

OFFENDER MANAGEMENT INSPECTION

A joint inspection by HM Inspectorates of Probation and Prisons

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

April 2008

FOREWORD

This is the first report of its kind in which our two inspectorates have sought to appraise arrangements under the National Offender Management Service offender management model as they apply to offenders serving a custodial sentence. The model seeks to embed a process by which offenders experience 'end to end' management by probation areas and prisons working closely together from the point of entry into custody. Whilst there have long been arrangements in place for cooperative working between the two organisations, these have now been formalised for certain categories of offender. An aim is that a prison sentence should no longer represent a disruptive hiatus in the offender's journey but one stage in an ongoing process of supervision under a seamless sentence.

We have seen staff and managers from both prison and probation welcoming the new arrangements and demonstrating commitment to making them work. There were some instances of this already resulting in tangible benefits for the reintegration of offenders back into their communities when released on licence and for good protection of the public.

We found some aspects of the model not yet working to the optimum. There was confusion and disagreement about which prisoners fell under the scope of the model; stretched resources impacting on community-based offender managers and prison-based offender supervisors; a lack of clarity about foreign national prisoners; and a need for those who deliver interventions in prison to be more fully aware of their relationship to the model.

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 Reading, HMP Canterbury, HMP Lewes, HMP Woodhill, HMP Albany, and HMP Bullingdon; and the area managers of Kent & Sussex and South Central whom we interviewed.

HM Assistant Chief

Inspector of Probation *Kate White*

HM Deputy Chief

Inspector of Prisons *Nigel Newcomen*

HM Inspectors

*Jane Attwood, Paddy Doyle, Susan Fenwick, Keith McInnis,
Joy Neary, Marie Orrell, Nigel Scarff, Sean Sullivan*

Programme Manager

Andy Bonny

Research Team

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

Inspection Admin Officer

Gareth Collins

Publications Team

Deborah Hewitt, Zach Rathore

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	18
3. SENTENCE PLANNING	23
4. SENTENCE PLANNING DELIVERY	25
5. OASys	28
6. OFFENDER ENGAGEMENT	30
7. DIVERSITY	32
8. PUBLIC PROTECTION	35
9. VICTIMS	38
APPENDIX 1 Prisons inspected in this area	40
APPENDIX 2 Role of HMI Probation and HMI Prisons	45

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

ART	Aggression replacement training
CARATS	Counselling, assessment, referral and treatment services
CDRP	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
DIP	Drug Intervention Programme
ESOL	English as a second or other language
ETE	Employment, training and education
ETS	Enhanced thinking skills
HMI Prisons	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
HMI Probation	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
HMP	Her Majesty's Prison
IPP	Imprisonment for Public Protection
MAPPAs	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
OASys/eOASys	Offender Assessment System/electronic OASys
OCA	Offender classification and assessment
OMU	Offender Management Unit
PPO	Prolific and other priority offender
RoH	Risk of Harm
SMB	Strategic Management Board
SOTP	Sex Offender Treatment Programme
YOT	Youth Offending Team

RECOMMENDATIONS

Improvements are necessary as follows:

Prison Area

1. offender management arrangements in each prison are reviewed to ensure that offender supervisors have the capacity to undertake their role in engagement with offenders and sentence plan delivery
2. all offenders within the scope of the offender management model are allocated a single, identified, offender supervisor within the prison
3. sentence planning meetings are held with all offenders who are within the scope of the offender management model
4. overdue Offender Assessment System assessments and reviews are completed so that all offenders within the scope of the offender management model have an accurate and up-to-date assessment and sentence plan
5. all keyworkers delivering interventions in custody (including education, health services, and the chaplaincy) are involved in relevant sentence planning meetings.

National

1. offenders within the scope of the offender management model are accurately and consistently identified by prisons and probation areas to ensure appropriate resource allocation; more guidance is given to address concerns about operating a two-tier system and to reflect the challenges of a *phased* implementation
2. video-link facilities are made available within all prisons and probation areas to support the offender management process
3. foreign national offenders within the scope of the offender management model receive the same service as other offenders, including assessment through the use of the Offender Assessment System and allocation of an offender manager in the community
4. offender managers in the community are enabled to provide an initial Offender Assessment System assessment for all cases falling within the scope of the offender management model
5. offender managers contribute to initial sentence planning meetings as specified in national 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 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 CDRPs 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 focusing 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 & Wales, depending on the offender's home area.

Methodology

During the inspection we meet with:

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

inspectors with evidence about the strategic 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

Overall, there was evidence of positive communication between prison and probation, with examples of efforts to improve links. There remained some obstacles to communication including delays in provision of some information which hindered timely reintegration planning. Limited video-link facilities between prisons and probation areas also inhibited full engagement in offender management.

Offender management model

It is undoubtedly significant that the roll-out of offender management has been taking place against the backdrop of a burgeoning prison population, putting the most extreme pressure on capacity in custodial institutions and squeezed capacity within the probation service. To implement an improved system for managing offenders when faced with these considerable constraints has inevitably presented challenges.

All prisons inspected had OMUs in place but these were structured in very different ways, for instance in respect of the inclusion of prison officer staff or of the case administrator role. Implementation of the offender management model was identified as being 'work in progress' in several prisons. Keyworker knowledge and understanding of the model varied and sentence planning was not always being driven through the OMU. Not all offenders we surveyed were aware of having an offender manager or offender supervisor, and ongoing contacts by both with the offender varied. Offender managers were not always sufficiently involved in sentence planning in custody. For some prisons, there had been difficulty in the identification of in-scope offenders at the start of implementation. The challenge of running two separate systems (one for offenders within the scope of the model and another for those outside it) had led in some instances to the model in prison being extended to include other offenders before this was required. This stemmed partly from discomfort with a system which did not afford equal opportunities to all prisoners. Unfortunately this had led to confusion as no offender manager role was yet required in the community.

