

OFFENDER MANAGEMENT INSPECTION

A joint inspection by HM Inspectorates of Probation and Prisons

A report on offender management
arrangements in custodial
institutions in the North East of
England

July 2009

FOREWORD

Within a variety of arrangements in place to deliver offender management, we saw many positive aspects to the work done with prisoners to address their offending-related needs. Managers from HM Prison Service and the probation areas across the region have established structures to facilitate good communication between their organisations, and there was evidence that prison staff and offender managers are also working together well, but that offender managers need to meet their responsibilities more often.

The role of staff in the Offender Management Unit was not always well understood by other departments in the prison and more could have been done to coordinate assessments and to involve key staff in the sentence planning process. The use of the Offender Assessment System has been given a high priority, with prisons receiving it on time and promoting its use within establishments. However, important information held by the prison is not always provided to offender managers in order to inform future assessments. The range and capacity of accredited programmes are insufficient to meet identified need.

Strategic and operational links with Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements are good, reflecting the importance given to this critical area of work.

ANDREW BRIDGES

HM Chief Inspector of Probation

ANNE OWERS

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our thanks to the governors and staff of the custodial institutions visited: HMP Castington, Kirklevington Grange and Holme House, and the regional manager for custodial services in the north-east, who we interviewed.

*HM Assistant Chief
Inspector of Probation*

Krystyna Findley

*HM Deputy Chief
Inspector of Prisons*

Nigel Newcomen

HM Inspectors

Nigel Scarff, Paddy Doyle, Marie Orrell, Andrew Rooke, Lucy Young

Programme Manager

Andy Bonny

Research Team

Olivia Adams, Samantha Booth, Louise Falshaw, Julia Fossi, Helen Meckiffe, Laura Nettleingham, Sherelle Park

Inspection Admin Officer

Pippa Bennett, Andy Doyle

Publications Team

Kirk Davis, Alex Pentecost

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS | 4 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 5 |
| CONTEXT AND GENERAL OVERVIEW | 6 |
| INSPECTION MODEL, METHODOLOGY AND PUBLICATION ARRANGEMENTS | 8 |
| SUMMARY | 10 |
| SHARING GOOD PRACTICE | 13 |
| SERVICE USERS' PERSPECTIVE | 14 |
| 1. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRISON AND PROBATION | 16 |
| 2. OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MODEL | 19 |
| 3. SENTENCE PLANNING | 24 |
| 4. SENTENCE PLANNING DELIVERY | 26 |
| 5. OASys | 29 |
| 6. OFFENDER ENGAGEMENT | 31 |
| 7. DIVERSITY | 33 |
| 8. PUBLIC PROTECTION | 36 |
| 9. VICTIMS | 40 |
| APPENDIX 1 Prisons inspected in this area | 42 |
| APPENDIX 2 Role of HMI Probation and HMI Prisons | 45 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

| | |
|---------------|--|
| CALM | Controlling Anger and Learning to Manage it |
| CARATS | Counselling, Assessment, Referral and Treatment Services |
| DIP | Drug Intervention Programme |
| ETE | Employment, Training and Education |
| HMI Prisons | Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons |
| HMI Probation | Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation |
| HMP | Her Majesty's Prison |
| IDRMM | Inter-Departmental Risk Management Meeting |
| IPP | Imprisonment for Public Protection |
| LIDS | Local Inmate Data System |
| MAPPA | Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements |
| MIAP | Managing Information Across Providers |
| NOMS | National Offender Management Service |
| OASys/eOASys | Offender Assessment System/electronic OASys |
| OMU | Offender Management Unit |
| PNC | Police National Computer |
| PPO | Prolific and other priority offender |
| RoH | Risk of Harm |
| SIR | Security Information Report |
| TSP | Thinking Skills Programme |
| ViSOR | Violent and Sexual Offender Register |
| YOI | Youth Offender Institution |
| YOT | Youth Offending Team |

RECOMMENDATIONS

Improvements are necessary as follows:

Area

1. the allocation of an offender supervisor takes into account the level and type of Risk of Harm presented by the offender
2. each prison introduces a strategy for offender management that formulates the role and purpose of the Offender Management Unit and addresses future developments
3. prisons develop robust mechanisms for communication between the Offender Management Units and other prison departments
4. quality assurance procedures are developed to ensure consistent and high quality work within Offender Management Units
5. all keyworkers delivering interventions in custody are involved in relevant sentence planning meetings
6. minutes of inter-departmental risk management meetings and any other risk management meetings are shared with offender managers to inform reviews of the Offender Assessment System
7. victim awareness work is undertaken as appropriate to the case.

National

1. greater access to video conferencing facilities is made available within all prisons and probation areas to support the offender management process
2. offender managers contribute to the management of the custodial aspect of the sentence as specified in National Offender Management Service guidance.

CONTEXT AND GENERAL OVERVIEW

Offender management model

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

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

Implementation of Phase I

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

Implementation of Phase II

In phase II, the model was extended to offenders serving certain custodial sentences. From November 2006 it included adult offenders serving a determinate sentence of 12 months or more, who were either assessed as posing a high or very high RoH or who had been identified by local Crime and Reduction Partnerships as PPOs. Prisons were required to set up OMUs by September 2006 and to deliver the offender supervisor role in custody. Prison area managers indicated that, in the early stage of resource determination, it had been hard to identify exactly what the needs were going to be and how these related to the existing resources, for example, probation departments within prisons or prison staff already involved in assessment and sentence planning. It was also noted that it had not always been clear to prisons at the start which offenders were included in the model, particularly in respect of those who were foreign nationals. There had been issues for area managers about the phased implementation of the model as this, in effect, required prisons to run two separate systems, one for those within scope of the model at the different stages, and one for other offenders. This had led to decisions in some prisons to include more offenders within the work of OMUs than were in scope at the time. This would have challenged the resourcing capacity of probation areas in England and Wales, which were not required to allocate an offender manager to these additional cases.

Implementation of Phase III

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

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

INSPECTION MODEL, METHODOLOGY AND PUBLICATION ARRANGEMENTS

Model

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

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

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

- communication between prison and probation
- offender management model
- sentence planning
- sentence planning delivery
- OASys
- offender engagement
- diversity
- public protection
- victims.

