



HM Inspectorate of Probation

# AUDIT OF ACCREDITED PROGRAMMES

Welsh Areas of the  
National Probation Service for  
England and Wales

*Report on:  
South Wales Probation Area –  
Reasoning and Rehabilitation*

---

September 2002

## Acknowledgements:

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

The audit team comprised:

Kate White	Andy Bonny
Mary Barnish	<i>Deputy Audit Manager</i>
Eileen O'Sullivan	Alan MacDonald
<i>Inspection and Audit Officers</i>	<i>Audit Manager</i>
Di Askwith	
<i>HM Inspector of Probation</i>	

## Glossary

ACE	Assessment, Case Recording and Evaluation System
CO	Chief officer
DTTO	Drug Treatment and Testing Order
HMIP	HM Inspectorate of Probation
IAPS	Interim Accredited Programmes Software
IQR	Implementation Quality Rating
LSI-R	Level of Service Inventory-Revised
N/A	Criteria not assessed
NPD	National Probation Directorate
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OGRS	Offender Group Reconviction Scale
PSO	Probation service officer
PSR	Pre-sentence report
R&R	Reasoning and Rehabilitation
SSR	Specific Sentence Report

## Contents

	Page
Context:	4
Scoring Approach:	4
Overview:	5
Findings:	6
<b><u>SECTION A: COMMITTED LEADERSHIP</u></b>	<b><u>8</u></b>
<b><u>SECTION B: PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES</u></b>	<b><u>10</u></b>
<b><u>SECTION C: QUALITY OF PROGRAMME DELIVERY</u></b>	<b><u>20</u></b>
<b><u>SECTION D: CASE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES</u></b>	<b><u>23</u></b>
Next Steps:	26
Scoring summary sheet:	26

## Context:

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

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

## Scoring Approach:

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

<b>Committed leadership and supportive management</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Programme management responsibilities</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Quality of programme delivery</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Case management responsibilities</b>	<b>20%</b>

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

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

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

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

## **Overview:**

- The audit visit took place in July 2002.
- This report relates to one accredited general offending behaviour group work programme: R&R.
- South Wales was running R&R from five delivery sites, all of which were visited by HMIP. Checks on resources and facilities were also carried out and informal discussions held with programme administrators.
- The audit comprised four main elements: assessment of advance information; observation of randomly selected videotaped programme sessions; a case file reading exercise; and interviews with staff and offenders.
- Interviews were held with senior managers, the information manager, a programme manager and treatment manager. Representatives of the following staff groups were also interviewed: programme tutors, case managers and PSR writers. Eleven offenders were interviewed.
- One audit criterion was not assessed – D1.8. This decision was taken because plans were awaited nationally for the accreditation of the Cognitive Skills Booster Programme to reinforce offender learning.
- HMIP monitored 12 R&R videos, randomly selected from three different delivery sites.

## **Findings:**

In April 2001 the three former services had combined into the new South Wales Probation Area. The challenge was to build from that point an area-wide programme delivery system which was owned by all staff, gave sentencers confidence and delivered R&R at a consistently high standard to offenders.

In year one of implementation, senior management commitment across the whole management team was not sufficiently focused on the What Works agenda generally or on accredited programmes in particular. The area lacked key implementation documents which might have shaped the first year of R&R roll-out. Staff were given insufficient guidance about their respective roles in supporting programme delivery; a large number of tutors were trained but then not deployed to deliver, and some delivery sites proved inadequately resourced. The case management task was not clearly defined or integrated.

There was confusion amongst sentencers and assessment staff about targeting and suitability issues. The lack of a reliable programme schedule led to long delays for many offenders and a loss of confidence on the part of staff. This was especially unfortunate because of local long-standing links with the R&R programme. The unification of three separate databases, and the limitations of IAPS, proved further hurdles to good communication and to the monitoring and evaluation of R&R. Attrition rates were extremely high and the number of completers in 2001/2002 was very low.

Since April 2002 there had been considerable improvements to the supporting context for R&R with the formation of a dedicated programmes unit. The majority of this work had yet to bear fruit, but much credit should go to the considerable efforts and commitment of programme and treatment managers in moving to establish a structure for programme delivery in South Wales. Tutors were delivering R&R to a high standard, with much evidence of the mindful tutoring areas should be aiming for in year two of implementation. This level of delivery was achieved by those tutors who were open to learning, and by an excellent treatment management regime.