Sentence planning

Sentence planning was not always given the priority it needed and the contributions of all staff to the delivery of the plan were not necessarily included. Not all prisons held sentence planning meetings and there was limited evidence of active participation in their plan by offenders themselves. We saw some good efforts by prison-based staff to engage offender managers in the community, with positive outcomes. Overall, though, offender manager attendance and contribution to sentence planning varied.

Sentence planning delivery

All prisons had induction facilities at the point of reception into custody, though there was little OMU involvement at that stage. Ongoing contact with offender supervisors during sentence was also limited in most cases, in some instances due to workload pressures on them. Some offenders indicated they had received help with offending-related needs such as ETE issues, or drug and alcohol use but over half remained concerned about their ability to find employment or accommodation on release. All prisons except one offered at least one accredited programme to tackle offending

behaviour but the range of interventions available was limited in some. There were some good examples of prisons expanding the range of provision through collaborative work with probation areas. The majority of offenders in our survey thought that they had been helped to address their offending behaviour while they were in custody and that staff had helped them prepare for release.

OASys

Not all offenders had an up-to-date OASys; one prison rarely used this national assessment tool and in others there was a backlog of initial assessments and reviews. OASys was not central to prison processes at the induction stage. In some prisons it was not clear how the assessments of other prison staff and those of other agencies were incorporated into OASys, leaving the assessment less comprehensive than was required.

Offender engagement

There was some attention being paid to the assessment of offender engagement, but in the main this featured in education work with offenders rather than throughout the OASys assessment and sentence planning process. Over half the offenders surveyed thought that the education provision they had received while in custody would help them on release. Whilst there were good arrangements in one prison for re-engaging offenders who had been recalled to custody, in the main there were no identifiable systems to support this. It was a missed opportunity for joint work between the offender manager and offender supervisor.

Diversity

In all prisons there was some attention given to diversity issues at an operational level, though the focus at strategic level for most was on race equality concerns. This was a narrower view of diversity issues than that usually found in probation areas. There were encouraging signs of attention in one establishment in particular to issues of disability and the needs of an ageing prison population. Services for foreign national offenders needed to improve generally to ensure that they had an equal opportunity to address their offending behaviour and reduce their likelihood of reoffending.

Public protection

Protecting the public from RoH issues had a clear priority within the prisons. Generally, there were appropriate links between the OMU and internal risk management processes in the prisons, aided in some instances by co-location of the OMU and public protection staff within establishments. It was not always clear, though, that systems were in place to ensure that OMU staff received all relevant information from the prisons' internal risk management processes. The OASys (where completed) was not always seen as a key document in terms of public protection issues. Some keyworkers were unfamiliar with its classification of RoH and used their own criteria to assess RoH, which was a matter of concern. Prison-based staff contributed to MAPPAs meetings in the community where needed. At strategic level, links with MAPPAs were undertaken through prison area management staff; prison senior managers were not represented on MAPPAs SMBs in the same way as their counterparts in police and probation areas. Accurate identification of PPOs in particular had proved challenging for some prisons, making it

difficult to allocate appropriate resources, but better systems to access the national PPO database were now in place.

Victims

There were good links in some prisons with police domestic abuse units and probation victim contact units. Victim safety issues were predominantly handled through prison risk management processes, with limited involvement of offender supervisors in some cases. A higher profile for OMU staff was needed in some prisons to ensure that they had the relevant information to promote victim safety from custody. Some victim awareness work was being undertaken in prisons through courses and accredited programmes, though in the main this was seen as being the role of the offender manager to follow through. Over a quarter of offenders in our survey indicated that victim awareness work had been undertaken with them and most of these had found it useful.

SHARING GOOD PRACTICE

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

Delivery of the sentence plan through the gate:

**OMI Criterion:
2.1a**

At HMP Bullingdon, arrangements had been made for an offender (who had been released before the end of his SOTP) to return from the community on a sessional basis and complete the programme. This enabled him to gain the maximum benefit from the intensive intervention to tackle his offending and thus minimise the RoH posed to the public. The arrangement showed a flexible approach from both the prison and the local probation area, enabling learning from the programme to be built on in the community.

Planned moves to aid resettlement:

**OMI Criterion:
2.1j**

The PPO scheme at HMP Lewes was working well. All PPOs due for release into the local area, but who were held in other establishments, were returned to the prison for the final three months of their sentence to aid their community reintegration. This demonstrated an encouraging regard to good offender management practice despite the considerable pressures on the prison estate nationally.

SERVICE USERS' PERSPECTIVE

The table below details the responses received from each inspection from a sample of offenders subject to offender management arrangements.

Prison	No. in sample	No. of responses	Response rate (%)
Reading	8	8	100
Lewes	11	11	100
Woodhill	14	13	93
Albany	72	60	83
Bullingdon	9	6	67
Total	114	98	86

Please note, the figures show that the combined user perspectives referred to in the body of this report are dominated by the responses from Albany as there were a larger number of prisoners under offender management arrangements in that establishment.

Inspection findings from HMP Canterbury, a dedicated foreign national prison, are included in this report but as none of our random prisoner sample was under offender management arrangements, there are no survey data for that inspection.

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

- 8 offenders said they were under the age of 21 years
- 13 stated they were from a black or minority ethnic group
- 5 reported that they were foreign nationals
- 3 were of the understanding that they had sentences of less than 12 months
- 12 were on recall to prison
- 19 self-identified as having a disability
- none of the sample identified as transgender or transsexual.

These responses go some way to indicating the diverse needs of those 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, most offenders identified themselves as having some problems on arrival in custody, such as contacting family, money worries, feeling depressed or suicidal, or having health problems. Most had been offered help with these difficulties within 24 hours, and approximately two-thirds thought that they had been given good information about the prison in their first week. A small proportion indicated that their race, language or religion might make it difficult for them to take part in activities in custody; a fifth thought the same about disability issues, and a slightly lower number thought their problems with reading and writing could act as an obstacle. Most offenders reported that these difficulties had not been dealt with.

