.12. Other useful materials included paper-based writing materials, flipcharts, whiteboards, and verbal games including assessing the price of random items in the room.
- 8.13. Crowden and Fairclough were able to respond to most of the participant's inquiries. Certain topics, such as domain names, demanded very fresh information. Anything that either mentor did not know was then given to the NBV team for research. In the following workshop, the mentors passed on findings to the participants.
- 8.14. This provided real-time information about the logistics and practicalities of their business, labour market information, the cost of goods and services and regional discrepancies, legal considerations, sources of funding and other industry-specific information.
- 8.15. The mentors also spent around half a day each week conducting research outside prison, interspersed with administrative work and report writing.
- 8.16. The prison's activities team was responsible for scheduling the workshops into the participants' day, the education department handled the booking of rooms and various administrative staff helped escort Richard Crowden around the prison who had not yet been given full security clearance.

9. **Challenges in delivery**

- 9.1. Certain challenges could not be avoided. These included obtaining security clearance for the unvetted second mentor and other NBV staff. The vetting process also includes a week-long induction period, where external staff receive a security briefing, creating additional disruption and delay. This was not scheduled or budgeted in our plans.
- 9.2. There was also the occasional prison lockdown. These matters constrained contact time with participants. This, however, was largely compensated for in the second phase of delivery, the one-to-one mentoring sessions.
- 9.3. There was also some departmental friction that presented challenges. There was already a business education programme taught inside the prison, and the team running this course feared the PEP would make theirs redundant.

- 9.4. The matter was resolved once NBV and Fairclough offered to hold a meeting to discuss the PEP, what it was, how it was being taught and what its aims were. The two programmes differed significantly enough that they were eventually reassured that the PEP was entirely complementary to their course and that the CFE model was designed to fill the gap in the prison's education and rehabilitation agenda.
- 9.5. On occasion, participants confided in the mentors something personal or a problem of theirs, such as illiteracy. The mentors are not counsellors, social workers, or English teachers, and it was right that they pointed the participants towards other prison services for support rather than take on that responsibility themselves.
- 9.6. The one-to-one mentoring sessions were not easy to organise. Fairclough said half his time was spent chasing after participants in the prison. He would then have to seek out the support of prison staff to find out where they were. This is another example of how useful the prison staff were and how essential cooperation is.

10. Graduation

- 10.1. Whilst initially envisaged as an intimate celebration of participants' achievements, the prison and NBV organised a highly impressive graduation ceremony that left participants very excited. Nigel Hirst introduced the ceremony and was followed with short speeches from Matt Smith and Joanna Clark. Richard Fairclough then gave out mock awards to some of the most distinguished participants, such as 'best behaved' and 'most entertaining'. LJ Flanders and Duane Jackson, both ex-prisoner entrepreneurs, were then invited to share their stories and offer inspiration to the graduates. A few participants from different cohorts were also asked to say a few words. The ceremony came as participants were awarded completion certificates and a round of applause from all those who attended.
- 10.2. Joanna Clarke said, "it was a hugely uplifting experience." It gave the men an opportunity to talk about their accomplishments and was an affirmation of their achievements. Family members and prison staff that attended saw a noticeable change in the men. The graduation event proved to be a hugely successful marketing campaign as word got out and more prisoners wanted to sign up.
- 10.3. Phil Townsley, a custodian and activities manager, acts as a link between the uniformed and non-uniformed departments during events, family visits and activities. He reported that the graduation ceremony took a fair amount of work in the background, including security clearances for everyone involved, prisoner behaviour, and briefing the uniformed staff.
- 10.4. Nevertheless, the price was deemed worth it by everyone involved. Townsley said the graduation was "brilliant . . . this is true rehabilitation." Participants gained new confidence in themselves.

The staff also achieved a sense of satisfaction, and it helped create a friendlier atmosphere between the uniformed staff and prisoners.

- 10.5. The certificate of achievement gave the men proof of their worth and having been celebrated in front of their peers and family their personal standing in the prison improved.

11. **Support ‘through the gate’**

- 11.1. The ability to provide support to participants outside of the prison is one of the PEP’s greatest strengths. Gareth Clarke said prisoners “have the skills to succeed in business, but they don’t have self-belief. They lack the softer skills such as motivation and commitment.” He therefore saw the PEP as the ideal next step: “What is different with this programme is that there is a past-the-gate component. The possibility to get support and funding post release is a key feature”.
- 11.2. Within the prison, the Resettlement Team is known as the ‘through the gate’ team. This team has various duties including capturing data when new prisoners arrive, tenancy and housing concerns, debt and court fine issues, as well as ETE (Education, Training, and Employment). The Resettlement Team also liaises with outside offender manager units (OMU) and parole supervisors to get documentation prepared for when prisoners leave prison custody.
- 11.3. This team was highly cooperative with Fairclough, working with him to track where participants were released or transferred, as well as how long particular participants had remaining before release.
- 11.4. Contacting participants ‘through the gate’ did prove a challenge, however. Of Cohorts I and II, the conversion rate of participants who followed up after release is currently about half.
- 11.5. A major reason for this challenge was the difficulty for the PEP team to establish lines of communication with the relevant prison staff to assist in ‘through the gate’ support. Not building a relationship early on with the Probation Office serves as an example for how failure of planning can cause difficulties later on. Marina Tocher, a probation officer within the prison, came to work with Fairclough only around the time of Cohort V.
- 11.6. Cooperation with outside offender managers and probation officers varies considerably: some are more willing than others to engage with prison resettlement teams and make full use of the services available to them. This created some frustration and it further demonstrates the need for close collaboration with the resettlement, careers and parole teams to compensate for this.
- 11.7. When possible outside parole officers and offender managers were contacted directly, and the participants were given the mentors’ contact details.

12. Improvements and recommendations: Recruitment and selection

- 12.1. Essential to the success of the recruitment phase were the valuable connections made in the weeks before the first cohort with the various prison department and staff. This need was not immediately obvious in the design of the PEP. However, Fairclough quickly tried to resolve this by seeking out various members of staff to develop relationships.
- 12.2. From this experience, Joanna Clarke offers a top-tip: “Embed yourself in those team meetings.” It is essential that the relevant prison staff are fully cooperative and understand what the PEP is set to achieve, and team meetings offer a space in which everyone is present. Fairclough reinforces this: “I cannot emphasise enough the importance of the embedding process.”
- 12.3. For a successful recruitment campaign, the main advertising should be conducted through personal conversations. Prisoners take far more seriously the word of trusted prison staff than they do information on posters and pamphlets.
- 12.4. To capitalise on this, the prison could invite ex-prisoner entrepreneurs to give talks and expose prisoners to the benefits of self-employment, as well as other guest speakers that will provide a greater inspiration.
- 12.5. Timing is also an issue to consider when recruiting. Gareth Clarke says, “almost every prisoner has the opportunity to succeed through the PEP. It’s very important to catch everyone 12 to 16 weeks prior to release.” This is to ensure that participants do not lose momentum in the run up to their release date.
- 12.6. A closer connection with the vocational training team should be made to assist the recruitment process. The prison staff had to be convinced very quickly that the intervention had value that other programmes simply did not offer. Toby Moss, the gym instructor, spoke strongly about needing “the right individuals in the [PE] department to realise its worth.”
- 12.7. Pauline Womack believed a future mainstreamed programme could do even better in attracting prisoners that “haven’t even thought of starting their own business, or don’t have academic skills but are very practically minded”.

