



HM Inspectorate of Probation

AUDIT OF ACCREDITED PROGRAMMES

North-West Region of the
National Probation Service for
England and Wales

*Level 2 Follow-up Report on:
Lancashire Probation Area –
Think First*

October 2002

Acknowledgements:

We are grateful for the cooperation of staff from the Lancashire Probation Area in completing this follow-up audit.

The audit team comprised:

Kate White
Eileen O'Sullivan
Inspection & Audit Officers

Alan MacDonald
Audit Manager

Glossary

ACE	Assessment, Case Recording and Evaluation System
ACO	Assistant chief officer
CO	Chief officer
IQR	Implementation Quality Rating
LSI-R	Level of Service Inventory-Revised
N/A	Criteria not assessed
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OGRS	Offender Group Reconviction Scale
PSO	Probation service officer
PSR	Pre-sentence report
TPO	Trainee probation officer

Contents

	Page
Scoring Approach:	4
Overview:	4
Findings:	5
SECTION A: COMMITTED LEADERSHIP	6
SECTION B: PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	8
SECTION C: QUALITY OF PROGRAMME DELIVERY	16
SECTION D: CASE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	18
Scoring summary sheet:	20

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 follow-up 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.

For this follow-up audit, those criteria that were fully met on the original audit have not been re-assessed. The marks awarded then have therefore been carried over.

Overview:

- The original audit of Think First in Lancashire took place in July 2001.
- The follow-up audit comprised the following elements: video monitoring of 12 recorded Think First sessions; a case file read; interviews with the ACO, programme and treatment managers, tutors, case managers and PSR writers.
- Only those criteria not fully met at the original audit have been re-assessed and new marks awarded.

Findings:

As a result of the initial Think First audit in July 2001 Lancashire had compiled an action plan to address the recommendations and areas for improvement. It was to the area's credit that much of the improvement work needed had been carried out.

Some of the recommendations had been addressed fully. Treatment management had become an established and much appreciated means of driving up the quality of delivery and scores from a second sample of videotaped sessions evidenced this. Targeting had become more accurate and staff ownership increased as a result of the implementation of a system of automatic allocation. Revised completion targets had been met. Weekend working had improved accessibility to Think First. Careful thought given to the use of staff time and the prevention of tutor fatigue had brought positive change to the programme schedule and benefits for both tutors and offenders.

In other respects results were more mixed. OASys training in risk and supervision planning had been beneficial in integrating programme work more seamlessly into overall supervision, but many supervision objectives were non-specific, difficult to measure and not subject to careful and regular review. Think First training had been given to resettlement staff but there were very few post-release offenders being allocated to the programme.

Plans were still outstanding for work to upgrade delivery sites. Improvements to the case management element of programme delivery had been limited. A decision had been taken to carry out a full structural review by March 2003 and it was hoped that this would make for better integrated case management. The administrative function was generally underused and needed to be enhanced. Monitoring and evaluation was not yet coordinated and therefore not impacting fully on practice. Lancashire had not been able to improve its performance in relation to the timeliness of programme commencement.

With strong management leadership, a committed staff group and an ongoing concern for best practice, the area remained well placed to continue to progress in their work with Think First.

Next Steps

Lancashire Probation Area achieved an IQR of **71%**.

This audit follow-up report and the IQR will be received by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel in March 2003.

SECTION A: COMMITTED LEADERSHIP

Recommendation(s) from the original audit which relate to this section.

The CO should ensure that the area:

- **develops an allocation culture in order to meet national targets for attendance and works on refining assessment within target groups;**
- **integrates case management with programme management.**

- ▶▶ **Largely met:** Lancashire had worked hard to achieve the move to a system of allocation rather than referral, issuing clear guidance about the automatic allocation of all suitable offenders and putting in place a process of monitoring by treatment managers.
- ▶▶ **Largely met:** The area had decided it was not viable to pursue a specialist case management model. Pending a full structural review focusing on programme delivery, there were some areas for improvement relating to case management which had not been progressed in the last 12 months.

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.*

Criterion fully met at original audit.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Considerable management time had been given over to issues concerning the integration of the case management component of programme delivery, including active consideration of a specialist case management model.
- This specialist model had been rejected and plans were in place for a structural review, the latest target date for which was March 2003.
- Refresher workshops had been delivered to case managers to improve their familiarity with the programme.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Practice instructions had given clear guidance requiring the automatic allocation of all suitable community supervision cases to Think First. Exceptional cases were being discussed with treatment managers who were keeping clear records of the decision taken in respect of each offender.

