Criminal Justice Joint Inspection

OFFENDER MANAGEMENT INSPECTION

A joint inspection by HM Inspectorates of Probation and Prisons

A report on offender management arrangements in custodial institutions in South-West England

June 2008

FOREWORD

What has come across strongly in our joint inspections in South-West England has been the challenge of implementing offender management within the context of extreme pressure on prison capacity. In establishments in the South West, prisoners were often a very long way from their home area, and meaningful contact with offender managers in probation areas was often difficult to achieve. At times of such demand on the estate, it was also very difficult for offenders to be moved between prisons to access the programmes and resources best suited to their reintegration needs and their sentence plans. The addressing of these challenges will determine the success of the offender management model.

Whilst all establishments had set up an Offender Management Unit as required, its centrality to prison processes and its relationship to other prison units was often unclear. Although staff and managers were committed to it, offender management had not yet moved centre-stage in the South West.

However, there were encouraging signs and some good practice to be shared. Where it was working well, offender management had been implemented as a genuinely shared piece of work between prison and probation. Staff spoke very positively of the benefits of joint training for offender management.

ANDREW BRIDGES
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

ANNE OWERS
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

CARATS	Counselling, assessment, referral and treatment services
CDRP	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
DIP	Drug Intervention Programme
ESOL	English as a second or other language
ETE	Employment, training and education
HDC	Home Detention Curfew
HMI Prisons	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
HMI Probation	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
IAG	Information, advice and guidance
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements
MTU	Mobile Temporary Unit
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
OASys/eOASys	Offender Assessment System/electronic OASys
OCA	Offender classification and assessment
OCN	Open College Network
OGRS2	Offender Group Reconviction Score2
OMU	Offender Management Unit
PO	Probation officer
PPO	Prolific and other priority offender
PPU	Public Protection Unit
PSO	Probation service officer
QA	Quality Assurance
RoH	Risk of Harm
ROTL	Release on temporary licence
RSU	Resettlement Unit
SMART	Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely
SMB	Strategic Management Board
SPO	Senior probation officer
VDT	Voluntary drug testing
ViSOR	Violent offender and sex offender register
VPU	Vulnerable Prisoner Unit
YOI	Young offender institution
YOT	Youth Offending Team

RECOMMENDATIONS

Improvements are necessary as follows:

Area

1. a clear and specific strategy is developed for the ongoing implementation of offender management in the South West, specifically detailing how all elements are resourced, delivered and monitored

2. offender management is given a higher priority across the different prison activities and drives the delivery of the sentence

3. all offenders falling within the scope of offender management have a comprehensive and up-to-date assessment using the Offender Assessment System tool

4. the level of contact between offender supervisors and offenders meets the minimum standard defined nationally

5. a diversity impact assessment on the implementation of the offender management model is undertaken in all prisons

6. sentence planning meetings are held for all offenders within the scope of the offender management model and systems are in place to communicate the minutes to the offender and all relevant staff

7. appropriate facilities are made available for delivering sentence planning boards within the context of the model

8. increased priority is given by offender supervisors to issues of victim safety, and victim awareness work is undertaken appropriate to the case.

National

1. offender managers in the community provide an initial Offender Assessment System assessment for all cases falling within the scope of the offender management model

2. offender managers contribute to the management of the custodial aspect of the sentence as specified in National Offender Management Service guidance.

CONTEXT AND GENERAL OVERVIEW

Offender management model

The NOMS offender management model gives a structure for moving adult offenders through both community and custodial sentences. A key feature of the model was the identification of RoH and likelihood of reoffending and the allocation of resources that were proportionate to these; in other words, the greater the risk the more resources needed to be provided to fulfil the objectives of the sentence and minimise the RoH and likelihood of the individual reoffending.

One underlying principle of the model was continuity of offender management throughout sentence; an offender manager was appointed to the case when the offender first came within scope of the model, and retained responsibility until the sentence was completed. This offender manager was located in the offender's home area or resettlement area. Their role included making an assessment of RoH and of need, and producing a sentence plan using the OASys. Working alongside the offender manager were keyworkers delivering specific interventions, and case administrators supporting a number of offender managers. If the offender was in custody, an offender supervisor was appointed in the custodial establishment to act as an important link between custody and the offender manager in the community.

Implementation of Phase I

The model was introduced in England and Wales in April 2005. Implementation was phased and Phase I focused on offenders in the community who were subject to community sentences and post-release licences. At this stage, responsibility was broadly located within the remit of the probation service; there was no requirement for OMUs in custody.

Implementation of Phase II

In Phase II, the model was extended to offenders serving certain custodial sentences. From November 2006 it included adult offenders serving a determinate sentence of 12 months or more, who were either assessed as posing a high or very high RoH or who had been identified by local CDRPs as PPOs. Prisons were required to set up OMUs by September 2006 and to deliver the offender supervisor role in custody. The area management team had adopted a project management approach to the implementation of the model in the South West. A specific offender management team had been established to provide advice and guidance to prisons. For example, the area management team was involved in each desktop exercise to decide the correct resource level. Lessons were learned from each exercise and disseminated to other prisons to improve how resources were determined. Implementation of the model to prisoners out of scope was seen as a pragmatic decision; one that would provide a consistent service to all prisoners. The area management team commented that where prisoners were being managed by local probation areas, delivery of the model worked well. Where probation areas outside of the South West were responsible for the management of the sentence, the model proved difficult to implement in practice. Area management observed that implementation of the model worked well in those prisons that had an established Reducing Reoffending Strategy that demonstrably engaged partners and all aspects of prison activities.

Implementation of Phase III

In January 2008, the model was further extended to include those sentenced to indeterminate periods of imprisonment for public protection, requiring probation areas to appoint an offender manager to take responsibility for the whole sentence, including the sentence planning and review process and the parole review.

Further phases were due to follow, with no date yet set for the extension of the offender management model to those serving life sentences, those serving under 12 months, or those serving other determinate sentences over 12 months who did not come within scope of Phase II.

INSPECTION MODEL, METHODOLOGY AND PUBLICATION ARRANGEMENTS

Model

Following the introduction of offender management arrangements in custody from November 2006, a new joint inspection of offender management arrangements in prison, including outcomes for prisoners, was developed by HMI Probation and HMI Prisons.

HMI Probation join HMI Prisons on some of their inspections to assess the quality of offender management arrangements for prisoners who are within the scope of the offender management model. The joint element of the inspection usually lasts for one day. Thereafter, HMI Prisons follow up any outstanding issues or queries on behalf of both Inspectorates for the rest of the inspection period. This joint approach to inspection is designed to maximise benefits while reducing the burden of inspection on prisons.

Prisons are assessed on how well they have met defined inspection criteria relating to offender management and focusing on the following themes:

- Communication between prison and probation
- Offender Management Model
- Sentence planning
- Sentence planning delivery
- OASys
- Offender engagement
- Diversity
- Public protection
- Victims

Inspections are carried out on a regional basis with between four to six prisons visited. It is recognised, however, that while the prisons inspected are in a particular region, the corresponding offender managers could be in any probation area in England and Wales, depending on the offender's home area.

Methodology

During the inspection we meet with:

- **keyworkers** (members of prison staff or external partners) delivering interventions in the custodial setting. This meeting is designed to provide inspectors with representative views about the delivery of interventions to in-scope prisoners
- **OMU practitioners** (offender supervisors and case administrators). This meeting is designed to provide inspectors with representative views about the front line operation of offender management
- **operational managers** (OMU manager, offender supervisor coordinator, senior probation officer, public protection manager). This meeting is designed to provide inspectors with evidence about the operational management and leadership of the prison in respect of offender management
- **strategic managers** (Governor/Director, Deputy Governor, Head of Reducing Reoffending, Head of Learning and Skills). This meeting is designed to provide

inspectors with evidence about the strategic management and leadership of the prison in respect of offender management.

