OFFENDER MANAGEMENT INSPECTION

A joint inspection by HM Inspectorates of Probation and Prisons

A report on offender management arrangements in custodial institutions in the Yorkshire & Humberside Region of England

May 2008

Criminal Justice Joint Inspection

FOREWORD

Considerable progress has been made in implementing offender management with evidence of positive engagement between prisons and probation areas at all levels. All prisons have established offender management units as required, but their work was not always governed by clear contracts or well understood across prison departments. Operational pressures to deploy staff beyond the unit were a consistent feature affecting the delivery of services to offenders. The extension of the model to prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection had yet to be fully achieved, and the impact of the model on diverse groups had not been fully assessed.

Significant efforts had been made by prisons to support attendance at, and contribution to, sentence planning meetings and this reflected the commitment and enthusiasm of staff to making offender management a reality. However, the Offender Assessment System had yet to be fully recognised as the primary planning and assessment tool and as the mechanism for helping to assess the demand for interventions. Similarly, we found that the work to manage Risk of Harm to others was not well integrated with the overall assessment and planning process.

ANDREW BRIDGES
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

ANNE OWERS
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

BME	Black and Ethnic Minority
CARAT	Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice and Throughcare
DIP	Drug Intervention Programme
ETS	Enhanced Thinking Skills
HDC	Home Detention Curfew
HMI Prisons	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
HMI Probation	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
IDTS	Integrated Drug Treatment System
IEP	Incentive and earned privilege
IPP	Indeterminate public protection
LIDS	Local Inmate Database System
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
NPS	National Probation Service
OASys/eOASys	Offender Assessment System/electronic OASys
OM	Offender Manager
OMU	Offender Management Unit
PPO	Prolific and other priority offender
RoH	Risk of Harm
SMB	Strategic Management Board
VDT	Voluntary Drug Testing
ViSOR	Violent and Sex Offenders Register
YOT	Youth Offending Team

RECOMMENDATIONS

Improvements are necessary as follows:

Area

1. a sufficient number of dedicated offender supervisors are available to provide timely and ongoing support to prisoners in scope of offender management

2. sentence planning targets are used to sequence and guide the delivery of interventions and arrangements for monitoring the quality of plans are established

3. OASys is completed to the required standard prior to any sentence planning meeting; improvement actions from quality assurance procedures are implemented

4. internal risk management meetings are linked to the OASys RoH assessment and management plan. Outcomes from meetings are appropriately recorded and communicated to all relevant staff

5. increased priority is given to the delivery of victim awareness work.

National

1. contracts and service level agreements between prisons and probation areas contain clear expectations of offender management and expected outcomes are explicitly documented and monitored

2. work with prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection is fully integrated into offender management

3. an equalities impact assessment is undertaken on offender management in all prisons.

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 Crime and Reduction Partnerships as PPOs. Prisons were required to set up OMUs by September 2006 and to deliver the offender supervisor role in custody. Prison area managers indicated that, in the early stage of resource determination, it had been hard to identify exactly what the needs were going to be and how these related to the existing resources, for example probation departments within prisons or prison staff already involved in assessment and sentence planning. It was also noted that it had not always been clear to prisons at the start which offenders were included in the model, particularly in respect of those who were foreign nationals. There had been issues for area managers about the phased implementation of the model as this, in effect, required prisons to run two separate systems; one for those within scope of the model at the different stages, and one for other offenders. This had led to decisions in some prisons to include more offenders within the work of OMUs than were in scope at the time. This would have challenged the resourcing capacity of probation areas in England and Wales that 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 joins 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 and Wales, depending on the offender's home area.

Methodology

During the inspection we meet with:

- **OMU practitioners** (offender supervisors and case administrators). This meeting is designed to provide inspectors with representative views about the front line operation of offender management
- **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 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

There was evidence of positive engagement between prisons and probation areas at all levels in both organisations. Significant efforts had been made by prisons to increase the contribution and attendance levels at sentence planning meetings and this was starting to have a positive effect. There was still some way to go to improve the accessibility of IT, including video conferencing to maximise efficient joint communication. Strategic links were in place in most areas. However, these were not sufficiently focused on monitoring offender management outcomes.

Offender management model

All prisons had an OMU established although, in some prisons, the strategic rationale for the structure of units was unclear. Implementation of the model against a rising prison population had put considerable pressures on resources and, in some establishments, this was hindering the capacity of the offender supervisor to work productively with prisoners to achieve sentence plan outcomes. In general, offender supervisors had a well developed understanding of their role, and there was much enthusiasm for the model of co-location where the OMU was linked to other prison departments central to offender management. The knowledge of other prison staff to offender management was not well understood and there was duplication in the work of offender supervisors and personal officers in particular. Induction arrangements were in place across all prisons but there was variable input from OMU staff. The majority of offenders knew who their offender manager and offender supervisor were. However, the deployment of uniformed staff to other tasks and the lack of involvement of relevant prison staff were undermining the application of the model.

