



HM Inspectorate of Probation

AUDIT OF ACCREDITED PROGRAMMES

East of England Region of the
National Probation Service for
England and Wales

*Report on:
Cambridgeshire Probation Area – Think First*

May 2003

Acknowledgements:

We are grateful for the cooperation of staff from the Cambridgeshire Probation Area in completing this audit.

The audit team comprised:

Eileen O’Sullivan
Jackie McAvoy
Inspection Officers

Frances Flaxington
HM Deputy Chief Inspector of Probation

Glossary

ACE	Assessment, Case Recording and Evaluation System
CO	Chief officer
HMIP	HM Inspectorate of Probation
IAPS	Interim Accredited Programmes Software
IQR	Implementation Quality Rating
LSI-R	Level of Service Inventory-Revised
N/A	Criteria not assessed
NPD	National Probation Directorate
NPS	National Probation Service
OASys	Offender Assessment System
PSR	Pre-sentence report
TPO	Trainee probation officer

Contents

	Page
Context:	3
Scoring Approach:	3
Overview:	4
Findings and recommendations:	5
SECTION A: COMMITTED LEADERSHIP	7
SECTION B: PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	9
SECTION C: QUALITY OF PROGRAMME DELIVERY	17
SECTION D: CASE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	20
Next Steps:	24
Scoring summary sheet:	25

Context:

Programmes achieving accredited status have undergone a rigorous process of development and scrutiny to ensure they have maximum impact in terms of reducing reoffending. Selecting well-tested programmes is however only part of the picture – without effective implementation by probation areas much of the positive influence on offenders’ behaviour may be lost.

Establishing robust quality assurance systems and independent audit arrangements for accredited programmes is therefore crucial. HMIP is responsible for auditing accredited programmes on behalf of the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel. Each probation area will be assessed against the delivery criteria given in the Performance Standards Manual June 2001, which also outlines how these criteria are to be met and evidenced.

Scoring Approach:

The criteria for the delivery of accredited programmes have been divided into four sections. These sections, and the overall weighting assigned for each section, are as follows:

Committed leadership and supportive management	20%
Programme management responsibilities	30%
Quality of programme delivery	30%
Case management responsibilities	20%

Each criterion is scored as **Fully Met** (2 marks), **Largely Met** (1 mark) or **Not Met** (0 marks).

The scoring summary sheet at the end of this report shows the marks awarded for each criterion – for those criteria designated as Mandatory (see Performance Standards Manual) the mark given is doubled. This denotes the critical impact these criteria have on the effective delivery of programmes.

The marks awarded for each section are shown and then expressed as a % by dividing the total number of marks scored by the maximum available, and multiplying by 100. Section B has been divided into seven sub-sections for ease of scoring.

To determine an area’s IQR, the scores for each section are multiplied by the appropriate factor to take account of the relevant weightings given above. The % totals for each section are then added together to give the IQR.

Overview:

- The audit visit to the Cambridgeshire Probation Area was conducted during February 2003 and focused entirely on Think First.
- Think First was being delivered on four sites, three of which were visited: Huntingdon, Peterborough and Cambridge. Checks on resources and facilities were carried out at all site visits.
- The audit comprised four main elements: assessment of advance information; video monitoring of 12 programme sessions; reading of 40 case files; and a visit to the area.
- A wide range of staff involved in the support and delivery of the programme were seen, including senior and middle managers, programme tutors, case managers and PSR writers. Board members, including the Chair, attended the audit presentations. A total of 12 offenders were also interviewed.
- Two of the audit criteria were not assessed – B4.3 and D1.8. The area had not yet been in a position to access national training for experienced tutors (B4.3) or training for the Cognitive Skills Booster Programme (D1.8).

Findings:

It was evident throughout the Cambridgeshire Probation Area that senior and middle managers were committed to the effective delivery of Think First. This was demonstrated by the public ownership of accredited programmes and the lead management role at context setting events. Regular discussion of programmes, and particularly Think First, was evidenced at Board, management and team meeting level. Tutor continuity and dedication was apparent and creative energy had been expended on collaborative cross-divisional working arrangements, in particular the use of administrative personnel across the programmes division.