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the prisoner population is carried out for all full prison inspections. For the purpose of the prison offender management inspections, prisoners in our randomly selected sample who were subject to offender management arrangements also received an annex questionnaire about their experience of offender management.

Publication Arrangements

A summary of initial findings forms part of HMI Prisons' feedback to individual establishments.

Following the conclusion of inspections in a particular region, a draft report is sent to the establishments concerned, as well as NOMS Headquarters, for comment. Publication follows approximately six weeks after this. Copies are made available to the press and also placed on both HMI Probation and HMI Prisons' websites. In addition, reports by HMI Prisons on the individual custodial establishments will also contain recommendations relevant to offender management in those settings.

Reports on custodial establishments in Wales are published in both Welsh and English.

SUMMARY

Communication between prison and probation

There was evidence in each establishment of joint work between prisons and probation to facilitate the management of the sentence and prepare offenders for release. Examples of prisons working to strengthen these arrangements included the use of standardised forms and the development of a specific role within the OMU with responsibility for external liaison. Difficulties with offenders being held far from their home area, combined with inadequate video conferencing facilities, was having a negative impact on the ability of both services to communicate efficiently. At a strategic level, communication arrangements were in place in all prisons and the corresponding probation areas. These arrangements, however, were not always focused on monitoring the quality of offender management implementation.

Offender management model

Offender supervisors had a good understanding of the model and their role within it. In the main they were enthusiastic and could see the benefits of the model. Some keyworkers noted improved communication as a result of having a single point of contact. The model was not sufficiently integrated with other departments within the establishments; in particular, role boundaries between offender supervisors and personal officers required further clarification. Not all of the prisons had strategic plans that adequately reflected offender management arrangements, nor was there sufficient guidance in place to support the implementation of the model. Not all staff had received training in the model. Most offenders knew and had met their offender manager, although this was less well evidenced for offender supervisors. Procedures to identify and allocate offenders to offender supervisors were not always clear. Ongoing contact between offenders and both offender supervisors and offender managers was limited.

All prisons had an OMU in place at the time of the inspection, although these differed in their level of development. A number of prisons had included those offenders that did not fall within the scope of Phase II. While this aimed to provide a consistent approach to prisoners, it meant that not all prisoners under offender management arrangements were resourced to have an offender manager in the community.

Sentence planning

Sentence planning was not always seen as central to the management of the case. Attendance at sentence planning boards by offender managers was inconsistent and often hindered by offenders being held long distances from the home area. Issues with OASys connectivity were also compounding this situation, impacting on both services' ability to contribute actively to the sentence planning process. Where sentence planning boards did take place, these tended to be chaired by prison staff, and responsibility for setting sentence plan objectives was often undertaken by the offender supervisor. Not all prisons had strategic plans in place to deliver the required number of boards for the full roll-out of the model.

Sentence planning delivery

All prisons provided an induction at the point of arrival at the prison. The role of the OMU and offender supervisors at this early stage of the sentence was fairly limited.

OMUs were not fully integrated into induction processes and often were not the driving force behind the activities the offender undertook during their sentence. Sentence planning was having a limited impact on the planned transfer of offenders to access interventions; mainly due to population pressures. Lack of integration of offender management and OCA functions created further difficulties. Most prisons provided an accredited offending behaviour programme, but there were noticeable gaps in interventions in some prisons, and population demands meant that transfer to other prisons to access interventions was difficult. Most offenders thought they had been helped to address their offending behaviour and that staff had helped them to prepare for release.

OASys

The number of offenders arriving into custody without an up-to-date OASys was of concern. In some prisons, separate assessment tools had been developed to ensure that key needs were identified at the point of induction. While these were seen as useful tools, they were often used to inform the interventions the offender would undertake, rather than a comprehensive OASys.

Offender engagement

Offender engagement tended to be narrowly defined, focusing on ETE and accredited programmes. Within these interventions, however, there were several good examples of staff adapting materials and approaches to facilitate attendance and positive engagement. The extent of knowledge and use of approaches to effectively engage offenders outside of these work areas was limited. Overall, specific systems to re-engage recalled offenders were limited.

Diversity

There was room for improvement in meeting the full range of diversity needs across the prisons inspected. While there were several examples of diversity needs being met, more needed to be done to address these issues in the delivery of offender management. Many of the prisons at the time of the inspection had not undertaken a diversity impact assessment on offender management. Systems to monitor the full range of diversity needs were not always in place.

Public protection

All prisons had arrangements in place to identify RoH classification and MAPPA status, although the extent to which these were consistently communicated across the different departments varied from prison to prison. Some prisons had established clear links between the PPU and the OMU, and where these were co-located, staff were particularly positive about these arrangements. Internal risk management meetings did not always fully integrate with the sentence planning process, and systems to ensure that the OMU and offender managers received information from these meetings was less well developed. All prisons had strategic links to MAPPA.

Victims

Staff within the OMU were not always seen as having a central role in the protection of victims. In a number of prisons, decisions relating to victim protection and safety were undertaken by other departments. Work with victims needed to be better coordinated across the prison, with a more central role given to OMUs. Aside from offending behaviour programmes there was little provision for direct victim awareness work with the offender.

SHARING GOOD PRACTICE

Below are examples of good practice we found during our visits:

Preparing offenders for release: **OMI Criterion: 2.1a**	In HMP Channings Wood all offenders who were within 16 weeks of release were identified to see if they required any individual assistance with resettlement issues such as job seeking, benefits or accommodation. Arrangements were made for them to attend a range of resettlement courses to assist them on release. These were half to one day in duration and were tailored to individual needs. On average, seven of nine prisoners being released each week completed one of these - an excellent achievement.

Managing RoH: **OMI Criterion:2.2a**	HMP Exeter had developed a local sentence care plan, which was drawn up with ten days of reception for public protection cases. The plan identified which local interventions at HMP Exeter would reduce RoH. Following the completion of OASys at eight weeks, the two documents provided both a short and medium term plan for reducing RoH, both within HMP Exeter and beyond.

SERVICE USERS' PERSPECTIVE

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the prisoner population was carried out for all full prison inspections. For the purpose of the prison offender management inspections, prisoners in our randomly selected sample who were subject to offender management arrangements also received an annex questionnaire about their experience of offender management.

In order to obtain a user perspective on short follow-up inspections, where prisoner surveys were not routinely conducted, 25 questionnaires were distributed to a random selection of prisoners under offender management arrangements. The table below details the responses received from each inspection.

Prison	No. in sample	No. of responses	Response rate (%)
Channings Wood	18	9	50
Verne	11	7	64
Guys Marsh	25	6	24
Exeter	25	13	52
Dartmoor	46	34	74
Total	**125**	**69**	**55%**

Please note, the figures show that the combined user perspectives referred to in the body of this report are dominated by the responses from Dartmoor as there were a larger number of prisoners under offender management arrangements in that establishment.

Responses to questions about the sample's background characteristics revealed the following:

- 4 offenders said they were under the age of 21 years

- 5 stated that they were from a black or minority ethnic group

- 3 reported that they were foreign nationals

- 2 were of the understanding that they had sentences of less than 12 months

- 10 were on recall to prison

- 12 self-identified as having a disability

- 1 identified as transgender or transsexual.

These responses go some way to indicating the diverse needs of those under offender management arrangements.

Offenders' responses were generally positive about the help and support received for problems when they had first arrived. 62% of offenders reported that they had had problems when they first arrived. Help and support to address these problems was offered to most offenders within the first 24 hours. Help to support health issues had the most positive response.

The majority of offenders had received an induction within the first week of arrival. Just over half reported that the induction provided them with the information they needed to know about the prison.

Most offenders had a sentence plan, although the extent to which they were involved in its development was disappointing. Ongoing contact between offenders, offender supervisors and offender managers during sentence was limited, as was attendance at sentence planning boards. Only 10% of offenders stated that they had had monthly contact with their offender manager and 6% with the offender supervisor. Few prisoners said that sentence planning meetings were useful to them.

