



*Effective
Supervision
Inspection*

*of the
National Probation Service for
England and Wales*

Report on:
Derbyshire Probation Area

2003

FOREWORD

This is the second report to be published within our new Effective Supervision Inspection programme.

We find Derbyshire to be excellently managed with close attention being paid to meeting Service Delivery Agreements, effective partnership agreements which represented value for money, diversity, resource allocation related to risk assessment and initiatives to reduce the proportion of low-risk offenders on the area's caseload. By any standard measure the area delivers generally high performance.

The evidence suggests that there is in most cases a good fit between assessment of risk and the level of intervention with offenders, though no evidence of formal reassessment or scores for the risk of reoffending were present in a significant minority of cases. Many examples of excellent practice in high risk of harm cases and child protection were identified. However, there was scope for better communicating supervision plans to offenders, thereby encouraging their active participation.

Though the evidence suggests that interventions were delivered efficiently, Derbyshire did not gather information about the outcomes of interventions or reconviction data; development of a more outcome-focused approach would benefit the identification of good practice.

Professor ROD MORGAN
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

October 2003

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our thanks to the Derbyshire Probation Board, its managers and staff for the considerable assistance received in enabling the inspection to proceed smoothly. Without their help, most especially in arranging a complicated programme of interviews with case managers, the work could not have been completed successfully.

The inspection also depended on the contribution made by local area assessors who assisted with the case manager interviews. Their participation and commitment was greatly appreciated.

HM Assistant Chief Inspectors: John Hutchings, Peter Ramell

HM Inspectors: Jane Webb, Andrew Bridges, Nigel Dewitt, Joe Simpson

Inspection Officers: Roseanne Cameron, Peter Carter

Inspection Admin Officers: Janet Brown, Lynn Carroll

Area Assessors: Toni Baptiste, Charlotte Dunkley, Rob Hodgson, Fiona Lyness, Sandra Marjoram, Sue Parker, Ann Powell, Lois Sealey, Paul Thompson-Butler, George White, Trevor Williams

CONTENTS

	Page
Glossary	4
Summary	5
Scoring summary sheet	8
Inspection arrangements	9
Scoring approach	10
Overview of the area	12
SECTION A	
QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT	14
SECTION B	
QUALITY OF ASSESSMENT	20
SECTION C	
QUALITY OF INTERVENTIONS	23
SECTION D	
QUALITY OF INITIAL OUTCOMES	28
THEMATIC ELEMENT: EBS	
Summary of the provisional findings for Derbyshire	30
The role of HMIP	36

GLOSSARY

ACE	Assessment, Case Recording and Evaluation System
ACO	Assistant chief officer
CO	Chief officer
CP	Community punishment
CPO	Community punishment order
CPRO	Community punishment and rehabilitation order
CRAMS	Case Record Administration and Management System
CRO	Community rehabilitation order
DTTO	Drug treatment and testing order
EBS	Employment and Basic Skills
ECP	Enhanced Community Punishment
EEM	European Excellence Model
ESI	Effective Supervision Inspection
HMIP	HM Inspectorate of Probation
ISP	Intensive supervision plan
LSI-R	Level of Service Inventory-Revised
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements
MAPPP	Multi-Agency Public Protection Panel
NACRO	National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders
NPD	National Probation Directorate
NPS	National Probation Service
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OGRS2	Offender Group Reconviction Scale
PO	Probation officer
PSO	Probation service officer
PSR	Pre-sentence report
SDA	Service Delivery Agreement
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SOVA	Society of Voluntary Associates
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bounded
SPM	Supporting Performance Measure
SSR	Specific sentence report
TPO	Trainee probation officer
WLO	Work and learning officers

SUMMARY

Key findings

- ▣ **Quality of Management:** The roles and responsibilities of the management team had recently been redesignated and continuity was sustained whilst new initiatives were developed. Board and managers followed NPD priorities, with particular strengths in performance management, monitoring and delivery of national and local targets. There were extensive diversity initiatives and evaluation of compliance with the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 would measure these achievements. Resources were allocated effectively, including reviewing staff roles to address the high number of low and medium-risk cases. Considerable attention was paid to maintaining positive relationships with partners and sentencers.
- ▣ **Quality of Assessment:** Generally assessment of offenders was satisfactory, the exceptions being reassessment of low and medium-risk cases and limited recording on contact logs. Liaison between the case manager and others, including partners, was comprehensive. The MAPPP structure had been communicated to all staff and managers monitored most cases in detail. Internal assessment documents were in use and all staff had had OASys training in preparation for a phased introduction. Greater attention should be given to communicating supervision plans to offenders.
- ▣ **Quality of Interventions:** Management of attendance and enforcement was the main priority for all staff. Referrals to programmes had risen and case managers reinforced the work of others. Inter-agency working ensured that public and child protection issues were addressed. There were wide-ranging arrangements for meeting offenders' diverse needs, except for literacy and dyslexia. Greater attention should be given to the extent to which interventions challenge offenders to accept responsibility for their offending. Case managers needed to be trained in victim issues and the Board should ensure that these are addressed with offenders.
- ▣ **Quality of Initial Outcomes:** There was no evidence of reoffending in most cases and interventions were delivered efficiently. Criminogenic factors for nearly all offenders showed either improvement or no deterioration. However, the application of learning skills by offenders was less positive. Evaluation by the area of the effectiveness of supervision would enhance decisions about resource allocation and staffing structures.

Recommendations

The Probation Board should ensure that:

- ▣ *victim issues are sufficiently addressed in the assessment and supervision of all offenders*
- ▣ *all supervision plans are reviewed every four months as required by the national standard*
- ▣ *contact with offenders is recorded in sufficient detail*
- ▣ *interventions with all offenders challenge them to accept responsibility for their offending behaviour*
- ▣ *greater attention is given to offenders' literacy needs.*

Next steps

- This report has been submitted to the Secretary of State and copies provided to the Commissioner for Correctional Services, the Director General of the NPS, the Probation Board and CO. Copies have also been made available to the press and are on the website of HMIP at:
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/justice/probation/inspprob>
- The report makes a number of recommendations which are designed to encourage the area in its work, to take further some of its own good practice and to promote improvements in quality and effectiveness in the future.
- The Board will be asked to send a response to the recommendations, together with an action plan, within three months of the publication of the report. It is anticipated that the recommendations will normally be implemented within 12 months of publication which should allow sufficient time for integration with existing developments. We will also expect the NPD to ensure that recommendations to Boards are implemented.
- Unlike previous area inspection programmes, ESI does not include routine follow-up inspections unless there is an issue of serious concern that needs to be addressed quickly. The inspection of the Derbyshire Probation Area has not revealed any such issues.
- As well as reports on individual areas we will publish periodic reports about findings across several probation areas, reflecting the fact that this is an inspection of the NPS. Such reports will include addressing race equality and wider diversity issues, bearing in mind that, for example, the number of minority ethnic offenders is typically very small in many probation areas. These reports will also include comparisons of the performance of areas with similar characteristics.
- Over the three year period of the ESI programme we will be looking at the NPS's work with about 4,500 cases. We have arranged with the Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate that cases in the sample will be followed through to the two year reconviction point. This will give a longer-term picture of the effectiveness of both individual areas and of the NPS as a whole.