At the time of the audit the area had fallen considerably behind in meeting its targets for the year and recognised this as a critical performance issue. Although sufficient programmes had been planned for, allocations to Think First had been much lower than anticipated in order to achieve the necessary completions. This had been exacerbated by some of the current tutor employment contracts, which did not specify the amount of unsocial working hours required and were insufficiently flexible to meet the increased number of required programmes. A review of employment contracts had been identified as essential, as part of the clarification process of resourcing given to Think First programmes. Senior managers had set up a cross-grade accredited programmes problem solving group, as part of its Think First implementation strategy, and this group focused on developing solutions to tackle attrition rates. Cambridgeshire acknowledged that the lack of target achievements had caused particular difficulties and they had, as a result, reviewed the situation to enable planning for appropriate future resource allocation. The advantages of introducing the OASys system had included greater refinement of referrals to Think First and a more robust approach to reducing attrition.

Cambridgeshire, through an internal mock audit, had identified an emerging need for staff to have access to key information relating to accredited programmes. The creation of an *Area General Accredited Programmes Manual* was being finalised to address this. Initial feedback from a pilot of the document was very positive and it was seen as an enabling tool by staff. Cambridgeshire had clearly recognised the challenges that lay ahead, in order to achieve the necessary targets, and had now commenced tackling these with vigour.

Recommendations

The CO should ensure that the area:

- *clarifies the relative priority and resourcing of the Think First programme as part of its What Works strategy to meet NPS targets (A1.2);*
- *achieves consistent allocation to Think First across all geographical divisions (A1.3);*
- *improves attrition rates (B2.4);*
- *concentrates tutor preparation and debriefing time solely to programme delivery (B3.3);*
- *implements supervision arrangements that are consistent across all geographical divisions (B5.1);*
- *reintroduces the appraisal system for all staff involved in accredited programmes (B5.2);*
- *monitors referrals to Think First and reissues guidance on offender eligibility and suitability (B6.1);*
- *improves the quality of supervision plans, integrating end of programme reports into subsequent supervision (D1.1, D1.7);*
- *further invests in training case managers, particularly in relation to programme content and the evidential base, to ensure sufficient knowledge and ownership of the programme (D1.3, D1.4).*

The NPD should ensure that:

- accreditation training for Think First is made available to promote effective delivery (B4.3);
- LAPS is further developed as an urgent priority so that a fully operational monitoring and evaluation system is made available for the collection and dissemination of accurate programme data (B7.1);
- post-programme report templates are issued which prompt inclusion of risk assessment and relapse scenarios (C1.6).

SECTION A: COMMITTED LEADERSHIP

A1.1 Committed leadership

2

Description: *The senior management of the area should be openly and explicitly committed to the proper running of the programme through policy and public statements.*

Strengths:

- Cambridgeshire set clear targets for programme completions over the four year period 2000/2004. The What Works Plan 2001/2004 detailed targets for running accredited programmes and their implementation.
- Senior managers had been prominent in leading context setting events and had communicated with all staff through formal presentations, team meetings, newsletters and e-mails in support of effective delivery.
- Think First implementation issues were regularly discussed at senior management meetings and action taken to achieve improvements.
- The senior management team was well informed about programme operation issues and described how this was integrated into an area-wide holistic approach to What Works.

A1.2 Management structures

1

Description: *Effective line management structures exist for the proper operation of the programme integrating this within case management structures. Adequate time should be set aside for the effective management of the programme.*

Strengths:

- There was evidence of integration of programme delivery across functional areas.
- Management structures for the delivery of accredited programmes were outlined in an organisational chart.
- Clear line management structures were in place to support the effective delivery of What Works.
- Comprehensive job descriptions existed and staff understood their roles and line management responsibilities.

Areas for improvement:

- Senior management had not ensured that current employment contracts for tutors provided the greatest flexibility for programme provision, which impacted on the overall level of resourcing to Think First.
- The accredited programmes problem solving group had not given sufficient or timely consideration to issues of referral and attrition.