If the area galvanises its leadership commitment, and strengthens case management arrangements, it will be better able to build on some very encouraging programme management achievements and a high standard of delivery.

## **Recommendations**

*The CO should ensure that the area:*

- *implements a What Works strategy which builds accredited programme capacity and quality so as to demonstrate proactive leadership and maximise programme completions (A1.1);*
- *prioritises adequate programme and treatment management provision to maintain and enhance delivery quality (A1.2);*
- *designs a programme of context setting events for all staff with senior management participation in learning and delivery to model commitment to accredited programmes and foster full organisational ownership (A1.1, A1.3);*
- *implements a strategy for ongoing liaison with sentencers to bring about closer alignment between sentencing practice and area objectives and to maximise suitable programme orders and completions (A1.4);*
- *improves its R&R delivery sites, paying particular attention to room size, ventilation and the provision of 'break out' rooms (B1.1);*
- *reviews its R&R information leaflets with a view to making them more comprehensive and available to offenders prior to sentence (B1.2);*
- *urgently implements a strategy to enhance programme attendance and addresses attrition levels, incorporating the monitoring of the timeliness of programme commencement (B2.1, B2.4);*
- *standardises the oral and written information given to potential tutor candidates, records details of assessment centre outcomes, and puts in place a tutor deselection policy (B3.1);*

- *clarifies the grade and role of treatment managers and draws up a competency-based job description to aid clarity (B3.2);*
- *reviews its targeting practice, implementing a clear policy with appropriate checks and filters in place so as to guarantee that exclusion criteria are being appropriately applied (B6.1);*
- *clarifies its practice in relation to the placement of female and minority ethnic offenders on R&R so as to reduce staff confusion and enhance the accessibility of the programme (B6.4);*
- *implements a clear monitoring and evaluation policy for programmes, drawing together the work of both the programmes' and information units, in order to facilitate regular feedback to the Board, managers and practitioners and enhance practice (B7.1, B7.2);*
- *improves supervision planning and review, focusing on SMART objectives and full integration of programme work so that offenders experience continuity of supervision and are able to maximise their programme learning (D1.1, D1.7);*
- *urgently accesses R&R training for all case managers and implements a system of proactive and structured case manager input to support offenders through every stage of the programme (D1.2, D1.3, D1.4);*
- *implements an enforcement policy which addresses issues of programme attendance and compliance in order to promote a clear and consistent approach to the enforcement of R&R orders (D1.5).*

*The NPD should ensure that:*

- *treatment manager training in relation to R&R is made available in South Wales (B4.6);*
- *an urgent review of IAPS is undertaken, so that a viable monitoring and evaluation system can be made available to promote the collection and dissemination of accurate programme data (B7.1);*
- *a revised end of programme report template is issued, prompting sections on risk assessment and relapse scenarios. (C1.6).*

## SECTION A: COMMITTED LEADERSHIP

---

### A1.1 Committed leadership

0

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

#### **Strengths:**

- There was a clear focus on completion targets in the 2002/2003 area business plan and a system of programme-related performance monitoring had been instituted in March 2002.
- The area training plan for 2002/2003 had given clear priority to training linked to What Works.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- During the first year of implementation there had been insufficient effective support from across the whole senior management group for programme provision and attainment of targets.
- An earlier R&R implementation plan had been abandoned on amalgamation and a new plan had yet to be formulated.
- Recent efforts to provide adequately resourced programme delivery arrangements were not yet fully embedded within organisational design and planning systems.
- A recently produced draft What Works strategy lacked detailed action and implementation plans.
- There had been little senior management involvement in programme awareness and context setting events and the area's 2002/2003 training plan lacked such provision.
- Monitoring data had not been used to develop evidence-based solutions to referral and completion shortfalls.