Over half the offenders had a named offender manager in the community and almost half of these reported contact from their offender manager while they had been in custody. Over half noted that they had an offender supervisor in the prison but none confirmed that they had at least monthly meetings with their offender supervisor to discuss sentence planning targets. Almost half the offenders reported having a

sentence plan, though only just over half of this group had been involved in the development of it.

More than two-thirds of offenders said that they had been helped to address their offending behaviour and most felt that they had been helped to prepare for release. Just over a quarter had undertaken work on victim awareness, with all except two offenders indicating they had found it useful. A little over a third indicated that the offending behaviour programmes they had undertaken would help them on release. Almost half reported having received help with ETE issues and a similar number thought this would assist them when they were released. Over a fifth noted that they had had help with drug or alcohol use and just under a third thought that their drug or alcohol programmes would help them on release. More than half felt that their experience in custody 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) Information from court, relating to potential self-harm issues, was routinely received by prisons. In one instance, community-based probation staff also informed the OMU directly if there were concerns but in most instances the involvement of the OMU was limited.
- (b) Nineteen offenders (23%) who responded to the particular survey question indicated that they had had problems with feeling depressed or suicidal when they first arrived in prison; 11 said that they had been offered help or support from a member of staff.

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) While there was evidence of joint work in preparation for release, prison-based staff noted difficulties in some instances in finalising resettlement plans because of late confirmation of accommodation availability, including places in approved premises.
- (b) At one prison, staff indicated that there were sometimes delays in receiving pre-release risk management plans from offender managers.
- (c) 41% of offenders had had contact from their offender manager since they had been in their current prison; 26% of these had received a visit and 29% had been contacted by letter. Only 15% thought that they had been supported by their offender manager whilst in custody.

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 the prisons identified reasonable relationships at operational level between themselves and offender managers, though the extent of the relationship did vary according to the particular probation area. Not surprisingly, local prisons appeared to have closer links with the probation areas nearest to them and some OMU staff had made

particular efforts to engage at local level, for example attending probation area team meetings to encourage the involvement of offender managers.

- (b) Establishments which took prisoners from a wide geographical area had attempted to build good relationships by allocating offender supervisors on a geographical basis, so each had responsibility for offenders from particular probation areas. This gave probation staff in the community some continuity in contact with the prison and gave offender supervisors the opportunity to develop familiarity with specific offices and their staff.
- (c) Video-link facilities to support offender management were not in place in all prisons, and some probation areas also lacked sufficient facilities, relying on the court-link facility. This inhibited offender manager participation in sentence planning.
- (d) There were differences in prisons' experiences of strategic level liaison between themselves and probation areas. One reported feeling 'unsupported' by their local probation area in making the change to offender management and others spoke of 'limited' links strategically. In the main, links at strategic level were between the prison service area managers and probation areas. Some prisons had experienced more positive liaison with probation senior managers and described the introduction of offender management as having enhanced relationships generally. Prison area managers also noted generally good links with probation managers and thought that the introduction of the offender management model had improved connections between prisons and probation.
- (e) There were particular challenges for prisons holding foreign national offenders. One establishment, whilst having no offenders within the scope of the offender management model at the time of our inspection, experienced an 'apparent reluctance' from probation areas to engage with foreign national offenders generally, given an assumption (frequently incorrect) that deportation would follow. There were particular difficulties in identifying a 'home' probation area for those serving more than 12 months and thus due for release on licence.

Summary

Overall, there was evidence of positive communication between prisons and probation, with examples of efforts to improve links. There remained some obstacles to communication, including delays in provision of some information which hindered timely resettlement planning. Limited video-link facilities between prisons and probation areas also inhibited full engagement in offender management.

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) Where sentence planning meetings or boards were being held, these were not always being chaired by offender managers or even attended by them. Only 8% of offenders in our survey said that their offender manager attended sentence planning meetings. One prison saw itself as 'working around the model' rather than operating it directly, with offender supervisors 'filling in the gaps' left by limited offender management engagement. Another establishment commented that the lack of training and/or experience of offender managers in chairing sentence planning meetings was an obstacle to the model working effectively. It should be noted that, at the time of the inspection, there was an expectation that offender managers chaired such meetings. However, a NOMS internal Strategic Review of Offender Management (which took place during the course of our inspection work) pointed to new guidance being issued in due course which could bring changes to these expectations.
- (b) Keyworkers' understanding of the offender management model and their role within it varied considerably. Some understood the role of the offender manager as brokering interventions and the offender supervisor as acting on their behalf. However, in other instances, sentence planning was not being driven by the OMU so keyworkers had no particular links with the offender supervisor. The involvement of keyworkers in delivering interventions to carry out the sentence was a cornerstone of good offender management, so their understanding of the model and their role within it was crucial.
- (c) Not all prisons had case administrators; where these were in place their role was different from that of case administrators in the community. The role in prisons was often combined with other responsibilities, limiting the potential for full engagement with the offender management processes, offender managers and offender supervisors.

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) In all the establishments holding in-scope offenders, there were links with the OCA department to ensure that any transfer met the needs identified in the sentence plan. In most instances this involved putting a 'hold' on offenders undertaking accredited programmes so that they were not transferred until completion. However, OMU staff in one prison noted that it was not always clear who was about to be moved or why; moves were not in accordance with the sentence plan but connected with the need to move prisoners within the prison estate to relieve overcrowding. It appeared that population management needs were a pressure driving most moves.
- (b) 18% of offenders in our survey said that there were plans for them to achieve all or some of their sentence plan targets in another prison, so a sizeable minority were expecting to move to other establishments at some point.

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 establishments and there had been no escape of any in-scope offenders in these establishments.

2.4c Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) Induction facilities were in place in all the prisons. There were some good examples of the use of peer mentors to talk to all new prisoners, and of the involvement of a voluntary organisation in respect of accommodation needs. 59% of offenders had attended an induction course in their first week, and 56% found this covered everything they needed to know.
- (b) 60% of prisoners in our survey indicated that they had had problems when they first arrived at the prison. 26% faced difficulties in contacting family, 24% had money worries, and 21% had health problems. Very positively, for those with family problems, help had been provided by staff within the first 24 hours in 49% of cases.