A1.3 Staff ownership of the accredited programme

1

Description: *There is full ownership of the programme by managers, programme tutors and other relevant staff, e.g. court personnel and case managers.*

Strengths:

- Senior and middle managers demonstrated commitment to Think First.
- Tutors were impressive in their efforts to ensure offenders attended the programmes available.
- Administrative personnel worked closely with the programmes division to ensure completion and collection of relevant data.

Areas for improvement:

- Case managers said that insufficient case management training about the programme had resulted in a lack of ownership.
- There was inconsistent allocation of referrals to programmes across the area. The internal audit revealed that of offenders eligible for Think First, only 25% were referred to the programme.

A1.4 Effective communication with sentencers

2

Description: *There is high quality, proactive communication with local sentencers and clerks to the justices about the programme, including written information.*

Strengths:

- Managers had given a number of presentations to magistrates informing them about accredited programmes and Think First in particular.
- The programme had been discussed at probation liaison committees. Senior managers had involvement with the county liaison meetings of the magistrates' court and probation service, annual sentencers' conference and the meetings of bench chairs. Accredited programmes had been a regular agenda item at these events. The area also participated in training for new magistrates.
- A bulletin on community sentences had been produced for the magistrates' courts.
- Information leaflets were available for sentencers.

Areas for improvement:

- The effectiveness of liaison with sentencers in respect of programme work had not been monitored.
- There was no evaluation of whether information was being systematically conveyed to solicitors/barristers or what impact it made in their dealings with offenders.

SECTION B: PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

B1.1 Resources and facilities

1

Description: *Adequate accommodation consistent with the Estates Standards Manual is available for all sessions of the programme.*

Strengths:

- Rooms throughout the area were of an adequate size for the delivery of groups of up to 12 offenders.
- The rooms were appropriately furnished and equipped with overhead projectors and flipcharts.
- Two video cameras were fitted at each of the delivery sites visited.

Areas for improvement:

- The Huntingdon site had only one main group room and no 'break out' facilities. However, the building was in the process of being refurbished to bring it up to required NPD estate standards.
- Videotapes at the Peterborough site were stored in a locked filing cabinet located within the group room.

B1.2 Provision of information leaflets about the programme

1

Description: *There should be a set of leaflets for offenders, sentencers and staff clearly describing the programme and its requirements.*

Strengths:

- Information leaflets for Think First were available for offenders, sentencers and staff and they described the programme and its content in straightforward language.
- Some offenders confirmed that they had seen the information leaflet prior to programme commencement.

Areas for improvement:

- Race equality and wider diversity issues were not addressed in the information leaflets.
- The complaints procedure was given separately to offenders.

B2.1 Managing attendance

2

Description: *Offender attendance and absence are managed to achieve the required National Performance Management target for offender completions. Attendance is managed to achieve coherent delivery with full impact for all undertaking the programme. The maximum number of absences by any one offender is consistent with the requirements of the programme manual for the specific accredited programme.*

Strengths:

- Attendance registers were well maintained.
 - All offenders were only allowed the permitted number of absences from the programme.
 - Case managers were clear about their specific responsibility for managing attendance and enforcement.
 - Liaison between programme delivery staff and case managers, in relation to offender non-attendance, was good and enforcement action timely.
-

B2.2 Avoidance of cancellation or disruption to sessions

2

Description: *Sessions are not cancelled or disrupted owing to offender crises, high workload or other pressures, and arrangements exist to deal with crises outside of the programme session. Sessions are delivered at the frequency defined in the programme manual.*

Strengths:

- Tutors had made concerted efforts to ensure sessions were not cancelled or disrupted. Only one session had been cancelled, due to severe weather conditions.
- All sessions were being delivered at the frequency set out in the programme manual.

B2.3 Catch-up sessions/Attendance

1

Description: *Provision is made for catch-up sessions, or a 'bus stop' approach, to allow offenders who miss a session to continue with the programme. All offenders missing sessions, who are not excluded from the programme, should attend catch-up sessions, or in the case of a 'bus stop' approach be moved onto another programme within ten working days, to ensure full delivery of the programme. Treatment managers must specify arrangements for monitoring the integrity of catch-up sessions.*

Strengths:

- Catch-ups were being offered and delivered to all offenders prior to the next main programme session.
- Programme tutors maintained a separate register for recording of catch-ups.
- Offenders were aware of the procedure for attendance when they missed a session.