### A1.2 Management structures

1

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

#### **Strengths:**

- A structural framework to support programme delivery had recently been established in the form of a programmes unit.
- Competency-based job descriptions outlined case management and programme-related roles within the new structure.
- Treatment management had been resourced with highly motivated staff who had developed a robust practice development regime.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- Programme management had not been appropriately resourced until April 2002 and the workload of the one initial programme manager with area-wide responsibilities had been excessive.
- Middle management and practitioner communication links had not successfully linked into the assessment, case management and programme delivery functions; programme-related

---

objectives had not been fully addressed in local management fora, which were not consistently attended by programme management staff.

### A1.3 Staff ownership of the accredited programme

1

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

#### **Strengths:**

- Programme managers and tutors were very committed to the value of the R&R programme and to ensuring high quality delivery.
- Context setting training events had recently been delivered to PSR writers which had been well received.
- Case managers were open to learning more about the R&R programme and how they might extend programme learning in subsequent supervision.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- Insufficient efforts had been made by senior management to redress the consequent low referral rates following programme scheduling difficulties.
- Senior management had not disseminated available evidence of high quality programme delivery standards to promote wider staff ownership of R&R.
- Referral data indicated unequal referral rates across geographical areas and functions, with few DTTO and licence referrals.
- Case manager attendance at three-way programme reviews was not consistent.

### A1.4 Effective communication with sentencers

0

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

#### **Strengths:**

- There was anecdotal evidence of inputs into local training events for new magistrates in some parts of the area, encompassing What Works principles and programmes.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- South Wales suffered from a lack of systematic senior management effort to promote appropriate R&R disposals within community sentence packages and to provide clarity about programme conditions and the use of SSRs.
- Magistrates, judges, justices' clerks and advocates were not kept adequately informed about the R&R programme and local delivery arrangements.
- Systems to feed back programme outcomes to sentencers, and to monitor the effectiveness of sentencer liaison, had not been implemented.
- Insufficient efforts had been made to build sentencer confidence following high attrition rates associated with 2001/2002 programme delivery problems.

## SECTION B: PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

---

### B1.1 Resources and facilities

0

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

**Strengths:**

- Plans for improved delivery sites, including purpose-built premises, were in hand to increase programme capacity.
- Sites in Port Talbot and Swansea were generally of a high standard.

**Areas for improvement:**

- There were problems with poor ventilation in Cardiff, Bridgend and Swansea group rooms.
- Pontypridd, Bridgend and Cardiff had rooms which were not big enough to accommodate 12 offenders and two tutors.
- No 'break out' rooms existed for sub-group work at the sites in Pontypridd and Bridgend, and for daytime groups in Cardiff.

### B1.2 Provision of information leaflets about the programme

0

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

**Strengths:**

- The offender leaflet had been drawn up using clear, plain language.

**Areas for improvement:**

- The sentencers' leaflet made no reference to the programme's theoretical base.
- There was no specific leaflet aimed at staff, giving a concise summary of the programme.
- Offenders were not routinely being issued with R&R information leaflets prior to sentence.
- The offender information leaflet lacked clarity about the video recording of sessions, psychometric testing and the complaints procedure.

### B2.1 Managing attendance

0

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

**Strengths:**

- Tutors and case managers worked together to manage instances of non-compliance and non-attendance.
- Offenders were only permitted the statutory number of catch-ups during the course of the programme.

**Areas for improvement:**

- The area did not have a responsive system for managing attendance to deliver the required number of programme completions, nor a formulated plan for enhancing completion rates over time. In 2001/2002 there had been very few completions towards a target of 535 and the attrition rate had been 95%.
- The interim enforcement policy made little reference to programme attendance.

**B2.2 Avoidance of cancellation or disruption to sessions**

2

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

**Strengths:**

- Delivery staff were highly committed to running groups without disrupting the timely progression of all 38 sessions.
- A calendar of session delivery for each programme was drawn up.
- Sessions were being delivered twice a week, a suitable frequency for the R&R programme.
- Regular and reliable tutor attendance had been aided by a careful process of planning and attention to detail on the part of programme managers. This took the form of a programme schedule, published in advance, combined with a shift chart to balance workload.
- Case managers were called upon if offender crises arose, rather than these being dealt with within the group and potentially detracting from R&R delivery.
- Pontypridd tutors had delivered a programme in Cardiff when their own group room was unavailable.