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

Section A – Quality of Management	
A1: Leadership and planning	Well met
A2: Resource allocation	Well met
A3: Management and supervision of staff	Satisfactorily met
A4: Partnership/contracting out	Well met
A5: Effective communication with sentencers	Very well met

Section B – Quality of Assessment	
B1: Assessment of risk of harm	70%
B2: Assessment of likelihood of reoffending	80%
B3: Case management	76%
B4: Documentation	78%
Score for section B	76%

Section C: Quality of Interventions	
C1: Managing attendance and enforcement	93%
C2: Delivering appropriate supervision	79%
C3: Diversity needs	79%
C4: Responsivity	90%
C5: Management of risk of harm	78%
Score for section C	83%

Section D: Quality of Initial Outcomes	
D1: Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes	64%
D2: Improvements are sustainable	69%
D3: Outcomes of interventions are assessed and reviewed using available data	Partly met
D4: Interventions demonstrate value for money	92%
Score for section D	76%

OVERALL SCORE FOR SECTIONS B-D	79%
---------------------------------------	------------

INSPECTION ARRANGEMENTS

- The ESI programme started in June 2003. All 42 probation areas comprising the National Probation Service for England and Wales are being inspected over a three year cycle, with areas of similar characteristics (in terms of size and population density) visited in the same year to facilitate comparisons in performance. This enables us to identify and promote effective work with offenders and disseminate information about good practice.
- Probation areas are being assessed on how well they have met defined inspection criteria focusing on the:
 - overall management of the area
 - quality of the assessments carried out on offenders
 - quality of the interventions carried out with offenders
 - initial results of the interventions, both in relation to criminogenic factors such as employment, accommodation and substance misuse, and also whether there has been any reduction in the risk of harm and the risk of reoffending.
- The inspection takes account of the regular NPS performance data. These are produced by the NPD who are responsible for their collection and quality assurance.
- Each inspection takes place over two weeks, about three or four weeks apart. The area is asked to identify a random sample of 100 offenders (more in the largest areas) who have been under supervision for approximately nine/ten months, 20 of whom are registered as high risk of harm. The cases come from most categories of orders and licences.
- During the first week of the inspection we examine the file, carry out an in-depth interview with the case manager and, where possible, interview the offender and any other people significantly involved in the supervision (e.g. accredited programme tutors, hostel key-workers, police in high risk of harm cases, CP supervisors, and staff of other organisations involved in providing a service to offenders in relation to drugs, alcohol, employment, etc).
- Inspection of about a third of the cases in the sample is carried out by experienced staff of the probation area being inspected. We think this provides a positive experience both for the area and the staff directly involved and that it increases ownership of the findings.
- The second week of the inspection involves meetings with senior and middle managers and Probation Board members to cover issues around the management of the probation area concerned, and to provide some feedback from the first week of the inspection. We also talk with the police in relation to the area's supervision of high risk of harm cases and with representatives of other organisations that are assisting the area with the supervision of offenders.
- ESI also includes an additional thematic element which, in due course, leads to the publication of a separate report describing the work of several probation areas. In the first seven probation areas being inspected in 2003/2004 the thematic element is on EBS. A summary of the provisional findings in relation to Derbyshire is included at the end of this report.

SCORING APPROACH

Assessment of the Quality of Management criteria is based on written evidence and discussions with Board members, managers and other organisations that work with the probation service in the supervision of offenders. A descriptive score is assigned to each of these criteria. Scoring of the Assessment, Interventions and most of the Initial Outcomes criteria is based on the inspection of work with the 100 offenders in the case sample. A numerical score is calculated for each of these criteria. More detailed information about the scoring methodology is available on the HMIP website.

Quality of Management criteria

- A score is derived from assessment of performance on each of the individual evidence items within the criterion (excluding those relating to the NPD). Scores are defined as:
 - **Very well met:** very strong performance on each item
 - **Well met:** strong performance on each item
 - **Satisfactorily met:** strong performance on the majority of items and at least satisfactory performance on the others
 - **Partly met:** good performance on some of the items and at least satisfactory performance on the others
 - **Not met:** at best only satisfactory performance on some of the items
 - **Poor:** otherwise.
- For Leadership and Planning some additional weighting is given to performance on SDAs and other Government targets. These are DTTO commencements, enforcement, accredited programme completions, sickness absence, victim contact, PSR timeliness, basic skill starts and basic skill awards.
- There is some discretion for lead inspectors for scores to be adjusted if this seems appropriate from other findings or contextual information.
- The same approach is adopted for the Quality of Initial Outcomes criterion D3 'Outcomes of interventions are assessed and reviewed using available data'.

Quality of Assessment, Interventions and Initial Outcomes criteria

- A score is calculated for each criterion based on the reading of case files, interviews with case managers, contact with others significantly involved in the supervision and, if possible, conversations with the offenders themselves.
- Scores for each of the criteria are weighted as set out below, with the critical criteria being weighted as twice the important criteria.

Quality of Assessment		
B1	Assessment of risk of harm	Critical
B2	Assessment of likelihood of reoffending	Critical
B3	Case management	Critical
B4	Documentation	Important

Quality of Interventions		
C1	Managing attendance and enforcement	Critical
C2	Delivering appropriate supervision	Critical
C3	Diversity needs	Critical
C4	Responsivity	Important
C5	Management of risk of harm	Critical

Quality of Initial Outcomes		
D1	Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes	Critical
D2	Improvements are sustainable	Important
D4	Interventions demonstrate value for money	Critical

- An overall performance rating for the area is then calculated, weighted as follows:
 - Quality of Assessment 30%
 - Quality of Interventions 40%
 - Quality of Initial Outcomes 30%

- The scoring sheet shows the assessment or score recorded for each criterion, plus the overall scores for Sections B, C and D. The assessment and scores are also recorded alongside the relevant criterion in the text.

OVERVIEW OF THE AREA

- In terms of its main revenue budget of £9.12 million in 2003/2004, Derbyshire is the 23rd largest probation area in England and Wales. It has a total population of some 980,000 with a population density (persons per hectare) of 3.7, somewhat higher than the England and Wales average of 3.1. As such, it comprises one of the 'medium size, higher density' areas in the family grouping of areas which we and the NPD currently use for making comparisons.
- The latest available data show that 3% of the population aged 18-54 are from minority ethnic groups, a somewhat lower proportion than the average of 9% for England and Wales as a whole.
- In 2002/2003 the number of all recorded crimes per 100,000 population was 10,800, slightly below the figure of 11,300 for England and Wales as a whole. The corresponding figure for violent crime – 1,900 per 100,000 population – was about the same as the national one.
- In 2001 (the latest year for which data are available) 778 persons were found guilty or cautioned for indictable offences per 100,000 population, which was lower than the England and Wales figure of 993.
- Data collected by the NPD on Derbyshire's performance on the main Home Office SDAs and on certain other key NPS and national standards targets are shown in the table overleaf. Except where indicated, the figures relate to the period April 2002 to March 2003.
- Derbyshire showed generally very good performance on the targets, meeting or nearly meeting all of them, except for that on basic skill awards.
- The NPD produces a weighted scorecard comparing area performance against targets for some of the above results. On those produced by the time of the inspection (in February and June 2003), Derbyshire was ranked second and first, respectively, among probation areas, so showing a very good performance.
- The reconviction rate for community orders was a little less than that predicted, but the difference is not statistically significant. However, some caution is also needed in interpreting reconviction data particularly at individual area level and the results need to be considered in the context of police clear-up rates and other variables.