13. Improvements and recommendations: The delivery

- 13.1. For the most part, participants approached the PEP with a positive outlook. One participant of Cohort III said he “just approached it with an open mind and wanted to learn something new”. However, discussions with prison staff revealed an underlying scepticism towards the prison’s educational courses. “Some negativity stems from fear, they don’t know how to get started”, said Grace Goodwin. A few feared a very formulaic approach, based on their experience of other business courses. “Other courses just go through a paper and don’t adapt to what you need”, said another participant from Cohort III.
- 13.2. These reservations about the PEP are felt by prisoners before attending the programme itself. Therefore, whilst the recruitment campaign worked to entice enough prisoners to join the programme, there is still room for improvement in communicating what the PEP is and how it differs from other interventions.
- 13.3. As more cohorts graduate, this problem will likely fade as other prisoners learn of the positive experiences of fellow prisoners and prison staff.
- 13.4. Future iterations should create a strategy that is more effective at communicating the purpose and content of the PEP.
- 13.5. Participants and senior prison staff, including Pauline Womack, agreed that extending the workshops and adding more supportive material would be highly beneficial. Even though the mentors had sufficient time to cover the curriculum and satisfaction with the course was very high, nearly all participants thought the wealth of information warranted a fourth session.
- 13.6. In the preparatory discussions, the potential for the workshops to assist in-prison start-ups was explored. The business models that suited this opportunity best were craft-related businesses. In theory, participants could prototype their products, start production, then sell them through a prison-owned subsidiary company, the ownership of which would be transferred to the prisoners upon release.
- 13.7. In practice, however, few participants were prepared to do so. The short time of six weeks before release meant that the participants preferred to focus on refining their business plans and making preparations for their release. Nevertheless, this remains an option to explore. It would be a worthwhile test in an extended pilot to see if it could be introduced into a PEP with a participant serving a longer sentence.
- 13.8. The availability of IT facilities was often raised as a possible improvement. It could increase the diversity of participants’ business ideas, as well as the ability to give participants instant information for their questions. This could save a lot of time for the PEP team, which could otherwise be spent on business research for the participants.

- 13.9. However, the positive impact of this should not be assumed. Many participants sought to build businesses in industries that they worked in before, and the participants were seemingly satisfied with the ability of the mentors to provide them with the information they wanted.
- 13.10. There are also many security complications and concerns of prisoner behaviour (“(e.g. using the internet to search for prohibited material) that may mean it is not possible to include as a resource. Each prison should make its own risk assessment with regards to this issue. The experience at HMP Ranby is that it is not necessary for the PEP to be successful.

14. **Improvements and recommendations: Graduation**

- 14.1. Joanna Clark said she would like to make the ceremony a bigger event but occurring less frequently. Each ceremony should include participants from three or four cohorts, as a significant number of participants may not be able to attend. This may be due to security and vetting issues, or if they have been transferred or released.
- 14.2. The extent of background security vetting for everyone involved, including the audience, cannot be underestimated. The prison staff spent a lot of time making sure the event was safe and would run smoothly. Another recommendation was to extend the graduation ceremony to other prisoners, serving as a powerful advertisement for future programmes.
- 14.3. However, according to some prison staff enthusiasm did die down after three or four weeks. Therefore, it would be optimal if participants attended their ceremonies shortly before release to maintain the excitement and momentum that prisoners feel as their sentences near an end.

15. **Improvements and recommendations: ‘Through the gate’**

- 15.1. The expectation that participants would continue to seek PEP support after release had been overestimated. Former prisoners often have many unresolved matters to address after release, including accommodation, re-establishing family and friend connections, sorting their finances, etc.: for legitimate reasons, the aftercare of PEP does not come up at the top of their list of priorities.
- 15.2. More attention should therefore be given to the post-release engagement strategy, planning how best to assist the transition to civilian life. The release date and location is known ahead of time, so the relevant information pertaining to a participant should be disclosed to the PEP team in order to provide support and guidance in advance.
- 15.3. The principle that the participants should seek contact with the delivery agency is correct, however the programme could do more to help and encourage them.

- 15.4. The Resettlement Team already prepares an 'action pack' for all prisoners upon release. Copies of this are given to both the prisoner and their offender manager outside of prison. A key recommendation is to share this action pack with the PEP team and develop it further.
- 15.5. For participants, the enhanced action pack should include the contact information of the PEP mentors, NBV business mentors, summaries of the work the participant has accomplished, and the recommended next steps that they should take for their businesses. While data restrictions could pose an obstacle, this measure could boost past-the-gate engagement.
- 15.6. Offender managers and probation officers can also ask past-participants who have been released if they would like to be contacted. Communication between the PEP team and the Probation Team is essential if effective support 'through the gate' is to be achieved.
- 15.7. It has also been recently discovered that the East Midlands Community Rehabilitation Company (DLNR-CRC) have offered to host post-release meetings with the participants and mentors. This will allow the participants to continue receiving support and guidance directly from the mentors.
- 15.8. The belated communication with the Probation Team is an aspect that future PEPs should not repeat. A key recommendation of this report is a complete mapping of all areas and departments of the prison. The Probation Team should be involved from the outset to create a strong link between the PEP team and the probation officers on the outside.
- 15.9. Just as attendance of the workshops relied upon the willingness of the participants to engage, so too does the 'through the gate' support. There were drop-outs in prison and there will likely be drop-outs after release.
- 15.10. Every intervention of outreach will draw back more participants but there is a finite number of those who will take advantage of this support. Achieving a 100% conversion rate will likely never be possible.

EVALUATION

16. The 'reformed' prison

- 16.1. With the announcement of the new 'reform' status of the prison, there was much excitement from staff. Feelings of empowerment and "new beginnings" gave a sense that HMP Ranby was at the forefront of UK penal reform.
- 16.2. For some veteran staff members, certain mantras and promises sounded familiar. A number of staff reported that HMP Ranby used to be less risk-averse many years ago, with more prisoners on ROTL (Release on Temporary Licence), for example.
- 16.3. Greater autonomy over the prison budget has increased staffing levels and improved the quality of cells and communal areas. However, over a year since its new status, some staff believe that "reform has been forgotten."
- 16.4. From NBV's perspective, however, the fact that HMP Ranby is a reform prison has meant that they are far more flexible and receptive to new ideas. The prison was very supportive, with Joanna Clarke saying she "cannot praise the prison highly enough" and that "they have been phenomenal."
- 16.5. When assessing the potential for the PEP to be implemented in other prisons, it is critical not to simply replicate the HMP Ranby PEP. No two prisons are the same and the resettlement function is not consistent across the country. The nuances of each prison must always be taken in consideration.

17. The planned evaluation methodology

- 17.1. A requirement of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) grant funding was a robust evaluation of the PEP. It demanded that high quality, consistent data be collected throughout the duration of the programme's delivery.
- 17.2. It would serve as an assessment of the success and cost effectiveness of the programme, and create an evidence base to help determine whether further PEPs are offered at HMP Ranby and other prisons in the future.
- 17.3. It was envisaged that several data points should be collected throughout the lifetime of the programme so that key variables could be tracked. The original design included an application form for prisoners to register their interest.
- 17.4. The information this form requested included pre-existing business ideas, qualifications, past business or self-employment experience, personal issues, release date and location of release.

- 17.5. This, however, did not match with the practice of delivery. An informal application by staff referral was preferred as it resulted in a far more effective recruitment process.
- 17.6. This data was instead collected during the vetting process conducted by Pauline Womack. Information about previous business experience and interest in self-employment was taken into consideration when selecting participants for the programme.
- 17.7. Other desirable data points include the participant's age, last place of residence, ethnicity, crime and previous offences (if any), length of sentence and time served, records of behaviour, among other indicators.
- 17.8. The data stored should include both successful and unsuccessful applicants so that any selection biases and recurring characteristics of successful candidates could be identified.
- 17.9. Real-time data could be collected as participants are tracked after release. The data desired was a log of drop-outs, including when and why; which participants received support in the community; and which participants received grant funding, including how much they received and how the money was spent. A greater degree of leniency was given to this collection, but a systematic approach to its collection was considered essential.
- 17.10. CFE also wanted to record a number of 'key outcomes'. This information included the number of participants who successfully start a business, those who work as self-employed freelancers, the number in regular employment, pursuing further training or education, and crucially the rate of recidivism. Negative outcomes, such as unemployment, sickness and disability, death and other factors should also be recorded. This data was to be tracked by the probation services and NBV's direct link to the participants.
- 17.11. Participants were asked to complete a number of surveys for the evaluation: a past experience questionnaire, a participant evaluation survey, and a feedback survey.
- 17.12. The past experience questionnaire was given to every cohort to find out the participants' previous work experience, training and education, as well as hobbies. The questionnaire made a distinction between traditional employment and self-employment or business. This was done to identify those with past entrepreneurial experience.
- 17.13. The evaluation survey was designed by CFE to be administered at various stages of the programme to measure how participation affects factors such as wellbeing, sociability, aspiration, self-efficacy, knowledge and skills. The survey was to be completed at the beginning of the programme, just before release, and after several months of support in the community.
- 17.14. The programme feedback survey asked participants to review the PEP. This assisted in understanding how participants felt about the support they received on the programme, and it will

help ensure that future iterations take into account any issues or complaints. This feedback survey was separate to the participant interviews.