Most offenders received help in a range of areas, such as housing and employment. 61% of offenders indicated that they had received help to address their offending behaviour and just over half (52%) stated that offending behaviour programmes would help them on release.

78% of offenders stated that staff had helped them to prepare for release and just fewer than three-quarters said that their experiences in prison would make them less likely to offend.

1. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRISON AND PROBATION

1.1d Specific Criterion:
Issues of risk of self-harm, if applicable, are clearly recorded. If the offender is in custody, these concerns are immediately communicated to prison staff.

Finding:

(a) Twelve offenders indicated that they had had problems with feeling depressed or suicidal when they first arrived in prison. More prisoners (17) were offered help or support from a member of staff than those that had identified this as a problem. This suggested that some offenders were helped with problems which developed later in their sentence.

2.1h Specific Criterion:
There is positive, proactive and timely joint working between prison-based staff, offender managers and others in preparation for an offender moving between custody and community.

Findings:

(a) There was evidence of timely joint working to prepare offenders for release, although this was not consistent. In two prisons, pre-release work for PPOs was well managed, with one prison having specific pre-discharge meetings, assisted by having a single point of contact for PPOs in the community. Many of the prison staff we interviewed stated that contact from offender managers, particularly in person, was limited. 78% of offenders stated that they had received help from a member of staff in preparation for release.

(b) There was evidence of prisons working to improve communication with offender managers. At the time of our inspection, two prisons had implemented the use of regional standardised forms to communicate between prisons and probation areas. One prison had integrated the role of the public protection clerk into the OMU to improve information sharing between offender supervisors and community-based offender managers. Another prison had improved information sharing through prison staff accessing the probation area's internal case recording system.

(c) Forty-nine offenders (71%) who responded to the survey stated that they had had contact with their offender manager since they had been in their current prison; 38 had had contact by letter, 16 by phone, and 32 recalled being visited by their offender manager. Only 27% of offenders felt supported by their offender manager.

4.6d Specific Criterion:
Relationships between offender managers in this criminal justice area and prisons facilitate the smooth transition of prisoners on release and prompt transmission of information from prison to probation and vice versa.

Findings:	(a) The quality of relationships between prison staff and offender managers was variable. A key theme noted across all prisons was the inconsistent attendance of offender managers at sentence planning meetings. In one prison, staff were trying to encourage greater participation of offender managers through telephone calls/conferences. Communication between prison staff and offender managers was a particular issue for those prisons where the prison population was not local to the area.
	(b) Strategic links had been established between all prisons inspected and the relevant probation area. The regional implementation group, jointly chaired by the Head of Reducing Reoffending and the Improvement and Performance Development Manager, was seen as a positive forum within which to discuss the implementation of the model. The development and pilot of a regional standardised offender management file was one outcome from this group. Prison area management had also established a separate forum for the Heads of OMUs to share best practice among the individual establishments. While a reporting structure to manage the implementation of the model had been put in place, there was less evidence that a systematic monitoring system had been established.
	(c) Video conferencing facilities were available in some establishments; however, issues relating to poor technical compatibility meant that this was not always an effective mode of communication. This was particularly problematic for those prisons where the offenders were more than 100 miles from their home area. Difficulties with the system meant that any potential benefits gained from the use of this facility to communicate with probation areas, were lost.
	(d) The use of management systems to monitor the effectiveness of communication between prisons and probation areas was limited. Shared processes to measure the timeliness of contact or offender manager attendance rates at sentence planning boards, for example, were underdeveloped. Prison area management were confident that sufficient reporting structures were in place. They acknowledged these structures were less efficient when working with probation areas outside of the region. Some 50% of the prison population were from areas other than the South West.

Summary

There was evidence in each establishment of joint work between prisons and probation to facilitate the management of the sentence and prepare offenders for release. Examples of prisons working to strengthen these arrangements included the use of standardised forms and the development of a specific role within the OMU with responsibility for external liaison. Difficulties with offenders being held far from their home area, combined with inadequate video conferencing facilities, was having a negative impact on the ability of both services to communicate efficiently. At a strategic level, communication arrangements were in place in all prisons and the corresponding probation areas. These arrangements, however, were not always focused on monitoring the quality of offender management implementation.

2.   OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MODEL

1.5c Specific Criterion:
The roles and liaison responsibilities of all workers - offender managers, offender supervisors, keyworkers and case administrators – in the community and custodial settings are clearly defined and understood.

Findings:

(a)   Most offender supervisors we interviewed had a good understanding of the offender management model and their role within it. Job descriptions had been developed for offender supervisors across the five prisons inspected, although two of the prisons were still in negotiation with the unions at the time of the inspection. In one prison, a training needs analysis had been undertaken for offender supervisors and case administrators.

(b)   Not all prisons had a written strategy on offender management. One of the documents seen during the inspection focused mainly on explaining the model rather than detailing fully how the model would be implemented.

(c)   The extent of knowledge of the offender management model was less evident for other residential prison staff. Insufficient attention had been paid to managing changes in roles, and roles and responsibilities were not always clearly defined. Concerns were expressed in some prisons that offender management had been developed in a silo and was not integrated into mainstream prison activities. Specific examples of this related to the lack of clarity about the boundary between the offender supervisor and personal officer scheme in one prison. In another prison not all keyworkers had received training in the offender management model or RoH issues. This view was supported by prison area management. Integration of the model with other aspects of prisons was identified as a key risk in the NOMS monthly monitoring process. Although most OMUs had established a regular meeting structure, we found that not all prisons had an established communication strategy that focused on integrating the role of the OMU into the wider prison establishment.

(d)   On average, half of the offenders who responded to our survey indicated they knew who to contact within the prison to gain help with community reintegration issues such as finding accommodation on release. The most positive responses were for accessing benefits (59%), employment (58%) and healthcare (55%).

(e)   The scope and role of case administration was different across the prisons. Where case administration support was in place, this was often viewed as insufficient to meet the needs of offender management. In some prisons, the role of case administrators was integrated into other roles such as public protection. In another prison, case administration staff had not been trained to undertake new tasks such as HDC and ROTL and this was impacting on the

quality and extent of support that could be offered.

(f) There was a consistent view among offender supervisors that they were driving the sentence planning process. Only 12% of offenders who responded to the survey stated that their offender manager attended sentence planning meetings. A key obstacle to full attendance, noted by offender supervisors, was the location of offenders in prisons that were not local to the probation area. Where offenders were in local prisons, staff commented that attendance was generally improved.

2.1j Specific Criterion:
Transfers of cases between areas are handled according to national requirements. The movement of prisoners is communicated promptly to offender managers. Wherever possible, the planned movement of prisoners is consistent with the sentence plan and, where unplanned moves occur for operational or security reasons, these are communicated promptly to the offender manager.

Findings:

(a) Understandably, at a time of a particularly high prison population, sentence planning did not always drive the transfer of offenders between establishments. The lack of integration with OCA was seen as a contributory factor. At least two prisons commented on the difficulty in transferring in-scope prisoners to undertake relevant programmes due to population demand and limited escort services. This also meant that offenders were being transferred to prisons where the interventions identified in their sentence plan were not being delivered. 18% of offenders in our survey said that there were plans for them to achieve all or some of their sentence plan targets in another prison.

(b) The movement of offenders was not always communicated promptly to offender managers and, with the exception of one prison, there did not appear to be a systemic process in place to notify offender managers of prisoner movement. In that prison, community offender managers either received an e-mail or the transfer of offenders was discussed and agreed through the sentence planning process if the move was required to access interventions or to a lower category prison.

2.4a Specific Criterion:
As applicable, satisfactory arrangements are in place for offenders to be contained in the custodial setting in accordance with sentence requirements for restriction of liberty.

Finding:

(a) Offenders had been contained satisfactorily in all prisons and most prisons had adopted the 'incentive' approach, whereby non-compliance with the custodial aspect of the sentence impacted on the offender's ability to progress to enhanced status.

2.4c Specific Criterion:
For all offenders, there is a comprehensive and timely induction promptly after sentence or release.