**B2.3 Catch-up sessions/Attendance**

2

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

**Strengths:**

- Cardiff tutors had developed a clear and effective grid system for monitoring offenders' attendance at catch-up sessions.
- Catch-up slots were being scheduled into each programme's overall delivery pattern.
- The programme manager, treatment manager and tutors were aware of the requirement to monitor one in seven catch-up sessions.
- 'Bus stopping' arrangements had occasionally been used to good effect, e.g. when low group numbers had led to the merging of two programmes. This had been done with sensitivity to offender needs and with minimal delay.

**Areas for improvement:**

- It was not always possible to monitor catch-up sessions as these sometimes had to be delivered in rooms without video equipment.

- Fitting catch-ups in before an evening session for employed offenders had been problematic at times.

## **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.*

### **Strengths:**

- Staff were aware of the target to begin offenders on R&R within one month of sentence or release.

### **Areas for improvement:**

- There was no written policy on timely programme starts, therefore commencement was not being routinely monitored and staff did not know the average waiting time.
- A clear schedule for programme delivery had only been put in place following the establishment of a programmes unit in April 2002. There had been lengthy delays to programme start for some offenders.
- In some cases delays had been such that psychometric tests had to be re-administered.
- A shortage of staff trained as psychometric testers had contributed to the delays and to some offenders not being tested.
- Only 12 of 32 cases (38%) had started a programme within one month of sentence.
- Of the remaining cases in the file reading exercise there were no examples of assessments of programme-readiness leading to a planned delay to group-start and to structured work in the early phase of supervision.

## **B3.1 Staff selection**

0

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

### **Strengths:**

- The assessment centre process was well established and widely understood.

### **Areas for improvement:**

- The area had yet to formulate a comprehensive deselection policy in respect of poorly performing tutors.
- There was no consistent pattern about issuing information to potential tutors; generally, more information was available about the assessment centre process than about the R&R programme itself.
- Some external applicants did not feel they had sufficient information to state an informed preference between the PSO roles of tutor, case manager and court officer.
- Records of assessment centre dates and outcomes were not available.

**B3.2 Staff roles and competencies**

1

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

**Strengths:**

- South Wales had job descriptions for all programme-related roles and all, but the one relating to the post of treatment manager, were competency based.
- Most staff were clear about their role and responsibilities and this was reinforced through supervision and team meetings.

**Areas for improvement:**

- Line management and supervision arrangements for tutors and the treatment manager were not reflected in the area's organisational chart.
- The core tasks, grade and competency areas for the treatment management role had yet to be fully defined.

**B3.3 Preparation and debriefing time for tutors**

2

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

**Strengths:**

- Managers were allotting preparation and debriefing time in excess of the required minimum to the tutor role in their staffing of groups and in the balancing of workloads.
- Newly-trained tutors were given at least a week's general preparation time following R&R training and before delivering their first programme.
- Tutors reported that they generally had enough time to carry out preparation and debriefing.

**Areas for improvement:**

- Some tutors reported short-term problems when moving to the tutor role and having to handover an offender caseload.

**B3.4 Staff continuity**

2

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

**Strengths:**

- Three tutors were routinely allocated to each programme and were introduced to offenders when they began R&R.
- Tutors had a clear understanding of the need for continuity and, wherever possible, followed the principle of 'baton-passing', so that each session was delivered by at least one tutor who had attended the previous session.
- Tutors and offenders reported high levels of tutor continuity, with additional staff only being brought in as a last resort.

**Areas for improvement:**

- The area had not been formally monitoring levels of tutor continuity.

#### **B4.1 Training arrangements for new staff**

1

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

##### **Strengths:**

- New tutors were not permitted to deliver the programme before they had received the R&R tutor training in its required form.
- Supervision and appraisal documents attested to a high level of attention being paid to staff training and development needs.
- South Wales had played a positive role in relation to the other three probation areas running R&R. This included sharing responsibility for the roll-out of training and making good use of two national R&R trainers who were South Wales staff.

##### **Areas for improvement:**

- Records had not been kept relating to which staff attended R&R context setting events or to assessment centre outcomes for tutors.