	Target	Derbyshire	England & Wales average
Proportion of magistrates' courts PSRs prepared in 15 working days (SDA 1a)	90%	87%	78%
Proportion of all reports (PSRs plus SSRs) which are SSRs (SDA 1b) April-June 2002	20%	19%	10%
Basic skills: % performance against starts target (SDA 2)	100%	106%	100%
Basic skills: % performance against awards target (SDA 2)	100%	21%	85%
Accredited programme completions: % performance in relation to target (SDA 3)	100%	90%	64%
Enforcement – breach taken where required within ten working days (all orders/licences) (SDA 4)	90%	91%	64%
DTTO starts: % performance in relation to target (SDA 6)	100%	146%	102%
Home Secretary's race equality employment target (SDA 7)	7.2% (target for the East Midlands Region)	8.6% (result achieved by the East Midlands Region)	
Sickness absence: average days absence (SDA 8)	10 days	9.1 days	11.9 days
Proportion of victims of serious sexual/violent offences (where offender sentenced to custody of 12 months or more) offered contact within eight weeks (SPM 1) April-December 2002	85%	90%	80%
Proportion of CROs where 12 appointments arranged in first 12 weeks	90%	89%	88%
Proportion of CPROs where required appointments arranged in first 12 weeks	90%	80%	80%
Proportion of CPOs with at least five hours average work arranged per week	90%	97%	90%
Two year reconviction rate for community orders (information for commencements in the first quarter of 1999)	To achieve actual rates that were lower than predicted	Actual 48.4% Predicted 50.0%	Actual 50.2% Predicted 51.7%

SECTION A QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT

A1	Leadership and planning	Well met
----	-------------------------	----------

Description:

The Board and CO lead the area in the achievement of national targets and implementation of national policies through the production of local policies and procedures which are regularly monitored and reviewed. Areas are enabled to work efficiently and effectively by the NPD who develop national targets and policies in line with Ministerial priorities and provides guidance and resources. The senior management team is committed to the implementation of national and local targets and priorities, including What Works strategies, risk management and promoting diversity.

Strengths:

- Derbyshire's Business Plan 2003/2004 described its main themes for the year, derived from national initiatives, together with 21 improvement priorities, national as well as local, developed from the most recent EEM assessment. Examples of local objectives included reduction in the volume of low-risk work, persistent offenders and car crime. The plan emphasised the importance of performance, fundamental to the leadership in the area, and recognised its considerable achievements. Business risk was evaluated, registered and reported to the Board. There was evidence of continuous development, each objective having a responsible officer and timescale for completion. An annual cycle for consultation and implementation had been established, leading to the operational action plan and each division and team formulating their own plan. Monitoring was by means of detailed six monthly reports to the Board.
- The area had a consistent and outstanding record of meeting SDAs and was ranked first in the June 2003 NPD weighted scorecard. Particular achievements included DTTO commencements, magistrates' court PSRs prepared in 15 working days, enforcement, and contact with victims within eight weeks.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

As well as meeting national targets, Derbyshire set its own to support its business priorities. They were introduced, reviewed and varied depending on their validity. Examples were the revocation of orders and PSR recommendations, both aimed to reduce the proportion of low-risk offenders on the area's caseload.

- There were extensive diversity initiatives in the area, which were underpinned by an established strategy and policies, addressing both offender and staffing matters. Diversity was defined widely, including disability, sexuality and family-friendly issues, as well as gender and ethnicity. Both the Board and the senior management team expected diversity awareness and interventions to be embedded throughout all their activities, for example being integrated into routine performance monitoring. All members and staff had received training, which resulted in team action plans. The equal opportunities strategy group, which included Board members, met quarterly and reported to the whole Board. One of its functions was to assess any diversity issues within NPD initiatives. The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 had led to the area funding NACRO research into links with

minority ethnic communities and the development of an action plan. A typical initiative was work by young people and ex-offenders within their own community, with feedback via partner organisations. Area-wide plans focused on offender issues such as singleton placements, racially motivated offending and exit interviews, and staff issues including retention, management training and lone placements. Particular efforts had been put into TPO recruitment and 20% of recent appointments were from a minority ethnic background.

- Performance monitoring and management were demonstrated throughout the inspection and the area had a strong information team. Standard monthly reports went to all middle managers, including comparisons between teams, and detailed information was made available for monitoring individual staff achievements. Additional specific reports were prepared on an ad hoc basis. All were written in both text and numerical formats which increased their accessibility. Face-to-face six weekly middle managers' meetings and quarterly accountability meetings with the CO reinforced the reports. The frequency and depth of reporting demonstrated Derbyshire's determination to maintain high levels of performance. Awareness of its importance permeated the area, reinforced by the assumption in the budget that the performance link would be maintained. An example of improved performance was referrals to accredited programmes which had increased by 62% since guidance was issued early in 2002. Performance achievements, such as PSR completions, were reported to partner agencies in the criminal justice sector which demonstrated their relevance to a range of organisations.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

Weekly exceptions reports were produced for line managers by the information team in order to monitor any cases that had not met the cash-linked targets, so that corrective action could be quickly taken.

- A mapping exercise was being undertaken which would link policies, guidance and service areas, provide clarity, encompass diversity and bring them all up to date. There were policies in place to support performance linked objectives. Consultation and cascade arrangements would be included, with finalised policies being included on the area's intranet. The risk policy was particularly comprehensive, with person specifications and role responsibilities for all grades of staff. Regular policy reviews took place following HMIP reports, and currently the children's safeguards and victims inspections were being used in this way.
- The NPD supported and held the area to account through the draft business planning process and by monitoring performance, reinforced by the performance link. Derbyshire had used comparative data from other probation areas to identify further improvements.

Area for Improvement:

- There was a report to the Board when the Race Relations (Amendment) Act became law in 2000, but there was no evidence that it had reviewed its initiatives to monitor compliance with the legislation.

Description:

The area demonstrates a strategic approach in allocating resources to deliver effective performance and shows positive results in relation to value for money.