Findings:

(a) Arrangements for inducting offenders were established in all prisons. In three prisons a specific risk/needs assessment was conducted on all offenders and was seen as a useful assessment process for those who arrived with no OASys. In one prison, offender supervisors formed part of the induction process and were able to discuss the role of the OMU and the role of offender supervisor. 69% of offenders in the survey had gone on an induction course within their first week, and 59% felt that the course provided them with all the information they needed to know about the prison.

(b) With the exception of advising offenders about the role of the OMU, the role of sentence planning was not a core feature in the initial days of the offender's arrival in the prison. This meant that in one particular prison, offending needs had already been identified and referrals made before the OASys assessment had been completed. Therefore, assessments and subsequent sentence plans did not always feature highly in the management of the offender's sentence. The OMU was sometimes seen as making a contribution to the offender's sentence rather than being the main influence behind the management of the sentence.

(c) In two of the prisons, offender supervisors commented that they were promptly allocated to offenders; however, in neither prison was there a clear system in place to monitor this.

(d) 62% of offenders considered they had problems on arrival into the prison. In the main, offenders who indicated a problem in a specific area received help and support to meet that problem within the first 24 hours of arrival. Over 50% of those prisoners that responded to our survey, who indicated problems with health (57%) and concerns with contacting family (56%), received help to address their problems at the start of sentence.

3.2a Specific Criterion:
There is continuity of offender management.

Findings:

(a) 84% of offenders in the survey indicated that they had a named offender manager in the probation service. 71% said that they had had contact from their offender manager since being in the prison.

(b) 59% of offenders surveyed said they knew who their offender supervisor was. Most offender supervisors we spoke to were confident that the offender would experience continuity of offender supervisor for the duration they were in that particular prison, though there were few systems in place to monitor this.

4.4a Specific Criterion:
Effective human resource structures are in place for the staff profile needed to service the Offender Management Model, to meet service delivery requirements and to plan for future needs and contingencies.

Findings:	(a) In all prisons an OMU had been established; the structure of which varied across the different prisons. Most prisons had appointed probation staff at PSO and PO grade as well as uniformed prison staff to create a balance of skills and knowledge. In some of the prisons the role of public protection had been integrated into the OMU, and in one, plans were in place to integrate the role of the discipline clerk into the OMU.
	(b) In one prison, plans were in place to have one file, managed by the OMU, that all staff within the prison could access.
	(c) In at least three prisons the OMU had been established within the required timescales but was not fully functioning. At the time of the inspection, two prison OMUs were not fully operating due to union negotiations on the necessary re-profiling exercise. The area manager acknowledged that different establishments were at different starting points on implementing the model, with some prisons much further on in their understanding than others.
	(d) Most prisons had extended the offender management model to those out of scope, and in two prisons this included those on remand and serving under 12 months. While this created some consistency across the prison, staff commented that it was difficult to manage a mixed caseload. Clear procedures to identify those in and out of scope and the subsequent expectations of offender supervisors were not always in place and heightened staff confusion. An example of this in one prison meant that there were four different induction and sentence planning procedures for the four different groups of offenders that had come under the umbrella of the offender management model.
	(e) In those prisons where there was a high population of foreign national prisoners, staff commented on the lack of information they had to make the model meaningful for the offenders. This often resulted in OMU staff undertaking a range of assessments, and in one establishment, offender supervisors commented that this was having a disproportionate impact on the amount of time they spent with foreign national prisoners.

4.4d Specific Criterion:
Staff role boundaries are well defined, and lines of accountability are clearly understood. All workers have a clear understanding of their role, task and relationship to offenders.

Findings:	(a) In all prisons a clear accountability structure to the governor for the work of the OMU was in place. Internal links with other departments were less well established. While some keyworkers indicated that communication had improved as a result of the model, it was acknowledged that there was some distance to travel for the model and the work of the OMU to be fully embedded across prison activities.
	(b) The extent to which staff received training on offender management was variable. Some staff recalled attending an internal briefing and training, whilst others had received joint training with the local probation area. Staff that had received joint training commented on the huge benefit this had had in developing a greater understanding of respective responsibilities of the model. Feedback from case administrators indicated that there was limited specific case administrative training. What existed was mainly delivered internally. There was recognition from area management of the need to invest in the case administrative role and they acknowledged that the role was not being delivered confidently by all staff. Encouragingly, we were told of plans for a joint prison and probation conference for case administrators in early 2008/2009.

4.3a Specific Criterion:
Resources are deployed appropriately and used well to support effective offender management.

Findings:	(a) In all prisons, resources had been identified and deployed according to the 'desktop exercise'. In one prison, this resulted in a re-negotiation of the contract so that all seconded probation staff were now deployed as offender supervisors. As mentioned earlier in the report, most prisons had adopted a 'mixed economy' of probation and prison based staff. In two prisons, staff roles were divided into MAPPA/PPO responsibilities – with one choosing to allocate to probation officers those offenders assessed as a high or very high RoH and PPOs, and to prison staff the remaining out-of-scope offenders. In one prison it was felt that the desktop exercise did not fully take into account resources for the case administrative role.
	(b) Most offender supervisors were OASys trained; however, not all were actively undertaking OASys assessments. This had implications for the prison to work within the national framework of OASys, particularly where there were a high number of offenders arriving without an up-to-date assessment.
	(c) Few prisons had plans in place to manage the increase in sentence planning meetings, although in one prison a separate OMU had been

built. In some of the other prisons, awareness of the increase in sentence planning boards and plans to prepare for this were at an early stage of development. It was unclear in some prisons how they intended to resource the increase in sentence planning boards that would be required to meet the full expectation of the model.

3.1j Specific Criterion:
The resources allocated to the case are consistent with the offender's RoH and likelihood of reoffending, and with PPO status as applicable.

Finding: (a)   In most prisons, the resources allocated were sufficient to meet the needs of in-scope offenders, but were stretched where other groups of offenders were included. In two prisons in particular, staff had raised concerns regarding high caseloads where individual offender supervisors were working with up to, and in excess of, 60 offenders each.

Summary

Offender supervisors had a good understanding of the model and their role within it. In the main they were enthusiastic and could see the benefits of the model. Some keyworkers noted improved communication as a result of having a single point of contact. The model was not sufficiently integrated with other departments within the establishments; in particular, role boundaries between offender supervisors and personal officers required further clarification. Not all of the prisons had strategic plans that adequately reflected offender management arrangements, nor was there sufficient guidance in place to support the implementation of the model. Not all staff had received training in the model. Most offenders knew and had met their offender manager, although this was less well evidenced for offender supervisors. Procedures to identify and allocate offenders to offender supervisors were not always clear. Ongoing contact between offenders and both offender supervisors and offender managers was limited.

All prisons had an OMU in place at the time of the inspection, although these differed in their level of development. A number of prisons had included those offenders that did not fall within the scope of Phase II. While this aimed to provide a consistent approach to prisoners, there was a negative impact on available resources, which meant that not all prisoners under offender management arrangements were resourced to have an offender manager in the community.

3.   SENTENCE PLANNING

1.5e Specific Criterion:
Sentence planning is given a high priority. It should: give a clear shape to the sentence, focus on achievable change, reflect the sentence purpose(s), set relevant goals for each offender.

Findings:

(a) The attendance at sentence planning meetings by the offender manager was variable, often hampered by offenders being held in establishments that were in excess of 100 miles from the local probation area. Where sentence planning did take place, boards tended to be chaired by managers within the OMU, resulting in a single agency focus. Consequently, it was offender supervisors that were setting key objectives not the offender manager. Offenders recalled limited involvement of other staff; only 20% of offender supervisors and 8% of prison staff from other departments attended these meetings. One prison noted that boards were routinely cancelled due to lack of appropriate attendance by key staff working with the offender.

(b) A number of keyworkers had commented that they were often not invited to sentence planning boards, although some did receive a copy of the sentence plan. In two of the establishments the quality of the notes taken at boards were considered insufficient.