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

Methodology

During the inspection we meet with:

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

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

Publication arrangements

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

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

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

SUMMARY

Communication between prison and probation

Issues of risk of self-harm were generally identified either from information received from courts or recorded on LIDS or OASys. OMUs were not automatically informed about identified risk of self-harm issues. A number of prisoners who had felt depressed or suicidal said they were not offered help within a day of their arrival. There was evidence that prison staff and offender managers were working in a positive, proactive and timely fashion. There was sufficient contact between offender managers and prisoners and prisoners felt supported. In the north-east, relationships between prisons and probation areas were good and there was an ongoing strategic focus on those relationships.

Offender management model

There was some variation between prisons in relation to the role and grade of offender supervisors and the knowledge of other staff about the OMU. In a minority of cases transfers had been organised based on sentence plans and OMUs had kept offender managers informed about any movement of prisoners. Comprehensive and timely inductions of new prisoners, which involved OMUs, were taking place. There was continuity of offender supervisors but just under half of the prisoners in the survey had had a change of offender manager. Each OMU had a different structure and all needed a strategy or policy in place that addressed their future development. There were inconsistent quality assurance processes in place. Resources mostly matched the workload of each OMU but were not always consistent with the offender's RoH, likelihood of reoffending and PPO status.

Sentence planning

On arrival, prisoners were allocated to activities and programmes before the sentence planning meeting had taken place, which could potentially restrict the options available to develop a sentence plan. Sentence planning meetings were generally organised by OMUs and offender managers would, in the main, chair them. The level of involvement of keyworkers and personal officers in the sentence planning process varied. Objectives or targets were not outcome focused. Prisoners were enabled to participate actively and meaningfully in the planning process and found the meetings useful. Some staff were frustrated by a lack of interventions available within individual establishments and perceived difficulties transferring prisoners to complete programmes available in other prisons.

Sentence planning delivery

Staff were aware of the concept of sequencing interventions and tried to achieve this. However, decisions were based primarily on the length of time the prisoner was likely to be in the prison before they were released. Prisoners sometimes had to wait before starting certain accredited programmes due to a lack of places or waiting to be transferred elsewhere. Sentence plans did not always cover the period after release from prison. Offenders attending certain accredited programmes were challenged about their offending behaviour. Basic skills assessments were taking place and most prisoners in the survey who needed help indicated that work had been done. There was

also evidence that some work on accommodation and contact with prisoners' families had taken place.

OASys

Prisons were receiving OASys on time. One prison had emphasised the importance of OASys and encouraged other departments to use it in their work with offenders. Keyworkers were using OASys either to inform their own assessments or ascertain if there was a need for their specialist intervention. Some prison staff were ensuring that the offender manager received information that could inform a review of OASys. It was not clear if minutes from internal risk management meetings were routinely provided to offender managers.

Offender engagement

A basic skills screening process was in place. If those needs became apparent later on during the custodial period, staff felt able to make referrals to education. The MIAP pilot promised to reduce the repeated assessment of prisoners. Apart from work by psychologists associated with accredited programmes, there was little evidence that attention was paid to methods that would be most effective with individual offenders. There was some work on self-esteem, and motivation was taken into account in certain cases, but the offenders' intellectual ability, learning style and capacity to change were not always considered. The majority of prisoners in the survey confirmed that they had been told why they had been recalled and some work had been done to re-engage them.

Diversity

There was an emphasis on identifying diversity issues when prisoners first arrived. This was demonstrated by the involvement of staff designated as diversity champions being involved in induction and the use of forms or checklists to identify diversity issues. Staff were able to provide a number of examples where arrangements for interventions had taken into account an individual offender's diversity needs. However, there was less evidence from staff about strategic planning, resources and monitoring of diversity initiatives and specific services to support work with minority groups.

Public protection

The OASys Risk of Harm and MAPPA classifications were accessible to most staff either from OASys or LIDS. However, not all keyworkers were aware of these classifications and their involvement in internal and external risk management meetings varied. Keyworkers would share any information they gained from prisoners that related to public protection. The arrangements for internal risk management meetings in each prison were different. OMU staff were encouraged to attend MAPPA meetings. Written reports to MAPPA were not standardised. There was appropriate representation at various strategic meetings dealing with public protection issues. Public protection policies and procedures were not uniform and user friendly. Resources were linked to RoH and to some extent PPOs.

Victims

Victim safety was prominent in all three prisons. Staff were aware of how they could protect victims while the offender was serving a custodial sentence, and requests for temporary release would take into account the location of the victim and other relevant factors. Victim awareness was not formally delivered in two prisons although the issue was covered by certain accredited programmes and, in a small number of cases, by offender supervisors.

SHARING GOOD PRACTICE

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

Public Protection:

**OMI Criterion:
2.2a**

In HMP Kirklevington Grange the IDRMM minutes were comprehensive and well structured. There was a pro-forma for producing the minutes of the meeting for each prisoner that had been discussed. The format of the minutes replicated sections in OASys. Minutes contained key information about the prisoner, the names of those who had attended the meeting, offence details and history relevant to Risk of Serious Harm, a review of the OASys risk management plan and the development of a new risk management plan, a review of MAPPA risk management strategies, sentence planning targets and information sharing. The minutes integrated several key public protection processes that operated in the prison and externally through MAPPA to give a whole picture of the offender.

Induction:

**OMI Criterion:
2.4c**

In HMP Kirklevington Grange the induction was particularly thorough. Prisoners were issued with a checklist and induction programme, which consisted of attendance at various departments or undertaking certain activities that they were expected to complete within the first two weeks of their arrival. Encouraging prisoners to use their initiative was part of the process of helping them become accustomed to a regime that was very different from their previous experience of prison life. Prisoners also had to complete a number of questionnaires about disability, race and ethnicity, previous sentence plan targets, an OASys self-assessment form and a feedback form about whether the twenty or more activities included on the induction were useful.

Communication:

**OMI Criterion:
4.6d**

One probation area had a functional mailbox for OMUs in prisons. This single point of electronic contact facilitated the prompt transmission of information from prison to probation. It helped match a prisoner and offender supervisor with the allocated offender manager quickly and reliably.

SERVICE USERS' PERSPECTIVE

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

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

| Prison | No. in sample | No. of responses | Response rate (%) |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Castington | 17 | 13 | 76 |
| Kirklevington Grange | 27 | 27 | 100 |
| Holme House | 25 | 24 | 96 |
| Total | 69 | 64 | 93% |

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

- six offenders said they were under the age of 21 years
- 20 stated they were from a black or minority ethnic group
- one reported that he was a foreign national
- six were on recall to prison
- six self-identified as having a disability.