Strengths:

- The Board had continued to use the budgetary allocation established by the former Committee but had made incremental changes in response to specific requirements. It considered that the arrangement allowed flexible responses to changing national initiatives, such as the recent investment in ECP. The budgetary cycle began earlier in the year than that for business planning and the audit committee was involved at an early stage. It identified a tension between maintaining standards and delivering new and changing targets, but had ring-fenced some services such as DTTOs and victim contact work. The Board approved budgetary increases to assist achievement of targets such as improving breach figures, and also reductions such as the recent vacancy freeze. Resources were allocated between divisions, dependant on workload and geography, taking rural issues into account. The Board would approve any change of approach, though senior managers would decide on detailed expenditure.
- There were explicit criteria for determining workload resources for offenders, based on their risk assessment. Low and some medium-risk cases were placed under core supervision, with group induction and a PSO holding the case, supervised by a PO. High, very high-risk cases plus other medium-risk cases were held within specialist teams and supervised by a PO. When the budget had been threatened, high and very high-risk cases had been prioritised. There was a robust mechanism for monitoring the accuracy of risk assessments and for implementing changes, including ACO approval before they could be downgraded from very high or high risk.
- Diversity initiatives were monitored through the planning process and reported to the Board.
- The most recent report from the external auditors was positive and said that the area kept within budget in 2001/2002 and responded well to its new governance arrangements. Particular comments referred to financial planning for contingencies. No other external assessment of value for money had been made recently.

Description:

The Board and CO have human resources planning strategies that ensure delivery of effective supervision to offenders.

Strengths:

- Board members were clear about their responsibilities as the employer and had been actively involved in resolving the workload dispute. They approved the links between the business, personnel and training plans as well as the EEM assessment. A staffing report was produced annually including cumulative information regarding the number of staff in post, their ethnicity, grades and absences due to sickness. There had been changes in proportions of different grades in the staffing structure, such as the increased number of PSOs. Achievement of national standards was evidence that the staffing arrangements ensured effective supervision of offenders.

- The content and frequency of supervision for each staff grade were listed in the supervision and appraisal policy, though there was some evidence of inconsistent implementation for CP sessional workers. Newly appointed middle managers received supervisory skills training and all staff were informed of the supervision policy in their induction. Individuals undertook a self-assessment as part of their appraisal, which was completed and signed by the line manager and their manager. Completion of appraisals was monitored, 75% being completed by mid-July with good linkage to the business plan. There was an exercise to ensure consistency across the area by ACOs from another division sampling appraisal objectives. All staff had an exit interview in the event of leaving the organisation.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

The staff appraisal report included a self-assessment, as well as line manager comments. Completed reports were sampled by an ACO from another part of the area to ensure there was a consistent standard.

- Each staff member had individual objectives, based on the performance development plan, which were reviewed half yearly. Some objectives were shared by all staff, such as achievement of national standards.
- The area's training plan was presented to the Board every six months and a budget of £40,000 had been agreed, supplemented by a range of in-house training initiatives. Much of the training supported national agendas, including OASys, risk assessment of sex offenders and EBS screening, together with briefings on accredited programmes. Staff of all grades received diversity and risk management training.
- The Board had used the NPD diversity policy 'Heart of the Dance' as the basis for its diversity initiatives and had established the Derbyshire Area Race Equality Scheme. As well as monitoring minority ethnic recruitment, the area had a support group for minority ethnic staff and supervision training for their managers. Also the Home Secretary's race equality target for the region of 7.2% had been exceeded, with 8.6% of staff being from a minority ethnic background.
- The area had produced a managing absence policy in response to the NPD target for reduction in sickness absence to 10 days, and an average of 9.2 days had been achieved. A national workload measurement tool was being developed which would be adopted in the area.

Area for improvement:

- Victim contact staff had received information about the case manager's work and ensured that victims were informed and consulted. However, there was no evidence of case managers being trained to promote the victim's perspective through their work with offenders.

Description:

The Board and CO have strategies and procedures in place to ensure that the area's partnerships with both voluntary and statutory agencies support service delivery and are value for money.

Strengths:

- The Board had recently approved a strategy to underpin its long-standing collaboration with voluntary and statutory partners and enhance the work of the area. It covered public protection, reduction of reoffending, CP, increasing awareness of the effects of crime and offender rehabilitation. Partnership agreements focused on adding value and delivering economically, with reports to the Board. Partners were wide-ranging, supported all aspects of service delivery and included provision for drug users and sex offenders, as well as domestic violence and victims organisations. CP staff had featured partnerships in their presentations to sentencers in order to increase the profile of CPOs. Partner agencies were very positive about the quality of work and the good relationships between themselves and the area. A link ACO was allocated to each agency according to their subject responsibility, and was assisted by the partnership business manager.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE
<i>The Crime and Disorder Partnership had funded a post with specific responsibility for prolific offenders.</i>

- SLAs or contracts were in place with all of Derbyshire's partners, which were monitored in three monthly performance reports. In the event of them failing to deliver, there was a precedent for the SLA being terminated. As a pilot arrangement Board members themselves participated in five Crime and Disorder Partnerships.
- The current partnership budget was £330,000 which was approximately 3% of the overall budget. There was an income-generating contract related to EBS. As well as financial resources for partner agencies, Derbyshire had made considerable investment in management time to support joint working strategies, including membership of the Derby City Crime and Disorder Partnership.
- There were established links with two organisations working with minority ethnic groups in specific parts of the area.
- A partnership had been established with an accommodation provider to support nearly 100 offenders located in two parts of the area, focusing on issues such as substance misuse, and sponsored by the Crime and Disorder Partnership. The SLA included provision of appropriate accommodation for high-risk, vulnerable and dangerous offenders. Each local housing authority provided funding to support the MAPPA and efforts had been made by the area to ensure that they fulfilled their legal responsibilities to homeless people.

Description:

There is high quality, proactive communication by the area, supported by the NPD, with local sentencers and clerks to the justices about the supervision of offenders and the provision of reports.

Strengths:

- One ACO had specific responsibility for relationships with the courts. Protocols were in place between the area and the Crown Court and magistrates' courts. They referred to the availability of PSRs, SSRs and stand down reports, and were reviewed regularly. An SLA had been signed with the Crown Court in the past year and liaison was taking place with the Magistrates' Courts Chief Executive to agree a similar arrangement.
- Communication between the area and all the courts took place in a number of ways, both face to face and in writing. The former included active and regular attendance at the Board by the Lord Chancellor's representative and by members who were also magistrates. There was a county-wide liaison committee, as well as local meetings and training sessions regarding new criminal justice initiatives. Other contacts were in relation to specific issues, such as the reduction in low-risk offenders on the area's caseload. There was regular written communication with judges and magistrates via specialist quarterly bulletins.
- The area carried out regular surveys of sentencers' views, with a 69% response last year, of whom 98% expressed satisfaction.
- Promotional material had been supplied by the NPD and used for training purposes. A national survey was to be carried out and a joint conference organised to assist good communication.

SECTION B QUALITY OF ASSESSMENT

B1 Assessment of risk of harm

70%

Description:

Risk of harm is satisfactorily assessed using an approved instrument (OASys where available), specialist assessment tools, where relevant, and draws on MAPPA, other agencies' and previous probation service assessments.