**3.2a Specific Criterion:
There is continuity of offender management.**

Findings:

- (a) 66% of offenders in the survey indicated that they had a named offender manager in the probation service. 41% said that they had had contact from their offender manager since being in the prison.
- (b) 58% of offenders surveyed said they knew who their offender supervisor was. In one prison, offender supervisor work was shared between staff. This meant that there was no continuity for the offender in terms of building a relationship with one person, to support them through their sentence plan.

**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) In all the prisons, including one with no in-scope prisoners, an OMU was in place. Some had no case administrator role, and OMUs varied in the extent to which existing probation staff had been incorporated. At the time of the inspection, some used only probation staff as offender supervisors, others used prison officer staff solely, and the remainder deployed a mixture of staff.
- (b) Two establishments identified the offender management model as being 'in its infancy', or as 'work in progress'. This related to the perceived lack of a strategy for offender management work and to the model not yet functioning fully.
- (c) Two prisons indicated difficulty in initially identifying in-scope prisoners, which had made it hard to quantify the resources needed. For example, one had been relying on an offender's previous convictions to identify PPOs - this was inappropriate as PPO status was defined locally in criminal justice areas and thus varied across England and Wales.
- (d) Several prisons had made the decision to extend the offender management model to include indeterminate sentence prisoners, such as IPPs, before the model was rolled out nationally to this group under Phase III of the model. This had created frustration for offender supervisor staff as there was no requirement in the community for these cases to have an offender manager, and this had also contributed to the high workloads noted elsewhere in this report. Strategic managers noted that it would have been difficult for them to 'run two systems' (one for those in-scope and one for those outside it) and that this had not been recognised in the staged implementation of the model. Prison area managers also made this point.
- (e) The initial desktop exercise - to identify resources needed to

implement the model - had been experienced by some prisons as useful in that it 'got everyone round the table'. However, there had not always been the resources to meet those needs once they were quantified.

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) As noted elsewhere in the report, all establishments had set up OMUs as required. Whilst there were clear staffing structures in place, these differed between prisons and no single model predominated. Area managers acknowledged that some models might be more effective than others in the longer term. One had already conducted an internal review of the implementation of offender management in their area with a view to identifying best practice.
- (b) While OMU staff in all prisons had undertaken some training in relation to the offender management model itself, there were gaps in training for some offender supervisors in respect of MAPPA and child safeguarding. This made it more difficult for them to engage effectively in public protection work.

4.3a Specific Criterion:

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

Finding:

- (a) In some prisons, the probation resource and other roles had been remodelled appropriately in order to set up the OMU. In two establishments, existing probation staff had taken on the role of the OMU. Whilst this had some advantages in terms of links with local probation areas and staff, probation officer staff were not always deployed appropriately and prison officer staff were not undertaking the offender supervisor role. In both establishments, the inclusion of prison officer staff within the OMU was planned for Phase III.

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) In two establishments, OMU staffing was sufficient to meet the current demand. However, in two other prisons offender supervisors were carrying individual caseloads of more than 70. In one instance this was in addition to other work, including parole reports and

programme management. In both these prisons, the high workloads limited the scope for the ongoing contact with offenders needed in order to carry out the sentence plan effectively and promote positive outcomes.

- (b) Offenders who were identified as PPOs received particular attention in some prisons. For example, in one prison the offender had been transferred elsewhere to access particular resources. In another, there was a PPO tracker officer, who provided both a service within the prison and linked closely with police and probation PPO staff in the community, to ensure continuity of offender management.

Summary

All prisons had OMUs in place but these were structured in very different ways. Implementation of the offender management model was identified as being 'work in progress' in several prisons. Keyworker knowledge and understanding of the model varied and sentence planning was not always being driven through the OMU. Not all offenders we surveyed were aware of having an offender manager or offender supervisor and ongoing contacts by both with the offender varied. Offender managers were not always sufficiently involved in sentence planning in custody. For some prisons, there had been difficulty in the identification of in-scope offenders at the start of implementation. The challenge of running two separate systems (one for offenders within the scope of the model and another for those outside it) had led in some instances to the model in prison being extended to include other offenders before this was required. This had led to confusion as no offender manager role was yet required in the community.

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), set relevant goals for each offender.

Findings:

- (a) As noted earlier in the report, not all prisons held sentence planning meetings. Where they did take place, offender manager attendance and contribution varied but was said by some prisons to be improving.
- (b) In one prison, OMU staff had worked hard to engage probation area staff by arranging visits for offender managers and attending team meetings in the community to encourage involvement. There had been positive outcomes to this, with all but one of 33 recent sentence planning meetings being chaired by the relevant offender manager.
- (c) Keyworkers delivering interventions were not always involved in sentence planning meetings. This included education, healthcare, and chaplaincy staff. This meant that their vital contributions to the delivery of the sentence were not necessarily being recorded in the plan.
- (d) In one prison, there were particular concerns by OMU staff that “*programmes staff drove the sentence planning process*” rather than the offender manager or offender supervisor. Sentence plans were often completed after work by other staff (such as healthcare or CARATS) had already begun, so the plan itself was not pushing forward the sentence. The centrality of the OASys sentence plan, and of the role of OMUs in steering it, was not yet recognised by all departments in every establishment.

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.

Finding:

- (a) In half the prisons there was evidence that offenders were enabled to participate in the sentence planning process through attending meetings and contributing to the identification of goals. In others, particularly where there were no formal sentence planning meetings, it was not clear how involved prisoners were or if their plan had been discussed with them. While just under half the offenders in our survey said that they had a sentence plan, just over a quarter indicated that they had been involved in its development. This was a missed opportunity and contrary to the offender management model as active involvement in the process was expected.