- 17.15. Through a lot of discussion with the steering group, it was agreed that the surveys were the right balance between what CFE wanted in terms of data collection and what the participants would actually complete. Completion of these surveys was not considered optional. All surveys were completed with pen and paper.
- 17.16. In the methodology, it was important that the content and conduct of all surveys could be reproduced for each cohort, in order to produce reliable results.

18. **Challenges to the evaluation**

- 18.1. CFE was aware that there would be difficulties obtaining access to prison data. It was thought that by gaining permission from prisoners to use their data as a condition for their participation, by anonymising the data cited in the evaluation documents, and ensuring that all sensitive data was stored securely, this would satisfy the legal and ethical requirements.
- 18.2. CFE was not informed until after the start of delivery of the programme that the evaluation plan would require approval by NOMS. A belated application was submitted in February, but this was denied. This blocked access to the relevant prison data, creating a serious obstacle to the PEP's evaluation.
- 18.3. Due to further difficulties in making contact with released participants of Cohorts I and II, and the short time-frame of the project, there is little real-time data on participants already 'through the gate'. As a result, the quantitative analysis of this evaluation is limited.

Workshop feedback surveys

Figure 1: Questions asked in the workshop feedback surveys



The first two questions asked participants to rate their experiences from 1 to 6 (poor to excellent, respectively).

The doughnut chart represents the combined scores for questions (1) and (2). The total number of respondents from Cohorts I to V was 38.

(1) How do you rate the content? = 5.6

(2) How did you rate the delivery? = 5.7

The lowest score given was 4, which appeared four times: three times in question (1) and once in question (2)

The modal score for both was 6, appearing 26 times in question (1) and 28 times in question (2). A score of 6 represents 100% satisfaction.

Figure 2: Combined responses to survey questions 1 & 2

Figure 3: Content and delivery satisfaction

100%
satisfaction

All of the respondents from Cohort IV rated both the content and the delivery 6 out of 6: a 100% satisfaction rate for the PEP.

94.3%
satisfaction

Overall, by combining both scores and converting them into a representation of the five cohorts' satisfaction with the intervention, the satisfaction rate was 94.3%.

Figure 4: "What areas did you find useful?"

If the programme is to try and achieve a 6 out of 6 score consistently, a few changes to the PEP may be needed. The answers to questions (3), (4) and (5) offer suggestions as to how to improve.

Drawing on the responses to question (3), the strong areas of the programme are:



Being able to offer
'through the gate'
support



Information
about funding
and loans



Personal stories of
the mentors that
motivated participants



Explaining
different types of
self-employment

6 out of the 38

respondents said they found everything about the programme useful.

Only one

respondent said nothing in particular about the programme was useful.

22 out of the 38

respondents said there were no areas that they would have liked to spend more time on.

Figure 5 "Do you have any further comments or suggestions?"

In answer to question (4), the respondents came up with a few suggestions:



Making and discussing business plans was an item identified very positively, but one that many participants wanted more time on.



More information about tax and insurance was also desired.



More time on marketing, creating a USP (unique selling point) and common business models was also mentioned.



The one suggestion made 6 times in both questions (4) and (5), which was more than all other suggestions combined, was for more workshop sessions.



The only two other suggestions made in question (5) included a greater focus on the ideas of participants in the group discussions, and access to a calculator.

Because question (5) allowed for general comments, it provided another source of qualitative feedback. Some of these comments included:

“Friendly, relaxed atmosphere allowed the group to relax”

“Great course, recommend to all”

“Very important to know that there will be ongoing help and one-to-one sessions”

“Very useful programme, I highly recommen it prior release”

“Seriously pleased with the course. Very impressed with the help I received on my business idea. I have already recommended the course”

“It made me forget about prison”

These surveys provide a strong case for the value of the PEP. The high scoring of the content and delivery, and positive written feedback from the respondents, demonstrate a high level of satisfaction, and demand for future interventions.

With regards to the integrity of the feedback survey, there is a small issue of sample size. With an average cohort size of 10, it appears that the results of the survey lacked the feedback of two or three participants in each cohort.

This may be explained by a few participants not wanting to complete the feedback survey. This does not affect the validity of the results but a larger sample size of respondents would have provided a greater degree of accuracy for the content and delivery scoring and perhaps a greater variety of suggestions and comments.

19. PEP teaching assessment

- 19.1. The purpose of the teaching assessment in the evaluation is to further discuss the experiences of the participants, mentors and other staff and team members, with feedback given from those involved. This provides an additional layer of qualitative analysis.

How did the participants rate their experiences of the PEP?

- 19.2. The participants reported a very high satisfaction rate to the PEP team. All interviewed participants remained enthusiastic about the content and mentors, and they reported few disruptions and good motivation within the workshops.
- 19.3. One participant from Cohort III found that the PEP was “more fun and hands on” compared to previous courses he completed.
- 19.4. Another sang the mentors’ praises: “I’d done a couple business courses since I got to prison but none had hit the nail on the head until this one. I hadn’t been able to connect all the dots and make it happen. These two [mentors] have changed my life completely, I couldn’t give a complete account of how they’ve helped me connect everything.”

How did the mentors rate the workshops?

- 19.5. Despite the constraints of delivering an educational programme in prison, the mentors encountered very few challenges. There was a high level of focus throughout the workshops, and both Crowden and Fairclough found most participants to be well engaged with few exceptions.
- 19.6. One of the most important tasks was ensuring equal engagement among participants, however, this was completed effectively with the dual-mentor teaching approach, as described in the delivery section.

What was the scope of business ideas amongst the participants?

- 19.7. The service and hospitality industries were relatively well represented. Most were well-proven small business concepts, rather than ambitious high-growth businesses. Gyms, personal trainers, restaurants, cafes, industrial cleaning and a few tech-based services were also represented. One of the most unusual plans from a participant was the production of an alcoholic orange juice in Paraguay for sale in Brazil.
- 19.8. Other notable exceptions included one participant who worked with his partner on the outside to launch his telecommunications business which provides prisoners cheap phone calls.
- 19.9. Business plans were not assessed by the mentors but were refined and added to. This was particularly true of logistical concerns that the participants had not considered. Very few participants

finalised their business plans, even after the one-to-ones because they simply did not have access to all of the necessary information, such as regional discrepancies in the cost of goods or services.

Has there been any notable change in the behaviour and outlook of the participants?

- 19.10. The mentors saw a noteworthy improvement in the participants' confidence and sociability. Most clearly, they were eager to engage in conversation rather than argue. They were not daunted by the interviews conducted for this report, whereas before the programme they might have been. Participants were eloquent and better at explaining what they were doing and what they wanted to do.
- 19.11. Prison staff also noticed a similar improvement in their positivity and self-belief. Gareth Clarke, from the prison's National Careers Service office said, "The PEP gives them some hope at the end of the tunnel. It made them think about things. It's a morale booster."
- 19.12. Toby Moss, the gym instructor, also reported that the PEP participants from the gym are now seen as "beacons to the other men" and are living examples of how the PEP can be "a lifeline" for those willing to engage and take the opportunity seriously.