- The number, both of referrals to the programme and programme orders, had increased significantly in the first half of the current year by comparison with the previous year's figures.
- Allocation rates were being monitored and broken down to individual officer level.
- Training in Think First had been given to all those managing resettlement cases, but the area lacked a policy governing the allocation of licencees to the programme and allocation of resettlement cases was not being monitored or checked by treatment managers.
- There were still some instances of PSR writers seeing OGRS 2 scores, the targeting matrix and OASys as secondary to an initial professional assessment of offender suitability.

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.*

Criterion fully met at original audit.

SECTION B: PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Recommendation(s) from the original audit which relate to this section.

The CO should ensure that the area:

- **pays further attention to the facilities provided and brings all accommodation up to the required level;**
- **addresses offender motivational and attitudinal issues, and external offender crises to reduce attrition during the group phase;**
- **reconsiders the use of tutor time and programming of sessions;**
- **gives careful consideration to refining appraisal using national competencies for tutors;**
- **reviews targeting and assessment of offenders and develops a clear plan for improvement;**
- **uses the newly developed database to provide staff at all levels with sufficient information to participate in review and refinement of policy and practice.**

- ▶▶ **Largely met:** Plans were in place to improve facilities and premises but these had not yet been brought to fruition.
- ▶▶ **Not met:** The role of the case manager had yet to be fully established.
- ▶▶ **Largely met:** Progress had been made in the effective allocation of tutor time and the scheduling of programmes.
- ▶▶ **Fully met:** Staff roles had become better linked to their respective competencies and this was reflected in the appraisal process.
- ▶▶ **Largely met:** There was clear evidence of an improvement in the accurate targeting of offenders to Think First.
- ▶▶ **Largely met:** Whilst the profile of the programmes database had improved amongst managers, not all practitioners were receiving Think First information reliably or finding it accessible.

B1.1 Resources and facilities

1

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

Progress since original audit:

- Plans were underway to provide improved premises in Preston and Blackpool, although these had not been realised at the time of the follow-up audit.
- A specification for video storage systems had been drawn up.
- New upright chairs with arms and writing tables had been purchased for all delivery sites.

B1.2 Provision of information leaflets about the programme

2

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

Progress since original audit:

- A comprehensive set of leaflets had been produced, each customised to the relevant audience.

- Information leaflets were being given to offenders either at the PSR or induction stage.
- A promotional video about Think First was also being used.

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- Attrition had been a focus of attention and the area's amended completion targets for 2001/2002 had been met.
- A new enforcement policy had been drawn up, incorporating guidance in relation to programme attendance.
- The case file read evidenced comprehensive and prompt liaison between tutors and case managers in relation to offenders who missed programme appointments.
- Compliance officers had been appointed and located at Blackpool, Blackburn and Preston.
- A driver had been appointed to transport offenders from outlying geographical areas, and this had proved helpful.
- There was improved consistency about procedures relating to the late attendance by offenders at Think First sessions.

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- The programme delivery schedule was being routinely published in advance and any amendments or additions to this notified to staff.
- A Think First diary was issued in respect of each individual offender, listing all the programme sessions and prompting the delivery of pre-group work.
- Sessions were only cancelled as a last resort and usually because of low offender numbers. There had been some appropriate use made of timely 'bus stopping' arrangements in these situations to minimise disruption for offenders.
- Tutors and case managers were liaising well about offender crises and taking care to manage these outside of programme sessions in order not to cause disruption.

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- Catch-ups were being offered as required and in 17 of 20 applicable cases (85%) attendance at catch-up sessions was clearly recorded.
- Considerable thought had been given to the content of catch-up sessions and a 'catch-up manual' compiled for use by tutors.
- Catch-ups sessions were being videoed but not monitored by treatment managers.
- Some catch-ups were rushed, particularly for Saturday groups, and the delivery was sometimes of inferior quality to the main sessions.

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- In only 12 of 30 cases examined in the file reading exercise (40%) did offenders either begin Think First within one month, or have a planned and recorded delay to programme start and additional intervention to make them programme-ready.
- Women were facing longer delays to programme start than were male offenders.
- A backlog of allocated offenders had built up, on occasion, at particular delivery sites where programmes had not been scheduled at sufficiently frequent intervals.

B3.1 Staff selection

2

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- Procedures for running assessment centres had been drawn up and implemented and staff spoke positively about the clarity of the selection and recruitment process.
- All tutors delivering Think First had passed an assessment centre.
- Assistance had been given to candidates who had not passed the assessment centre at their first attempt.