Summary

Sentence planning was not always given the priority it needed and the contributions of all staff to the delivery of the plan were not necessarily included. Not all prisons held sentence planning meetings and there was limited evidence of active participation in their plan by offenders themselves. We saw some good efforts by prison-based staff to engage offender managers in the community, with positive outcomes. Overall, though, offender manager attendance and contribution to sentence planning varied.

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) In all the prisons there was some evidence of interventions being sequenced appropriately, though this was limited on occasions. The particular importance of tackling literacy issues before undertaking programmes was highlighted by OMU and keyworker staff.
- (b) Some establishments offered a limited range of interventions, although there were no common themes in respect of gaps in provision. One prison noted that offender managers needed to be more aware of what interventions were available in custody, so that the sentence planning process could be more effective in identifying what was available in a particular establishment and which interventions might require a move to another prison.

2.5a Specific Criterion:

Constructive interventions encourage the offender to accept responsibility for their offending behaviour and its consequences.

Findings:

- (a) All except one prison offered at least one accredited programme. Through collaborative work with a probation area, two prisons had expanded their range of programmes by providing ART, using tutors from the community. This was a good example of joint work between prisons and probation areas to enable access to interventions that would challenge offenders to accept responsibility for their offending and its consequences.
- (b) 67% of offenders in our survey thought that they had been helped to address their offending behaviour whilst in custody. This was one of the most positive responses in the survey and indicated a clear focus by prisons on their role in tackling offending behaviour. 38% thought that the offending behaviour programmes they had undertaken would assist them once they were released.
- (c) Some offenders in the survey (30%) also reported help with offending-related needs such as thinking skills e.g. acting on impulse. Others noted help they had received about drug use and alcohol use; 29% and 20% respectively. Just under half had received help with ETE issues – an important factor in reducing reoffending on release.

2.5c Specific Criterion:

Arrangements are in place for basic skills inputs to be delivered if this need has been identified.

Finding:

- (a) From our survey, 44% of offenders remembered receiving a basic skills' assessment in their first week in custody. All prisons had arrangements in place for basic skills' inputs to be delivered where this was needed, and 53% of offenders thought that the education programmes they had undertaken would help them on release. 21% were aware who to contact within the prison to get help with arranging continuing education in the community.

2.5e Specific Criterion:

The nature and timing of accredited programme work is consistent with sentence plan objectives.

Finding:

- (a) One prison held a lengthy waiting list for the ETS programme; another had waiting lists for both ETS and the short-duration drug programme. A third prison noted delays in provision if the prisoner was assessed as needing a programme that was only available in a category C prison. The OMU liaised with the psychology department to arrange the transfer of prisoners who needed other programmes but "*it was hard to get someone moved to category C*". This was due to pressure on prison places nationally.

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) As noted earlier in the report, all prisons offered induction soon after reception into custody, although there was limited involvement by OMU staff at that stage. It was not clear in most prisons when offenders within the scope of the offender management model were identified; for example, at reception, induction or later. There was potential for some offenders not to be accurately identified at that stage and thus miss early involvement from offender supervisors.
- (b) Ongoing contact with offenders by their offender supervisor during sentence was limited in some prisons; in some instances this was due to caseload numbers. None of 69 offenders in our survey said that they met their offender supervisor at least monthly to discuss their sentence plan targets. Offender supervisors with high caseloads commented on the difficulties they faced in keeping regular contact with offenders, so the opportunities for them to help

in preserving community links was limited.

- (c) Despite work undertaken with them in respect of ETE and accommodation concerns, over half the offenders in our survey thought that they would have problems finding a job and accommodation on release. More focus by offender supervisors on these supporting protective factors could have been beneficial. More positively, though, 83% of offenders thought that prison staff had helped them prepare for release; this was the most positive response in the survey and was very encouraging. Work to promote community reintegration was clearly taking place but not necessarily through contact with offender supervisors.
- (d) In one prison, families were invited to celebrate offenders' success in achieving awards for activities undertaken, for example, in respect of ETE or literacy and numeracy. This helped to preserve family links and assisted with community reintegration.

Summary

All prisons had induction facilities soon after reception into custody though there was little OMU involvement at that stage. Ongoing contact with offender supervisors during sentence was also limited in most cases, in some instances due to workload pressures. Some offenders indicated that they had received help with offending-related needs such as ETE issues, or drug and alcohol use but over half remained concerned about their ability to find employment or accommodation on release. The range of interventions available was limited in some prisons, though there were some good examples of this being expanded through collaborative work with probation areas. The majority of offenders in our survey thought that they had been helped to address their offending behaviour while they were in custody and that staff had helped them prepare for release.

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) Three establishments noted a high number of prisoners being received without an OASys where one was required. In several prisons, there was a backlog of initial assessments and reviews as OMU staff struggled to keep up with demands on them. Some OMU staff and operational managers expressed frustration at the volume of initial assessments they had to complete, as they had initially expected to be involved mainly in reviews. In some instances, this was connected with the decision to include more offenders within the scope of the offender management model than was required at the time, thus there had been no offender manager in place in the community to undertake the initial OASys. This was causing unfortunate tensions between prisons and probation and concern about those offenders not covered by the current scope of the model.
- (b) There were limited links in one establishment between the assessment undertaken at induction and the OASys, as the offender supervisor would not meet the prisoner to begin their assessment until several weeks after reception into custody. OASys was not routinely used as the assessment tool at induction in most prisons, so was not central to prison processes at that stage.
- (c) In one prison, OASys was rarely undertaken. Instead, the OMU had devised its own format for assessing needs, based on the Reducing Reoffending Action Plan pathways. There were no links between this document and any RoH screening, which was a matter of concern as there were potential risks to staff and other offenders (as well as more widely to the public) which were not being identified alongside the offender's needs.

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) In some establishments, it was evident that assessments carried out by prison staff outside the OMU, and by other agencies providing services (such as accommodation or substance misuse services), were fed back into the OASys through offender supervisors. One prison used a checklist in the offender supervisor file to check what information, and which other assessments, had been taken into account. In other prisons it was less clear how the assessments of

others, for instance those of accredited programmes staff or health or education, were incorporated. This meant that the OASys was likely to be less comprehensive than was required.