Areas for improvement:

- The area had not yet implemented a system of integrity checks for catch-up sessions.
- Weekend delivery of one programme made catch-ups difficult to implement.

B2.4 Timeliness

0

Description: *All offenders commence the programme, or specified pre-programme phase, within the first month of the order or within three months if other structured pre-programme work is undertaken. Occasionally, the timing may be different to permit other preliminary work to be completed, e.g. a programme of drug detoxification.*

Areas for improvement:

- Timeliness of Think First commencements was not being routinely monitored within the area.
- The file reading exercise demonstrated that 35 of 40 cases (88%) did not commence the programme within one calendar month. Where offenders were not starting the programme within the required timescale, it was not always clear whether this was because other preliminary work needed to be completed first.
- In the majority of cases sampled significant delays between psychometric testing and group work commencement were a cause for concern.

B3.1 Staff selection

1

Description: *A staff selection procedure meeting the requirements of the programme manual is in place and only staff meeting the defined criteria are selected to deliver the programme.*

Strengths:

- The area was only using appropriately selected and trained tutors to deliver the Think First programme.

Areas for improvement:

- Few tutors had been given written information concerning their role prior to commencing training.

B3.2 Staff roles and competencies

1

Description: *Differences in role between grades or posts are clearly reflected in job descriptions. A defined set of competencies exist for each staff role involved in the programme, using those specified in the programme manuals and the national management manual.*

Strengths:

- Programme and treatment managers and tutors were confident and clear about their roles.
- All gave sound accounts of the ways they ensured that the staff they supervised understood their own roles and responsibilities.

Areas for improvement:

- Not all programme staff had employment contracts which specified the amount of unsocial hours working required.
- Case managers were not as clear as other staff about all aspects of their role profile.

B3.3 Preparation and debriefing time for tutors

2

Description: *Tutors are allowed 1½ hours for preparation and debriefing for each session in addition to the programme delivery time.*

Strengths:

- There was evidence that programme tutors and treatment managers allowed the requisite time for preparation and debriefing for each session.
- Treatment and programme managers demonstrated that appropriate time for preparation and debriefing was built into the course timetable.

Areas for improvement:

- Tutors were undertaking administrative tasks, which detracted from preparation and debriefing time, and this was not being routinely recorded.

B3.4 Staff continuity

2

Description: *Three leaders should normally be assigned to each accredited programme to allow for leave, sickness and other contingencies. All sessions of the programmes are delivered by at least two of the three assigned staff. Continuity is maintained by at least one of the staff members having run the previous session.*

Strengths:

- Three staff members were assigned to each programme, with all of the sessions being delivered by two of the designated tutors.
- Session registers provided evidence of good tutor continuity and this was confirmed by offenders.

B4.1 Training arrangements for new staff

1

Description: *Training courses exist for all grades and roles involved in delivering the programme and all staff newly assigned to the programme receive training before running their first programme. The training delivered follows that defined in the programme training manual.*

Strengths:

- All staff had completed the relevant tutor training prior to running their first programme.
- There was a comprehensive training schedule available for all staff involved in programmes.

Areas for improvement:

- Case managers highlighted that they would benefit from refresher training on Think First to support them in their role.
- The training timetable did not allow equal access for all staff members, particularly those who were employed part-time or worked on the evening programmes.

B4.2 New staff paired with an experienced colleague when running their first programme

1

Description: *Staff newly trained in a programme should be paired with a more experienced colleague when running their first course.*

Strengths:

- Practice within the area was that new staff were paired with experienced tutors when running their first course.

Areas for improvement:

- The low numbers of trained tutors sometimes prevented the pairing of new and experienced tutors.
- Local guidance had been issued which detailed that a TPO should not be paired with an inexperienced tutor to deliver the programme, and this did not happen in practice. The role of the TPO within the area was to support experienced tutors.
- Tutors were not always clear what constituted being classified as an 'experienced tutor'.