These responses are indicative of the diverse needs of those individuals under offender management arrangements.

General themes from the survey are identified below and specific data are included in the main body of the report.

In their responses to the survey, under two-thirds identified that they had had some problems when they first arrived at the prison, mainly in relation to feeling depressed or suicidal, their accommodation or contact with family members. Around a third had been offered help within 24 hours with a specific problem although this was less so for accommodation issues. The majority of prisoners had received a timely and thorough induction. For a minority of prisoners, during their time in custody, reading and writing,

religion and disability had made it more difficult for them to take part in activities and these issues had not always been dealt with.

All the prisoners had a named offender manager who, in the majority of cases, had been in contact since they had been in custody, mainly by visiting them. Three-quarters felt they had been supported. Unfortunately, just under half of the prisoners in the survey had experienced a change in offender manager whilst they had been in custody. The majority of prisoners had an offender supervisor who they saw either weekly or monthly and they felt supported by them. In most cases, prisoners had a sentence plan that they had helped develop, and which took into account their individual needs. The majority had attended sentence planning meetings, which they had found useful.

Offenders had been offered help with a range of problems, such as ETE, substance misuse and offending behaviour. Over half had done some work on victim awareness and most had found this useful. The majority did not feel they had been helped with the problems they could face on release, such as financial issues and finding accommodation. However, a quarter had been helped with arranging a place at college or continuing education, and contacting external drug or alcohol agencies on release. Over three-quarters of offenders in the survey concluded that their experience in prison had made them less likely to offend in the future.

1. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRISON AND PROBATION

1.1d Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) One establishment received information from courts about risk of self-harm in post-sentence reports that were completed after a prisoner had been initially remanded in custody or following sentence. These reports were usually followed up by phone calls from the court duty officer on the day. In another prison, risk of self-harm issues were recorded on the LIDS.
- (b) The OMUs in all three prisons were not directly involved in the process of identifying risk of self-harm and, in one prison, there were no formal systems to ensure the OMU was aware that a prisoner had these issues.
- (c) Fifteen offenders (60%) indicated that they had had problems with feeling depressed and suicidal when they first arrived at the prison. Four had been offered help or support from a member of staff within the first 24 hours of arriving.

2.1h Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) There was evidence of positive, proactive and timely joint working between prison staff and offender managers in varying degrees in all three establishments. In two prisons, pre-release reviews or meetings were used to capture any relevant issues to be addressed before the prisoner was released. 35% of prisoners stated that they had received help from a member of staff in preparation for their release.
- (b) Offender supervisors ensured offender managers were up to date by sending e-mails and occasionally attaching post-programme reports.
- (c) Fifty-eight offenders (94%) who responded to the survey stated that they had had contact with their offender manager since they had been in their current prison; 25 had contact by letter, 26 by phone and 47 remembered being visited. Three-quarters felt supported by their offender manager.

4.6d Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) All three establishments reported that relationships between prisons and probation areas within the north-east were generally either very good or satisfactory. Outside the region, individual offender managers' involvement with OMUs appeared to reduce the further away they were from the prison although there were exceptions to the rule.
- (b) One probation area had a functional mailbox for OMUs in prisons. This single point of electronic contact facilitated the prompt transmission of information from prison to probation. It helped match a prisoner and offender supervisor with the allocated offender manager quickly and reliably.
- (c) All three OMUs commented that they had to sometimes remind or prompt offender managers when, for example, a sentence plan review was due. Although acknowledging the primacy of the role of the offender manager, OMUs felt it was their responsibility to ensure processes they managed operated smoothly.
- (d) Resettlement was the key function of one prison; a number of prisoners had been released on temporary licences to attend accredited programmes delivered in the community by two probation areas. These arrangements were working well and involved a considerable amount of cooperation between the prison and probation staff. In another prison, there were also plans for probation area staff to come in and deliver an accredited programme.
- (e) There was evidence that at the strategic level, prisons and probation were actively focusing on their working relationships. In the North-East region an offender management operational group, which consisted of probation and prison staff, met every two months. The meeting covered training needs, improving communication and discussed any national updates concerning the offender management model.
- (f) There were examples of joint training and opportunities for prison and probation staff, including administrative staff, to shadow each other. In one prison there was a conscious effort to make offender managers feel welcome when they visited. They were met at the gate by the offender supervisor and briefed about the interventions available in the prison before chairing sentence planning meetings. Access to video conferencing facilities varied and in one prison was non-existent.

Summary

Issues of risk of self-harm were generally identified either from information received from courts or recorded on LIDS or OASys. OMUs were not automatically informed about identified risk of self-harm issues. A number of prisoners who had felt depressed or suicidal said they were not offered help within a day of their arrival. There was evidence that prison staff and offender managers were working in a positive, proactive and timely fashion. There was sufficient contact between offender managers and prisoners and prisoners felt supported. In the north-east, relationships between prisons and probation areas were good and there was an ongoing strategic focus on those relationships.

2. OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MODEL

1.5c Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) The role and grade of offender supervisors varied between the three prisons. Generally, the role of prison officer offender supervisors included identifying which prisoners were in scope, participating in sentence planning, ensuring everything was in place for sentence planning meetings, liaising with the offender manager, making referrals within the prison and to other establishments, and liaising with interventions if there were problems. A key aspect of the role was communication; one offender supervisor described the role as 'the eyes and ears of the offender manager'. In one prison, probation officers were offender supervisors.
- (b) The level of knowledge within each prison about the role and purpose of the OMU, offender supervisors and offender managers was uneven. The three OMUs were aware that their profile within their prison could be improved. Keyworkers in one prison were confused about the difference between offender supervisors and offender managers. The main contact keyworkers had with offender supervisors was when they received referrals from them. There was evidence that keyworkers had direct contact with offender managers and it was not always clear that offender supervisors were aware of this. In one prison the Head of the OMU had been involved in training prison officer staff about offender management and the tasks that offender managers would undertake.
- (c) Case administrators were deployed differently in each prison. They had a key role in maintaining complex systems, which required knowledge of internal prison and external probation processes.

2.1j Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) There was a mixed picture concerning the transfer of prisoners. One prison had a high turnover of prisoners because it was a local prison and there was a pressure to fill places and also supply prisoners to two other prisons in the area. Occasionally, IPPs were suddenly moved on. On the other hand, there was evidence that prisoners were moved to other establishments to undertake a specific

programme. Whatever the reason for a prisoners transfer, the OMUs acknowledged it was their task to inform the offender manager, usually by e-mail.