Summary

Not all offenders had an up-to-date OASys; one prison rarely used this national assessment tool and in others there was a backlog of initial assessments and reviews. OASys was not central to prison processes at the induction stage. In some prisons it was not clear how the assessments of other prison staff and those of other agencies were incorporated into OASys, leaving the assessment less comprehensive than was required.

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.

Finding:

- (a) A basic skills' screening was carried out at induction in all the prisons. As noted earlier in the report, 44% of offenders in our survey reported receiving a basic skills' assessment in their first week in custody. 53% felt that the education provision (including basic skills) that they had received would help them on release.

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 most prisons, there was evidence that consideration had been given to the best way to engage an offender in relation to education work, so that individual learning needs were met. However, there was limited indication of attention being paid to this for assessment and sentence planning in general. In the survey, only 10% of offenders thought that their sentence plan had taken their individual needs into account.

1.4c Specific Criterion:

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

Finding:

- (a) In the survey, 16% of offenders reported difficulty with reading and/or writing skills; just over half noted that these difficulties had been dealt with. There was evidence of learning styles' assessments being undertaken in relation to education classes but, as with the criterion above, there was limited evidence that this information was being taken into account in sentence planning.

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) Where offenders were recalled to custody, in the main there was no identifiable system in place to re-engage them. Prisons identified limited support from offender managers in most cases. For example,

offender supervisors were expecting the offender manager to visit and give explanations but this was not taking place routinely. Neither were offender managers always passing information through offender supervisors. This was an opportunity for joint working which had been missed.

- (b) There were good arrangements in one prison where prison-based probation staff issued an explanatory leaflet to those offenders affected. A system was in place for the offender manager to contact the prison when recall was in progress so that the OMU was warned to expect the offender.

Summary

There was some attention being paid to the assessment of offender engagement, but in the main this featured in education work with offenders rather than throughout the OASys assessment and sentence planning process. Over half the offenders surveyed thought that the education provision they had received while in custody would help them on release. Whilst there were good arrangements in one prison for re-engaging offenders who had been recalled to custody, in the main there were no identifiable systems to support this. It was a missed opportunity for joint work between the offender manager and offender supervisor.

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) There were some examples of active assessment of diversity needs being undertaken at induction, though not through use of OASys, which meant that these individual needs would not necessarily be taken into account in sentence planning. Examples included cell-sharing risk assessments and the use of Language Line (a telephone interpretation and translation service) at reception.
- (b) A good example at one prison (whose population included a number of older offenders and those with disabilities) was an interview by the disability liaison officer for all offenders at their reception into custody. In our survey, 21% of offenders identified disability issues as affecting their ability to engage in the interventions and other activities provided in the prisons.
- (c) Where potentially discriminatory and/or disadvantaging factors had been identified, we heard of a number of examples of these being taken into account; for example, in relation to the provision of a signer for the hearing-impaired, or the timing of meetings to take account of faith commitments.
- (d) In one establishment, there was good evidence from meetings of accredited programmes staff of attention to the needs of individual offenders, including issues relating to faith, ethnicity or disabilities. Mentors and 'buddies' were used on programmes to assist those with particular needs to overcome any obstacles to their engagement.

2.7a Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) ESOL classes were run in a number of establishments to assist with language issues, and in one prison there were dyslexia specialists who provided one-to-one support.
- (b) In one prison there were a number of offenders with physical disabilities who were either incapacitated or needed wheelchair access. Arrangements were sometimes made for particular gates to be opened specifically to enable easier access to parts of the prison, or for meetings with staff to take place on residential units.

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

Finding:

- (a) In one prison, offenders who were likely to be a singleton in any group programme (perhaps because of race or ethnicity) were asked beforehand if they consented to this and were given support in the group if they identified this as a need. In the same prison there was a self-support group for black and minority ethnic offenders.

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

Findings:

- (a) In all prisons there was evidence of some services having been developed to support work with minority groups, though the focus in most was on race and ethnicity issues, or language concerns. All establishments had access to Language Line or to Big Word interpretation and translation services.
- (b) Two establishments identified that improvements were needed in services for foreign national offenders. In one of these there were no accredited programmes available. More attention needed to be paid to appropriate provision for foreign national offenders if they were to have the same opportunity as others to address their offending behaviour.

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

Finding:

- (a) Race equality issues were clearly part of prisons' strategic planning processes, and there was required monitoring against prison service audit criteria in respect of racist incidents, for example. As noted in the criterion above, the focus at strategic level tended to be on race and ethnicity, a narrower definition of diversity issues than that usually found in probation areas in the community. A potential effect of this was less attention given to other needs, such as disability.

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

Findings:

- (a) Initiatives varied across prisons and there was little evidence of their impact being monitored. One establishment funded a diversity manager post which linked with the communities outside the prison;

it also had equality and diversity representatives in each residential unit. The same prison had built raised garden areas with seating, to meet the needs of the significant number of older prisoners in its population. This was the only establishment where there appeared to be a good understanding of the range of diversity needs.

- (b) At one establishment, a Muslim community resettlement worker was involved with younger offenders from a Muslim background. This role was seen as an important one in supporting community reintegration and the worker was invited to all relevant sentence planning meetings.

Summary

In all prisons there was some attention given to diversity issues at an operational level, though the focus at strategic level for most was on race equality concerns. This was a narrower view of diversity issues than that usually found in probation areas. There were encouraging signs of attention in one establishment in particular to issues of disability and the needs of an ageing prison population. Services for foreign national offenders needed to improve generally to ensure that they had an equal opportunity to address their offending behaviour.