Strengths:

- Risk of harm assessments were consistently completed at the beginning of supervision and to a high standard; 84% were satisfactory or excellent. This included most high or very high risk of harm cases in the sample and these assessments were repeated at least every four months. The area used its own assessment tool, with OASys being introduced by October 2003 for medium to very high risk of harm cases, with low-risk cases to be included in the future.
- There were examples of excellent risk assessments and 94% were found to be appropriate. Approximately three-quarters of the sample were either low or medium risk, a figure that was consistent with the area's caseload.
- Derbyshire had established a joint MAPPP office with the police, which was also supported by housing and health providers in the area. A detailed referral guide was available for all staff, together with training at meetings and the staff conference. Those interviewed were knowledgeable about the processes.
- 78% of high or very high risk of harm cases had a satisfactory risk management plan prepared within five working days of the order being made, the offender's release from prison or being assessed as high risk.
- There was a good fit between the interventions planned for an offender and the risk assessment, with 89% being sufficient or excellent. CP placements were determined on the basis of the risk of harm assessment, with high and very high-risk offenders placed in a workshop where they received closer supervision.
- All grades of staff interviewed confirmed that there was generally appropriate management involvement in assessments of high and very high risk of harm or child protection cases, as set out in area policy. For example, ACO approval was part of the process of forming the risk management plan.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

Sylvia is a 'risk alert' offender due to child protection concerns and because of this she has been seen weekly throughout her order by POs in the enhanced supervision team. There was an excellent risk assessment, which was being reviewed at least every four months, as required by the national standard. Work had been focused very appropriately on her contact with her children, managing her drug problem, social and family relationships and the better management of money. Additional help had been provided by a partnership drugs agency. Sylvia had responded well to supervision, keeping appointments and complying with all the conditions of her CRO.

Areas for improvement:

- Risk of harm was only reassessed every four months for cases that were at high or very high risk or following a significant incident. Although the level of risk was shown on the supervision plan review, it did not appear to have resulted from a formal reassessment. As a result, three-quarters of cases were assessed as unsatisfactory in relation to this aspect of practice.
- In two of the 19 high risk of harm cases there was insufficient evidence of the required management involvement taking place.

B2	Assessment of likelihood of reoffending	80%
----	---	-----

Description:

The likelihood of reoffending and criminogenic factors are satisfactorily identified and assessed using an approved instrument (OASys, OGRS2, LSI-R, ACE).

Strengths:

- OGRS2 was used to assess reoffending and criminogenic factors. 86% of cases were satisfactorily assessed.
- The Thornton Matrix 2000 was used to assess sex offenders.

Area for improvement:

- A quarter of cases had no evidence of an identifiable risk of reoffending score.

B3	Case management	76%
----	-----------------	-----

Description:

The case is managed effectively and interventions coordinated to enable criminogenic factors to be addressed and any risk of harm managed. The initial supervision plan or CPO assessment takes account of the PSR, SSR or sentence plan in licence cases, and describes an overall plan of work for each offender, in line with the assessments of risk of harm and need and the likelihood of reoffending.

Strengths:

- Derbyshire had its own supervision plan format used in conjunction with its risk assessment tool.
- SMART objectives were set in the initial supervision plan for 71% of offenders and these took the risk and need assessment into account.
- The liaison responsibilities were clearly defined in 83% of the cases, particularly for high or very high risk of harm or child protection cases. Nearly all significant others considered that the liaison responsibilities of themselves and the case manager were readily identifiable.
- In 71% of cases the interventions identified addressed offending behaviour and community reintegration.
- The supervision plans for 76% of offenders were sensitive to race equality and wider diversity issues.
- In almost all cases steps had been taken to make sure that offenders understood the requirements of their order or licence.

Areas for improvement:

- ▣ Although the initial supervision plans and CPO assessments for three-quarters of the sample met the content and timing of national standards, drawing on MAPPA assessments where appropriate, this standard should be provided for all cases.
- ▣ The MAPPA action plan had not been integrated into the supervision plan in three of the relevant cases.
- ▣ There was no evidence that more than a third of relevant offenders had had the supervision plan communicated to them, so they were denied the opportunity to participate actively in the planning process.

B4	Documentation	78%
----	---------------	-----

Description:

All relevant documentation is available and has been satisfactorily completed.

Strengths:

- ▣ 71% of case records were well organised, with completed standard forms and race and ethnicity information included.
- ▣ Contacts were recorded electronically on CRAMS and used by line managers as well as case managers.

Area for improvement:

- ▣ Notwithstanding the above, recording was generally sparse, particularly concerning the content of contacts with offenders, and information was not on file for the use of other staff or subsequent case managers.

SECTION C QUALITY OF INTERVENTIONS

C1 Managing attendance and enforcement

93%

Description:

Contact with the offender and enforcement of the order or licence is planned and implemented to meet the requirements of national standards.

Strengths:

- There was evidence in 89% of cases, including all high and very high risk of harm offenders, that the frequency of appointments and work sessions met national standards, the requirements of the order or licence, the achievement of planned objectives and risk of harm considerations. The majority of significant others confirmed this. Group induction and attendance was arranged for low risk of harm cases. Some offenders, especially those at risk of reoffending, attended more frequently than required by national standards.
- Case managers monitored attendance and took appropriate action to ensure compliance with nearly all offenders. This was confirmed by the majority of significant others who said that absences were reported to the case manager and were dealt with effectively.
- The area had provided written guidance to staff on acceptability of absence and this was reinforced at meetings with first line managers. Judgements about the acceptability of almost all absences were deemed to be appropriate.
- Compliance and enforcement had been key priority areas for all grades of staff. Many positive comments were made about liaison between case managers and CP supervisors. Case administrative officers and a range of detailed monitoring systems assisted staff to meet the targets.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

Patrick is in his early 20s and is on a 12 month CRO for an offence of criminal damage. It was clear that his offending was linked to issues around EBS. As a result, these issues were addressed as a priority during supervision by involving the area's specialist employment staff, but with continuing close monitoring of their work by the case manager, who also provided strong motivation to Patrick to make best use of these facilities. All missed appointments were quickly followed up and appropriate action taken. As well as improving his employment situation, supervision was also leading to better behaviour in Patrick's use of alcohol and he was showing signs of being able to think things through more and make sensible decisions.

Areas for improvement:

- Although the area had performed well in relation to enforcement following non-compliance, it still needed to ensure that the required action was taken in all relevant cases. Breach or recall action was required in 36 cases, and insufficient action was taken for five offenders.

Description:

Interventions are delivered to achieve the objectives identified in the initial supervision plan and recorded according to the requirements of national standards. Supervision is prioritised according to an ongoing assessment of risk and need and takes account of previous reviews and work already undertaken by the area and other agencies. Case managers oversee and coordinate the work of other staff and partner organisations and all staff play an active part in motivating and supporting offenders throughout their supervision.