Sentence planning

Considerable progress had been made in delivering sentence planning boards within the nationally prescribed time scales and gaining a contribution from the offender manager either in writing or in person. The extent to which other prison staff were involved in sentence planning meetings was variable and this potentially limited positive reinforcement of key interventions. A high number of offenders had had the opportunity to discuss their sentence plan and most found this useful. Further work was needed to ensure that views were consistently obtained from offenders to inform future offender management development. Across the prisons there was little evidence of quality assurance processes for sentence planning.

Sentence planning delivery

Induction was well established and all prisons had arrangements to deliver basic skills screening. Sentence planning was not always the driving force behind the sequencing of interventions, and ongoing contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was limited. Only a third of prisoners had discussed their sentence plan with their offender manager, and many did not feel supported by them whilst in custody. All prisons offered a range of interventions although there were gaps in key interventions, the most common being domestic abuse programmes. Timely access to accredited programmes was being hindered by long waiting lists and pressures on the prison

population as a whole meant that transfer to other establishments was problematic. Most offenders did not think their offending behaviour had been successfully challenged. While most prisons had conducted a needs analysis, few had made use of aggregated OASys data.

OASys

The insufficient quality of completed OASys was impacting on the management of prisoners and on staff time. The difference in the assessment of RoH in the community and in the custodial environment was a particular issue. OASys was not routinely being used as the main assessment tool and contributions from other staff were missed. Although quality assurance systems were in place in all establishments, there was less evidence that the key areas identified for improvement had been responded to.

Offender engagement

There were some examples that staff had given consideration to the most effective methods of engaging with offenders. However, these tended to be limited to education, training and employment interventions and accredited programmes. There was less focus on how an offender supervisor would engage with offenders to aid compliance with the sentence plan objectives aside from attendance at planning boards. Just over half of offenders felt sentence planning took account of their individual needs. Procedures for managing offenders who had been recalled varied across establishments, and in two prisons OMU staff were not sufficiently informed of recall decisions.

Diversity

The management of diversity issues had insufficient profile. There was some evidence of services and resources being dedicated to work with minority groups, but this was not consistent. Prisons needed to ensure that they were paying appropriate attention to issues of disability. Overall, there was a need to ensure that all prisons had undertaken an equality impact assessment on the implementation of offender management.

Public protection

RoH and MAPPA classifications were, in most cases, clearly identified although not always consistently communicated to staff. We found evidence in two prisons of inconsistent management of IPP prisoners. Further work was needed to ensure the specific needs of this group were being appropriately addressed. All prisons had procedures in place to manage the ongoing planning for RoH and child safeguarding issues. While we were pleased to see that this important area had been given priority, the processes for communicating the outcomes from meetings to offender supervisors and offender managers needed formalising to ensure a consistent approach. Furthermore, the links between the internal risk management meetings and the OASys RoH assessment and management plan were underdeveloped. Offender supervisors did not always contribute to the setting of licence conditions; the scope for them to contribute to MAPPA meetings was better. Not all prisons had strategic links to MAPPA SMBs and representation at child safeguarding boards was underdeveloped.

Victims

There were adequate procedures to protect victims, managed through the internal risk management meetings. Opportunities were being missed to integrate victim protection into the wider role of offender management. There was some evidence of direct victim awareness work being delivered, but this was not seen as a key role of the offender supervisor. Specific victim-focused interventions were a gap in almost all prisons inspected.

SHARING GOOD PRACTICE

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

Delivery of the sentence plan: provision of interventions **OMI Criterion: 2.1**	In HMP Askham Grange, arrangements had been made for the local probation area to manage the delivery of accredited programmes. Programmes could take place either on prison or probation premises and provision extended to the evening. This enabled those offenders in work to access evening programmes. This was a promising arrangement that provided greater flexibility and access to a broader range of programmes.

SERVICE USERS' PERSPECTIVE

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

In order to obtain a user perspective on short follow-up inspections, where prisoner surveys are not routinely conducted, 130 offender management questionnaires were distributed to a random selection of prisoners under offender management arrangements. The table below details the responses received from each inspection.

Prison	No. in sample	No. of responses	Response rate (%)
Askham Grange	5	5	100
Hull	25	22	88
New Hall	25	20	80
Wakefield	25	20	80
Wealstun	25	23	92
Everthorpe	25	22	88
Total	**130**	**112**	**80**

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

six offenders said they were under the age of 21 years

22 stated they were from a black or minority ethnic group

16 reported that they were foreign nationals

11 were on recall to prison

27 self-identified as having a disability

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

Just under half of those surveyed had had help with contacting family and emotional wellbeing on arrival in custody. While 53% reported problems with housing, only 9% had actually been given help in this area.

Most offenders had attended an induction course on arrival. Just over half said that the course had provided them with sufficient information about the prison regime and services available to them.