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) Where OASys had been completed, keyworkers in most instances confirmed that they had access to both RoH and MAPPA classifications. Some keyworkers indicated that, in general, they obtained the information they needed from the prison security department. The OMU was not yet seen as a key vehicle for information about risk issues.
- (b) When OASys had not been completed, staff were left unclear about the RoH level. Programmes staff in one prison were unfamiliar with the OASys classifications of RoH generally, using “*our own criteria of risk*” instead. This was of concern.

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 supervisor roles in contributing to the addition of licence conditions varied between prisons. In some instances this was handled by senior managers, in others by discipline staff, and in others through the prison’s risk management meetings. We saw several examples of relevant licence conditions being included appropriately.

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) In all but one prison there appeared to be good links between the OMU and internal risk management processes, aided by co-location of the OMU and public protection staff in some instances.
- (b) Although all the prisons gave appropriate priority to public protection issues, the OASys RoH reviews did not drive this process. Where issues were identified in the prisons’ internal risk management meetings and/or by public protection staff, the OMU had a crucial role in ensuring this information was fed back to the

offender manager to inform ongoing planning. It was not always clear what systems were in place to ensure that the OMU received relevant information. In one prison, links with public protection staff were limited; OMU staff were concerned that relevant information did not always pass through them as they were not involved in internal risk management meetings.

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) In all the establishments holding in-scope prisoners, prison staff attended MAPPA meetings in the community where needed. In one instance, OMU staff identified potential duplication where both the offender supervisor and prison public protection staff attended the same meeting.
- (b) One prison indicated that OMU staff were not always advised of MAPPA meetings whilst the offender was still in custody and they had, appropriately, raised the matter with the probation area concerned.

4.1f Specific Criterion:

An appropriate strategic contribution is made to public protection.

Finding:

- (a) Strategic links to MAPPA were made at prison area management level; area staff attended MAPPA SMBs within their locality and senior managers from individual prisons were not represented. This contrasted with the contribution of other MAPPA 'Responsible Authority' bodies such as probation areas or the police, both of whom were represented at senior management level on the SMB in their locality. This made effective use of resources (as some prisons held offenders from all over the country) but strategic links for prisons at probation and police area level were consequently more limited.

4.3b Specific Criterion:

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

Findings:

- (a) Public protection issues, including RoH to others, had a clear priority within all the prisons; internal risk management processes were resourced appropriately and staff were enabled to attend MAPPA meetings in the community.
- (b) As noted earlier in the report, the accurate identification of offenders

within the scope of the offender management model had proved challenging for some prisons in the initial stages, thus making it difficult to allocate proportionate resources. This was particularly the case for PPOs, where it was not possible to assess who fell within this category without information from police or probation, as identification was locally defined through CDRPs. The position had improved as prisons were now able, on a routine basis, to cross-reference their database with the national PPO database, J-Track, to reveal the locality of all PPOs in custody. Some prisons did use J-Track to identify their PPOs, and, as noted earlier, one establishment had a PPO tracker officer who worked across the prison and the community to ensure PPOs were properly identified and received a priority service to reduce their likelihood of reoffending.

Summary

Public protection issues had a clear priority within the prisons. Generally, there were appropriate links between the OMU and internal risk management processes in the prisons, aided in some instances by co-location of the OMU and public protection staff within establishments. It was not always clear, though, what systems were in place to ensure that OMU staff received all relevant information from the prisons' internal risk management processes. The OASys (where completed) was not always seen as a key document in terms of public protection issues. Some keyworkers were unfamiliar with its classification of RoH and used their own criteria to assess RoH, which was a matter of concern. Prison-based staff contributed to MAPPAs meetings in the community where needed. At strategic level, links with MAPPAs were undertaken through prison area management staff; prison senior managers were not represented on MAPPAs SMBs in the same way as their counterparts in police and probation areas. Accurate identification of PPOs in particular had proved challenging for some prisons, making it difficult to allocate appropriate resources, but better systems to access the national PPO database were now in place.

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) In some prisons, good links were noted between the prison and victim contact units in probation areas, and with police domestic abuse units, which promoted victim safety. We also found some positive examples of OMU staff working to ensure that victims were not harassed by offenders in custody.
- (b) Mostly, it was public protection staff in prisons who handled the mail and telephone monitoring of offenders who posed a potential risk to those outside in the community. Where there were good links between these staff and the OMU, this worked effectively. However, in some establishments where those links were limited, offender supervisors had less of a role in promoting victim safety. This was a concern for offender supervisors themselves, who thought that they needed to be more involved. It indicated a need for OMU staff to have a higher profile within internal risk management processes in some prisons, as they were the offender manager's 'eyes and ears' in the custodial setting and needed relevant information to ensure victim safety.

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 three prisons, the Sycamore Tree programme was run through the chaplaincy. This was a victim awareness programme that used restorative justice principles. The content was covered in six sessions designed to enable offenders to understand the impact of their crime on victims, families and the community. It also encouraged them to accept personal responsibility for their actions and pointed to the need to make amends. Surrogate victims came into prison to tell their stories. At the end of the programme, offenders were given the opportunity to take part in symbolic acts of restitution, taking the first step towards making amends for their past behaviour. The programme was available to all regardless of

faith, gender or age and was presented by trained Prison Fellowship staff and volunteers.

- (b) Some accredited programmes included victim awareness more generally, but in the main this was seen as an issue for offender managers to follow through rather than for OMU staff.
- (c) At one prison, there was a restorative justice project which involved regular conferences with victims.
- (d) 27% of offenders in our survey said that victim awareness work had been undertaken with them whilst they were in custody and 25% had found this useful. Whilst this was encouraging, there was considerable room for improvement.

Summary

There were good links in some prisons with police domestic abuse units and probation victim contact units. Victim safety issues were predominantly handled through prison risk management processes, with limited involvement of offender supervisors in some cases. A higher profile for OMU staff was needed in some prisons to ensure that they had the relevant information to promote victim safety from custody. Some victim awareness work was being undertaken in prisons through courses and accredited programmes, though in the main this was seen as being the role of the offender manager to follow through. Over a quarter of offenders in our survey indicated that victim awareness work had been undertaken with them and most of these had found it useful.