Strengths:

- The interventions for 88% of offenders were appropriate, with timing and sequencing reflecting their risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending. Changes to risk of harm occurred in 30 cases, of which nearly all were dealt with satisfactorily.
- Twenty-nine cases had additional licence or order requirements, and nearly all were appropriately implemented.
- The supervision plan reviews of all the relevant high or very high risk of harm cases integrated the MAPPA action plan.
- Community reintegration issues, such as accommodation, employment, substance abuse and relationships, were relevant to 74 offenders and were sufficiently addressed in 79% of these cases.
- Case managers motivated most offenders by reinforcing work undertaken by others, including arranging contact in the course of an accredited programme, and this was confirmed by nearly all the significant others. Particularly good examples related to offenders attending the Dove project for sex offenders.
- There were examples of close liaison between staff in CP and supervision teams, which allowed timing and sequencing of interventions to reflect the risk assessment. 86% of cases had evidence of active communication.
- In almost all cases the work required on CPOs and CPROs was demanding and kept the offender fully occupied.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

Robert is 24 years old with an addiction to heroin and a high likelihood of reoffending. He was sent to prison for an offence of theft, being eventually released to supervision by the probation service on a nine month period of licence. He was placed in a hostel, where he was afraid he would be at a disadvantage through people knowing about his drug problem and thinking he was 'different', but this was handled well by staff and there were no issues of concern. Useful work was done getting him to take responsibility for his actions, do more for himself, not expect others to do things for him, and not see himself as a victim. Further work on his drug misuse is currently continuing on a DTTO.

Areas for improvement:

- Progress against supervision plan objectives had not been reviewed with about a third of offenders, including some high and very high risk of harm cases.

- There needed to be more examples of SMART objectives being set in supervision plan reviews.
- Only 57% of offenders, who were in range, had commenced accredited programmes within the required timescale, although in most cases there were appropriate reasons for this. There was evidence that the area had already identified this as an area for improvement, had issued guidance and monitored its effectiveness, with increases in referral rates for more recent orders and licences.
- Interventions with all offenders needed to challenge them to accept responsibility for their offending behaviour.
- In about a third of the cases there was no evidence of the victim's perspective being sufficiently considered by case managers.

C3	Diversity needs	79%
----	-----------------	-----

Description:

There is a full range of interventions to meet diverse needs. There is evidence of appropriate support arrangements for women, minority ethnic and disabled offenders.

Strengths:

- The arrangements for delivering interventions were sensitive to offenders' diversity needs in about 80% of cases and this was confirmed by those who were interviewed. Examples included:
 - workshop placements for offenders on CPOs requiring intensive supervision
 - adjusted reporting times
 - mixed race sessions for CP and accredited programmes
 - more frequent home visits to offenders without access to public transport
 - offenders with childcare responsibilities had their CPO working hours adjusted to meet their needs and childminder fees were paid.
 - good examples of CP placements and programmes being arranged for those with a disability
 - rural issues were considered and transport provided where necessary
 - referrals to programmes run by adjoining urban areas.
- Guidance on individual CP placements had also been issued. This included minority ethnic offenders being given a choice throughout the order of individual supervision rather than attendance at an otherwise all-white group. There was a shortage of supervisors from minority ethnic groups. Similarly in respect of accredited programmes, minority ethnic (and female) offenders would either have the programme delivered one to one or be given the chance to start at a later date.

Area for improvement:

- Literacy and dyslexia were relevant issues with 60 offenders, but were not sufficiently addressed for a third of the cases. A basic skills evaluation had been introduced but was not used consistently.

Description:

Offenders' learning style, motivation and capacity to change are taken into account in the assessment and intervention plan.

Strengths:

- Sufficient consideration had been given to the methods most likely to be effective with 88% of the offenders, including nearly all the high or very high risk of harm cases.
- For 83% of prison licence cases the level of pre-release work was consistent with the risk and need assessment, the offender's motivation and capacity to change.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

Louise was placed on a CRO for an offence of violence against the person. There were mental health and child protection issues in the case and much of the supervision included close working together with other agencies, particularly the local authority Social Services Department. In her own work with Louise the case manager focused on getting her to take more responsibility for her behaviour, and understand the reasons for other people's responses. There was careful consideration being given to the methods of work likely to be most successful in achieving this. Louise was now doing better both at managing her relationships with other people and controlling her anger and temper.

Description:

Risk of harm is actively managed in consultation with other agencies.

Strengths:

- The level of interventions was appropriate to the risk of harm assessment for 98% of offenders. Examples included accommodation advice, hostel provision and increased contacts. This was echoed in meetings with partner agencies, including confirmation by police of the availability of surveillance for offenders subject to MAPPA and thought likely to reoffend.
- The area was currently involved in 15 child protection cases and its liaison with the other agencies was assessed as excellent or sufficient in all of them.
- Five high risk or very high risk of harm cases had inter-agency risk management plans. Four were assessed as excellent and all of these were being delivered appropriately.
- Changes to risk of harm were identified and managed sufficiently in most cases.
- Derbyshire's strong level of enforcement practice included the high and very high risk of harm cases.
- None of the cases in the sample required liaison with the NPD Public Protection Unit or Prison Service Lifer Unit, but the ACOs were clearly familiar with the necessary procedures.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

Jack is a middle-aged man who was placed on a lengthy CRO for sexual offences related to children, with an additional requirement to attend the sex offender treatment programme. The case manager saw Jack frequently and worked closely with colleagues to ensure that he gained as much as possible from the programme about understanding his behaviour and preventing its repetition. She also went to great lengths to obtain a report on the victim's response to the offence in order to challenge his refusal to consider victim issues. We assessed supervision as having been excellent in addressing the risk of reoffending and, through this, the risk of harm to the public.

Area for improvement:

- In one high risk of harm case the inter-agency management plan was assessed as poor.

SECTION D QUALITY OF INITIAL OUTCOMES

D1 Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes

64%

Description:

Planned objectives are achieved and the risk of harm/likelihood of reoffending is demonstrably reduced.

Strengths:

- Attendance by offenders at appointments or work sessions was high, and was assessed as excellent or sufficient in 80% of cases.
- There had been no evidence of reoffending in 87% of cases.
- Case managers identified a number of criminogenic factors associated with offenders. The most common were deficits in thinking skills, followed by relationship problems and alcohol misuse and this was confirmed by the offenders who were interviewed. Analysis of progress with these factors showed either an improvement or no deterioration for nearly all cases. There was improvement with 68% of the criminogenic factors and no deterioration in 25%.
- Three-quarters of offenders had complied with the requirements of their order or licence.

Areas for improvement:

- OASys was not in use at the time that the orders and licences in the case sample originated. It was being introduced for medium to very high-risk cases, but there was no timescale for it to be extended to low-risk offenders. Consequently, there were no examples of the score being reassessed.
- There needed to be more evidence of changes in offenders' attitudes, beliefs and behaviour in relation to offending, including an increased awareness of the effect of their offence on the victim.
- Community ties and social circumstances had improved for just over half the relevant cases.
- There was limited evidence of offenders being able to apply learning outcomes or skills as a result of being on supervision or licence.

D2 Improvements are sustainable

69%

Description:

Results are capable of being sustained beyond the end of supervision.

Strengths:

- Attention had been given to developing links with family and community resources in three-quarters of relevant cases.
- Two-thirds of offenders had been considered for contact with mainstream organisations to address their criminogenic needs.