B4.3 Training arrangements for experienced staff

N/A

Description: *Competency-based booster and developmental training arrangements exist for all staff experienced in delivering the programme. All programme delivery staff are required to attend such training when they have demonstrated their competence to do so. [This will include delivering a stipulated minimum number of courses.]*

This criterion had not been assessed as training for experienced tutors has yet to be rolled out nationally.

B4.4 Staff knowledge of the concepts and methods used in the programme

1

Description: *All relevant staff have a knowledge of the programme model, targeting, objectives and methods sufficient for effective delivery of the programme.*

Strengths:

- There was a good level of knowledge about programme concepts and methods amongst programme and treatment managers and tutors.
- All tutors delivering the programme had successfully completed the national training.

Areas for improvement:

- The *Area General Accredited Programmes Manual* provided more information for staff, but had yet to be implemented formally and circulated to local offices.
- Whilst case managers demonstrated an adequate grasp of the concepts and methods used in the programme, they indicated the need to develop more knowledge and to actively keep Think First on the team agenda.

B4.5 Staff knowledge of the theoretical and evidential basis of the programme

1

Description: *All relevant staff have a knowledge of the programme's theoretical base and evidence, sufficient for effective delivery of the programme.*

Strengths:

- Programme and treatment managers had a thorough knowledge of the theoretical and evidential basis of the programme.
- Tutors were able to identify some research evidence for this intervention.

Areas for improvement:

- All case managers had received Think First training, although not all could identify its theoretical and evidential basis.

B4.6 Supporting skills necessary to run programmes

1

Description: *From interview, observation, appraisal and training audits all relevant staff have supporting skills including core group work skills, presentation skills, case management, etc, sufficient for the effective delivery of the programme.*

Strengths:

- A training schedule had been devised to support staff in their effective delivery of programmes.

Areas for improvement:

- Scheduling of programmes meant that not all staff were able to access training. This specifically affected part-time staff and those running evening groups.
- Case managers identified that they would benefit from further training on post-group work to reinforce learning.

B5.1 Staff supervision and quality of practice

1

Description: *All staff involved in the programme receive support and supervision at a frequency specified in the national management manual. This will enable tutor skills to be developed and problems resolved within the lifetime of the current programme by supervisors familiar with effectiveness methods and the programme. The manager to have observed staff in the delivery of the programme either directly or through video prior to each supervision session.*

Strengths:

- Programme and treatment managers demonstrated their commitment to providing supervision, as set out in the national management manual.
- There was clear evidence that tutors received regular supervision.

Areas for improvement:

- A lack of transparency was apparent between arrangements for line management and treatment management supervision.
- Differential arrangements were in place amongst treatment managers for the recording of supervision sessions.

B5.2 Staff appraisal

0

Description: *All members of staff involved with the programme have their competence to perform their assigned role assessed annually through the appraisal process. Staff whose performance is assessed as below the acceptable standard but making progress should be given further training and other assistance to improve their performance and a date set for review. Staff who are not making progress in achieving the required standard of performance should not take any further part in running the programme.*

Areas for improvement:

- Appraisal arrangements had been suspended during 2002, a decision taken due to the additional workload involved in the training and implementation of OASys. However, this had been identified as a management priority area for the coming year.

B6.1 Offender selection and assessment

1

Description: *Routine monitoring results confirm the profile of those entering the programme are consistent with the criminogenic needs addressed by the programme, the level of risk of reoffending and the level of risk of harm/dangerousness.*

Strengths:

- Monitoring results showed that the majority of those offenders commencing the programme met the correct targeting criteria.
- Guidance had been reissued to staff in June 2002 on the area policy on suitability criteria and the targeting matrix.

Areas for improvement:

- Managers identified that, of those offenders eligible for the programme, only 25% had been referred.
- There were mechanisms in place to exclude an offender who might fall within the requisite targeting band, although there was an inconsistent approach to using this information to monitor suitability.