20. Cost of the PEP

- 20.1. During the design of the programme, the cost per four participants was established by CFE and NBV at £7,500, confirming the estimate set out in the Centre's original prison report. In the delivery, however, this figure had to include certain unforeseen expenses.
- 20.2. Prison lockdowns were one main unexpected cost, varying depending on the severity of the situation. In prison-wide shut-downs, the mentors would be locked for many hours past their contract without being able to deliver the workshops. On other days, lockdowns only affected particular blocks of the prison, which meant that only a few participants did not attend.
- 20.3. Certain areas were over-budgeted, which offset the unexpected costs and allowed funds to be reinvested into the programme. This was largely caused by fewer than expected participants requiring 'through the gate' support, allowing for a large part of the £20,000 grant being devoted to Cohorts IV and V.
- 20.4. Whilst there will always be unforeseen costs, the estimated cost for a successful PEP intervention of £1700-2000 per prisoner is still an achievable outcome.
- 20.5. The cost of the programme should be put into the wider perspective of the savings that will be made once the PEP is implemented nationally. In the UK, the cost of each re-offender is £131,000, and the total cost per annum for reoffending is £4.5 billion. Even if the PEP proves moderately successful, it will make significant savings for the public purse.

- 20.6. CFE makes its own estimate of a PEP participant recidivism rate of 14%. This is a cautious calculation; case studies conducted in Texas, Germany and the UK all report reoffending rates even lower than this for programmes of prison entrepreneurship (see CFE May 2016 report).
- 20.7. The successful implementation of the CFE model could lead to savings of £1.4 billion per annum. Furthermore, this does not take into account the added benefit of economic growth and job creation that almost 11000 new business could bring to the national economy.

21. **Improvements and recommendations: Data collection**

- 21.1. One of the limitations to this evaluation report has been the lack of access to the prison data that are necessary for a more in-depth quantitative analysis of the pilot.
- 21.2. One valuable improvement would be to examine the prison data of the applicants to identify what the potential biases were and to understand what selections were made alongside potential indicators for those applicants who did not continue to participate.
- 21.3. The programme needs to be analysed over an extended period of years, in order to record the recidivism rate. It is far too soon for this to be examined.
- 21.4. A control group should also be recruited in parallel to the PEP and given the evaluation survey at the same points in time: whilst the PEP is administered, just before release, and then several months of 'through the gate' support. The control group should contain prisoners of the same or similar characteristics and it should be the same size as the cohort. The control group should not undertake the PEP and questions should avoid any mention of the programme.
- 21.5. The interviews conducted for the evaluation covered all areas of the PEP. However, because of restricted time and difficulties in reaching the participants, those men who were 'through the gate' were unable to be interviewed.
- 21.6. These include participants who did not complete the programme, those who have been released but did not follow up on support, those who did receive community support but no grant funding, and those who received both community support and grant funding.
- 21.7. A future evaluation should include interviews and completed surveys from all these participants.
- 21.8. The most important improvement is getting the approval of all surveys and requests for prison data by the Ethics Committee. Their rejection of information requests regarding prison data and survey results was not foreseen. A recommendation for new iterations of the PEP in other prisons is to have secured approval upon launching the project.

22. **Improvements and recommendations: Maximising the potential of the PEP**

- 22.1. For the continued future success of the PEP, the programme's alumni should be rallied and utilised. Ex-offender entrepreneurs need to invest their efforts through inspirational speeches or by providing mentorship and training inside the prison and 'through the gate'. Their leadership and experience can do much to improve the morale of the participants and the effectiveness of the programme.
- 22.2. Future programmes may wish to engage larger firms and established entrepreneurs in the area to give guidance and opportunities to the participants or to make donations to the PEP.
- 22.3. Delivery agencies should remain focused on business support and guidance and not branch out into providing counselling services, social work, or alcohol and drug support groups. Instead, delivery agencies should establish stronger connections with organisations that do provide such help and services for the participants.
- 22.4. Future iterations of the PEP may also wish to integrate with other programmes. These do not have to be complementary education programmes but may include recreational activities. Phil Ashford has reported that in other prisons choirs can prove to be highly complementary.
- 22.5. The PEP develops core skills of problem solving, communication, teamwork, planning, as well as character traits such as self-esteem and motivation. Whilst it is difficult to measure the 'softer' outcomes of character and behaviour improvement other than through the qualitative data collected in this report, if this character development contributes to a reduction in participant reoffending, then it should be considered more valuable than the measurable economic gains associated with self-employment. This is important, because participants may benefit from this even if they decide not to pursue their business ideas after release.
- 22.6. If implemented in other prisons, each PEP should be designed in consultation with local stakeholders and respond to local needs. In other words, there is no 'one size fits all' policy.
- 22.7. In the future, a database of the outcomes of PEPs nationwide can be developed with continual updates of results and suggestions for best practice.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this evaluation, it is clear that the Prison Entrepreneurship Programme at HMP Ranby has been extremely well received. One of the participants went as far as stating the programme has “changed [his] life completely”. This is reinforced by the PEP’s 94.3% satisfaction rate.

The analysis of the PEP was largely qualitative and focused on three aspects of the intervention: design, delivery and evaluation. The pilot was well executed keeping largely with its initial design. Improvements were drawn from the experiences of the PEP team, highlighting areas not previously considered and where the mentors were forced to adapt to unforeseen circumstances.

The success of delivery has been rooted in the dedication of the individuals involved. This is particularly true of the mentors who built the crucial relationships with staff and participants, Pauline Womack providing administrative support and security clearances in prison, and Joanna Clarke who gave operational oversight and strategic management.

From this evaluation, there are several key requirements that have been identified as necessary for a successful implementation of the CFE model of the PEP:

- The prison leadership must recognise the value of the programme and take ownership of it;
- Before delivering the programme, a full mapping of the prison must be undertaken to identify all relevant departments and staff;
- Sufficient time should be allocated to the PEP to prevent cohorts overlapping and allow more time for recruitment and selection;
- A tailored action pack should be created for each released participant to assist in ‘through the gate’ support, containing all relevant information about their business plans and the delivery agency’s contact information;
- The delivery agency should be local to the prison’s catchment area;
- Future evaluations must get approval from the prison’s Ethics Committee or equivalent body to fully analyse data and survey information;
- There is no ‘one size fits all’ policy. Each prison must adapt the model of the PEP according to their own needs.

In future, the successful implementation of PEPs will require:

- Entrepreneurial training of governors;
- A formal mechanism for best practice sharing between prisons;
- Greater use of ROTL for prisoners starting businesses;
- A review of the regulations and security procedures that can make working with external providers a challenge;
- An expansion of the financial capability and support services currently only offered in certain prisons.

Consequently, if expanded on a larger scale, PEPs will naturally foster wider prison reform.

The Centre also desires to leave behind a sustainable legacy. By training selected prisoners at HMP Ranby to become self-sustaining

entrepreneurs, the CFE model will help entire cohorts to build new lives and escape the cycle of reoffending. If successful, the aim is to continue the programme at HMP Ranby and beyond to:

- Generate a virtuous cycle of ex-prisoners becoming entrepreneurs and employing and mentoring other prisoners; and
- Reduce the national reoffending rate in the long-term. The PEP will serve as a powerful tool to reduce recidivism and unemployment and provide economic growth with an increase in jobs and business ventures.

With a long-term commitment, the programme's revenue streams will require diversification. Possibilities include charitable donations, sponsorship from regional firms, direct investments

in ex-prisoner businesses, and subletting prison equipment and space to participants.

The findings of this report demonstrate that many prisoners are interested in self-employment. Both the qualitative and quantitative analysis of this evaluation demonstrate clear benefits to the character and outlook of the participants. Even though there is no available data regarding the participants' recidivism yet, CFE expects to generate interest beyond the capacity of the pilot.