- In two-thirds of the cases, where they were involved, the significant others thought that the positive outcomes were sustainable. The offenders who were interviewed made a similar response.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE
<p><i>Maurice is an offender on licence following a prison sentence. There was excellent use of SMART objectives in the supervision plan, and its reviews, including detail comments on how these objectives would be achieved in the light of his changing circumstances. Supervision produced significant progress in his drug and alcohol misuse, as well as improvement in his relationships with others. The inspection showed that there had been much positive change in his attitudes, beliefs and behaviour in relation to offending, as well as a greater awareness of the effect of his past criminal behaviour on victims.</i></p>

D3	Outcomes of interventions are assessed and reviewed using available data	Partly met
-----------	--	-------------------

Description:

All available data are used to assess the effectiveness of interventions.

Strengths:

- There was robust and extensive evidence of written and face-to-face evaluation of performance information.
- The area had commissioned its own research by NACRO that led to different interventions with minority ethnic communities.

Area for improvement:

- Derbyshire did not gather information about the outcomes of interventions and it was not used to develop good practice. Monitoring and evaluation were restricted to the measurement of national and local targets and did not consider the more general effectiveness of the area’s work.

D4	Interventions demonstrate value for money	92%
-----------	---	------------

Description:

Interventions are delivered with efficient and appropriate use of resources.

Strengths:

- There was strong evidence that the resources allocated to the case sample were consistent with the offender’s risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending.
- Similarly, in 89% of cases resources were being used efficiently to achieve the planned results.
- The Board and management team looked pro-actively at resource deployment, ensured that the resources for high-risk cases were maintained and that there was a balance between the urban and rural parts of the area. They had attempted to make better use of staff time by reducing the number of low-risk cases and establishing group induction and reporting arrangements, which were the responsibilities of PSOs.

THEMATIC ELEMENT: EBS

SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONAL FINDINGS FOR DERBYSHIRE

Introduction

Every inspection under the ESI programme includes a thematic element. For the first seven areas visited under the programme the thematic element was EBS. A full report on the whole thematic inspection is scheduled to be published as soon as possible after the visit to the last of these seven areas.

Pending publication of the thematic report, each of the area ESI reports includes a summary of the provisional EBS findings for the area. The summary for Derbyshire is as follows.

Quality ratings

Quality of EBS Management: Of the 13 relevant Management Criteria, nine were Met and four were Partly Met.

The other criteria were scored by analysing the EBS work done by the area (where applicable) with the 100 cases examined for the main ESI. The scores for the individual questions (listed further below) were weighted and aggregated to produce the following three quality ratings.

<i>Quality of EBS Assessment</i>	57%
<i>Quality of EBS Interventions</i>	52%
<i>Quality of EBS Initial Outcomes</i>	53%

Overall assessment

The score for Initial Outcomes reflects a high figure for ‘improved EBS status’. Derbyshire achieved encouraging figures both for Assessment and Interventions, although in both cases there was room for improvement. Greater integration of the planned system into front-line practice was required. To improve further, the area could develop strategic links with the local employment market and establish a clearer basis for its resource allocation for EBS. Nevertheless, this was a satisfactory overall result.

Recommendations

The Probation Board should ensure that the area:

- ▣ *develops a strategic approach to the ‘demand side’ of its employment work, i.e. its work with employers*
- ▣ *bases its allocation of resources to EBS more explicitly on a calculation of what is required in order to achieve the targets set.*

SECTION A QUALITY OF EBS MANAGEMENT

Criteria relating to A1: Leadership and planning (1):	Assessment
<i>The area has a strategic plan to implement local and national EBS policies, etc:</i>	
<i>a) there is a plan that states both SDA and local targets for both employment and basic skills, and how they will be met;</i>	MET
<i>b) race equality and diversity measures, including monitoring by race and gender, were built-in at the planning stage;</i>	MET
<i>c) the plan re EBS has been clearly communicated to relevant staff, courts and relevant partners.</i>	PARTLY MET

Strengths:

- Relevant EBS targets and performance measures covered in the area Business Plans for both 2002/2003 and 2003/2004.
- 2003/2004 Operations Plan also engaged with national secondary measures.
- There were detailed supporting planning documents and team breakdowns which showed the plans for meeting these targets.
- Race and gender data were collected, and the system was already established for reporting to the equal opportunities strategy group, with figures benchmarked against caseload proportions.
- Briefings had been given to managers and teams, and an SLA had been agreed with Jobcentre Plus.
- A good basis for communication, re EBS, had been established with the courts and with other partners in 2001.

Area for improvement:

- A higher level of communication with the courts since 2001 was needed to explain the importance of EBS to reducing reoffending.

Criteria relating to A1: Leadership and planning (2):	Assessment
<i>Effective management structures exist, and managers are held to account for delivering EBS:</i>	
<i>a) the area's senior management team has demonstrated collective commitment to achieving its EBS targets;</i>	MET
<i>b) monitoring reports are used to hold managers to account for performance against EBS targets, including by race and gender;</i>	MET
<i>c) national and local EBS targets are met;</i>	PARTLY MET (1 of 2 achieved)
<i>d) (For NPD:) action by the NPD both supports and holds the area to account for its achievement of SDA targets.</i>	N/A

Strengths:

- There was evidence of regular discussion within the senior management team.

- The CO had established and implemented the performance accounting system, seeing all managers individually, in addition to the accountability through the line managers.
- The area had achieved 127 starts ('into teaching') in 2002/2003, against the target of 116.

Area for improvement:

- Only four specified basic skills awards in 2002/2003 were achieved against the target of 19.

Criteria relating to A2: Resource allocation:	Assessment
<i>The area demonstrates a strategic approach in allocating resources effectively for EBS work:</i>	
<i>a) expected EBS results have been defined and are clearly understood by staff, and any relevant partners / providers;</i>	MET
<i>b) the area can demonstrate that its resource allocation for EBS is appropriate for delivering its planned EBS results.</i>	PARTLY MET

Strengths:

- The managers and staff were very clear about the EBS results required.
- Partners were also aware of the required EBS results.
- The area had reviewed how it was spending its EBS resource allocation and was seeking information about attrition rates in order to improve its resource planning.

Areas for improvement:

- It was not evident that, to date, the size of the area's resource allocation for EBS was based on any calculation. The area had hitherto developed its allocation iteratively and through pursuing bidding opportunities rather than by long-term business case planning.
- There was a thin allocation for the assessment, referral and development of offenders in relation to EBS, and very little resources for developing work with employers.

Criteria relating to A3: Management and supervision of staff:	Assessment
<i>The area's human resources management ensures effective EBS work with its offenders:</i>	
<i>a) recruitment and assignment of staff are aligned to the area's EBS objectives;</i>	MET
<i>b) staff are held accountable for achievement of individual and/or team targets.</i>	MET

Strengths:

- The role of the WLOs had developed following a documented 'best value'-type review.
- The key role for WLOs was to track offenders under supervision (though the basic skills starts had been achieved in the north of the county in 2002/2003 without the appointment of WLOs).
- 'Standard objectives' on achieving employment and training targets were required to be included in the performance planning documents for all relevant staff for 2003/2004.

Area for improvement:

- Work and resources on the 'demand side' – a strategic approach for engaging with employers – could be developed.