#### **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.*

##### **Strengths:**

- Programme and treatment managers paid careful attention to appropriate tutor pairings when drawing up the programme schedule and new tutors were placed with experienced staff.
- New tutors felt well supported and clearly benefited from working closely with more experienced colleagues.
- The area was beginning to build a library of best practice videos.
- Pairs of tutors, which included a new staff member, made time to rehearse sessions in advance of delivery.

#### **B4.3 Training arrangements for experienced staff**

2

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.]*

##### **Strengths:**

- The progression towards accreditation training was clearly understood by all tutors.
- Work towards accreditation was thoroughly monitored as part of tutor supervision.
- Five South Wales tutors had received accreditation training.

**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.*

**Strengths:**

- A programme information pack had been compiled, aimed at members of the assessment unit and PSR writers were well-informed.
- R&R tutors, the programme manager and treatment manager demonstrated excellent knowledge of the concepts and methods used in R&R.
- Creative use had been made of the *Prison Service R&R Course Summary Manual* in drawing up a tutor information pack.

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

1

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

**Strengths:**

- The programme manager, treatment manager and tutors were well versed in R&R's theoretical and evidential base.

**Areas for improvement:**

- Case managers and PSR writers were not confident about their understanding of the theory and evidence underpinning the programme and felt that they could carry out their role more effectively if they had fuller and more up-to-date knowledge.

**B4.6 Supporting skills necessary to run programmes**

1

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

**Strengths:**

- The area had given structured induction to new PSO tutors, including a basic group work skills course.
- The South Wales training plan prioritised training events which helped to build the What Works agenda.
- The area's policy of consistently pairing newly qualified and experienced tutors had led to considerable learning and skills sharing.
- Training had been delivered in general group work skills and motivational interviewing.
- Tutors' training needs were being identified through video monitoring and supervision.

**Areas for improvement:**

- Training had not been delivered to case managers or treatment managers in South Wales.

## **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.*

### **Strengths:**

- Practice supervision was being regularly delivered to tutors by the treatment manager. Since the setting-up of the programmes unit, programme managers had been able to give regular line management supervision.
- Sessions were being video monitored at the required frequency and were a very useful focus for supervision.
- Tutors felt that programme and treatment managers were accessible and spoke positively about their experience of supervision.
- Standard agendas were being used for supervision and written records kept of all sessions.

## **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.*

### **Strengths:**

- Appraisals were routinely being carried out on all programme staff.
- Programme and treatment managers liaised about tutor performance. Written reports on the quality of tutor delivery, drawn up by the treatment manager, were used directly to inform the appraisal process.
- There was evidence of intensive and productive coaching work by the programme manager and treatment manager with an individual tutor. This had produced encouraging results, raising the standard of R&R delivery.
- Appraisal documents attested to careful consideration being given to training needs and developmental progress.

## **B6.1 Offender selection and assessment**

1

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

### **Strengths:**

- 29 of 32 cases (91%) fell within the correct OGRS 2 targeting band of 31-100%.
- Useful targeting guidance had been drawn up to accompany the targeting matrix.
- Tutors were applying a secondary targeting filter at the stage of the semi-structured interview and raising concerns about offender suitability at that point.

- There was evidence of informal liaison between assessment unit staff and programme delivery staff about potential R&R referrals.

**Areas for improvement:**

- Routine monitoring of the suitability of offenders did not yet form part of the treatment manager's brief and therefore insufficient attention was being given to it.
- Few offenders on licences and DTTOs were accessing R&R.
- Decisions not to refer to R&R were being made by individual practitioners and checks and filters at middle manager level were not reliably in place to review these decisions prior to sentence. Staff felt this was leading to a number of missed referrals of potentially suitable offenders.
- South Wales was referring some offenders to R&R without a programme condition on their order/licence, sometimes following assessment at court via SSR rather than full PSR assessments. The policy about R&R conditions and the use of SSRs in relation to programmes was not clear and was leading to considerable variation in sentencing and case manager referral practice.
- The area had carried out only limited monitoring of targeting practice and was unable to break available data down to individual officer level.

**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.*

**Strengths:**

- Offenders had a good level of knowledge about the requirements of R&R.
- In 17 of 32 cases (53%) offenders were being informed both verbally and in writing about the programme.
- Statements of understanding were used and signed by offenders.

**Areas for improvement:**

- The R&R information leaflet was not always issued to offenders.