CFE believes that HMP Ranby can become a model of prison entrepreneurship. The reported success of the PEP at HMP Ranby has already spread by word of mouth, and NBV have been approached by representatives from HMP Lincoln and HMP Nottingham to discuss the programme.

APPENDIX

NOMS GRANT FUNDING APPLICATION

Describe your idea, with reference to the advertised themes, and explain why you think it is likely to be effective in achieving the intended outcomes (500 word limit).

The idea

Having received Neil Richard's endorsement, the Centre for Entrepreneurs wishes to work with HMP Ranby and NBV Enterprise Solutions to introduce a Prison Entrepreneurship Programme (PEP) that will help 50 prisoners prepare for business start-up.

PEPs allow prisoners in the final months of their sentence to take part in a structured 6-12 week programme where a trained business coach delivers weekly sessions to help them start a business. Over the duration of the programme, participants develop their business idea, receive mentoring and training, and work through all aspects of starting a business. Upon release, further mentoring and competitive access to grant funding is available to support them for a further six months as they launch and grow the business. In a unique adaptation of this model, the Centre will pilot a new approach where prisoners can start trading while inside, with the prison acting as custodian to their businesses until they are released.

Effectiveness

The Centre's original research has revealed that:

- existing PEPs in the US, Germany and the UK have been highly successful in reducing reoffending compared to the national average, reporting reoffending rates of 5-11%;
- academic studies have found a high incidence of entrepreneurial traits among prisoners. This may be attributable to the entrepreneurial nature of many crimes;
- testimony from CJS experts and surveys conducted by the Centre in four UK prisons demonstrate a high level of interest in entrepreneurship among prisoners (79%);
- employment outcomes are poor for ex-offenders, making an alternative all the more necessary. In 2012-13, only 26% of prisoners entered employment on release from prison, while recent government data shows that two years after release only 36% of ex-prisoners find formal employment. Around three-quarters of employers would use a conviction to discriminate against an applicant (Working Links);
- based on our evaluation of cost and reoffending figures submitted to us by an existing UK PEP, we estimate that prison entrepreneurship programmes are capable of generating a 17x return on investment by significantly reducing the rate of reoffending.

Aligning with themes

Helping people back to work

The evidence suggests that many prisoners have the right traits to be entrepreneurs and wish to start a business after release - this programme caters for such demand. Even for participants that do not end up starting a business, the programme develops their employability skills.

Addressing multiple and complex needs

Entrepreneurship empowers prisoners to think, act and live more autonomously and enables ex-prisoners to support themselves economically, reducing welfare dependency and indebtedness.

Listening and responding to people with lived experience

The programme will recruit local ex-prisoners who have become successful entrepreneurs to mentor participants. It will also facilitate peer-to-peer mentoring among prisoners - up to 40% of prisoners have experience of self-employment or entrepreneurship.

Valuing volunteers

We will form a local business advisory group to secure voluntary support and in-kind services from bankers, lawyers, accountants and others to help prisoners in the programme. We will also recruit local entrepreneurs - ex-offenders and others to provide volunteer mentoring in and out of prison.

Describe how you intend to ensure that any products or benefits of your project will support wider prison reform (300 words limit).

By running a Prison Entrepreneurship Programme (PEP) at HMP Ranby and tracking/evaluating it comprehensively, the Centre will generate evidence on the effectiveness of PEPs in a UK context that will inform future decisions around PEPs in other prisons. By ensuring that the measurement and evaluation standards we use are appropriate and robust, we will enable policymakers and prison governors to make confident judgements about the efficacy and value of PEPs in general. While some evidence exists, it is fragmented and unstandardised.

With the evidence we generate - be it reduced reoffending, new venture creation, and/or increased employment among ex-prisoners - we will reach out to policymakers, prison governors and other CJS stakeholders to raise awareness of the impact of PEPs and - if the evidence supports it - promote and support their expansion. This can be done through various events (roundtables, working groups, summits), follow-up publications, and toolkits for prisons that wish to introduce their own PEPs.

The PEP model we propose - based on the findings of our research - calls for changes in the prison system echoed by many other organisations and individuals. To facilitate the implementation of PEPs, our report calls for (1) entrepreneurial training of governors (2) a formal mechanism for best practice sharing among governors (3) greater use of ROTL for prisoners starting businesses (4) greater IT and Internet access for market research and educational purposes (5) a review of the regulations and security procedures that can make working with external providers a challenge (6) an expansion of the financial capability and support services currently only

offered in certain prisons. Consequently, if expanded on a larger scale, PEPs will naturally foster wider prison reform.

Describe how the project will leave a sustainable legacy (300 words limit)

By training selected prisoners at HMP Ranby to become self-sustaining entrepreneurs, our programme will support an entire cohort of prisoners to build new lives and escape the cycle of reoffending. If successful, we will aim to continue the programme at HMP Ranby and beyond to (1) generate a virtuous cycle of ex-prisoners becoming entrepreneurs and employing and mentoring other prisoners and (2) reduce the national reoffending rate in the long-run. This will leave behind a sustainable legacy of reduced recidivism (savings to the taxpayer), reduced unemployment, and an increase in both jobs and businesses.

Given the substantial interest in self-employment among prisoners demonstrated by our survey in four UK prisons (approximately 80%), we expect to generate interest beyond the capacity of an initial programme. This will prove demand to the prison governor and lay the foundations for future iterations of the programme, especially if the success of the initial cohort engenders positive reputational effects. In the long-run, we would seek to diversify the programme's revenue streams - possibly through securing charitable donations; securing sponsorship from local/regional firms; taking stakes in ex-prisoner businesses; and subletting prison equipment and space to entrepreneurs. With both prison staff and prisoners committed to the success of the PEP, we hope to see HMP Ranby become a model example of an entrepreneurial prison.

As a formally designated reform prison, the success of a PEP at Ranby would make the case for a roll-out of PEPs across the country. Based on data from the evaluation of the Ranby programme, the projected impact of PEPs in other prisons could be estimated, with each completed programme improving the quality of the data. Rather than implementing identical programmes in every prison, we believe each PEP should be designed in consultation with local stakeholders and respond to local needs.

Describe who you will be working with and how you plan to engage stakeholders, In particular, set out how you intend to maintain, strengthen and develop new working relationships (500 words limit).

The Centre for Entrepreneurs as lead bidder will work closely with the not-for-profit social enterprise NBV Enterprise Solutions Ltd - an enterprise agency that has been delivering business support across the East Midlands for over 30 years. NBV will provide an accredited business coach to deliver the weekly workshops to participants and will provide ongoing mentoring to participants upon their release. NBV is highly experienced in providing support to marginalised individuals, and will use its connections with the business community and knowledge of local institutions to provide prisoners with the best possible support both inside and outside of prison. The Centre, NBV Enterprise Solutions and HMP Ranby will host monthly meetings to review project status and ensure everything is on target.

The Centre will establish a national expert steering group to oversee the design and delivery of the programme. It will include organisations and individuals with experience of delivering prison entrepreneurship programmes, entrepreneurship and criminal justice experts from the academic and the voluntary sectors, and representatives from the business community.

Individuals who have already pledged to join the steering group include:

- Chris Stacey, co-director, Unlock
- Rod Clark, chief executive, Prisoners' Education Trust
- Phil Ashford, co-founder, Enterprise Exchange (prison entrepreneurship programme)
- Sheena Leaf, founder, The Entrepreneur Inside (prison entrepreneurship programme)
- Duane Jackson, founder, Kashflow and Supdate (ex-offender entrepreneur)
- Jacob Hill, founder, Lazy Camper and Offploy (ex-offender entrepreneur)

Phil Ashford of Enterprise Exchange will be retained at the beginning of the project to co-create the programme's course plan with NBV and the Centre. The plan will be reviewed, edited and signed off by the whole steering group. The group will then meet a minimum of four times during and after the programme to oversee its progress.