- (b) The regional manager for custodial services acknowledged that, due to population pressures, matching prisoners to individual interventions in other prisons was difficult. In one prison there had been an influx of IPPs who, until relatively recently, could not be transferred to other prisons - this had had the knock-on effect of restricting the movement of other prisoners. However, the regional manager felt that moving prisoners while they were in the middle of a programme or course was less likely to happen now.

2.4a Specific Criterion:

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

Finding:

- (a) Offenders had been contained satisfactorily in all prisons. Generally, prisons adopted an incentive approach, whereby non-compliance impacted on the offender's ability to progress to enhanced status.

2.4c Specific Criterion:

For all offenders, there is a comprehensive and timely induction promptly after sentence or release.

Findings:

- (a) All three prisons had some type of induction where the OMU was either directly involved with other departments at a particular time in the week for a group induction or an individual prisoner would attend the OMU.
- (b) The majority of offenders had had an induction within their first week, which they felt covered everything they needed to know about the prison.

3.2a Specific Criterion:

There is continuity of offender management.

Findings:

- (a) Offender supervisors that we spoke to were confident that offenders would not normally have a change of offender supervisor while in one establishment.
- (b) All the prisoners in the survey had a named offender manager and the majority had an offender supervisor. However, just under half had experienced a change in offender manager since they had been in custody.

4.4a Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) The regional manager for custodial services felt that the north-east had benefited from regular and effective joint meetings of prison and probation operational managers. The offender management operational group was chaired by a senior manager from HM Prison Service and this had provided the impetus for getting the offender management model off the ground in all the prisons in the area.
- (b) All three prisons had an OMU but the structure of each unit varied widely. In one prison the offender supervisor role and the OASys assessor role were being merged. However, in the same prison the offender supervisors were prone to being deployed elsewhere, which they feared would eventually have a negative impact on the quality of their work. In another prison they had a dedicated role for offender supervisors who were not called upon to undertake other duties. Prisoners in the survey indicated that they met their offender supervisor about every week in 27% of cases and about a month or less in 65%. The majority felt supported by their offender supervisor.
- (c) One prison had reduced the number of probation staff to just one probation officer grade who worked with high RoH cases, prepared parole reports and countersigned OASys. Conversely, another prison had retained its seconded probation officers who were designated offender supervisors and worked with in-scope prisoners and life sentence prisoners. This decision was based on their competence, and wide understanding of probation work, coupled with the need to risk assess high numbers of prisoners for temporary release.
- (d) None of the prisons had a strategy or policy that addressed offender management generally and, in particular, the role, purpose and future development of their respective OMUs. In one prison the present arrangements for offender management appeared to have evolved over time due to various external pressures rather than a clear strategy.

4.4d Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) In all three prisons there were structure diagrams with clear lines of accountability for offender management through to the governor.

- (b) The relationship between the role of personal officer and offender supervisor was not always clear. There was an understanding that personal officers dealt with the day-to-day needs of prisoners but sometimes offender supervisors appeared to be undertaking these tasks as well. The involvement of personal officers in sentence planning and other related processes was not consistent across the three prisons.
- (c) One prison acknowledged that there were issues for the OMU getting information from healthcare and security departments, which, to some extent, had been addressed. The regional manager for custodial services was aware that new rules had recently been introduced in relation to data protection. This has meant that staff within prisons have to make a business case for having access to certain types of information. He was confident that Heads of OMUs would be able to find a way of working with the new arrangements.

4.3a Specific Criterion:

Resources are deployed appropriately and used well to support effective offender management.

Findings:

- (a) In one prison, at the time of the inspection, it was unclear what the impact of a review of staffing levels would have on the OMU. In two prisons, managers were clear that the resources they had in place were about right for the workload although there were times when staff felt they had too much to do.
- (b) In one prison all prisoners had an offender supervisor whether they were in scope or not. However, the intention was that those prisoners in scope would have more contact with the offender supervisor, normally once a month.
- (c) The regional manager for custodial services was clear that, in the next few years, resources would be tight. Offering a service to prisoners who were not in scope may be possible at a local level, but the focus will be on what a prison was required to do under the offender management model.
- (d) There were some examples of local quality assurance processes being applied to offender management. In one prison a chart had been created that listed the relevant national standards for the management of offenders and the action against each standard for offender supervisors. In another prison a senior officer in the OMU carried out monthly file quality checks to ensure key documents and processes had been completed.

3.1j Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) The deployment of probation officers in two prisons demonstrated that their resources were allocated consistent with the offenders RoH and PPO status, less so for likelihood of offending. The probation officer offender supervisor in one prison managed PPOs, carried out RoH assessments and prepared parole reports. In the same prison the CARATs team automatically picked up PPO cases. However, allocation of work to prison officer offender supervisors was not based on the nature of the offence or the offenders RoH. In another prison only probation officer offender supervisors managed in-scope prisoners.
- (b) In one prison the education department prioritised PPOs and MAPPA cases. In another, it was acknowledged that public protection work caused increased demands. An increase in the number of more challenging prisoners who had complex needs and made more demands also had an impact on the workload of staff and resources.

Summary

There was some variation between prisons in relation to the role and grade of offender supervisors and the knowledge of other staff about the OMU. In a minority of cases, transfers had been organised based on sentence plans and OMUs had kept offender managers informed about any movement of prisoners. Comprehensive and timely inductions of new prisoners that involved OMUs were taking place. There was continuity of offender supervisors but just under half of the prisoners in the survey had had a change of offender manager. Each OMU had a different structure and all needed a strategy or policy in place that addressed their future development. There were inconsistent quality assurance processes in place. Resources mostly matched the workload of each OMU but were not always consistent with the offender's RoH, likelihood of reoffending and PPO status.