(c) 67% of offenders reported having a sentence plan, resulting in a sizeable minority that had no sentence plan in place. Concerns were expressed by staff that, in these cases, interventions were not being driven by a clear assessment of need. 32% of offenders stated that their offender manager had discussed their sentence plan with them and only 6% of offenders recalled seeing their offender supervisor on a regular basis to discuss their sentence plan targets.

(d) There were examples of prisons seeking to improve the involvement of offender managers in sentence planning. In one prison a standard process had been put in place to notify offender managers of sentence plan objectives and any achievements. In another prison a process was in place for offender supervisors to Chair sentence planning boards in the absence of the offender manager. In that same prison, a new building had been established to support up to 40 sentence planning boards per week. None of these arrangements resulted in offender managers playing a central part in sentence planning boards.

(e) OMU staff in two prisons expressed concerns regarding the quality of sentence plan objectives; staff from one particular OMU felt that the objectives set were not outcome oriented, while in the other, prison staff were concerned that there was too much emphasis placed on meeting key targets rather than focusing on the quality of sentence plans. Issues with connectivity and the lack of active involvement by offender managers in the sentence planning process

were seen as key contributory factors.

(f)   Two of the prisons had adopted a quality assurance process for assessing 10% of sentence plans, similar to the OASys QA arrangements. At the time of the inspection the outcome of these processes was unclear.

1.5j Specific Criterion:
The offender is enabled to participate actively and meaningfully in the planning process and the requirements of the sentence are explained to them.

Findings:

(a)   Only 42% of the offenders surveyed were involved in their sentence planning boards, despite the fact that just over two-thirds had reported having a sentence plan. There was limited evidence to indicate how the views of offenders were being monitored and used to inform future practice. Just under a quarter (24%) of those surveyed considered the sentence planning meetings as useful.

(b)   In two prisons, arrangements were in place to publicise the offender management model. This included an evening surgery held twice a week on the wings in one prison.

Summary

Sentence planning was not always seen as central to the management of the case. Attendance at sentence planning boards by offender managers was inconsistent and hindered by offenders being held long distances from the home area. Issues with OASys connectivity were also compounding this situation, impacting on both services' ability to contribute actively to the sentence planning process. Where sentence planning boards did take place, these tended to be chaired by prison staff, and responsibility for setting sentence plan objectives was often undertaken by the offender supervisor. Not all prisons had strategic plans in place to deliver the required number of boards for the full roll-out of the model.

4. SENTENCE PLANNING DELIVERY

2.1a Specific Criterion:
There is appropriate sequencing of interventions both in custody and the community, according to RoH and likelihood of reoffending. Work in the community builds on activity in prison, especially in relation to education and substance misuse treatment.

Findings:

(a) There was some evidence that interventions were sequenced according to RoH to others, although this was not considered sophisticated. In two prisons, fast track arrangements for PPOs to access accredited programmes and drug interventions were in place. Area management acknowledged that current arrangements for the delivery of programmes in both prisons and probation areas failed to provide a consistent service to offenders. As such, sequencing of interventions tended to be based on what was available as opposed to when a specific intervention was needed. The different offending behaviour programmes, and training and audit arrangements, were cited as key obstacles to providing a more uniform service to offenders across both parts of their sentence.

(b) While most prisons offered an accredited programme, staff reported gaps in a range of areas across the five prisons, including structured victim and alcohol interventions, domestic violence and anger management and some gaps in ETE provision. In one prison, despite 20% of prisoners having dyslexia or other learning difficulties there were no dyslexia services and no trained staff to diagnose the type and extent of the difficulties. The need to provide interventions in domestic abuse and alcohol were noted as key gaps in provision by area management. While there was the commitment to improve the way in which prison and probation interventions were delivered, the role of joint commissioning had yet to take real effect.

(c) The extent to which OCA was integrated into offender management had an impact on the length of time it would take to negotiate the transfer of offenders to access appropriate interventions. Where there was limited or no involvement of OCA, staff commented that the transfer of prisoners to access interventions was not always timely. The task of moving prisoners to access interventions as part of their sentence planning reflected the difficulties in delivering the model at a time of high prison population demands. Additionally, area management highlighted the constraints the existing transfer contract had on the movement of individual prisoners.

(d) Three of the prisons had developed a database to track the profile of offending related needs; however, during the time of the inspection it was not clear how information was being used to address gaps in provision.

2.5a Specific Criterion:
Constructive interventions encourage the offender to accept responsibility for their offending behaviour and its consequences.

Findings:

(a) Annual programme timetables were published and available in two prisons. In particular, one prison had developed a booklet of interventions, which was distributed across the establishment. 48% of offenders in the survey felt that they had been given help with their thinking skills and 52% were positive that the offending behaviour programme they had undertaken would help them on release.

(b) The use of short non-accredited programmes had been developed in two prisons. There was one example of prisons improving offender supervisor access to, and knowledge of, interventions through the development of workshops.

(c) There was evidence from the survey that offenders also received support in meeting other offending related needs. 34% received help with drug use and 27% alcohol use. Just under half (48%) received help with ETE.

2.5c Specific Criterion:
Arrangements are in place for basic skills inputs to be delivered if this need has been identified.

Findings:

(a) All prisons had arrangements in place to screen for basic skills needs. 54% of offenders who responded to the survey had received a basic skills assessment during the first week of arrival at the custodial establishment. 39% felt that vocational and/or skills training would help them on release. Just under half of those surveyed knew who to contact to gain help in arranging a place at a college on release.

(b) Keyworkers at one prison noted that incorporating the IAG assessment into the induction process was improving the 'movement' of individual learning plans with the offender, although there were some concerns expressed that this was happening independently from offender management arrangements.

(c) In two prisons, arrangements had been made to improve the attendance of offender managers at post-programme reviews and this was having a positive effect.

2.5e Specific Criterion:
The nature and timing of accredited programme work is consistent with sentence plan objectives.

Finding: (a)   There were considerable delays in accessing accredited programmes in two prisons. In one prison, keyworkers commented that there was a four and a half year waiting list for the cognitive skills programmes and three years for the healthy living programme. The prioritisation process in one prison meant that offenders were undertaking interventions close to release, and this had resulted in a two year waiting list for the cognitive self-change programme. Concerns were expressed in one prison that delaying programmes until close to release was impacting on parole opportunities.

2.5f Specific Criterion:
For offenders in prison, action is taken immediately after reception into custody to preserve employment, accommodation and family ties where these are put at risk. Supporting protective factors are evident in a custodial setting; offenders are given help throughout their time in custody to preserve appropriate community links and/or resources that may be important to them.

Finding: (a)   All prisons provided an induction process that aimed to identify key areas of concern for offenders and orientate them into the prison. The scope of the induction and extent to which OMU staff were involved varied from prison to prison. This meant that in some prisons offenders that were within scope were not always identified at the earliest opportunity and didn't always know who their offender supervisor was. Some induction processes incorporated IAG assessments, although the outcome of the assessments was not always shared with OMU staff.

Summary

All prisons provided an induction at the point of arrival at the prison. Half the offenders that responded to the survey stated that the induction had provided them with all the information they needed to know about the prison. The role of the OMU and offender supervisors at this early stage of the sentence was fairly limited. OMUs were not fully integrated into induction processes and often were not the driving force behind the activities the offender undertook during their sentence. Sentence planning was having a limited impact on the planned transfer of offenders to access interventions; mainly due to population pressures. The lack of integration with the OCA unit created further difficulties. Most prisons provided an accredited offending behaviour programme, but there were noticeable gaps in interventions in some prisons. Most offenders thought they had been helped to address their offending behaviour and that staff had helped them to prepare for release.

5.   OASys

1.3b Specific Criterion:
Using OASys, criminogenic factors relevant to each individual offender are assessed. Positive influences such as supportive and pro-social factors are also identified.