Working with Neil Richards of HMP Ranby, the Centre will also help to form a local business advisory group that convenes business support organisations and service companies that can offer in-kind / reduced price support services for participants both in prison and upon release. This may include the local chamber of commerce, a local bank, law firm, accountancy firm and others. This will feed into HMP Ranby's wider business engagement strategy.

The Centre will also seek to engage larger firms in the area and high net worth individuals (for example Retford-based business owner and billionaire Tony Langley) who may be encouraged to donate to fund the ongoing delivery of the prison entrepreneurship programme.

To assist with the design and execution of the programme evaluation, the Centre will use an existing relationship HMP Ranby has with the University of Cambridge. A Criminology PHD candidate will be engaged in the design stage of the programme to embed evaluation procedures from the very start. They will then be brought back in after the programme to work with the Centre in analysing data and writing up the results.

Provide a detailed project plan to include proposed stages of delivery, key milestones, risks and mitigations.

Project Plan: HMP Ranby Prison Entrepreneurship Programme

Lead bidder: Centre for Entrepreneurs

Supporting bidder: NBV Enterprise Solutions

Host prison: HMP Ranby

Project manager: Matt Smith, director, Centre for Entrepreneurs

Project background:

The Centre for Entrepreneurs ('the Centre') will work with NBV Enterprise Solutions and HMP Ranby to introduce a Prison Entrepreneurship Programme (PEP) that will help prisoners prepare for self-employment and business start-up.

Project board (to meet monthly)

- Matt Smith, Centre for Entrepreneurs - Chair
- Joanna Clarke, deputy chief executive, NBV Enterprise Solutions
- HMP Ranby representative - to be confirmed

Project team

- NBV Enterprise Solutions coach - delivering the programme
- Phil Ashford, founder, Enterprise Exchange - consultant working with NBV to design programme

Evaluation team

- Maximilian Yoshioka, lead researcher, Centre for Entrepreneurs - evaluation
- Roland Mortimer, research assistant, Centre for Entrepreneurs - analysis
- University of Cambridge Criminology PHD candidate - evaluation

Key stages of delivery

1. Design

October to November 2016

Direct cost: £10,700

Milestones:

- Sign agreement with NBV and HMP Ranby Prison.
- Form steering group and local business advisory panel.
- Appoint consultant to assist with programme design.
- Design programme with consultant and NBV, and evaluation methodology with academic partner.
- Submit programme and evaluation design to steering group review, review edits, and final sign off.

2. Implementation

November 2016 to February 2017

Direct cost: £47,935

Milestones:

- Host a launch event to promote the scheme inside the prison and nationally.
- Promote the programme throughout the prison and secure participation from interested prisoners.
- Run an initial taster workshop on entrepreneurship open to all interested prisoners.
- If needed, run a selection process to identify final 50 participants (criteria to be determined, but could include existing business idea, nature of business idea, remaining sentence length, behavioural suitability, and diversity of background).
- Run in depth workshops from mid November to February.

- Allocate competitive start-up grants of up to £1000 to 20 of the 50 participants before the end of the programme (to be managed and spent on behalf of participants by NBV).
- Run a pitching event after the programme ends in February to showcase the prisoners' businesses.

3. Ongoing mentoring and support

March 2016 onwards

Direct cost: £28,000

Milestones:

- Engage participants when released, to give ongoing business support and mentoring.

4. Evaluation

March 2016 to June 2016

Direct cost: £7,500

- Initial evaluation report completed by June 2016.

NB a further £25,360 of overhead costs are also incurred over the duration of the project. All costs are broken down by stage and quarter in the budget.

Risks and mitigations

We have identified a number of possible risks with respect to this programme and the mitigating actions to minimise them:

- **Inability to secure all or any funding required**

Lower or delayed funding levels would potentially affect the project's ability to deliver all of the interventions, so lower levels of activity and outputs would be agreed. No funding would mean the project would not go ahead. However the programme aligns with the national priorities of NOMS and the Ministry of Justice and the associated desired outcomes, so it is hoped that the PEP will receive full support.

- **Inability to attract the right team to deliver the PEP within the necessary timescales**

Current NBV Adviser and Trainer team members would be transferred to this programme initially to ensure all activities commenced immediately. Robust and equitable recruitment and induction processes are in place and NBV's ability to attract high calibre applicants and low staff turnover is both endorsed and supported by IIP accreditation processes, along with excellent staff training and support mechanisms. We therefore do not anticipate any issues with recruiting high calibre candidates to meet demand as the project moves forward.

- **Difficulties in engaging with beneficiaries**

Strong relationships with relevant strategic partners will be developed, especially with the prison governor and relevant prison personnel to raise awareness amongst staff and prisoners and secure commitment to the PEP. Most of the education taking place in prisons today is vocationally and craft oriented, with basic literacy and numeracy support for the high number of inmates suffering from dyslexia. These interventions and skills would be critical in establishing the path to the PEP and indeed business start-up for many of the programme's beneficiaries, so a partnership approach to tuition would be carefully nurtured and highly valued by the NBV Team. Tried and tested engagement protocols will be established and ongoing review and monitoring will ensure they continue to be adjusted to ensure relevance and success. NBV will ensure that good referral processes are established and if necessary increased engagement activities will be implemented.

- **Poor performance and under-achievement of planned outputs and outcomes**

NBV's vigorous and successfully audited performance management and monitoring systems and processes will identify any underperformance immediately. The NBV Deputy Chief Executive and Management Team will work with other Steering Group members to establish rigorous reporting mechanisms. Any required adjustments to accommodate potential underachievement and improvements in delivery will be made swiftly. In addition NBV has never had a contract reduced or cancelled as they have consistently over delivered against profiled targets and outputs in the past.

- **Non-compliance with requirements at audit**

The current and successful internal audit regime used by NBV for other projects and endorsed at external Contract, BIS, DWP and Article 13 and 16 European audits, will be established for the PEP Programme. NBV's ISO 9001 accredited systems, internal checks and audit processes will ensure the validity of all delivery for the PEP Project.

- **Clients unhappy with the PEP service**

NBV is dedicated to providing customer satisfaction through excellent customer service and publishes this commitment via their Customer Charter. NBV acknowledges in the unlikely event of an unhappy participant, most often issues are resolved by discussing any concern with the client and agreeing a different approach. However, in case of occasions where concerns cannot be resolved through discussion, we have a comprehensive complaints procedure which is clearly explained to all clients and understood by all staff. Our controlled process is based on understanding the nature of the complaint, investigating it thoroughly, monitoring it internally via our Quality Management System and keeping the complainant informed of progress. In the unlikely event that a complaint is unresolved it would be progressed to the NBV Senior Management Team and reported to the PEP Steering Group.

We acknowledge that low risk problems which may occur during the delivery of the Project should be dealt with by NBV and reported to the Prison and Steering Group where appropriate. If high risk problems arise with immediate action required, NBV would directly consult with relevant Partner prior to tackling the issue. NBV has its own feedback management system in place which is part of its ISO system and feedback would be reported at each Steering Group to ensure complete transparency. In this way The Project Team and Board will ensure ongoing continuous improvement of the PEP Programme. Through a rigorous process of ongoing monitoring and client feedback we will ensure that the Project delivers appropriate and client led services and that any issues are accommodated within the support offered and enhanced where necessary to meet any additional needs which may emerge during the lifetime of the Project.

Provide detail on how quality of the project will be assured on an ongoing basis (300 words limit).

The Centre for Entrepreneurs will provide overall management of the project and work with its national expert steering group and a diverse group of stakeholders to ensure that the programme is delivered to the highest possible standard. In order to achieve this, the Centre will:

- co-create the programme course content with NBV and Phil Ashford, founder of Enterprise Exchange - an existing prison entrepreneurship programme. The content will be reviewed and edited by the steering group, before it is signed off by HMP Ranby, NBV and the Centre.
- convene the expert steering group several times over delivery of the programme. This will ensure that the design, implementation and evaluation phases are scrutinised and debated from a range of expert perspectives, including those of prison management, experienced PEP providers, CJS experts and ex-prisoner entrepreneurs.
- regularly check-in with NBV to ensure that the programme is meeting the project's key goals and milestones. If and when problems are encountered, we will source solutions from our own expertise and our extended network of prison entrepreneurship programmes providers.
- during the programme, survey both prisoners and prison staff involved to ensure it is running smoothly and identify any dissatisfaction or concerns. If these arise, we will work quickly and effectively to resolve any underlying issues.