B6.2 Offender knowledge and understanding of the programme requirements

1

Description: *The requirements of the programme are clearly communicated on at least two occasions to each participant verbally and in writing, and there is evidence from signed consent forms, observation and/or interview that offenders know and understand the requirements.*

Strengths:

- Offenders demonstrated that all were familiar with the requirements of the programme and these arrangements had been explained to them prior to commencement.
- Case managers were generally clear in their explanations to offenders, which were reinforced by programme tutors at the pre-group stage.

Areas for improvement:

- Interviews with offenders indicated that not all had been given the information leaflet prior to programme commencement.

B6.3 Group size

2

Description: *For group programmes the maximum starting group size during the previous year did not exceed 12 and the minimum was not less than four.*

Strengths:

- Programmes did not commence with more than 12 participants and numbers did not fall below four during completion.
- Staff had a clear understanding of the minimum and maximum group starting sizes.

B6.4 Accessibility of group work programmes

2

Description: *If female or minority ethnic offenders are placed in mixed groups there are no singleton placements unless agreed to by the offender. Appropriate support arrangements should be evidenced for these programme participants.*

Strengths:

- Think First was only being used with male offenders within the area. Women offenders were referred to the Priestley One-to-One programme.
- The area had scheduled evening and weekend groups to ensure maximum attendance for employed offenders.
- Transport had been provided to maximise the attendance of offenders living in rural areas.
- Cambridgeshire was now a pathfinder area, providing mentors for black and Asian offenders on accredited programmes. Staff were finding this useful for addressing diversity issues.
- Attention had been paid to the needs of travellers, a minority group with a significant number of programme attendees in the more rural areas.

B7.1 Implementation of monitoring and evaluation design

1

Description: *Interview and observation show that monitoring and evaluation arrangements are working as intended and are understood and supported by all staff involved. This should include both input and feedback of data to managers and practitioners at local level.*

Strengths:

- Monitoring and evaluation information was being routinely collated across all staff groups.
- Information was provided to senior managers for use at Board and area management meetings.

Areas for improvement:

- Case managers found the information they received to be of limited use because it did not enable them to directly improve their practice.
- The area was not routinely monitoring attrition and programme exclusions.

B7.2 Practice is informed by monitoring and evaluation evidence

1

Description: *Consistent use is made of evaluation information as it becomes available by those with most direct responsibility, e.g. managers giving regular consideration to attendance and completion information, practitioners to offender feedback and attitude/behaviour change scores. Awareness/knowledge about evaluation results from the same programme operating elsewhere will be relevant.*

Strengths:

- Responsivity in programme scheduling, which included evening and weekend groups, had been achieved.
- The area had provided taxis and a mini bus for offenders, in response to offender feedback concerning the lack of availability of public transport in the more rural areas.

Areas for improvement:

- Some case managers said that they found it harder to schedule appointments with those attending evening groups. There was an over-reliance on tutors to monitor any significant issues that might affect attendance in such cases.
- The information department identified areas where current monitoring and evaluation data could be used to inform practice, but this had not progressed to the implementation stage.

SECTION C: QUALITY OF PROGRAMME DELIVERY

C1.1 Adherence to programme manual

1

Description: *All sessions of the programme should be delivered in line with the instructions of the programme manual and demonstrate close adherence to the aims and objectives. There should be evident commitment to follow the intention/purpose of the exercises used, including repetition/reinforcement, where these are designed parts of the programme.*

Strengths:

- Video monitoring demonstrated that adherence to the programme manual was strong overall, and treatment management supervision notes showed that this was given close attention.
- Extraneous additional material was not added to the programme.
- Session material was covered in the correct order.
- The aims and objectives of sessions were mostly met.

Areas for improvement:

- Exercises were not always run to time, with a number taking too long and others being rushed. This affected the pace of some sessions, which were assessed as too slow.
- Tutors did not always check out how far group members' learning related to the session aims and objectives.