Findings:

(a) At least three prisons commented on the number of offenders arriving in custody without an OASys. In one prison, it was noted that up to 60% of offenders were arriving without a completed OASys at the point of induction. As not all staff in OMUs had been OASys trained, this was having an impact on the capacity to complete OASys where there was no offender manager or no completed OASys. Staff expressed their frustration with the connectivity of OASys, which did not always work sufficiently. In at least two prisons there was no clear strategy for managing the increased workload of OMU staff due to the number of prisoners arriving without a comprehensive assessment.

(b) Keyworkers were not always actively contributing to or accessing OASys assessments. This meant that key information was not consistently used to inform the assessment or validate information. This, combined with inconsistent sentence planning, created the sense among some staff that the OASys was not underpinning the management of the sentence.

(c) In at least three prisons, a separate risk/needs assessment tool had been developed to use at the point of induction. This served to provide some structure to the management of the sentence by identifying key areas of work where there was no OASys. The assessment, however, was not always integrated when a subsequent OASys was completed. In one prison, a risk/need assessment was conducted even when there was an OASys, resulting in duplication of process. In addition, the assessments were establishment-specific, which meant that in one prison the information was not easily transferable if the offender moved.

(d) In two of the prisons the Head of the OMU conducted a 10% sampling exercise to assess the quality of OASys.

1.3d Specific Criterion:
Assessments draw on those of other agencies including those previously carried out by the prison and probation services, YOTs, DIP and other treatment providers.

Finding:

(a) The use of other information to inform the OASys assessment was not consistent across the prisons. For example, in two prisons, staff noted that learning assessments and information from keyworkers were not routinely used to inform OASys. Opportunities to gain and

review valuable information on an offender's behaviour was being missed.

Summary

The number of offenders arriving into custody without an up-to-date OASys was of concern. In some prisons, separate assessment tools had been developed to ensure that key needs were identified at the point of induction. While these were seen as useful tools they were often used to inform the interventions the offender would undertake, rather than a comprehensive OASys assessment.

6. OFFENDER ENGAGEMENT

1.4a Specific Criterion:
A basic skills screening is carried out at the start of sentence in every case, and a full assessment follows where indicated.

Findings:

(a) 54% of offenders surveyed had had a basic skills assessment at the start of sentence.

(b) In one prison they had developed a specific IAG centre that provided a 'drop in' every lunch time so offenders could access information on available courses.

1.4b Specific Criterion:
Attention is paid to the methods likely to be most effective with each offender, whether in custody or in the community.

Findings:

(a) There were several examples of prisons considering how best to meet the needs of offenders. A number of OMU staff commented that the induction process and the OASys – where one was completed – were the main sources of information used to identify any key barriers to engagement. While learning needs assessments were incorporated into most induction processes, knowledge regarding learning styles was underdeveloped among offender supervisors across the prisons. In one prison some offender supervisors were trained in motivational interviewing approaches but this was not consistent. In another, a checklist of potential barriers was completed on all offenders accessing accredited programmes. Typically, general discussion was used to assess responsivity issues, rather than any structured approach.

(b) There was an example of accredited programme staff attending the induction to introduce programmes. In this same prison, staff used peer mentors and peer tutors in accredited programmes (those that had recently completed) and education to facilitate offender attendance and provide an overview of the programme from an offender perspective. In one prison, specific open days and 'taster courses' had been established to provide offenders with additional information on the interventions available. This process was also used to identify motivation levels and potential barriers to learning. Education staff were also based in workshops to provide work-based learning.

1.4c Specific Criterion:
Offenders' intellectual ability, learning style, motivation and capacity to change are taken into account at the earliest opportunity.

Finding:

(a)   There was evidence that intellectual ability was taken into account at the earliest opportunity during the induction process. As noted previously in this report, there was less evidence that learning styles and motivation levels were systematically assessed and seen as a core part of the sentence planning process.

2.2e Specific Criterion:
Following recall, clear explanations are given to the offender as to the reasons for their imprisonment, and efforts made to re-engage the offender.

Findings:

(a)   There was limited evidence to indicate that recalled offenders were subject to different procedures from other offenders. In three of the prisons, recalled offenders were required to undertake the same induction process as other offenders. It was not always clear whether sentence plans were routinely updated when offenders were recalled, and communication from offender managers, although improving in one prison, was inconsistent in the other prisons.

(b)   In one prison, arrangements were in place for all recalled offenders to be seen by their offender supervisor, who undertook a protective factors assessment, explained the purpose of recall and liaised with the offender manager to clarify sentence and licence dates.

(c)   Ten offenders who responded to the survey had been recalled. Of these, six had a named offender manager. Contact with the offender manager following the offender's recall was limited; only four offenders reported having any contact.

Summary

Offender engagement tended to be narrowly defined, focusing on ETE and accredited programmes. Within these interventions, however, there were several good examples of staff adapting materials and approaches to facilitate attendance and positive engagement. The extent of knowledge and use of approaches to effectively engage offenders outside of these work areas was limited. Overall, specific systems to re-engage recalled offenders were limited.

7.   DIVERSITY

1.4d Specific Criterion:
At an early stage, diversity issues, potentially discriminatory/disadvantaging factors and any other individual needs are actively assessed. If identified, plans are put in place to minimise their impact.

Findings:

(a)   The active assessment of diversity needs was undertaken during the induction process in most prisons. As not all induction processes incorporated the offender supervisor, this meant that information relating to diversity needs was not always incorporated into the OASys assessment and sentence planning process. Just over a third of offenders (32%) felt that the sentence plan had taken account of their individual needs.

(b)   There was an example of active information sharing in one prison where there were particularly high numbers of foreign national offenders. Information was obtained on their country of origin and language at induction and passed to the appropriate officer. Where it was assessed that the command of the English language was a barrier, all relevant offenders were referred for ESOL.

(c)   One example of responding to diversity needs related to translating a licence into Polish, so that the offender had a full understanding of the requirements on release.

2.7a Specific Criterion:
Arrangements for interventions take account of offenders' diversity issues. Factors relating to disability, literacy and dyslexia are addressed.

Findings:

(a)   There were some examples of prisons adapting services for offenders with disabilities; this had been considered in at least two prisons. In one prison, all intervention group rooms were on the ground floor to facilitate those offenders with physical disabilities. In another establishment, a disability questionnaire had been developed to assess individual needs.

(b)   A number of keyworkers across the different prisons provided examples of how programme materials were adapted for different learning needs; these included changing the font type and printing information on yellow paper for those offenders diagnosed with dyslexia. There were additional examples of adjusting programme work to address literacy and numeracy issues through the use of visual aids.

(c)   Arrangements to provide ESOL classes were available across all the prisons inspected, although monitoring arrangements for the take-up of these classes and any successful outcomes were less clear among the staff we interviewed.

(d) A small number of offenders reported difficulties with religion, race, disability, and reading and writing skills, indicating that these problems would hinder them taking full part in prison activities. None of the offenders who reported a difficulty with religion and race indicated that these had been dealt with. Disability and difficulties with reading and writing were responded to in two instances respectively.

2.7b Specific Criterion:
Singleton placements of minority offenders in any mixed setting only occur with offenders' informed consent.

Finding:

(a) In most prisons there was a process in place to manage singleton placements within groups with the consent of the offender e.g. the offer of alternative groups. Keyworkers explained that ethnic minority offenders were routinely consulted on whether they wanted to attend a group where they were the lone minority ethnic member, or wait for another group with wider representation. There was evidence in only one prison of clear guidance on the management of singleton placements in its programme manual.

4.6f Specific Criterion:
Services are developed, as appropriate, to support work with minority groups.

Findings:

(a) In most prisons, ESOL was available and staff had access to translation services; the most commonly used were Language Line and the Big Word. There was only one prison where there were no official translator services available; staff there were reliant on offenders to translate – not a satisfactory arrangement.

(b) One prison had delivered interventions for fathers, aimed at improving communication within the family and improving parenting skills. The success of these programmes resulted in OCN awards.

(c) In one prison, where there were a high number of foreign national offenders, OASys had been translated into 27 different languages.