NBV:

- is an accredited Institute of Leadership and Management (ILM) Centre and SFEDI NVQ Training Provider (SFA UKPRN 10004799)
- is a fully accredited member of the National Enterprise Network
- achieved IIP accreditation in 2000 and continues to retain the standard
- is ISO 9001-2008 accredited and has been since 2003
- trains customer facing staff in line with nationally recognised standards.

NBV is acknowledged as one of the leading business support agencies in the UK and is recognised nationally as an exemplar of good practice by Government Departments such as BEIS, DWP and DCLG.

Provide information on previous experience or transferable skills relevant to working in the CJS (300 words limit).

In May 2016 the Centre for Entrepreneurs released a comprehensive report titled “From inmates to entrepreneurs: how prison entrepreneurship can break the cycle of reoffending”. The report makes the case for entrepreneurship programmes in prisons. As part of the research, the Centre:

- convened national experts and stakeholders to feed in to report, including current and past providers of prison entrepreneurship programmes both in the UK and abroad, criminal justice practitioners and researchers, prison governors and staff, and ex-prisoner entrepreneurs themselves. Methods included in-depth interviews, roundtable events, and surveys.
- ran a survey of 100 prisoners in four prisons (Isis, Thameside, Feltham and Wealstun) in partnership with Catch22 and Tempus Novo to determine experience of and interest in entrepreneurship among prisoners. The Centre also surveyed (in partnership with Unlock) around 150 ex-offenders to uncover the challenges faced by ex-offenders in the community trying to start their own businesses.
- participated in the Ministry of Justice’s Policy Fellows working group on prison reform and the Royal Society of Art’s working group for the ‘Future Prisons’ project.

NBV has previously undertaken entrepreneurship programmes at HMP Ranby, Whatton, Lincoln Nottingham and Lowdham Grange. Joanna Clarke, NBV’s Deputy Chief Executive has also worked with the Business in Prisons Programme via Nottinghamshire Probation Service and Dukeries Training Agency.

NBV has the skills and experience of working with priority groups to be found within HMP Ranby, including economic migrants, young people, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic individuals and people with disabilities. NBV has an excellent reputation for understanding the needs and barriers specific groups face and would build on their successful track record of innovation and diversity to the benefit of all PEP participants.

Describe any specialist knowledge or expertise your organisation has which is relevant to your proposal (300 word limit).

The Centre for Entrepreneurs has unrivalled knowledge and understanding of prison entrepreneurship programme models worldwide. In writing our *‘From inmates to entrepreneurs’* report, we interviewed representatives of leading prison entrepreneurship programmes in the US, Germany and the UK, questioning them on their philosophies, methods and outcomes and examining their data. We have a balanced understanding of the pros and cons of different models and of what works, and are well-placed to lead on the design of a new programme at HMP Ranby.

The Centre has comprehensively examined the academic literature on the entrepreneurialism of prisoners and their suitability for a career in entrepreneurship. We are familiar with the key drivers of re-offending, and have made the case that entrepreneurship addresses many of them. We have run our own surveys of prisoners and ex-offenders, and have original data on their interest in and previous experience of entrepreneurship. Finally,

using data from a successful UK prison entrepreneurship programme, we have produced preliminary estimates of the financial savings PEPs are capable of generating.

NBV has been supporting enterprise for the last 33 years. They fulfil a social purpose by enabling people to change their lives, improve their skills and enhance their self-esteem through recognising the differences in enterprise culture across different social groups and works hard at giving everyone the opportunity to be entrepreneurial.

NBV has a strong tradition of partnership working and a history of successful contract delivery for such organisations as the Local Authorities, Jobcentre Plus, DWP, Community Groups, DCLG, BEIS, Universities, HMP Service and LEPS.

With exceptionally high standards NBV has a fully implemented ISO 9001 quality management system which is independently audited, along with comprehensive Health and Safety, Environmental, Equality and Diversity and ICT and Data Protection policies and procedures.

Our joint expertise will help us to design and supervise an impactful programme at HMP Ranby.

Describe your approach to meaningfully evaluating the impact of your project, including how you will ensure quality (300 words limit).

The Centre will design a robust and appropriate set of measurements that will objectively and effectively track programme outcomes. While the specific details of the metrics will be determined in due course, we envision several key components, including:

- surveys of participants at regular time intervals to measure progress in both soft outcomes (increased confidence, motivation and improved skills) and hard outcomes (proportion of participants that start businesses or find employment, business survival rates, job creation).
- innovative usage of other forms of data, including the Justice Data Lab to track reoffending, Companies House to track business registrations, HMRC data to track employment outcomes and earnings, and DWP data to track benefit usage (there is precedent for this - see 2013 experimental MoJ/DWP/HMRC data share).

To ensure the quality and reliability of our evaluation, we will:

- co-design our tracking and evaluation methods with experts from our steering group to ensure they are informed by a range of perspectives. We will also use our connections with existing PEPs to learn from their experiences in evaluating their impact.
- recruit an academic to assist with the design and implementation of the evaluation. HMP Ranby have an existing relationship with the University of Cambridge where a Criminology PHD candidate is available to assist the Centre in designing and executing the evaluation.

- minimise the trap of “cherry-picking” an unrepresentative sample of prisoners, by taking steps to ensure that our programme cohort is representative of the wider prison population on a variety of demographic factors (age, educational and professional background, offence type among others).

Provide detailed projections of costs and planned quarterly expenditure in line with project milestones - please give a full breakdown of costs on a spreadsheet.

Item	Unit cost	Quantity	Q4 2016	Q1 2017	Total
Project management					
CFE management time	£ 600	10	£ 2,400	£ 3,600	£ 6,000
CFE operations time	£ 350	10	£ 1,400	£ 2,100	£ 3,500
NBV management time	£ 600	10	£ 2,400	£ 3,600	£ 6,000
NBV operations time	£ 350	10	£ 1,400	£ 2,100	£ 3,500
Expert steering group					
Travel expenses	£ 100	10x6	£ 2,000	£ 4,000	£ 6,000
Lunch	£ 60	6	£ 120	£ 240	£ 360

Design					
Consultant time	£ 500	5	£ 2,500		£ 2,500
NBV rep time	£ 600	5	£ 3,000		£ 3,000
CFE time	£ 600	5	£ 3,000		£ 3,000
Travel	£ 100	3x4	£ 1,200		£ 1,200
Hotels & subsistence	£ 100	10	£ 1,000		£ 1,000
Execution					
NBV director oversight	£ 500	6 (12x.5)	£ 1,500	£ 1,500	£ 3,000
NBV delivery	£ 450	12	£ 2,700	£ 2,700	£ 5,400
NBV delivery - travel	£ 50	12	£ 300	£ 300	£ 600
Travel - advisors, others	£ 100	30	£ 1,500	£ 1,500	£ 3,000
Launch event	£ 1,000	1	£ 1,000		£ 1,000
Flyers	100+35	2,000	£ 135		£ 135
Collateral	£ 20	50	£ 1,000		£ 1,000
Materials	£ 60	50	£ 3,000		£ 3,000
Pitching event	£ 1,000	1		£ 1,000	£ 1,000
Mentor matchmaking	£ 800	6	£ 2,400	£ 2,400	£ 4,800
Grants	£ 1,000	40/2	£ 10,000	£ 10,000	£ 20,000

Contingency			£ 1,000	£ 1,000	£ 2,000
Prisoner company formation costs	£ 600	5	£ 3,000		£ 3,000
Ongoing support					
Ongoing mentoring	£ 1,400	20		£ 28,000	£ 28,000
Evaluation					
PHD candidate travel	£ 100	5	£ 250	£ 250	£ 500
CFE evaluation design	£ 300	10	£ 3,000		£ 3,000
CFE writing	£ 300	10		£ 3,000	£ 3,000
Digital report	£ 1,000	1		£ 1,000	£ 1,000
			Total Q1	Total Q2	Total
			£ 51,205	£ 68,290	£ 119,495

LOOKING TO START UP IN BUSINESS?