Three-quarters of offenders surveyed had a sentence plan and over two-thirds had been involved in its development with a high number attending meetings to discuss the content. Just over two-thirds of those surveyed said that sentence planning meetings were attended by offender supervisors and offender managers. Attendance by prison staff and other agencies was low.

Most offenders knew who their offender manager and allocated offender supervisor were. While 79% had had visits from their offender manager, only a third felt sufficiently supported. Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners revealed a similar picture; 59% reported ongoing monthly contact but just over a third described this as useful.

Finding a job, accommodation and money/finances were the most common problems cited by offenders. Despite this, the amount of help given to address these problems whilst in custody was low. Only 10% of those surveyed felt they had been prepared for release.

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.

Finding:	(a)	Thirteen offenders indicated that they had felt suicidal or depressed when they first arrived in prison. Nineteen said they had been provided with help from a member of staff. This indicated that more offenders then those who had had an identified need at the start of sentence were given help. In one establishment, information on vulnerability was gained from LIDS, OASys and the initial reception form. Where there was a current assessment of care in custody and teamwork, a global e-mail was sent to the whole of the establishment. It was unclear from the other prisons inspected what information had been received from court or directly from the OMUs where there were concerns about risk of self-harm.

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)	Joint work to prepare offenders for release into the community was variable. While in one prison offender management had strengthened the assessment of post-release needs, in others the assessment of resettlement needs conducted at induction was not routinely followed up. This meant that it was difficult to determine whether progress had been made and what had been achieved. This was also the case in those establishments where there were dedicated resettlement officers. In two establishments a process for completing a summary of resettlement needs had been developed. However, neither prison used the summary at key points in the sentence or linked work to prepare offenders for release sufficiently to other aspects of sentence management. Of those prisoners surveyed 90% stated that they had not received help from a member of staff in preparation for release.
	(b)	There was evidence of significant efforts made by some establishments to develop links with the community. Resettlement managers from one prison attended a wide range of criminal justice and other community bodies involved in reducing reoffending initiatives. We found one example where a prison had created a full-time community partnership coordinator post whose main role was the development of initiatives aimed at improving resettlement opportunities in the reducing reoffending pathways. In another, an accommodation officer held most of the cases with complex housing

needs and was able to work with offender managers where there were specific RoH issues that impacted on move on accommodation. There was the potential for this arrangement to facilitate improved resettlement.

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) The quality of relationships between prisons and offender managers was generally described as positive. Not surprisingly, local prisons had developed better relationships with those probation areas/trusts that were nearest to them. Being able to access a probation area's internal case management system and attendance at community-based team meetings were processes described by staff that had helped to improve communication and to foster working relationships.

(b) We saw evidence that prison staff were actively encouraging offender manager attendance at sentence planning boards, and this was starting to bear fruit with some establishments reporting better involvement in the custodial element of the sentence. We saw one example of an information exchange protocol setting out how information would be shared (i.e. use of common forms), supported by an information pack detailing contact arrangements that was sent to offender managers. In another, the Head of Interventions and Programmes had provided several dates for post-programme review meetings to encourage offender managers to attend.

(c) In one prison, visits by offender managers for the purposes of reviewing the OASys and sentence planning were being limited and offender managers were completing both processes in one visit. Whilst this was a pragmatic approach, we were concerned that it had the potential to undermine the principle that the assessment determined the targets/objectives in sentence plans.

(d) With the exception of one prison, strategic links had been established between establishments and the relevant probation area. Service level agreements and contracts were mostly in place and were monitored through regular meetings. The agreements tended to be related to resources rather than offender management outcomes and therefore monitoring of outcomes wasn't always possible.

(e) Efforts had been made in some establishments to provide joint training. For example, in one prison the Head of Public Protection and the local probation area public protection coordinator were responsible for providing training on MAPPA and the case administrator role.

(f) In one high security establishment the line of accountability was

direct to area management of the high security estate. The impact of this was we could not see a good link between this establishment and regional work on the development of offender management strategy.

(g) The use of IT systems to promote better relationships was variable. In two prisons concerted efforts had been made to ensure that staff had appropriate access to ViSOR; in one, four prison staff had been trained to access VISOR and two computers where this system was available had been provided. Video conferencing was not consistently made available to support offender management and practical difficulties meant that, even when in place, this resource was not fully utilised. This had the effect of inhibiting offender manager engagement in sentence planning.

Summary

There was evidence of positive engagement between prisons and probation areas at all levels in both organisations. Significant efforts had been made by prisons to increase the contribution and attendance levels at sentence planning meetings and this was starting to have a positive effect. There was still some way to go to improve the accessibility of IT, including video conferencing to maximise efficient joint communication. Strategic links were in place in most areas. However, these were not sufficiently focused on monitoring offender management outcomes.

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) Most offender supervisors we interviewed had a well developed understanding of their role in relation to offender management. Almost all the establishments inspected had uniformed and probation staff working as offender supervisors. On the whole, this approach to staffing the units worked well, but in two establishments, staff expressed frustration that uniformed staff had wider responsibilities than just the offender supervisor role - this meant that they were often deployed to other activities related to the prison regime.