(d) There was limited evidence that the full range of diversity needs was being monitored to ensure that the right interventions were available.

4.1g Specific Criterion:
Diversity issues are an integral part of the strategic planning and implementation process and are regularly monitored against agreed criteria.

Findings:

(a) There was variation in the extent to which diversity issues were integral to the strategic implementation of offender management. While most prisons worked to a race equality plan, a number of prisons were only just engaging in impact assessments for offender management. As such, monitoring the impact of the offender management model on different offender groups was in its infancy. Evidence of regular discussion of diversity issues as a standard agenda item in team meetings was limited.

(b) A number of prisons had monitoring processes in place to review diversity needs. In at least two prisons, systems were in place to monitor SMART data and this had been used in one prison to assess the equality of access to activities and interventions for black and minority ethnic offenders. In another prison, management systems to monitor and analyse data on diversity on a regional and establishment basis were also in place. It was clear that monitoring systems were well established for race and ethnicity issues; there was less evidence that other diversity needs were being monitored and responded to.

4.3c Specific Criterion:
Sufficient resource is allocated to support diversity initiatives and their impact is monitored.

Findings:

(a) There were a number of examples of prisons working to support diversity initiatives, although the extent to which these were monitored for outcomes varied. Three establishments had a dedicated foreign national clerk/liaison officer. In one prison where there was a high foreign national population, a dedicated foreign national unit had been established. The unit had established relationships with the Border and Immigration Service and a range of consulates to increase its understanding and gain additional information of the issues relating to specific ethnic groups. In another, a communication contract was in place to support offenders in maintaining family links in their country of origin.

(b) In two prisons, resources were dedicated to diversity fairs and cultural evenings aimed at improving the knowledge of both staff and other offenders of different cultures. Other examples included a travellers' chaplain and in one establishment an offender mentoring scheme was in development.

(c) One prison had an elected Prison Council – a development for which they had won a Butler Trust award.

Summary

There was room for improvement in meeting the full range of diversity needs across the prisons inspected. While there were several examples of diversity needs being met, more needed to be done to address these issues in the delivery of offender management. Many of the prisons at the time of the inspection had not undertaken a diversity impact assessment on offender management. Systems to monitor the full range of diversity needs were not always in place.

8. PUBLIC PROTECTION

1.2c Specific Criterion:
The OASys RoH classification – and the MAPPA classification if applicable – is clear, accurate and has been communicated to all staff involved in the case.

Findings:

(a) Arrangements for identifying the OASys RoH classification and MAPPA level were established across most offender management arrangements inspected. Where offenders arrived without a completed OASys, offender supervisors in one prison would contact the relevant SPO. In another prison, offender supervisors had access to the local probation area's internal case management system and would use this to verify RoH status. In this same prison, an internal case tracking tool had been developed, which enabled information on RoH to others to be communicated easily to the rest of the prison staff. In another prison, there was a dedicated offender supervisor for public protection with a responsibility for liaising with external agencies regarding RoH issues and accessing ViSOR.

(b) Concerns were expressed by some OMU staff that RoH assessments at the point of induction were not always informed by a comprehensive OASys. In one prison, an assessment tool similar to OGRS had been implemented to assess the likelihood of reoffending, but had no accompanying assessment to support the classification.

(c) Keyworkers in one prison were clear about where to gain information on RoH and with whom to discuss concerns relating to RoH.

1.5d Specific Criterion:
Where relevant, recommendations are made for restrictive licence conditions or community order requirements aimed at minimising RoH to others.

Findings:

(a) Most offender supervisors we spoke to commented that they had had some involvement in setting licence conditions but this was not consistent across the individual establishments. In some prisons, offender supervisors discussed licence conditions at sentence planning or internal risk management meetings. As stated previously, offender supervisors did not always have a responsibility for influencing this aspect of the sentence. This meant that key information relating to the resettlement of offenders was not routinely used to support reintegration.

(b) In one prison, staff commented that there was no formal procedure to check offenders' licences before release to ensure that the appropriate licence conditions had been included.

2.2a Specific Criterion:
RoH to others is managed throughout as a high priority. It is thoroughly reviewed within the required timescales (at least every four months) and always following a significant change that might give rise to concern. There is ongoing planning to address RoH to children, the public, known adults, staff and prisoners. For custody cases, the offender manager and offender supervisor provide evidence of engagement with internal risk management processes.

Findings:		
	(a)	In a number of prisons, there was an established link between staff in the OMU and internal risk procedures. A number of OMUs were co-located with the PPU or had a dedicated public protection staff member. The area manager commented that where this structure was in place it worked well and provided staff with a shared understanding of and responsibility for public protection.
	(b)	In all prisons inspected there were established monthly public protection meetings. The attendance at these meetings by offender supervisors varied, although this appeared to be an improving picture. In one prison, offender managers were not routinely invited to participate in these meetings. In another prison, concerns were expressed that the public protection meetings were not fully integrated into the sentence planning process.
	(c)	In most prisons, there were established links with security where additional information on RoH issues could be obtained. Clarity on who should gather RoH information and how it should be shared was not always consistent. For example, in one prison it was the role of the offender supervisor to determine whether mail/visit monitoring was required and in another it was the responsibility of the security department.

2.2b Specific Criterion:
MAPPA are utilised effectively for appropriate cases, i.e. those where RoH warrants multi-agency involvement, including at key points in a custodial term.

Findings:		
	(a)	Most prisons complied with the national guidance of holding MAPPA meetings six months before the offender's release into the community. A good example at one establishment of managing children's safeguarding issues was the practice of holding additional meetings prior to the MAPPA meeting to aid information sharing. In two establishments, safeguarding procedures were incorporated into public protection policy and there were guidance and procedures for information sharing across the two organisations.
	(b)	In one prison, risk management meetings for MAPPA cases were held three months prior to release and as such were not sufficiently feeding into community MAPPA meetings that were held six months before an offender was released.
	(c)	In one prison, staff commented that they did not always know what MAPPA level an offender was, given the difficulties in obtaining

information from offender managers. It was of concern that in one prison there were in excess of 100 offenders assessed under the MAPPA structure where the MAPPA level was not indicated and they had not been allocated to an offender supervisor at the time of the inspection.

(d) The attendance of offender supervisors at community MAPPA meetings was variable. It was not always clear if they attended regularly and the communication of MAPPA minutes and the minutes from prison risk management meetings was not happening reliably.

4.1f Specific Criterion:
An appropriate strategic contribution is made to public protection.

Findings:

(a) All prisons had strategic links to MAPPA; however, representation at panel meetings varied within the region. In one prison the Head of Public Protection attended the Level 3 meetings and the area manager the SMB. In another prison it was the governor that attended the MAPPA SMB.

(b) All prisons had in place a public protection policy, but this was not consistently integrated into the offender management model. In one prison, the policy had not been updated (it was three years old) and did not reflect the offender management model and the development of the OMU.

4.3b Specific Criterion:
Resources follow risk, with RoH to others a clear priority, and PPOs given proportionate resource.

Findings:

(a) RoH was given a clear priority in most of the establishments, although this was not always consistent for PPOs. Most offenders assessed as representing a high RoH were prioritised for interventions. Concerns were expressed in one establishment that there were limited interventions available for high RoH offenders; there were no accredited programmes for offenders with high levels of violence, and domestic violence provision was also a gap. In such cases, it was unclear what work was being undertaken with the offenders. The need to provide domestic violence interventions was identified by the area manager as a clear gap in provision within the prison area.

(b) In one prison, there were clear procedures for managing PPOs. A specific pack had been developed, which offender supervisors were required to work through within three or four days of the offender's arrival. Priority for prison programmes was in place, including an immediate referral to CARATS. While there was the expectation of enhanced contact from the offender supervisor and regular updates communicated to the offender manager, it was not clear that the

offender supervisor was carrying out any purposeful or offence focused work with the offender.