Then this programme is for you!



From personal trainers and graphic designers to baristas and carpenters, whatever business you dream of starting we can help!



Transform your idea into a business with the help and support of our great package of training and funding. NBV will be on hand to provide you with advice every step of the way.



Not only will you get support in prison, but NBV will also be there after your release to help you take your business forward!

STARTING IN BUSINESS TESTIMONIALS

This was a great course, really worthwhile! I feel much more ready to launch my business now than I did before

Mike delivered the content very well and in a great manner and enthusiasm. A great workshop!

It was the most useful course I have attended, if my business is successful, part of it will be due to how much I have learned here.

NBV

PEP LEAFLET AND APPLICATION FORM REVERSE

ENTREPRENEURSHIP PROGRAMME APPLICATION FORM

Name:

ID: Age:

Wing location:

Do you already have a business idea? If so, what is it?

.....

Qualifications:

.....

Have you run your own business or been self-employed in the past?

If so, what kind of business was it?

.....

Do you have any personal issues?

.....

Sentence length:

Likely release date:


Likely location on release:

PLEASE RETURN TO ACTIVITIES

Data Protection


By completing this form you acknowledge and agree that the data contained within can be held on a computer and used for any purposes and disclosures as registered under the Data Protection Act 1998. Please note that this service may be wholly or partly funded by Ministry of Justice and records may also be accessed by third parties for monitoring and audit purposes only.

PAST EXPERIENCE SURVEY

Section 1										
Please CIRCLE the number that shows how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Strongly Disagree =1 and Strongly Agree = 10										
	Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree									
I am satisfied with my life at the moment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I feel anxious about my life at the moment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The things I do in my life are worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I feel that I belong to a community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I find it difficult to get on with other people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I enjoy working with other people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I want to contribute to the greater good of society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10


Section 2

Please CIRCLE the number that shows how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.
Strongly Disagree =1 and Strongly Agree = 10

	Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree									
I am worried about the future	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I would like to change my life for the better	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I am interested in pursuing further education/training	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I would find it too difficult to find a job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I am confident in my ability to start my own business	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Section 3

Please CIRCLE the number that shows how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.
Strongly Disagree =1 and Strongly Agree = 10

	Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree									
I can achieve goals I set my mind to	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I am find it difficult to come up with new ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I feel confident presenting my ideas to others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I find it difficult to plan for the future	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I am able to identify new opportunities for myself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I find it difficult to manage my finances	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I am good at managing my time effectively	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
I have the knowledge and skills to set up my own business	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

EVALUATION GUIDE

Introduction

This document sets out guidance for the evaluation of the jointly delivered CFE/NBV prison entrepreneurship programme (PEP) at HMP Ranby. A key requirement of the NOMS grant funding award is a robust evaluation of the PEP, which is only possible if highly quality, consistent data is collected throughout the programme.

Data from the evaluation will support (1) an assessment of the success and value for money of the intervention and (2) the creation of an evidence base which will help determine whether further PEPs are offered at HMP Ranby and other prisons in the future.

CFE will not need access to the data before carrying out the first evaluation, due in June 2017. Until then the data may be held by NBV and/or HMP Ranby, provided this is in a safe and secure location. Maintaining several copies of the data is highly advised.

1. General data collection

It is important that data is collected throughout the lifetime of the programme, and not just at the end, in order to keep track of some key variables. This data should include:

- Application form: Information acquired through the application form (on pre-existing business idea, qualifications, past business/self-employment experience, personal issues, release date, location on release) should be stored, for both successful and unsuccessful applicants.
- Prison data: Any relevant data already held by the prison on applicants (both successful and unsuccessful) should be looked up and stored. Relevant data will include.
- Real-time data: The programme should keep track of key participation data in real-time. This will include logging which participants drop out (including when and why), which receive support in the community, and which receive grants (including amounts and what the money is spent on). This list is not definitive and can be added to by the course instructor – but a systematic approach is essential.

2. Past experience questionnaire

- The programme cohort should be questioned on previous work experience, training/education and hobbies. It is up to the course instructor how this is done, e.g. orally or via a written questionnaire. The questionnaire should distinguish between traditional employment and self-employment/business, so that prisoners with past entrepreneurial experience can be identified. The questionnaire will primarily be of use to the course instructor in tailoring the programme, but it will also benefit the evaluation.

3. Evaluation surveys

- CFE has designed an evaluation survey that will be administered to participants at various stages of the programme, in order to measure how participation affects factors such as wellbeing, sociability, aspirations, self-efficacy and knowledge/skills. The survey should be administered in paper form at (1) the beginning of the programme (2) just before release (3) after several months of support in the community.
- A control group should be recruited and given the same survey (at the same points in time) to ensure that any changes observed among the programme cohort are not coincidental. The control group should be as similar in characteristics and size as possible to the actual programme cohort. To allow for the inclusion of a control group, the survey questions will be phrased in a way that avoids referring to the programme itself.

4. Key outcomes

- The “key outcomes” are the long-term occupations/activities that participants begin during the programme. These include starting a business, working as a self-employed freelancer, finding a job, pursuing further training/education, and not reoffending. Negative outcomes such as unemployment or sickness/disability should also be recorded.
- All participants on the programme should be tracked if possible, apart from those that drop out at a very early stage.

5. Qualitative interview

- In depth interviews with programme participants, prison/probation staff and NBV staff should be conducted after the intervention to get their detailed views. These can be conducted in person or over the phone. The interview questions will be designed by CFE in consultation with NBV.
- Participant interviewees should be chosen based on the stage of the programme they made it to. These groups will include: (1) prisoners who participate but drop out at an early stage (2) those who complete the prison training but fail to receive support in the community (3) those who receive community support but no grant funding and (4) those who both receive both community support and grant funding.

6. Programme feedback

- Separate to the past experience and evaluation surveys, a standalone survey will ask participants (but not the control group) for their feedback on the programme. This will assist in understanding how participants felt about the support received on the programme, and ensure that future iterations take into account any issues or complaints.

7. Data sharing and data privacy

- While conducting the evaluation will require CFE having access to data from both HMP Ranby and NBV, it is important to address concerns around data privacy.
- This will be done by asking prisoners for permission to use their data (via a request on the signed application form), by anonymising the data cited in the evaluation documents, and ensuring that sensitive data is stored securely.

NBV FEEDBACK SURVEY



Business is easier with our support!

Workshop Feedback – Week 3

In order for us to continuously improve the services we deliver, we would really appreciate it if you would take 5 minutes to provide feedback on the PEP workshops. Please hand your completed form to a member of NBV staff.

Your comments are of great value to us, so thank you!

Initials: B-S

Group: 1

1. How did you rate the content? Please score 1 to 6 (1=lowest, 6=highest)



1

2

3

4

5

6



2. How did you rate the delivery? Please score 1 to 6 (1=lowest, 6=highest)



1

2

3

4

5

6



3. What areas did you find particularly useful?

Survival income.
Start up costs

4. Were there any areas you would have liked us to have spent more time on?

Insurances

5. Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

very useful program,

I highly recommend it.
Prior release

Centre for
Entrepreneurs

CFE

powered by

LETTERONE

Centre for Entrepreneurs
New Entrepreneurs Foundation
1 Mark Square
London, EC2A 4EG

 @CFEntrepreneurs
centreforentrepreneurs.org

Company number: 07469562 | Registered Charity No: 1140102