

OMI: SCORING METHODOLOGY

This note sets out the arrangements for producing scores in the OMI.

Scores for general criteria and sections 1 to 3

Numeric scores are produced for each of the general criteria in sections 1 to 3 (the sections relating to practice), and also for each of sections 1 to 3 overall - ie for each of:

1. ASSESSMENT AND SENTENCE PLANNING
 - 1.1 General Criterion: PREPARING FOR SENTENCE
 - 1.2 General Criterion: ASSESSMENT OF RISK OF HARM
 - 1.3 General Criterion: ASSESSMENT OF LIKELIHOOD OF REOFFENDING
 - 1.4 General Criterion: ASSESSMENT OF OFFENDER ENGAGEMENT
 - 1.5 General Criterion: SENTENCE PLANNING

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERVENTIONS
 - 2.1 General Criterion: DELIVERING THE SENTENCE PLAN
 - 2.2 General Criterion: PROTECTING THE PUBLIC BY MINIMISING RISK OF HARM
 - 2.3 General Criterion: VICTIMS
 - 2.4 General Criterion: ENSURING CONTAINMENT AND PROMOTING COMPLIANCE
 - 2.5 General Criterion: CONSTRUCTIVE INTERVENTIONS
 - 2.6 General Criterion: RESTRICTIVE INTERVENTIONS
 - 2.7 General Criterion: DIVERSITY ISSUES

3. ACHIEVEMENT & MONITORING OF OUTCOMES
 - 3.1 General Criterion: ACHIEVEMENT OF INITIAL OUTCOMES
 - 3.2 General Criterion: SUSTAINABILITY OF PROGRESS

Also, alongside the scores for each of sections 1 to 3, i.e. for Assessment and Sentence Planning, Implementation of Interventions and Achievement and Monitoring of Outcomes – a score is also produced for Assessment and Management of Risk of Harm to Others – ie the “*Risk of Harm*” thread.

This is derived from the scores for individual questions in the OMI Case Assessment Tool in sections 1 and 2 which relate to *Risk of Harm* issues, mainly in 1.2 (Assessment of Risk of Harm), 2.2 (Protecting the Public by minimising Risk of Harm) and 2.3 (Victims).

Deriving scores for the general criteria

The scores are based on results from the Offender Management Case Assessment Tool. The score for each general criterion is based on the results for individual questions in it, and also for the summary question (SQ). Specifically, the score for each general criterion is calculated:

- by calculating the average across each individual question for that criterion of the proportion of relevant cases where the work assessed by that question was judged to be sufficient (“above the line”)
- then taking the proportion of cases ‘above the line’ on the SQ (ii)
- calculating the score for the general criterion as a weighted average : $80\%*(i) + 20\%*(ii)$

Deriving scores for each of Sections 1 to 3 and for the Risk of Harm thread

The score for each section is an average of the scores for its component general criteria, with no weighting. The score for the RoH thread is calculated as an average, over all the questions in sections 1 and 2 which relate to *Risk of Harm* issues (as above), of the proportion of relevant cases where work was judged ‘above the line’.

Scoring arrangements for OMI Section 4 (Leadership and Strategic Management)

A descriptor score “well met”, “satisfactorily met”, “partly met” or “not met” is assigned to each of the general criteria in section 4 ie

4. LEADERSHIP AND STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT
- 4.1 General Criterion: LEADERSHIP AND PLANNING
- 4.2 General Criterion: PERFORMANCE AGAINST NATIONAL AND REGIONAL TARGETS
- 4.3 General Criterion: RESOURCE DEPLOYMENT
- 4.4 General Criterion: WORKFORCE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
- 4.5 General Criterion: REVIEW AND EVALUATION
- 4.6 General Criterion: COMMISSIONING OF SERVICES

The score is assigned on the basis set out in the following table. The derivation takes into account the number of specific criteria making up that general criterion (see OMI criteria, also on the website). The correct descriptor score for each criterion is determined by considering performance against the outline in the top row under each General Criterion and working down until the matching outline is reached.

	4.1 Leadership & Planning (11 specific criteria)	4.2 Performance against national & regional targets (5 specific criteria)	4.3 Resource deployment (6 specific criteria)	4.4 Workforce planning & development (9 specific criteria)	4.5 Review & evaluation (5 specific criteria)	4.6 Commissioning of services (6 specific criteria)
Well met	Strong performance on at least 6 specific criteria, and satisfactory performance on all remaining specific criteria.	Strong performance on at least 3 items, and satisfactory performance on all remaining specific criteria.	Strong performance on at least 4 specific criteria, and satisfactory performance on all remaining specific criteria.	Strong performance on at least 5 specific criteria, and satisfactory performance on all remaining specific criteria.	Strong performance on at least 3 items, and satisfactory performance on all remaining specific criteria.	Strong performance on at least 4 specific criteria, and satisfactory performance on all remaining specific criteria.
Satisfactorily met	At least satisfactory performance on at least 6 specific criteria.	At least satisfactory performance on at least 3 specific criteria.	At least satisfactory performance on at least 3 specific criteria.	At least satisfactory performance on at least 5 specific criteria.	At least satisfactory performance on at least 3 specific criteria.	At least satisfactory performance on at least 3 specific criteria.
Partly met	Satisfactory performance on 4 or 5 specific criteria.	Satisfactory performance on 2 specific criteria.	Satisfactory performance on 2 specific criteria.	Satisfactory performance on 3 or 4 specific criteria.	Satisfactory performance on 2 specific criteria.	Satisfactory performance on 2 specific criteria.
Not met	Satisfactory performance on 3, 2, 1 or no specific criteria	Satisfactory performance on 1 or no specific criteria	Satisfactory performance on 1 or no specific criteria	Satisfactory performance on 2, 1 or no specific criteria	Satisfactory performance on 1 or no specific criteria	Satisfactory performance on 1 or no specific criteria