3. SENTENCE PLANNING

1.5e Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) In one prison, sentence planning was seen as crucial in driving the sentence. There was evidence that, within days of a prisoner's arrival, decisions were being made and/or assessments undertaken about employment within the prison, potential education courses and other needs the prisoner may have that could be addressed by different departments. Therefore, before a sentence planning meeting had taken place, many decisions had already been made. This was a pragmatic approach, with the intention that objectives in the sentence plan would supersede any decisions made on induction. However, there was a risk that the sentence plan objectives and the sequencing of interventions would be driven by the needs of the establishment rather than the needs of the individual prisoner. In the survey the majority of prisoners had a sentence plan.
- (b) In all three prisons offender managers chaired sentence planning meetings. The organisation of the meetings was managed by the OMUs. There were occasions when offender managers were unable to attend meetings, mainly because of the travelling involved. If this happened, a sentence planning meeting would still take place via a telephone conference with the offender manager, followed by an interview with the offender. Prisoners in the survey were asked who had attended the meetings - 80% identified the offender supervisor, 64% the offender manager and 30% prison staff from other departments. The majority felt that the meetings were useful.
- (c) There was some frustration in one prison where staff felt there were not enough interventions available and transferring prisoners to other establishments to undertake programmes was a problem. It was suggested that one option was to lower a prisoner's RoH classification so that the prisoner was eligible for open conditions where they would have access to more programmes. Obviously, this course of action would be inadvisable unless a full RoH assessment had been completed. Consequently, objectives were in sentence plans for prisoners to attend programmes that they were unlikely to start. Prisoners who completed the survey felt that the sentence plan contained achievable targets for their current prison, but less than a third had targets that could be achieved in another establishment. This suggests that individual prisons were not always considering if programmes could be completed elsewhere.

- (d) The involvement of keyworkers and others at the sentence planning meeting varied. There was evidence in one prison that at some meetings CARATS education and psychology workers attended. Other prison staff contributed short written reports using national templates.
- (e) Objectives were generally short, action orientated and not outcome focused.

1.5j Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) In all three prisons, offenders attended the sentence planning meetings. In two prisons, offenders received a letter setting out the time and place of the meeting and who would be chairing it. A similar notification was e-mailed to the offender manager. In one prison the objectives that were set at the sentence planning meeting were recorded on the record of contact, sent to the prisoner in the form of a letter and e-mailed to the offender manager.
- (b) The majority of prisoners in the survey felt they were involved in the development of the plan and 75% had discussed it with their offender manager and at sentence planning meetings.

Summary

On arrival, prisoners were allocated to activities and programmes before the sentence planning meeting had taken place, which could potentially restrict the options available to develop a sentence plan. Sentence planning meetings were generally organised by OMUs and offender managers would, in the main, chair them. The level of involvement of keyworkers and personal officers in the sentence planning process varied. Objectives or targets were not outcome focused. Prisoners were enabled to participate actively and meaningfully in the planning process and found the meetings useful. Some staff were frustrated by a lack of interventions available within individual establishments and perceived difficulties transferring prisoners to complete programmes available in other prisons.

4. SENTENCE PLANNING DELIVERY

2.1a Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) There was some evidence that interventions were sequenced according to RoH and likelihood of reoffending. However, other factors determined the order in which interventions were delivered. The main driver was the date of release or parole date of the prisoner. In one establishment the priority was for appropriate offenders to attend the TSP, even if they had been accepted for courses that were being run by other departments. Following the completion of TSP, offenders either stayed in the prison and attended other courses or, if appropriate, transferred to another prison for CALM or the sex offender treatment programme.
- (b) Sequencing interventions also depended on the offender manager having knowledge about which interventions were available in each establishment. Keyworkers were keen to ensure that the register of interventions in their prison was kept up to date. In one prison many of the offender supervisors had previously run programmes and were familiar with the interventions on offer, which was useful knowledge to have at sentence planning boards when considering suitable programmes.
- (c) CARATS teams prioritised PPOs and, on their release, arranged links with DIP agencies to address any outstanding objectives in care plans. In one prison there was limited contact between psychologists and offenders after their release to follow up outstanding treatment needs identified in post-programme reports.
- (d) Keyworkers were aware of the importance of sequencing interventions and would ensure, for example, that prisoners attended literacy, numeracy and basic IT courses before commencing any other courses or programmes.
- (e) Half the prisoners in the survey did not have sentence plan targets that covered the period when they would be on licence in the community. This made it less likely that work in the community would build on activity undertaken in the prison in a planned and coherent way.
- (f) About a quarter of prisoners who were in the survey had received help maintaining or avoiding relationships, finding a job, arranging a place at a college or continuing education and contacting external drug or alcohol agencies in preparation for their release. There was less help for claiming benefits, opening a bank account, continuity of healthcare and finding accommodation.

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

Findings:

- (a) A number of accredited programmes were being delivered either in establishments or prisoners were attending programmes run by probation areas in the community. Some accredited programmes encouraged offenders to accept responsibility for their offending behaviour and its consequences.
- (b) 51% of offenders in the survey felt they had been given help with their thinking skills and 60% with their attitude towards offending. 59% thought that a member of staff had helped them address their offending behaviour and 79% said that, overall, the interventions they had experienced in custody would make them less likely to offend in future.
- (c) Offenders also received support in meeting other offending-related needs - 42% had received help with drug use, 37% alcohol use and 75% with ETE.

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

Findings:

- (a) In one prison, information, advice and guidance workers were involved in the induction process and identified prisoners with basic skills needs. Offender supervisors could also refer prisoners for a basic skills assessment. In another prison, all prisoners were seen by education staff for a one-to-one meeting within two weeks of their arrival.
- (b) Just under a third of the prisoners who responded to the survey had not received a basic skills assessment. Of those who had, 32% of the assessments had been completed within the first week of their arrival and 38% some time later. There were 38 prisoners who felt they needed help with basic skills and 27 indicated that the work had been done.

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

Findings:

- (a) Sentence plan objectives rarely included a date that the prisoner would start an accredited programme. As stated earlier, a lack of places for certain accredited programmes resulted in delays or prisoners waiting for a transfer to complete programmes in other establishments. However, it was less difficult for one prison where

prisoners attended accredited programmes that were run in the community and the prison was allocated so many places per programme. In another prison, if a prisoner had not undertaken any courses or programmes within six months of their arrival the offender supervisor would investigate why.

- (b) A number of staff in each prison mentioned that there was a need for an intensive intervention to address alcohol misuse.

2.5f Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) OMUs were not directly involved in the initial reception process although they did participate in various degrees with the induction of new prisoners. In-scope prisoners would be serving relatively long sentences; consequently, preserving employment and accommodation were not relevant issues for the majority. In one establishment, which had 18 to 21-year olds, families were invited to attend sentence planning meetings and post-programme reviews.
- (b) Some prisoners in the survey felt that housing matters and contact with their families had not been immediately addressed on their arrival. However, prisoners also indicated that during the rest of their time in custody these issues had been addressed by staff.
- (c) OMUs occasionally discovered prisoners who had not been identified as in scope by a previous establishment and needed to be told about the roles of the OMU, offender manager and offender supervisor.