(b) In at least four of the establishments, job descriptions were in place for the offender supervisor role. The extent to which the roles and responsibilities of OMU staff were understood by other departments was variable. This was especially noticeable between personal officers and offender supervisors. In one prison, staff responsible for managing resettlement pathways also had a role in supporting offenders at sentence planning boards; this was a duplication of roles with the offender supervisor. Key workers were not always familiar with the role and responsibilities of the OMU although the effort made in one prison to communicate information about the new model to all keyworkers was seen as beneficial. We saw an example where CARATs had developed a local protocol for information exchange and used a form to improve liaison with offender managers and to better inform resettlement decisions.

(c) The allocation of individual prisoners to offender supervisors varied considerably. Probation officers working as offender supervisors tended to manage those prisoners assessed as a high or very high RoH or IPP, including oversight of OASys completion. Allocation to prison staff offender supervisors tended to be based on numbers and capacity as opposed to skills and experiences.

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) Transferring prisoners to undertake interventions in line with sentence plan objectives was problematic even where offender

categorisation and allocation was integrated with, or linked to, offender management units. We came across numerous examples of the problems faced by prisons in this regard. In one of the female establishments, staff reported that transfers to other prisons were affected by insufficient notice or inappropriate allocation. Overall, the movement of prisoners was seen as a complex area of work because of population pressures and a range of other drivers for movement than OM. Movement of prisoners was not always communicated promptly to offender managers.

(b) Despite the difficulties in transferring prisoners, 66% of those surveyed said that there were plans for them to achieve all or some of their sentence plan targets in the prison they were currently held in. Just over a third had indicated that they would achieve some of their sentence plan objectives in another prison.

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) In the main, offenders were held in the establishment appropriate to their categorisation. In one prison we came across an example of an IPP prisoner being held under category C conditions for over a year despite being a category D prisoner.

2.4c Specific Criterion:
For all offenders, there is a comprehensive and timely induction promptly after sentence or release.

Findings:

(a) Arrangements for inducting prisoners were established in all prisons. A variety of assessment tools was used, including those that were structured against the seven resettlement pathways. Induction processes were also geared towards identifying protective factors at the earliest opportunity. It was not always clear the extent to which information from these assessments had been informed by the OASys. Staff who we spoke to stated that there was scope to increase the communication links between the induction process and the OMU.

(b) In one prison, offender management had been integrated into the induction process and offenders were given the opportunity to talk with staff from the OMU and to receive information about offender management. Offenders were allocated to an offender supervisor at the earliest opportunity and public protection issues were also assessed. In two prisons there was a clear approach to integrating the role of key workers into the induction process so as to respond to immediate needs. In one, a 'passport' system had been created in

which assessments of accommodation, employment, drug misuse and mental health issues were carried out when the prisoner arrived. In this prison, information from the induction process was stored electronically and could be accessed immediately by all staff.

(c) 56% of prisoners surveyed stated that they had attended an induction course within the first week and 30% after more than one week at the establishment. 14% said that they had not attended an induction course. 59% felt that the induction course had covered everything they needed to know about the prison.

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.

Finding:

(a) There was some evidence that the individual resource allocated to a case was consistent with the offender's RoH status and other offending-related needs. Most establishments allocated probation offender supervisors to manage IPP prisoners, whereas prison offender supervisors worked with determinate sentence prisoners. The consistent identification and prioritisation of PPOs was less well evidenced; in one establishment staff were unaware of the requirement to provide this group of offenders with a 'premium' service.

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

Findings:

(a) 89% of prisoners in the survey said they had a named offender manager and 77% had had contact from their offender manager since receiving a prison sentence. A sizeable majority (79%) of the contacts had been through official visits.

(b) There appeared to be few systems in place to monitor continuity of offender management although staff were able to describe where this happened. Where prisoners were allocated to a team rather than an individual, there was less scope for prisoners to build a relationship with one person. Ongoing contact levels between prisoners and offender supervisors differed, with some offender supervisors not seeing prisoners within the national standard timescale; this was sometimes delayed by inadequate procedures to identify whether a prisoner was in scope. 74% of prisoners we surveyed indicated that they had an offender supervisor and just over half of respondents stated that they had had monthly contact. It was concerning that 38% indicated that they had never seen their offender supervisor. Whilst a high proportion of those surveyed knew they had an offender manager and had had some contact with them, just over a third of prisoners had discussed their sentence plan with their offender manager and nearly two-thirds did not think

they had been supported by their offender manager whilst in custody. 34% of prisoners had experienced a change in offender manager although little is known of the impact of this.

4.3a Specific Criterion:
Resources are deployed appropriately and used well to support effective offender management.