C1.2 Adherence to treatment style

1

Description: *From direct observation or video evidence, programme tutors make competent and appropriate use of the techniques specified. There will be evidence of effective communication of the material, offender understanding and engagement. Pro-social attitudes are skilfully modelled by workers and are predominant in the group. This includes challenging pro-criminal or anti-social attitudes and behaviour.*

Strengths:

- There was evidence of the use of open questions within programme sessions.
- Tutors showed sensitivity to responsivity issues during delivery.
- Group members were encouraged to make links between exercises and the session.

Areas for improvement:

- Anti-social views were not always tackled consistently and, at times, were left unchallenged.
- Participants were not always encouraged to validate ideas for themselves or to elicit self-motivating statements.
- Further attention was required in summarising points and reflecting these back to the group.

C1.3 Group work skills

1

Description: *Programme tutors demonstrate effective management of the group, including effective co-working to facilitate learning by offenders and modelling pro-social behaviour. Disruption by participants is minimised.*

Strengths:

- Group members were generally involved in sessions and well engaged.
- Tutors used appropriate language and were clearly spoken in most cases.
- Groups were well managed and participation encouraged from all members.

Areas for improvement:

- Introductions and endings of exercises needed further attention, with some endings being too abrupt.
- Handovers were not always smoothly done and, at times, tutors needed to be more explicit about leading exercises.
- Insufficient attention had been given to the use of praise as a way of motivating and encouraging group members.

C1.4 Programme delivered addressing race equality and diversity issues

1

Description: *From direct observation or video evidence, issues of racism and sexism are effectively addressed whether arising within programme delivery or offender response. Staff are alert to race equality and diversity issues, they always respond appropriately and show that they have considered and developed strategies for responding, e.g. relevant resources and arguments, clarity about boundaries, approaches that may promote perspective taking.*

Strengths:

- Some attention had been paid to diversity issues within the programme setting. Tutors highlighted issues of good practice, but stated there was an absence of specific area guidance on dealing with race equality and wider diversity.
- The area had commenced roll-out of diversity and cultural awareness training. Managers stated that all staff would have access to this over the next year.

Areas for improvement:

- Opportunities to discuss diversity issues were not being created within a team setting, with priority given to agendas concerned with other issues such as programme scheduling and resourcing.

C1.5 Programme integrity checklist

2

Description: *The programme integrity checklist for each session is completed.*

Strengths:

- Programme integrity checklists were completed after every session and were seen as an important part of the debriefing process by tutors.
- There was timely completion of the checklist for all sessions.

C1.6 End of programme summary reports

1

Description: *The case record shows that at the end of the programme delivery staff prepare a summary for the case manager indicating:*

- *Participation in the programme*
- *progress made*
- *an assessment of risk, including the identification of factors relevant to the individual concerned*
- *an assessment of the offender's coping skills*
- *likely scenarios for relapse, including immediate precursors and triggers which might give prior warning*
- *identification of remaining treatment needs.*

Strengths:

- Tutors were completing end of programme summary reports on all relevant offenders.
- Both tutors and case managers reported on the usefulness of the document.

Areas for improvement:

- Some case managers reported that the reports were too 'jargonistic' and, at times, this prevented them always being integrated into adequate supervision plan reviews.
- The area had been using the report format issued by the NPD, which did not include a risk assessment or identify offending triggers or likely relapse scenarios.

SECTION D: CASE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

D1.1 Initial supervision plan sets relevant objectives for the offender

1

Description: *The supervision plan integrates the programme into the overall plan of work for each offender. Specific objectives are set in a sequence appropriate for the offender and are recorded in the initial supervision plan and regularly reviewed. Assessments should be based on OASys when available, or ACE or LSI-R before then.*

Strengths:

- Initial supervision plans gave some attention to integration of the programme aims.
- In 27 of 40 cases (68%), case managers had made use of appropriate targeting tools to assess offender suitability.

Areas for improvement:

- Only 11 of 40 cases (28%) evidenced objectives that were either fully or mostly SMART.
- There was insufficient attention given to regularly reviewing objectives in supervision plans. In just 11 of 35 cases (31%), were objectives set in supervision plans regularly reconsidered.