B3.2 Staff roles and competencies

2

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- A comprehensive and specific job description had been drawn up for the role of the programme manager.
- The job description for tutors had been linked to the required community justice occupational standards.
- All staff were clear about their respective roles and understood their key functions.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- A review had been carried out of contractual working arrangements for programme delivery staff and consultations were being held with the unions about a flexible working week.
- The delivery rota had been revised and the number of sessions reduced from two per day to one per day in order to minimise offender and tutor fatigue.
- A number of useful tools had been devised to help shape the content of preparation and debriefing work. These included a set of prompts to facilitate post-session review by co-tutors and a workbook for staff to record how various elements of a particular session had drawn on tutor competencies.
- Clear records were being kept of pre and post-session work by tutors and there was encouraging evidence that this work had been developed within the context of treatment management.

B3.4 Staff continuity

1

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Think First staffing rotas had been drawn up to incorporate contingency arrangements, including the allocation of a third tutor to each programme.
- Tutor continuity was clearly seen as an important priority and records were being kept of which tutors were scheduled to deliver each Think First session.
- During times of tutor shortage it had not always been possible to provide a third tutor.

B4.1 Training arrangements for new staff

2

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.*

Criterion fully met at original audit.

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

2

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

Progress since the original audit:

- Care had been taken to pair new tutors with experienced ones.
- TPOs were working routinely alongside experienced tutors and spoke of a positive co-working experience.

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.]*

Criterion not assessed at original audit.

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

2

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

Criterion fully met at original audit.

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

2

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

Criterion fully met at original audit.

B4.6 Supporting skills necessary to run programmes

2

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Work was being done by tutors and treatment managers to review the match between tutor skills and the required competencies for skilled programme delivery.
- A staged induction course for new PSOs was in place and Think First tutors had benefited from this.
- Tutors had been provided with complementary training, including motivational interviewing and group work skills.
- Treatment managers had received training in supervision skills and managing black and Asian staff.

B5.1 Staff supervision and quality of practice

2

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Supervision of tutors by treatment managers was happening at above the required frequency and tutors attested to the developmental benefits of this regime.
- Individual learning needs had been given an increased priority, written records of these were kept and reviewed and they informed the overall training plan.

- Attention was being paid to performance by reviewing videotaped work. Treatment managers were scoring and assessing this accurately and their comments were thorough and instructive.

B5.2 Staff appraisal

2

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- Staff ownership of the annual appraisal cycle was good.
- Appraisal objectives had been formally linked to the community justice occupational standards and to competencies from the national management manual.

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- Practice instructions requiring automatic allocation to Think First had been published. This was instrumental in moving Lancashire from a referral culture to one of allocation.
- Treatment managers were now monitoring those allocations falling outside the OGRS 2 band for Think First and a log was being kept of decisions made in relation to these cases.
- A small-scale validation exercise on OGRS 2 scores had been carried out, which had revealed significant discrepancies between first and second calculations and action taken to remedy this and produce more consistent results.
- In the file reading exercise, 22 of 30 cases (73%) fell within the acceptable Think First target band of 31-74% or were above the band but with planned additional work in place.
- The remaining cases had OGRS 2 scores above the targeting band, but with no additional structured intervention planned or delivered.

B6.2 Offender knowledge and understanding of the programme requirements

2

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- A leaflet had been drawn up outlining programme requirements. This was being issued to offenders at pre-group session 4.
- Appraisal objectives for court-based staff outlined the requirement on them to pass on to offenders sentenced to Think First clear information about the programme.
- Programme tutors were routinely attending induction sessions and briefing offenders about Think First.

- Statements of understanding/offender contracts were being signed and retained on case files.
- In 25 of 30 cases in the file read sample (83%), programme requirements had been communicated to offenders both verbally and in writing.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Session records showed that groups were starting with between four and 12 offenders.

B6.4 Accessibility of group work programmes

1

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Lancashire had drawn up strategies for the delivery of programmes to black, Asian and women offenders and had decided upon an integrated approach rather than running separate groups.
- The file read exercise revealed a number of aspects in which diversity issues and the support of those with particular needs might have been better addressed and recorded. In only one of 21 applicable cases (5%) were Think First cases managed with a full regard to diversity considerations.
- The area had conducted a disability audit of all Think First delivery sites.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- The programmes database developed for programmes, and based on Lotus Notes, had been made available to all managers.
- Think First tutors were receiving monitoring and evaluation data via their practice development meetings.
- Programme and treatment managers were meeting every eight weeks, together with the ACO with programme responsibility, and were spending some of this time discussing emerging evaluation data.
- An objective specific to the monitoring of Think First had been incorporated into the performance planning document of the programme manager.
- Case managers and PSR writers said the programme information they received was limited and was accessed via e-mail or team meetings.
- There was an over-reliance by staff on anecdotal evidence relating to the progress of individual offenders on Think First rather than on emerging evaluation results from local or national programme delivery.

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.