Findings:

(a) In all prisons, resources allocated to the implementation of the offender management model were based on a desktop exercise. Although this had provided them with a starting point, in some prisons the exercise had underestimated the number of cases that the OMU would be dealing with, and this was compounded in establishments where there were staff vacancies. Not all establishments had a clear workforce plan to manage increased numbers of prisoners in scope of offender management and the subsequent work. In at least three establishments, strategic leaders commented that the OMU was considered under-resourced to meet the needs of in scope prisoners. The overall effect of this level of resource was reduced contact with prisoners.

(b) In two establishments, successful negotiations with unions meant that offender supervisors now worked office hours as opposed to shifts. In another, the staff profile of the OMU was protected and the general perception of staff was that this had been an improvement. We had concerns that uniformed staff were deployed to other duties; in one prison, offender supervisors were spending around half of their time on offender management tasks and in some cases less. The required standards of offender management were being compromised.

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) An OMU had been established in all prisons. Most had appointed a mix of probation officers and uniformed staff in order to maximise external communication with local probation areas/trusts and to create a more integrated approach. Staff commented positively on the co-located and integrated approach. The links with other prison departments central to offender management varied considerably across the six establishments and did not always work efficiently to support work with offenders. Coordination of work was sometimes hindered by the OMU being located separately. We saw examples of the public protection unit and resettlement unit being combined, while in others they operated separately.

(b) The organisation of OMUs in the prisons inspected varied and was not always based on a clear rationale. In only one establishment was there evidence that the resettlement policy had given rise to a model of using a team-based approach; offender supervisors and case administrators worked together to manage a particular prisoner's sentence rather than as individuals. In two prisons the rationale for the structure of the OMU was less clear and not linked to offender management outcomes and, in one of them, offender management had evolved as a response to growing numbers in scope, as opposed to a planned development.

(c) We inspected one high security establishment and one open prison. In the case of the high security establishment, the profile of the prisoner population meant that all prisoners were seen as a priority within the offender management model. A similar approach had been adopted by the open prison, where resettlement and case management had historically been key features of the regime. The strict entry criteria of the open estate meant that prisoners were generally assessed as a low RoH, resulting in low numbers that were in scope for offender management. Both of these establishments highlighted the difficulty in operating two systems to manage prisoners i.e. those in scope and those not in scope. They had chosen to implement offender management across the prison population as a way of managing the prisoner profile in their establishment.

(d) There was a variety of ways in which the recording of work with prisoners was managed. We found examples of case records compiled differently, and information held in different places and different formats. The lack of an accessible single recording system in some establishments impacted negatively on the notification of important information.

(e) Staff in offender management units were managed differently, sometimes by prison staff and sometimes by probation staff. In two establishments there were no formal structures for team meetings and, although the probation offender supervisors received monthly supervision that included case management reviews, this did not extend to prison staff. The oversight of work and management of skills development was less well evidenced amongst the latter staff group. The impact of this on the work of the OMU was unclear at the time of inspection.

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) All offender supervisors interviewed were clear about their role in delivering offender management. The role of other residential staff and their contribution to the model was less clear. Most key workers

we interviewed had developed an understanding of the principles of the model. However, their contribution was often hindered by insufficient communication between the two staff groups, compounded by non-attendance at sentence planning boards and, in some cases, the lack of appropriate access to key documents, such as OASys and sentence plans.

(b)   In all but one prison there was a clear line of accountability for the work of the offender management unit. In one establishment the line of accountability was confused with staff reporting to a line manager with a different specialist function – this meant that the line manager did not have a sufficient understanding about the work of their staff.

Summary

All prisons had an OMU established although, in some prisons, the strategic rationale for the organisation for units was unclear. Implementation of the model against a rising prison population had put considerable pressures on resources and, in some establishments, this was hindering the capacity of the offender supervisor to work productively with prisoners to achieve sentence plan outcomes. In general, offender supervisors had a well developed understanding of their role, and there was much enthusiasm for the model of co-location and where the OMU was linked to other prison departments central to offender management. The knowledge and contribution of other prison staff to offender management was problematic and there was overlap in the role of offender supervisors and personal officers in particular. Induction arrangements were in place across all prisons but there was variable input from OMU staff. The majority of offenders knew who their offender manager and offender supervisor were. However, the deployment of uniformed staff to other tasks and the lack of involvement of relevant prison staff were undermining the application of the model.

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) Arrangements were in place to hold sentence planning meetings in all establishments although the effectiveness of these varied. Most prisons had identified the number of weekly boards they needed to plan for and, despite difficulties in obtaining sufficient room space, they were fairly successful in securing the attendance of community offender managers in sentence planning. In general, offender supervisors supported this way of working and some commented that they felt it supported greater team work. 77% of the prisoners we surveyed said they knew they had a sentence plan. In one prison, arrangements to hold sentence planning boards within the first two weeks of the prisoners' arrival and then again six weeks later, when the offender manager would be invited, meant that prisoners had an early opportunity to meet with their offender supervisor and offender manager. There was the potential for this to have early and tangible benefits for the prisoner and the prison although plans to manage the sentence were being driven by the prison rather than the OM.