Criteria relating to A4: Partnership/contracting out:	Assessment
<i>The area's management of partnerships and of contracting out ensures effective EBS work with its offenders:</i>	
a) <i>'Best Value' appraisals have been undertaken to establish whether EBS services provided will best be delivered by area staff, or contracted out to commercial or voluntary sector providers or through partnership and referrals;</i>	MET
b) <i>EBS contracts with providers are designed to achieve the area's EBS targets;</i>	MET
c) <i>providers are held accountable for achievement of relevant EBS targets.</i>	PARTLY MET

Strengths:

- Current arrangements had developed following a 'best value'-type review presented to the Board that had led to the ending of the old contract with SOVA.
- An SLA with Derbyshire Connexions service for 2002/2003 was based on a calculation designed to achieve that year's target for starting basic skills awards.
- The area was clearly aiming to hold its partners accountable for contributing to the achievement of its EBS targets.

Area for improvement:

- Although the area had succeeded in obtaining the full commitment of its partners to its targets, the funding for the north of the county was still in doubt, and many tutors had reservations about working with offenders who were being 'compelled' to attend tuition.

SECTION B QUALITY OF EBS ASSESSMENT

Criteria relating to B2: Assessment of likelihood of reoffending:	Score
<i>Risk of reconviction and criminogenic factors are identified and assessed using an approved tool:</i>	<i>(percentage of relevant cases)</i>
a) <i>basic skills screening has been carried out at start of supervision;</i>	54%
b) <i>the offender's employability has been assessed (using OASys where available) at start of supervision;</i>	80%
c) <i>there is a clear assessment of the extent to which there are EBS criminogenic factors in this case.</i>	51%

Strength:

- There was a high level of employability assessments.

Areas for improvement:

- A higher level of basic skills screenings was needed.
- In more cases there should be a clear assessment of the extent to which difficulties with employment and/or basic skills have contributed to the person's offending behaviour.

Criteria relating to B3: Case management:	Score
<i>The initial supervision plan integrates any EBS interventions into the overall plan of work for the offender:</i>	<i>(percentage of relevant cases)</i>
a) <i>appropriate EBS interventions have been planned in response to the EBS assessment;</i>	55%
b) <i>the ISP either integrates EBS interventions into the overall work plan, or clearly explains why the offender does not need them.</i>	43%

Areas for improvement:

- ▣ EBS interventions should have been planned in a higher proportion of relevant cases.
- ▣ The planned EBS interventions could have been more clearly integrated into the overall work plan in more of the relevant cases.

Criteria relating to B4: Documentation:	Score
<i>Case records are well organised and contain all relevant information:</i>	<i>(percentage of relevant cases)</i>
a) <i>there is an adequate record in the case manager's file of the EBS plans and interventions undertaken by others;</i>	53%
b) <i>each quarterly review properly incorporates the EBS elements.</i>	42%

Areas for improvement:

- ▣ A record of the EBS plans and interventions undertaken should have been more evident in the cases where work had been done.
- ▣ Case managers needed to incorporate the EBS elements into the quarterly review in more of the relevant cases.

SECTION C QUALITY OF EBS INTERVENTIONS

Criteria relating to C2: Delivering appropriate supervision:	Score
<i>Contact with the offender is planned and implemented to ensure that EBS objectives of supervision are met:</i>	<i>(percentage of relevant cases)</i>
a) <i>EBS interventions take place as planned, or decisions to depart from the plan are recorded and justified;</i>	53%
b) <i>there is appropriate use of resources (partnerships and community groups, etc), with the EBS work undertaken being monitored and recorded and the contribution to meeting the EBS objectives of supervision regularly reviewed;</i>	45%
c) <i>the case manager prepares and motivates the offender, reinforces work undertaken by others, etc.</i>	60%

Strength:

- ▣ There was some evidence of case managers appropriately motivating offenders and reinforcing EBS work done by others.

Areas for improvement:

- A higher level of implementation of planned EBS interventions was needed.
- The coverage of EBS work in the majority of supervision reviews in relevant cases was disappointing.

Criteria relating to C5: Management of risk of harm:	Score
<i>Risk of harm is actively managed following offender assessment:</i>	<i>(percentage of relevant cases)</i>
a) <i>EBS interventions and changes are constantly monitored for any possible risk of harm considerations.</i>	57% (4 of 7 cases)

Strength:

- Risk of harm considerations (i.e. EBS-related ‘significant incidents’) were identified in only seven cases out of the total sample.

Area for improvement:

- It was of concern that in three of the seven cases the response to the incident(s) was assessed as being insufficient, i.e. not enough was done by the case manager to minimise the risk of harm posed to the public.

SECTION D QUALITY OF EBS INITIAL OUTCOMES

Criteria relating to D1: Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes:	Score
<i>Planned EBS objectives are achieved, with likelihood of reoffending demonstrably reduced:</i>	<i>(percentage of relevant cases)</i>
a) <i>a measurable EBS objective was achieved during supervision (to date);</i>	41%
b) <i>employment and/or basic skills status has improved since start of supervision;</i>	65%
c) <i>there has been an improvement in OASys score since start of supervision.</i>	N/A

Strength:

- A high figure was recorded for offenders whose EBS status had improved since their current supervision started.

Area for improvement:

- The figure for offenders who had achieved a measurable EBS objective was low compared with those whose EBS status had improved. Further analysis of the figures may shed some light on this.

THE ROLE OF HMIP

HMIP is an independent Inspectorate, originally established in 1936 and given statutory authority in the Criminal Justice Act 1991. The Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000 renamed HMIP 'Her Majesty's Inspectorate of the National Probation Service for England and Wales.' HMIP is funded by the Home Office and reports directly to the Home Secretary.

Home Office Aims

HMIP contributes primarily to the achievement of Home Office aims to:

- ensure the effective delivery of justice, avoiding unnecessary delay, through efficient investigation, detection, prosecution and court procedures. To minimise the threat to and intimidation of witnesses and to engage with and support victims
- deliver effective custodial and community sentences to reduce reoffending and protect the public, through the prison and probation services, in partnership with the Youth Justice Board.

Role

- Report to the Home Secretary on the extent to which the National Probation Service for England and Wales is fulfilling its statutory duties, contributing to the achievement of Home Office and Criminal Justice Aims and meeting performance and efficiency targets as required.
- Demonstrate that inspections contribute to improved performance in the National Probation Service.
- Contribute to sound policy and effective service delivery by providing advice and disseminating good practice, based on inspection findings, to Ministers, Home Office and National Probation Service staff and probation boards/areas.
- Promote actively race equality and wider diversity issues in the National Probation Service.
- Promote the overall effectiveness of the criminal justice system.

Code of Practice

HMIP aims to achieve its purpose by:

- undertaking its work with integrity in a professional, impartial and courteous manner
- consulting stakeholders in planning and running inspections and regarding reports
- forming independent inspection judgements based on evidence
- the timely reporting and publishing of inspection findings and recommendations for improvement
- promoting race equality and wider diversity issues in all aspects of its work, including within its own employment practices and organisational processes
- developing joint approaches with other Inspectorate and Audit bodies to ensure a coordinated approach to the criminal justice system
- working to minimise the burden of inspection on the National Probation Service.

The Inspectorate is a public body. Anyone who wishes to comment on an inspection, a report or any other matter falling within its remit should write to:

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