APPENDIX 1
Prisons inspected in this area

HMP Reading	
Task of the establishment	Closed young offender institution and remand centre, holding convicted, sentenced and remanded young adult male prisoners aged between 18 and 21
Area organisation	South Central
Number held	268
Certified normal accommodation	190
Operational capacity	297
Date visited	22 May 2007
Number in scope of Phase II	24
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	June 2004
Brief history	Reading was built in 1844 on the site of a small jail. It was designated as a local prison in 1973 and was re-roled as a remand centre and young offender institution in 1992. In 2001, criticism of Reading led to its establishment, along with HMP Leicester, being the first to be selected to meet the challenge of performance testing. Improvements were assessed to have been made and a five-year service level agreement was awarded in April 2003
Description of residential units	A, B and C wings – main Victorian wings containing single and double accommodation cells Separated prisoner unit – located beneath B wing Kennett Unit – 20 bed resettlement unit

HMP Canterbury	
Task of the establishment	Canterbury has been a foreign national establishment since 2006
Area organisation	Kent & Sussex
Number held	284

Certified normal accommodation	196
Operational capacity	284
Date visited	14 August 2007
Number in scope of Phase II	None
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	September 2004
Brief history	The prison lies close to the centre of Canterbury and dates from 1808. Originally, it was a 'county gaol' serving local courts. The prison was re-roled from a local to category C on 30 March 2003. In 2006, it became a foreign national prison
Description of residential units	There are three wings: A wing accommodates 142 prisoners, B wing 96 and C wing 46

HMP Lewes	
Task of the establishment	Lewes is a category B male local prison holding adult remand and convicted prisoners and remand young adults, serving the courts of East and West Sussex
Area organisation	Kent & Sussex
Number held	526
Certified normal accommodation	458
Operational capacity	558
Date visited	21 August 2007
Number in scope of Phase II	45
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	August 2005
Brief history	Lewes was used as a centre for young offenders throughout the 1940s and 1950s. It was briefly a borstal in 1963. In the early 1970s, it became a training prison with a lifer wing. In 1990, it became a local prison housing mainly short-term and remand prisoners
Description of residential units	The prison has three residential wings (A, B and C)

	leading from the centre. Below A and C wings are K and G wings, which comprise the first-night centre and a small unit for vulnerable prisoners. F wing is a free-standing residential block. There is also a type three healthcare centre located in a separate building in the prison grounds
--	---

HMP Woodhill	
Task of the establishment	HMP Woodhill is a local prison. It also holds category A prisoners, has a close supervision centre, housing some of the most difficult prisoners in the system, and a protected witness unit
Area organisation	High Security Directorate but also linked to the South Central Area
Number held	807
Certified normal accommodation	641
Operational capacity	807
Date visited	4 September 2007
Number in scope of Phase II	102
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	August 2005
Brief history	HMP Woodhill was opened in 1992. It started as a local prison, but in the late 1990s took on a high security role as a core local prison
Description of residential units	<p>The prison has a first-night centre and six house blocks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> House block 1 category A unit and adults House block 2 young people's unit House block 3 drug strategy House block 4 vulnerable prisoners and adults House block 5 induction House block 6 protected witness unit, close supervision centre and category A prisoners

HMP Albany	
Task of the establishment	HMP Albany is a category B training prison
Area organisation	South Central
Number held	522
Certified normal accommodation	530
Operational capacity	529
Date visited	13 November 2007
Number in scope of Phase II	200
Number in scope of Phase III	Not applicable at the time of the inspection
Last HMI Prisons inspection	October 2005
Brief history	HMP Albany occupies the site of a former military barracks on the outskirts of Newport, Isle of Wight, and was designed and built as a category C training prison in the early 1960s. Security was subsequently upgraded, and from 1970 to 1992 Albany was part of the dispersal system. Before January 1998, it held 50% vulnerable prisoners, with the remainder on normal location; it now holds 80% sex offenders. In recent years, several services have been clustered between the three prisons on the Isle of Wight (Albany, Camp Hill and Parkhurst) and there is a project in progress to look at the suitability of clustering all three prisons
Description of residential units	There are five original accommodation units (A to E wings), identical in design and all located off one main corridor. Each wing contains four floors, with three spurs of eight cells on each floor. The first floor has only two spurs of prisoner living accommodation (with a total of 16 cells), as the third spur is for staff offices. A modern unit (F and G wings) opened in May 2003 and houses up to 80 prisoners

HMP Bullingdon	
Task of the establishment	HMP Bullingdon is a category C local training prison for convicted and unconvicted adult male prisoners. It serves courts in Oxfordshire and Berkshire but also holds significant numbers from the London area
Area organisation	South Central

Number held	953
Certified normal accommodation	767
Operational capacity	943
Date visited	15 January 2008
Number in scope of Phase II	123
Number in scope of Phase III	Figure not available
Last HMI Prisons inspection	Full unannounced: September 2002. Short follow-up: June 2004
Brief history	Bullington Community Prison was built in the late 1980s and early 1990s and opened in February 1992. It was built with four cellular blocks based around the same T-shaped design of three spurs, each with three landings off a central office complex. Each unit can hold 190 prisoners apart from Blackthorn, which can hold 197. Edgcott unit was added in April 1998. It is an L-shaped quick-build unit with two spurs each with two landings. It can hold up to 181 prisoners. Extensive building work is ongoing to provide a refurbished reception, new unit and ancillary building
Description of residential units	<p>Arcott: remand and convicted prisoners; carries out resettlement programmes</p> <p>Blackthorn: remand and convicted prisoners</p> <p>Charndon: training unit; carries out drug strategy</p> <p>Dorton: training unit, plus prisoner support unit for prisoners who can not cope on normal location</p> <p>Edgcott: training unit, plus self-contained unit for vulnerable prisoners carrying out the SOTP</p> <p>Healthcare: 24-hour facility with spaces for 15 in-patients</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 978-1-84099-148-2