The extent to which offender managers chaired sentence planning boards was generally positive. In two establishments we were told that the level of attendance by offender managers was particularly high and, if offender managers were unable to attend, telephone conferencing was available or a request was made for written input.

(b) Where OASys was available this was used to inform the sentence planning process. In some instances sentence planning boards had taken place without a full OASys and it was concerning that the initial assessments of likelihood of reoffending and RoH were based on informal assessments at induction stage. In these cases the scope for OASys to drive sentence planning and other key activities was limited. Initial sentence plans and reviews seen on inspection showed that targets for offenders were focused on undertaking specific interventions, rather than the behaviour and attitudes that needed to be changed; this sometimes meant that the interventions provided were limited to those available in the prison and not always linked to the assessment of RoH and offending need. Work to reinforce interventions was often not included as a key target.

(c) As previously indicated, the involvement of other prison-based staff in sentence planning was variable. In one prison, key workers contributed to sentence planning meetings without exception, either through attendance or a written contribution, and all found this a useful information-sharing forum. In other establishments the

involvement of key workers and feedback to relevant staff was inconsistent and impacted adversely on their potential to offer reinforcement of learning or positive changes in behaviour.

31% of prisoners who responded to our survey indicated that staff from other prison departments attended sentence planning meetings.

(d) It was good to see that one prison had established a quality assurance process for sentence planning, although at the time of the inspection, the outcome from this process was unclear.

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) Of those offenders that indicated they had a sentence plan in our survey, 82% had had the opportunity to discuss these; 60% said that they found this useful. In all establishments, arrangements were in place to involve the prisoner in the sentence planning meeting. Where the prisoner was absent, it was unclear how the outcomes from the meeting were communicated. There was also limited evidence of how prisoner views were being used to inform and improve offender management.

Summary

Considerable progress had been made in delivering sentence planning boards within the nationally prescribed time scales and in gaining a contribution from the offender manager either in writing or in person. The extent to which other prison staff were involved in sentence planning meetings was variable and potentially limited positive reinforcement of key interventions. A high number of offenders had had the opportunity to discuss their sentence plan and most had found this useful. Further work was needed to ensure that views were consistently obtained by offenders to inform future offender management development. Across the prisons there was little evidence of quality assurance processes for sentence planning.

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) Whilst sentence planning was driving the delivery and sequencing of some interventions, this was not the case across all establishments. Staff raised concerns with us about communication between the programmes unit and the OMU e.g. in one establishment this meant that programme managers/tutors decided when a prisoner would undertake a programme rather than when the sentence plan indicated that it needed to be done. We saw another example where access to programmes was related to the achievement of organisational targets rather than individual need or the principles of effective practice.

(b) In one open prison the provision of accredited programmes was managed by the local probation area with delivery taking place either on prison or probation premises. Evening groups could be provided for offenders who were in work. Another example involved the CARAT team linking women to DIP arrangements in the community if they could not be facilitated in the establishment. Staff acknowledged that there were many benefits to this approach, including access to a wide range of interventions and timely starts to programmes.

(c) Not all prisons had a robust method to analyse the needs of the prisoner profile. Examples included the use of an annual prisoner survey based solely on self-disclosure as opposed to any aggregated assessment data. Conversely, in another establishment no resettlement needs analysis had been completed to inform the interventions being offered. This meant that, while a wide range of interventions was available, it was not possible to establish whether these were appropriate to meet the needs of all prisoners being held. In four establishments a needs analysis had been undertaken, yet only one establishment had based their analysis on aggregated OASys data and this came closest to matching the needs profile of the population. The range of different methods used highlighted the complexity of monitoring prisoner needs and providing appropriate interventions against a rising population where there were frequent moves of prisoners.

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

Findings:

(a) Most establishments offered a range of interventions. However, there were gaps, mainly additional accredited programmes to address alcohol-related offending, domestic abuse and more general violent offending behaviour. At the time of the inspection one prison was not running any programmes under the effective regimes prison service order.

The extent to which information was shared between those who delivered interventions and the staff of the OMU differed across the prisons. In some prisons there were clear processes in place to provide the outcome of assessments to offender supervisors together with an expectation that they attend programme reviews. In other establishments there was limited attendance by offender supervisors at post-programme reviews.

(b) The number of prisoners who said their offending behaviour had been successfully challenged was low. Just under a third stated that staff members had helped them to address their offending behaviour, while 37% and 29% respectively said that they had received help with their thinking skills, such as impulsivity and attitudes to offending. Given these responses, it was surprising that 67 of the 105 prisoners surveyed stated that they were less likely to offend in the future.

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

Finding:

(a) All prisons had arrangements to deliver basic skills; 42% of prisoners surveyed recalled receiving a basic skills assessment within the first week in custody although, in one establishment, the result of the assessment was not routinely provided to those providing interventions. 34% of prisoners who responded to the survey had had help with basic skills.