D1.2 Effective liaison arrangements between the case manager and programme staff

1

Description: *The case records show, and interviews with selected staff indicate, the existence of effective arrangements for liaison, handover and communication. This should include the three-way meetings between the case manager, programme staff and the offender at the end of the programme.*

Strengths:

- Records demonstrated ongoing dialogue with programmes staff and the case manager.
- Fourteen of 20 cases (70%) provided evidence that the case manager had attended the three-way meeting.
- Whilst offenders were on the programme there was some evidence of positive liaison between programme delivery staff and case managers.

Areas for improvement:

- Case managers routinely attended Sessions 14 and 22 of the programme, with any additional contact taking place on an individual basis. There was limited evidence of liaison on the case record, unless there were specific issues that needed addressing.

D1.3 Supporting the offender through all phases of the programme

0

Description: *The case manager is responsible for preparing and motivating the offender prior to their participation on an accredited programme and for reinforcing learning during the programme.*

Areas for improvement:

- There was a lack of clarity as to the level of detail of the required pre- and post-programme sessions.
- Some case managers stated that their high caseloads did not always allow sufficient time to prepare and motivate offenders prior to programme commencement.
- Sessions 14 and 22 were routinely attended by case managers; any further contact was largely in response to particular difficulties an offender might be experiencing.

D1.4 Understanding and knowledge of programme methods

1

Description: *Interviews with case managers demonstrate they have a clear understanding of the aims and objectives of the programme and that they either have the requisite skills to undertake reinforcement, follow-up and/or relapse prevention work, or the ability to refer to staff possessing these skills.*

Strengths:

- All case managers had attended training, with one exception, and this individual had been scheduled onto the next available course.
- They demonstrated a reasonable grasp and knowledge of the programme.

Areas for improvement:

- Case managers expressed a lack of confidence in being able to deliver pre- and post-programme work effectively.
- The area had not equipped case managers to reinforce learning during the programme nor carry out appropriate follow-up work with offenders.

D1.5 Monitoring of attendance and enforcement

2

Description: *Responsibility for the monitoring of attendance and the enforcement of orders is clearly defined with appropriate systems in place. There is evidence of effective enforcement in all cases.*

Strengths:

- Case records demonstrated a very high level of recording offenders' attendance, non-compliance and enforcement action taken, with 94% of those cases reviewed fully meeting this requirement.
- An enforcement policy was in place which staff were aware of and used appropriately.
- They were clear about their responsibilities in relation to the monitoring of attendance and enforcement.

D1.6 Documentation

1

Description: *The case record shows that all relevant documentation is completed.*

Strengths:

- Records of programme attendance and enforcement action were clear.
- Routinely, relevant documentation was present on the case file.

Areas for improvement:

- In cases where the offender had not commenced the programme within one calendar month there was an absence of recording. Only two of 35 cases (6%) had a documented good reason for a delay in programme start.

D1.7 End of programme review

1

Description: *The supervision plan review for each offender shows that at the end of the programme appropriate individual objectives are identified to strengthen and build on the progress made, and to achieve successful community reintegration.*

Strengths:

- In 12 of 17 cases (71%), some attention had been given to community reintegration issues.
- Offenders referred to the post-programme report during interview.

Areas for improvement:

- A deadline of two weeks was given for completion of the end of programme review following its completion. Case managers reported that reports were not always prepared within this timescale, which was attributed to programme tutors' other commitments.

D1.8 Reinforcement and relapse prevention work

N/A

Description: *There are specific arrangements in place to reinforce learning and for relapse prevention work, including booster programmes where required by the programme, delivered by appropriately trained and skilled staff.*

This criterion was not assessed due to the non-availability of the Cognitive Skills Booster Programme at this stage.

Next Steps

In this the second year of the audit cycle, HMIP has moved to a revised follow-up process depending on a probation area's performance rating.

HMIP advised COs in June 2002 that areas scoring less than a 50% IQR would be subject to a fresh audit within six months of the audit report being received by the probation area.

Areas which have now met or exceeded a 50% IQR will not be subject to any follow-up process but will next be assessed within HMIP's normal inspection cycle.

IQR score

The Cambridgeshire Probation Area achieved an IQR of **59%**.

This audit report will be received by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel in Autumn 2003.