**B6.3 Group size**

2

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

**Strengths:**

- The starting group size for R&R was consistently between four and 12 offenders.
- Some groups had been appropriately 'bus stopped' when numbers fell below four.

## **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.*

### **Strengths:**

- Singleton placements of women or minority ethnic offenders were only permitted with informed offender consent and with additional support available.
- Tutors had made considerable efforts to support women, minority ethnic and disabled offenders.
- Diversity issues featured as a standing agenda item for the supervision of tutors.
- Staff had recently received race equality training.
- Video evidence showed that group members with literacy difficulties were given sensitive and appropriate support in the group setting.

### **Areas for improvement:**

- Few women were accessing R&R. Although this was primarily due to the priority given to the women's acquisitive crime programme, this alone did not account for the lack of referrals. Some case managers and PSR writers were confused about whether women should be referred to the programme.
- There was a lack of policy documents in South Wales relating to accessibility issues.
- Offender consent to a singleton placement was not always being checked thoroughly enough, leading to considerable delays for some women.

## **B7.1 Implementation of monitoring and evaluation design**

0

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

### **Strengths:**

- Monthly meetings of a combined group of staff from the information unit and the programmes unit were beginning to do some helpful work.

### **Areas for improvement:**

- The area's progress with monitoring and evaluation had been inhibited by delays in the full implementation of IAPS and by the amalgamation of the three different databases used in the former Glamorgan services.
- South Wales was producing very little data and few summary reports in addition to the programme returns required by the NPD.

## **B7.2 Practice is informed by monitoring and evaluation evidence**

0

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

### **Strengths:**

- Some evaluation results were being discussed in group supervision and team meetings.
- Useful guidance notes on inputting data had been produced for programme administrators.

***Areas for improvement:***

- All staff groups reported a lack of reliable monitoring and evaluation feedback about the programme.
- There was no area-wide policy for the systematic monitoring and evaluation of R&R.
- Although a lot of data were being collected, these were not being analysed and practice was not being refined as a result of feedback about R&R work.

## SECTION C: QUALITY OF PROGRAMME DELIVERY

---

### C1.1 Adherence to programme manual

2

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

#### **Strengths:**

- The video monitoring results showed adherence to the programme manual as the strongest area of performance in programme delivery. It was clear from discussions with staff and from the treatment manager video monitoring forms that programme integrity had figured significantly and successfully in skills development.
- Programme tutors consistently covered the session material in the correct order.
- Inappropriate extras were not added to programme sessions.
- Exercises were set up and run correctly.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- Checking out of group learning did not always link sufficiently with the aims and objectives of the sessions.
- Exercises were not always explained properly.

### C1.2 Adherence to treatment style

1

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

#### **Strengths:**

- Racist, sexist and offence-supporting comments were quickly picked up and challenged.
- The use of open questions to facilitate learning was consistently good.
- Tutors demonstrated an ability to listen and allow for answers.
- Members of the groups were encouraged to explain and validate ideas for themselves.
- Overall, tutors demonstrated good skills in engaging offenders and communicating the programme material.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- Opportunities to summarise points during some of the sessions were not maximised.
- Tutors did not always reflect back learning from the sessions.

### C1.3 Group work skills

2

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

#### **Strengths:**

- Tutors were clearly spoken and used appropriate language.

- There were excellent examples of the use of praise.
- All group members were generally involved in the sessions and the groups were well managed.
- A relaxed and positive working atmosphere was created by programme delivery staff.

**Areas for improvement:**

- Handovers between tutors were not always well integrated in delivery, sometimes conducted perfunctorily and without connecting component parts of the sessions.
- Greater awareness of positive pro-social modelling with reference to body language was required in some sessions.

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

1

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

**Strengths:**

- The videos observed contained examples of racist and sexist comments being challenged.
- Treatment manager comments indicated that discriminatory language had been dealt with in programme sessions.
- Some tutors had made use of minority ethnic newspapers to facilitate discussion in sessions.

**Areas for improvement:**

- Interviews with tutors indicated that knowledge of race equality and wider diversity issues in programme delivery varied between staff.