Summary

All prisons had arrangements in place to identify RoH classification and MAPPA status, although the extent to which these were consistently communicated across the different departments varied from prison to prison. Some prisons had established clear links between the PPU and the OMU, and where these were co-located, staff were particularly positive about these arrangements. Internal risk management meetings did not always fully integrate with the sentence planning process, and systems to ensure that the OMU and offender managers received information from these meetings was less well developed. All prisons had strategic links to MAPPA.

9.   VICTIMS

Findings:

(a) While there were some examples of offender supervisors promoting victim safety from within the establishment, this aspect of work was underdeveloped. In one prison, a process had been implemented to ensure the separation of victim information from the main offender file. There were other examples of offender supervisors having regular contact with the victim liaison officer in the community. It was not always clear whether offender supervisors saw victim safety as part of their role and this was compounded by other departments leading in this area of work.

(b) As stated previously in this report, the role of the offender supervisor in protecting victims was variable; most work was undertaken by security and did not always form part of a comprehensive RoH management approach led by sentence planning.

Findings:

(a) Aside from certain sessions of accredited offending behaviour programmes, there were few specific victim awareness interventions available across the prisons. One prison delivered the Sycamore Tree Programme twice a year. This programme, which was six sessions long, aimed to raise victim awareness and teach offenders the principles of restorative justice. Overall, little was done in the way of direct victim work with offenders across the establishments. 39% of offenders who responded to the survey had undertaken victim awareness work and 30% described the work as useful.

(b) In one prison, a previous victim awareness course had been discontinued. A booklet for self-learning was now available for prisoners. The content of the booklet was sufficient and covered all aspects of victim awareness. Concerns were expressed, however, that offenders were unlikely to complete the exercises on their own.

Summary

Staff within the OMU were not always seen as having a central role in the protection of victims. In a number of prisons, decisions relating to victim protection and safety were undertaken by other departments. Work with victims needed to be better coordinated across the prison, with a more central role given to OMUs. Aside from offending behaviour programmes there was little provision for direct victim awareness work with the offender.

APPENDIX 1
Prisons inspected in this area

HMP Channings Wood	
Task of the establishment	Category C training prison for convicted male adult prisoners
Area organisation	South West area and part of the Devon cluster for provision of health services with Exeter and Dartmoor
Number held	655
Certified normal accommodation	634
Operational capacity	667
Date visited	3 July 2007
Number in scope of Phase II	152
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	Last full inspection: 28 October to 1 November 2002 Last short unannounced inspection: 2 – 4 November 2004
Brief history	Channings Wood was built on the site of a Ministry of Defence base by a combination of contract and prisoner labour. Work began in 1973 and the prison officially opened in July 1974. The building programme replacing old wooden huts with new purpose-built buildings was completed in 1991. Since that time, the vulnerable prisoner capacity had been increased by 40 by the installation of a MTU in 2003
Description of residential units	Seven house blocks, including a drug treatment therapeutic community, a drug free compliance testing unit, vulnerable prisoners' accommodation and two small self-contained facilities for enhanced prisoners

HMP The Verne	
Task of the establishment	HMP The Verne is a category C training prison for adult male prisoners, including life-sentenced prisoners
Area organisation	South West

Number held	587
Certified normal accommodation	558
Operational capacity	593
Date visited	7 August 2007
Number in scope of Phase II	40
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	19–20 July 2005
Brief history	HMP The Verne opened in 1949 on the site of a Victorian fortress, and many of the original buildings are still in use. A, B and C wings were built in the early 1970s. Due to security considerations and the relaxed regime, the prison has operated stringent allocation criteria since January 2006
Description of residential units	There were six identical 'hotel style' wings, five of which held a maximum of 86 prisoners, and one (C2) held 92. In addition, D wing provided dormitory accommodation with curtained bed spaces and ran a Kainos programme. A1 and C1 wings accommodated only enhanced-level prisoners on the incentives and earned privileges scheme. A2 wing was the induction wing

HMP Exeter	
Task of the establishment	A local prison serving the courts of Cornwall, Devon and South-West Somerset. It houses adult male prisoners and young offenders, both unconvicted and convicted
Area organisation	Prison Service South West area
Number held	447
Certified normal accommodation	316
Operational capacity	533
Date visited	17 October 2007
Number in scope of Phase II	80
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection

Last HMI Prisons inspection	13 – 17 December 2004
Brief history	HMP Exeter was built in the 1850s as a local prison and still continues in this role today as the local prison for South-West England. The prison is a typical Victorian prison of radial design, with three galleried wings leading from a central hub, plus a separate, refurbished unit that currently houses vulnerable prisoners
Description of residential units	A and C wings consist of single cells, mainly for double occupancy, housing adult and young adult prisoners, both sentenced and remanded. All cells have in-cell sanitation B wing is the first night/detoxification centre and houses newly arrived and vulnerable prisoners D wing houses vulnerable prisoners, mainly in single cells. There is no integral sanitation on this wing

HMP Guys Marsh

Task of the establishment	Guys Marsh is a category C training prison for adult and young adult male prisoners
Area organisation	South West
Number held	563
Certified normal accommodation	520
Operational capacity	578
Date visited	22 January 2008
Number in scope of Phase II	202
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	18-22 October 2004
Brief history	Guys Marsh was a military hospital converted to a borstal in 1960, and became a YOI in 1984. In 1992 it became a closed establishment and started to accommodate adults. It is now a category C prison and closed YOI
Description of residential units	There are currently nine living units: one unit holding 73 young adults and eight units holding adult prisoners – six holding 428; one holding 40 enhanced

	status prisoners, and one unit in a less secure setting holding 40 enhanced prisoners

HMP Dartmoor	
Task of the establishment	Category C training prison with the majority of the prisoner population being transferred in from category B 'locals'. However, its primary function is as a resource for other establishments in the South West
Area organisation	South West
Number held	631
Certified normal accommodation	618
Operational capacity	646
Date visited	12 February 2008
Number in scope of Phase II	242
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	Unannounced short follow-up 13 – 14 February 2006
Brief history	Dartmoor is entering the final year of a service level agreement and is performing reasonably well, hitting the majority of its targets
Description of residential units	A Wing provides 136 spaces for the general population

B Wing (VDT Unit) provides 118 places

C Wing accommodation is mothballed. The ground floor is used to deliver the induction programme

D Wing provides 132 spaces for prisoners on first night induction

RSU provides spaces for 45 prisoners

F & G (VPU) provides spaces for up to 197 prisoners |

APPENDIX 2
Role of HMI Probation and HMI Prisons

HMI Probation - Statement of Purpose

HMI Probation is an independent Inspectorate, funded by the Ministry of Justice and reporting directly to the Secretary of State. Our purpose is to:

- report to the Secretary of State on the effectiveness of work with individual offenders, children and young people aimed at reducing reoffending and protecting the public, whoever undertakes this work under the auspices of the National Offender Management Service or the Youth Justice Board

- report on the effectiveness of the arrangements for this work, working with other Inspectorates as necessary

- contribute to improved performance by the organisations whose work we inspect

- contribute to sound policy and effective service delivery, especially in public protection, by providing advice and disseminating good practice, based on inspection findings, to Ministers, officials, managers and practitioners

- promote actively race equality and wider diversity issues, especially in the organisations whose work we inspect

- contribute to the overall effectiveness of the criminal justice system, particularly through joint work with other Inspectorates.

HMI Prisons – Statement of Purpose

To provide independent scrutiny of the conditions for and treatment of prisoners and other detainees, promoting the concept of 'healthy prisons' in which staff work effectively to support prisoners and detainees to reduce reoffending or achieve other agreed outcomes.

Anyone who wishes to comment on this report should write to:

HM Chief Inspector of Probation	HM Chief Inspector of Prisons
2nd Floor, Ashley House	1st Floor, Ashley House
2 Monck Street	2 Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ	London SW1P 2BQ

Or contact us through our websites at:

http://www.inspectorates.justice.gov.uk/hmiprobation

http://www.inspectorates.justice.gov.uk/hmiprisons