Progress since the original audit:

- There were specific examples of limited evaluation results prompting refinements to practice: concerns about targeting accuracy had led to an audit of OGRS 2 scores; attrition in the pre-programme phase prompted a focus on psychometric tests.
- Trainee psychologists had been appointed but their work in scoring and analysing psychometric data had yet to be established and results made available to the wider staff group.
- Treatment managers had made significant progress in monitoring the quality of programme delivery and using these results to drive up standards.
- The area had made unsuccessful attempts to recruit a research officer to coordinate the evaluation of programmes.

SECTION C: QUALITY OF PROGRAMME DELIVERY

Recommendation(s) from the original audit which relate to this section.

The CO should ensure that the area:

- **differentiates the developmental needs of individual tutors using video monitoring and supervision sessions to explore practice issues such as co-working arrangements and adherence to the programme manual.**

- ▶▶ **Largely met:** Encouraging work had been done by treatment managers to monitor accurately the standard of programme delivery and to give individual input to tutors in order to improve performance.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Less personal anecdotal material was now being added and thus inappropriate extras were generally avoided.
- The timing of some exercises and sessions remained a problem, with sessions ranging from 1 hour 40 minutes to 2 hours 10 minutes.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Group members were encouraged to validate ideas for themselves.
- Positive listening skills were supported by helpful body language.
- Open questions were not used consistently and this sometimes closed down offenders' responses.
- There were few instances of programme staff eliciting self-motivating statements from offenders.
- Some sessions showed encouraging examples of tutors challenging offence-supporting views.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Co-working arrangements did not always work well, with one tutor sometimes dominating a session.
- In some sessions co-tutoring was disjointed and tutors were not consistently supportive to one another.
- Tutors were seen talking over each other and there was confusion about which tutor was leading each particular element of a session.

C1.4 Programme delivered addressing race equality and diversity issues**2**

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.*

Criterion fully met at original audit.

C1.5 Programme integrity checklist**2**

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

Criterion fully met at original audit.

C1.6 End of programme summary reports**2**

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.*

Criterion fully met at original audit.

SECTION D: CASE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Recommendation(s) from the original audit which relate to this section.

The CO should ensure that the area:

- **strengthens and structures the case management role during group delivery;**
- **improves the quality of supervision planning and use of structured tools for assessment in determining SMART objectives for offenders.**

- ▶▶ **Not met:** There remained a lack of clarity about the case manager role during group delivery.
- ▶▶ **Not met:** Although programme work was being better integrated into overall supervision, few objectives were SMART and regular reviews were not consistently carried out.

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

0

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Lancashire had taken paper-based OASys following training in October 2001 and had therefore given a specific focus to improved supervision planning. There was encouraging use of material drawn from OASys assessments in compiling supervision plans, although this did not yet apply to every case.
- Of cases sampled, eleven of 30 (37%) had evidence of full integration of Think First into the overall plan of supervision.
- In only six of 30 cases (20%) were the objectives set in the initial supervision plan fully SMART.
- In only eight of 27 applicable cases (30%) were programme-related objectives fully and regularly reviewed.

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

2

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.*

Criterion fully met at original audit.

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- Motivational interviewing training had been delivered.
- Compliance officers had taken up post and were involved in maintaining offenders through the programme.

- In only five of 30 cases (17%) were all the required pre-programme sessions recorded as being delivered within one month of sentence/release.
- Staff interviews revealed differential practice in relation to pre-programme sessions: some case managers were beginning to deliver these sessions immediately after sentence/release; others waited for the prompt of receiving an offender's Think First diary before starting to deliver.
- Case managers also conceded that confusion about the timing of pre-programme delivery was compounded by a lack of clear recording and sometimes resulted in the repetition of pre-programme material.
- Whilst there was some positive and responsive crisis management work being done, in only nine of 24 cases (38%) did case managers play a full and proactive role in motivating offenders and securing their compliance.
- Case managers had no clear understanding of the frequency and content of supervision with offenders whilst on a group; there was no evidence of them working to reinforce offender learning during programme attendance.

D1.4 Understanding and knowledge of programme methods

2

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.*

Criterion fully met at original audit.

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.*

Criterion fully met at original audit.

D1.6 Documentation

1

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

Progress since the original audit:

- The file read exercise showed some progress in the storage and usage of programme-related documents by case managers. In 21 of 30 cases (70%) all relevant paperwork was available on case files.

D1.7 End of programme review

0

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.*

Progress since the original audit:

- The file read showed little evidence that the end of programme review was influenced by the post-programme review. In only two of six applicable cases (33%) did this happen sufficiently.
- There were no examples of fully SMART programme-related objectives in end of programme reviews.

- Cases examined during the file read offered no recorded evidence of full attention having been paid to community reintegration work in the post-programme phase.

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.*

Criterion not assessed at original audit.