**C1.5 Programme integrity checklist**

2

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

**Strengths:**

- Programme integrity checklists were completed for each session of the programme, together with the attendance monitoring sheet.
- Time was allowed to complete programme integrity checklists and related information at the end of each session.

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

1

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

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

**Strengths:**

- Reports commented fully on offenders' participation in the programme and covered progress in relation to all cognitive deficits.
- The reviews identified objectives for future work with the offenders.
- The completion of end of programme reports was seen as an important priority and there was an expectation on the part of tutors that these would be done.

***Areas for improvement:***

- The end of programme report was found by case managers to use 'programme-specific language' to such an extent that they had difficulty assimilating it within the supervision plan review.
- The report format being used did not automatically prompt an assessment of risk or of likely relapse scenarios for offenders.

---

## SECTION D: CASE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

---

### 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.*

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- Relevant programme-related objectives were not set in relation to every R&R offender. In only one of 32 cases (3%) were the objectives SMART.
- Supervision plans failed to integrate programme interventions into an overall sequence of supervision. In only four of 32 cases (13%) was there sufficient integration.

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

0

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

#### **Strengths:**

- Tutors and case managers liaised about offender progress, principally through the use of e-mail and telephone contact.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- Handover arrangements at programme completion were not always working well, and did not facilitate a seamless experience of supervision by offenders.
- Communication was principally from tutors to case managers rather than being a two-way liaison.
- Three-way meetings did not take place for all completed R&R cases.

### 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.*

The programmes unit was in the process of compiling resources for pre and post-group work to be delivered by case managers, but this scheme had yet to be implemented across the area.

#### **Strengths:**

- There was evidence of some reactive involvement on the part of case managers when alerted by tutors to a problem with offender attendance or motivation.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

- No clear policy was in place to shape the case manager role.
- Some case managers lacked confidence in delivering structured and appropriate motivational work prior to programme start.

- Case managers were unclear about how often to see offenders while they were attending R&R. In only one of the 32 cases sampled was there evidence of adequate work to reinforce offender learning during the programme.

#### **D1.4 Understanding and knowledge of programme methods**

0

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

##### **Strengths:**

- Case managers were able to give some account of the programme model and of its aims and objectives.

##### **Areas for improvement:**

- As they had not had the relevant R&R training, case managers did not feel confident in undertaking motivational, reinforcement or relapse prevention work.
- Although some case managers had previously been trained as R&R tutors, no skills audit had been carried out across all case management staff to ascertain the nature and level of training input needed.

#### **D1.5 Monitoring of attendance and enforcement**

1

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

##### **Strengths:**

- There was general consistency between the way programme attendance was monitored and enforced and the approach to other elements of supervision such as case manager or community punishment appointments.
- Tutors and case managers were clear about their respective roles in securing compliance and taking enforcement action.
- Most enforcement action was taken within the required national standards timescales.

##### **Areas for improvement:**

- Some case managers reported that standard enforcement letters were not worded helpfully, focusing more on warnings rather than enquiries about absence.
- The South Wales enforcement policy had not been fully implemented and had only interim status. It did not address specifically issues of programme attendance.
- There had been some instances of miscommunication between tutors and case managers, e.g. relating to cases of continued programme attendance pending breach action.
- Enforcement of programme cases was not being routinely monitored.

---

**D1.6 Documentation****1**

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

**Strengths:**

- A new area-wide case file format, introduced in October 2001, had facilitated the ordered storage of programme-related documentation.

**Areas for improvement:**

- In 17 of 32 cases sampled (53%) key programme documents were missing, most typically the statement of understanding.

**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.*

**Areas for improvement:**

- There were no examples of SMART objectives being set in any of the supervision plan reviews on the 14 completed cases in the file reading sample.
- Only two of these 14 cases (14%) showed evidence of adequate community reintegration work in the post-programme phase of supervision.
- Supervision plan reviews were not influenced by post-programme reports. In only three of 12 applicable cases (25%) were supervision objectives outlined which related to outstanding work not sufficiently covered by the programme.

**D1.8 Reinforcement and relapse prevention work****N/A**

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

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

### **Next Steps**

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

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

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

### **IQR score**

The South Wales Probation Area achieved an IQR of **42%**.

This audit report and the IQR will be received by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel in Spring 2003.