Summary

Staff were aware of the concept of sequencing interventions and tried to achieve this. However, decisions were based primarily on the length of time the prisoner was likely to be in the prison before they were released. Prisoners sometimes had to wait before starting certain accredited programmes due to a lack of places or waiting to be transferred elsewhere. Sentence plans did not always cover the period after release from prison. Offenders attending certain accredited programmes were challenged about their offending behaviour. Basic skills assessments were taking place and most prisoners in the survey who needed help indicated that work had been done. There was also evidence that some work on accommodation and contact with prisoners' families had taken place.

5. OASys

1.3b Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) All three prisons now received OASys on time after initial teething problems. There were occasionally IT issues in accessing OASys. A small number of OASys would have a dummy PNC number. This practice could cause difficulties for a prison, for example, not being able to use PNC numbers to differentiate offenders with similar names or who were from the same family.
- (b) In one prison there was a drive to enhance the profile of OASys by its use in other departments, including psychology and those delivering offending behaviour programmes. In another prison, referral forms for each accredited programme identified the OASys scores required for an offender to be eligible.

1.3d Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) Offender supervisors in one prison passed on information about an offender's behaviour to offender managers partly to ensure it was taken into account when OASys was reviewed. However, staff agreed that offender managers were not routinely sent the minutes of internal risk management meetings. The minutes we read contained a rich source of information that would have contributed to a review of OASys.
- (b) In two prisons there was evidence that keyworkers had access to OASys and used it either to compare OASys with the results of their own assessment or to check whether it highlighted issues/needs related to their specialist area of work, for example, accommodation.

Summary

Prisons were receiving OASys on time. One prison had emphasised the importance of OASys and encouraged other departments to use it in their work with offenders. Keyworkers were using OASys either to inform their own assessments or ascertain if there was a need for their specialist intervention. Some prison staff were ensuring that the offender manager received information that could inform a review of OASys. It was not clear if minutes from internal risk

management meetings were routinely provided to offender managers.

6. OFFENDER ENGAGEMENT

1.4a Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) In all three prisons a basic skills screening process was in place. A prisoner's basic skills could be ascertained from OASys and, in one prison, there was an expectation that the basic skills assessment score would be recorded in OASys or on LIDS. Keyworkers felt that the provision of basic skills matched demand.
- (b) Keyworkers were aware that the ability of prisoners to participate in or complete a programme was related to their level of basic skills. If, for any reason, it became apparent during a programme that a prisoner was struggling with literacy or numeracy, a referral would be made to education.
- (c) In one prison a MIAP pilot was operating. In practice this meant that when prisoners moved between prisons or were released into the community, providers could access their record of learning by using a unique secure learning number. This system was intended to avoid duplication and repeated assessments for basic skills.

1.4b Specific Criterion:

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

Finding:

- (a) In one prison, accredited programmes were monitored to ensure they were effective by asking participants to review the work they had completed every week. Many programmes could be delivered one to one. The methods of delivering programmes catered for all types of learning style. However, there was little evidence of mindful consideration of the methods that were most likely to be effective with each offender.

1.4c Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) Offenders' intellectual ability and learning style were rarely assessed at the earliest opportunity, apart from basic skills. There was some work with prisoners on self-esteem or lack of confidence to facilitate their ability to participate in programmes.

- (b) In one prison there was some awareness of the importance of a prisoner's motivation and how it could be used to encourage them to complete programmes and courses. It was noted by some staff that most prisoners subject to IPP had a vested interest to cooperate and engage with programmes in order to provide evidence that their RoH had reduced.

2.2e Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) In one prison, recall papers were served on the prisoner and the offender supervisor attempted to re-engage with them by working on a new sentence plan. Occasionally, the offender manager would visit the prisoner and explain in more detail why they had been recalled.
- (b) In another prison an administrator ensured that offenders remained with the same offender supervisor even if they had been released and were subsequently recalled.
- (c) Of the six offenders that had been recalled, five indicated that they had been told why.

Summary

A basic skills screening process was in place. If those needs became apparent later on during the custodial period, staff felt able to make referrals to education. The MIAP pilot promised to reduce the repeated assessment of prisoners. Apart from work by psychologists associated with accredited programmes, there was little evidence that attention was paid to methods that would be most effective with individual offenders. There was some work on self-esteem, and motivation was taken into account in certain cases, but the offenders' intellectual ability, learning style and capacity to change were not always considered. The majority of prisoners in the survey confirmed that they had been told why they had been recalled and some work had been done to re-engage them.

7. DIVERSITY

1.4d Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) Diversity issues were usually identified at the induction stage or via OASys. There were some examples of OMUs identifying disadvantaging factors, for example, prisoners who were being bullied or staff gathering specialist information about a particular culture to enable them to work more effectively with a prisoner. In one prison there were several staff designated as diversity champions who proactively identified prisoners with a disability.
- (b) Just under a third of the prisoners in the survey were black or from a minority ethnic group. Six considered themselves to be disabled. The main issues that would have made it more difficult for a small number of prisoners to take full part in the activities in custody were reading and writing skills (six). Over half of those prisoners (four) felt this issue had been dealt with by the prison. The majority of prisoners confirmed that the sentence plan had taken into account their individual needs.

2.7a Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) There was provision in one education department for prisoners with special educational needs. The same education department was keen to promote diversity and understanding of difference by celebrating black history week and remembering Holocaust day.
- (b) Staff from other organisations that delivered interventions in prisons had questions about basic skills and diversity included in their own assessment processes.
- (c) All printed literature for prisoners was available in the most common languages used in the prison.
- (d) We saw an example where arrangements had been made to deliver an accredited programme to a high RoH prisoner who was in hospital. In another case a Muslim prisoner was allocated to a project in the community that had no facilities or privacy for prayers and another placement had been found to accommodate the prisoner's religious practices.

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

Finding:

- (a) Those staff involved in the delivery of programmes were clear that any minority offender would be given a choice about whether to join a group programme. If they did not wish to join a group programme, alternative arrangements would be organised.

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

Findings:

- (a) In two prisons, staff mentioned the work of the race equality action team, where prisoner representatives worked alongside staff to increase understanding of diversity issues within the prison. These representatives would also raise matters that prisoners did not necessarily discuss with individual members of staff.
- (b) All three prisons mentioned the work of the chaplaincy, which provided facilities to incorporate various faiths with support, prayer and discussion groups taking place.
- (c) The staff that were interviewed could not provide any examples of appropriate services being developed to support work with minority groups.