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

Finding:

(a) Although accredited programmes were being delivered in all prisons, there were issues with accessibility and long waiting lists. While

some OMUs worked proactively to transfer offenders to start courses in other prisons, this was often hindered by high population pressures. As indicated earlier, this was having an impact on the extent to which sentence plan outcomes could be sequenced and realised. In a prison that was resourced to deliver 60 ETS starts, there were 100 prisoners on the waiting list. The length of time prisoners were required to wait to start this programme was determined by release dates although there was evidence of IPP prisoners being prioritised for interventions.

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) All prisons had arrangements for induction on arrival at the prison and these included additional assessments in line with the seven reducing reoffending pathways. Some establishments offered a 'surgery' type approach where offenders were provided with information on a range of services. Where the OMU was not integrated into induction processes, staff commented that information was not routinely shared with them, including the outcomes from information, advice and guidance assessments. Several establishments had invested heavily in encouraging community agencies to provide interventions in prisons, thus strengthening offenders' links with the community and providing a degree of continuity before and after release.

(b) In one prison, work was in progress to increase the engagement of families with the prisoners' sentence. This had led to the development of family days, where the families of prisoners were invited into the establishment and provided with the opportunity to learn more about the prison regime and the different interventions prisoners would be required to undergo. As an early development there was the potential for this to reinforce the work of the prison and maximise offenders' compliance with interventions.

Summary

Induction was well established and all prisons had arrangements to deliver basic skills screening. Sentence planning was not always the driving force behind the sequencing of interventions and ongoing contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was limited. Only a third of prisoners had discussed their sentence plan with their offender manager and many did not feel supported by them whilst in custody. All prisons offered a range of interventions although there were gaps in key interventions, the most common being domestic abuse programmes. Timely access to accredited programmes was being hindered by long waiting lists and, pressures on the prison population as a whole meant that transfer to other establishments was problematic. Most offenders did not think their offender behaviour had been successfully challenged. While most prisons had conducted a needs analysis, few had made use of aggregated OASys data.

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)   OASYS was not consistently used as the main tool for assessing offender needs and RoH to others. Where different assessments had been used at the point of induction, these were not always used to inform and update OASys. In one establishment, key workers could access the OASys but could not contribute to it. Overall, the benefits of using a range of information to validate or inform the OASys assessment were not being fully realised.

(b)   Access to OASys was problematic in one prison where concerns expressed by OMU staff about the number of prisoners arriving without a completed OASys and where the quality of the information was not satisfactory. In some cases the information had not been sufficiently updated, whilst in others the detail of the assessments was insufficient.

Concerns about the quality of RoH assessments were expressed by some staff. We were told that RoH assessments completed by prison-based staff were not always comprehensive. Additionally, offender managers' assessments sometimes lacked sufficient detail in plans to address RoH to prisoners and prison staff. Confidentiality issues were also cited as an issue during the inspection; staff from one OMU stated that offender managers were putting information in the OASys that should not be disclosed to the offender but were not always informing prison staff of this. This meant that, in one establishment,

offender supervisors were tasked to redo the assessments that were incomplete. Additionally, when an offender manager reviewed the OASys, they did not always routinely notify prison staff. This was further complicated by continued issues with OASys connectivity and ownership.

(c) Quality assurance systems were in place in all prisons. Some had a process where probation offender supervisors countersigned completed OASys assessments. All probation officer offender supervisors were OASys trained but this had not extended to all prison staff in the offender supervisor role. In two establishments OASys assessments were audited by the psychology department and, across the Yorkshire and Humberside area, a benchmarking exercise had been undertaken as a means of ensuring consistency. A recent development in one high security establishment had led to the decision (November 2008) to quality assure assessments within the high security estate. Despite the range of systems used to assess OASys quality, processes were not always in place to address the key areas identified for improvement.

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.

Finding:

(a) Information from other agencies was not routinely being drawn upon to inform the OASys assessment. Information from other assessment tools, inconsistent attendance at sentence planning boards and difficulties in accessing relevant documentation meant that the opportunities to use fully valuable information on an offender's behaviour were being missed.

Summary

The insufficient quality of completed OASys was impacting on the management of prisoners and on staff time. The difference in the assessment of RoH in the community and in the custodial environment was a particular issue. OASys was not routinely being used as the main assessment tool and contributions from other staff were missed. Although quality assurance systems were in place in all establishments, there was less evidence that the key areas identified for improvement had been responded to.

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) All prisons provided an initial basic skills screening as part of an offender's induction. In one prison, learning difficulties were highlighted in the assessment but there was no specialist provision to address these. In another, literacy and numeracy issues (if not already completed and recorded in OASys) were picked up at induction, and a system was in place to provide a diagnostic assessment and intervention where the offender was assessed as a Level 2.

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) Overall, while there was some evidence that consideration had been paid to the how staff could best engage with offenders, this tended to be driven by key worker staff and focused on retaining compliance on programmes and in encouraging take up of education. There was less evidence that the assessment of offender engagement had been integrated into sentence planning and delivery. In one establishment, a comprehensive needs assessment was conducted on arrival and forwarded to wing staff but not consistently used thereafter. Just over half of the offenders surveyed felt that their sentence plan took account of their individual needs.