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

Findings:

- (a) It was not clear how diversity issues were integrated as part of strategic planning or how the issues were monitored. Certainly, there was an emphasis on staff being trained in diversity and one prison said that it had received a good audit for race equality.
- (b) Staff were also being used to sign or speak other languages if they had these skills. In one prison, diversity was an action point in most meetings. There was some awareness amongst staff of the disproportionate impact on families from black and minority ethnic groups who have to travel to a predominately white area for visits.

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

Finding:

- (a) In one prison there had been some investment in diversity initiatives. For example, interventions had been arranged for those young prisoners who were fathers. There had been some input about travellers that had led to prison managers identifying them as a specific group within the prison. There was also an awareness of regional differences and gang culture. Overall, it was difficult to quantify the resources allocated for diversity initiatives and any monitoring systems that were in place.

Summary

There was an emphasis on identifying diversity issues when prisoners first arrived. This was demonstrated by the involvement of staff designated as diversity champions being involved in induction and the use of forms or checklists to identify diversity issues. Staff were able to provide a number of examples where arrangements for interventions had taken into account an individual offender's diversity needs. However, there was less evidence from staff about strategic planning, resources and monitoring of diversity initiatives and specific services to support work with minority groups.

8. PUBLIC PROTECTION

1.2c Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) In all three prisons the OASys RoH classification and MAPPA category were accessed by staff, including some keyworkers, from LIDS and OASys. In one prison, CARATS workers received a list of prisoners subject to MAPPA and the level at which they were managed. In another prison a screening checklist was used to ascertain which PSI or probation service officer applied to a prisoner. The list included risk to children, PPOs, the Sex Offender Act, MAPPA, the Harassment Act, domestic violence, victim issues and racially motivated offending in relation to current or previous offences.
- (b) In one prison the education department did not have access to OASys and would have preferred more information about prisoners because they were using external providers. In one case a prisoner was allocated courses that were related to building and construction work. However, education staff were not aware that, when released, the prisoner would not be allowed to work on a building site.
- (c) It was clear that keyworkers were aware of their duty to share any information that had been disclosed by a prisoner about domestic violence or child protection to an appropriate member of staff or by completing a SIR.
- (d) Keyworkers attendance at internal risk management meetings and external MAPPA meetings varied between prisons. In one prison, because National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offender workers were involved in finding accommodation for prisoners in certain cases, they had been invited to MAPPA meetings.

1.5d Specific Criterion:

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

Finding:

- (a) Offender managers and, occasionally, probation staff working in prisons decided which additional conditions should be in an offender's licence. Generally, prison officer offender supervisors were reluctant to be involved in this task as they felt probation staff had more relevant knowledge and experience.

2.2a Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) The arrangements for internal risk management meetings in each prison were different. In one prison a decision had been made to call the meetings 'internal MAPPA meetings' rather than the official title of IDRMMs. In another prison there was the IDRMM, which met every two weeks to consider high RoH, MAPPA Level 2 and in-scope cases or those prisoners demonstrating concerning behaviour. Comprehensive minutes that integrated the risk management plan and sentence plan from OASys were produced on individual prisoners. In addition, there was a weekly risk assessment board to discuss medium RoH and other in-scope prisoners.
- (b) In one prison the high priority given to RoH was demonstrated by all offender supervisors attending RoH, child protection and violent and sexual offender register training.

2.2b Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) There was a general desire that OMU staff should attend MAPPA meetings dependent on their workload and how much notice the prison had been given. If a member of staff could not attend, a report was submitted. However, the reports were not always based on a template with standard headings.
- (b) It was apparent from the staff we interviewed that other agencies attending MAPPA meetings valued the information supplied by prisons, which was often seen as vital and important.
- (c) In two prisons, OMUs logged the attendance of prison staff at MAPPA meetings by local probation areas. The name of the person who attended, whether a report was submitted and the minutes received were noted. One prison was using recently issued national templates for MAPPA information sharing. To ensure those attending MAPPA meetings were aware of the regime that operated in the prison, the OMU had included a summary about it in one of the information-sharing templates.

4.1f Specific Criterion:

An appropriate strategic contribution is made to public protection.

Findings:

- (a) There was an area public protection meeting where public protection leads from each prison met quarterly and received updates on a number of national and regional issues. Two Heads of OMUs attended a joint police/probation managers' meeting covering two probation areas and one attended the Responsible Authority Group for Teesside. In one prison there was a quarterly Strategic Public Protection meeting, which had oversight of all aspects of public protection procedure. Prison representation on Strategic Management Boards was dealt with at an area level.
- (b) All three prisons had a public protection policy. In one prison the policy was combined with child safeguarding and, in another prison, there was a separate child protection policy and safeguarding strategy. However, all three public protection policies included some reference to child protection or child safeguarding even if this was not explicit in the title of the documents. The structure and content of each policy and procedure were very different. One policy contained a number of complicated flowcharts, another outlined the responsibilities of different staff in relation to public protection and all of them, to some degree, replicated information from national policies or procedures.

4.3b Specific Criterion:

Resources follow risk, with RoH to others a clear priority, and PPOs given proportionate resource.

Findings:

- (a) In one prison there had been a conscious decision to retain probation officers, a relatively expensive resource, to manage high RoH cases and to review risk in relation to the large number of prisoners who received release on temporary licence.
- (b) There was some evidence of prioritisation of PPOs demonstrated by all PPO cases with drug issues having some form of intervention from the CARATS team and speedier access to relevant programmes.
- (c) The majority of staff from the three prisons felt that more resources would be helpful, in particular, funding for the provision of accredited programmes, for example, CALM and addressing substance related offending.

Summary

The OASys Risk of Harm and MAPPA classifications were accessible to most staff either from OASys or LIDS. However, not all keyworkers were aware of these classifications and their involvement in internal and external risk management meetings varied. Keyworkers would share any information they gained from prisoners that related to public protection. The arrangements for internal risk management meetings in each prison were different. OMU staff

were encouraged to attend MAPPA meetings. Written reports to MAPPA were not standardised. There was appropriate representation at various strategic meetings dealing with public protection issues. Public protection policies and procedures were not uniform and user friendly. Resources were linked to RoH and, to some extent, PPOs.

9. VICTIMS

2.3a Specific Criterion:

Victim safety: High priority is given by the offender manager to issues of victim safety, where there is a direct/potential victim, restrictive/prohibitive conditions on an order/licence concerning a victim, or concerns about children's safeguarding outcomes. Particular regard is paid to victims/potential victims who could be deemed particularly vulnerable. In certain cases, offender supervisors will have a role in promoting victim safety from a custodial setting by monitoring calls and working to prevent harassment from prison.

Findings:

- (a) Relevant staff in all three prisons had some knowledge and experience of how they would take into account the safety of victims and what methods they had available to protect them. Any applications for early or temporary release took into account the locality of the victim. The victim's statement about the circumstances of the offence provided a fuller picture of what had happened, the role of the offender and the impact on the injured party. In one prison, senior managers were clear that victim safety was at the 'heart of the assessment process'.
- (b) In another prison, arrangements were in place to identify prisoners who had been involved in domestic violence (although not convicted for this type of offence) so that victim safety could be taken into account.
- (c) In one prison any victim safety issues identified by offender supervisors would result in the production of a SIR.

2.3b Specific Criterion:

Offender awareness about victims: Victim awareness work appropriate to the case is delivered to offenders wherever relevant, and especially where there is a direct victim. Particular care is taken in addressing this in cases of racially motivated offending or hate crime.

Findings:

- (a) In one establishment, seven victim awareness programmes were delivered in 2008. In another prison, the Sycamore Tree programme, which aimed to raise victim awareness, was considered too expensive. Reparation was undertaken in the community by prisoners on licence working with groups of people with special needs. Senior managers felt that projects for disadvantaged members of the community challenged prisoners' perception of themselves as victims.
- (b) Apart from certain accredited programmes dealing with victim awareness in various degrees and some individual staff challenging offenders about this issue, there was no formal intervention delivered in two prisons.

- (c) 59% of prisoners in the survey had undertaken work on victim awareness and 91% felt it was either very useful or useful.

Summary

Victim safety was prominent in all three prisons. Staff were aware of how they could protect victims while the offender was serving a custodial sentence, and requests for temporary release would take into account the location of the victim and other relevant factors. Victim awareness was not formally delivered in two prisons although the issue was covered by certain accredited programmes and, in a small number of cases, by offender supervisors.

APPENDIX 1
Prisons inspected in this area

| HMP YOI Castington | |
|---|---|
| Task of the establishment | Juvenile and young offender closed establishment |
| Area organisation | Northumberland |
| Number held | 334 young adults and 132 juveniles |
| Certified normal accommodation | 400 |
| Operational capacity | 410 |
| Date visited | 19 th January 2009 |
| Number in scope of Phase II | 30 |
| Number in scope of Phase III | 16 |
| Last HMI Prisons inspection | 12 th June 2006 |
| Brief history | Originally a satellite of HMP Acklington and became independent in 1983 and used to accommodate offenders up to the age of 21. In April 2000, re-roled to become part of the juvenile estate. A section 91 unit to hold up to 40 juvenile offenders opened August 2000. |
| Description of residential units | <p>Young adults</p> <p>Dunstan - first night centre and induction</p> <p>Cuthbert - remand and convicted</p> <p>Bede - sentenced</p> <p>Edwin - maximum 60, 'working unit' for sentenced prisoners, mostly enhanced</p> <p>Juveniles</p> <p>Finian - first night, induction and unconvicted</p> <p>Godric - convicted</p> <p>Oswald - juveniles convicted under section 91 (Powers of the Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000)</p> <p>Hospital - inpatient unit</p> <p>Separation and care segregation unit</p> |

| HMP Holme House | |
|---|---|
| Task of the establishment | Local category B prison |
| Area organisation | Tees Valley, South-West Durham, East Durham and North Yorkshire. |
| Number held | 935 |
| Certified normal accommodation | 857 |
| Operational capacity | 994 |
| Date visited | 17 th March 2009 |
| Number in scope of Phase II | 198 |
| Number in scope of Phase III | 58 |
| Last HMI Prisons inspection | 11 th April 2005 |
| Brief history | Opened in 1992, with two additional house blocks added in the late nineties, Holme House is a purpose-built local category B prison for adult males. |
| Description of residential units | <p>House block 1 - sentenced adults</p> <p>House block 2 - sentenced adults</p> <p>House block 3 - vulnerable and OP prisoners</p> <p>House block 4 - unconvicted adults, induction and first night</p> <p>House block 5 - resettlement unit, sentenced adults</p> <p>House block 6 - therapeutic community, sentenced adults</p> <p>Healthcare</p> |

| HMP Kirklevington Grange | |
|---|---|
| Task of the establishment | Category D resettlement prison for adult male offenders |
| Area organisation | North-East England |
| Number held | 273 |
| Certified normal accommodation | 283 |
| Operational capacity | 283 |
| Date visited | 10 th March 2009 |
| Number in scope of Phase II | 40 |
| Number in scope of Phase III | 0 |
| Last HMI Prisons inspection | 18 th July 2005 |
| Brief history | Kirklevington was opened in 1992 as a resettlement prison for adult male offenders intending to settle in the north-east area. |
| Description of residential units | <p>A, B, C, F, G, H, J and R units – single rooms in the main building situated off the main corridors on the ground and upper floors</p> <p>D and E units – 40 single rooms in two modern, prefabricated buildings</p> <p>K unit – 40 single rooms in a modern, prefabricated building</p> <p>L unit – 60-beds, single rooms with en-suite shower, toilet and sink facility, the newest residential unit, opened in 2008</p> |

APPENDIX 2

Role of HMI Probation and HMI Prisons

HMI Probation - Statement of Purpose

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

- report to the Secretary of State on the effectiveness of work with individual offenders, children and young people aimed at reducing reoffending and protecting the public, whoever undertakes this work under the auspices of the National Offender Management Service or the Youth Justice Board
- report on the effectiveness of the arrangements for this work, working with other Inspectorates as necessary
- contribute to improved performance by the organisations whose work we inspect
- contribute to sound policy and effective service delivery, especially in public protection, by providing advice and disseminating good practice, based on inspection findings, to Ministers, officials, managers and practitioners
- promote actively race equality and wider diversity issues, especially in the organisations whose work we inspect
- contribute to the overall effectiveness of the criminal justice system, particularly through joint work with other Inspectorates.

HMI Prisons – Statement of Purpose

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

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

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

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

Or contact us through our websites at:

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

<http://www.inspectorates.justice.gov.uk/hmiprison>

ISBN 978-1-84099-298-4