1.4c Specific Criterion:
Offenders' intellectual ability, learning style, motivation and capacity to change are taken into account at the earliest opportunity.

Finding: (a) Across all prisons there was evidence that the offenders' educational ability had been taken account of at induction stage. 51% of those surveyed said they had received help with education during their sentence. There was limited evidence that an offenders' motivation to change or learning style was routinely assessed.

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.

Finding: (a)   Two of the prisons noted difficulties in the management of recalled prisoners. In one, prisoners were often sent to a local prison first so OMU staff were not always aware why they had been recalled. In the second, a copy of the letter sent to the prisoner explaining why they had been recalled was not systematically copied to the OMU. Often, in both these establishments, OMU staff had to contact the offender manager for information. Despite these difficulties, of the 10% of those surveyed who had been recalled, all stated that they had been informed of why they had been recalled to prison.

Summary

There were some examples of that staff had given consideration to the most effective methods of engaging with offenders. However, these tended to be limited to education, training and employment interventions and accredited programmes. There was less focus on how an offender supervisor would engage with offenders to aid compliance with the sentence plan objectives aside from attendance at planning boards. Just over half of offenders felt sentence planning took account of their individual needs. Procedures for managing offenders who had been recalled varied across establishments and, in two prisons, OMU staff were not sufficiently informed of recall decisions.

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.

Finding:

(a) The assessment of diversity needs tended to be conducted as part of initial induction arrangements. Not all diversity assessments were comprehensive and OASys was not always actively used as part of the process. In one establishment each specialist service would assess and make judgements about specific needs e.g. drug misuse or mental health. The lack of an integrated approach meant that diversity issues were not consistently and accurately reflected in sentence plans.

2.7a Specific Criterion:
Arrangements for interventions take account of offenders' diversity issues. Factors relating to disability, literacy and dyslexia are addressed.

Findings:

(a) Most, though not all, prisons were able to provide a range of examples of how interventions were adapted to meet individualised needs, such as using past group members as peers to help engage new prisoners or, where prisoners had special needs, providing materials in large print and coloured paper. In one establishment Age Concern had been brought in to assess and manage issues related to sight and hearing loss, the outcome of which was communicated to offender supervisors and offender managers. Some key workers and OMU staff highlighted the need to be more responsive to issues of physical disability, examples included the lack of support aids to facilitate offenders' attendance at interventions, and poor wheelchair access meant that one establishment was not Disability Discrimination Act compliant.

(b) In one of the female prisons there were examples of seeking individual community work placements for prisoners. While employment, training and education workers provided sessions on diversity and equality for prisoners in this establishment, these events were not delivered consistently nor linked clearly to interventions e.g. accredited programmes that were adapted to their need.

(c) Arrangements were made in some prisons to provide English for speakers of other languages classes for those prisoners who did not speak English before they attended programmes, and we saw an example of individual assessments conducted for two prisoners with

mental health problems in preparation for their attendance at ETS.

(d) 24% of those who were surveyed considered they had a disability. We found evidence in one prison of the use of a disability questionnaire to identify needs.

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

Finding:

(a) In most prisons there were arrangements for managing singleton placements in a group with the offenders' consent or by offering an alternative programme or providing additional support if required.

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) All prisons were required to collate information on race equality issues and this was clearly part of their strategic planning. While there were examples of prisons responding to a wider range of individual diversity needs, there was less evidence that this was integral to strategic planning to inform future service delivery. An example of this was a needs analysis undertaken in one establishment that provided a comprehensive analysis of general need against the resettlement pathways. However, it did not differentiate between the needs of the different groups held at that establishment. In a different prison, whilst general diversity issues were mentioned in the resettlement policy, there was limited reference to the specific needs of the increasing population of indeterminate sentence prisoners, nor the significant numbers of BME and Muslim prisoners. During our inspection we found evidence that only one establishment had completed a diversity impact assessment of the implementation of the offender management model.

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

Finding:

(a) There were some examples of prisons providing resources to support diversity initiatives, such as work to bring in local community groups to deliver interventions, but this was not extensive. In one female prison, a parenting programme had been specifically developed for those being held in the mother and baby unit. Additional support had also been provided to women with

children who had been released. It was good to see that specific links had been established with an accommodation project that worked with women released on HDC to gain suitable move on accommodation, and we were told that women who were released from the mother and baby unit were provided with a house, as opposed to a room.

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

Findings:

(a) Evidence of services developed to support work with minority groups was inconsistent. Most prisons had access to, and used, interpreters as appropriate; this sometimes included the use of members of staff and other prisoners who spoke other languages to explain key prison processes to offenders whose first language was not English. One prison had translated the OASys self-assessment questionnaire into 36 different languages. While in one prison the needs of older people were addressed by Age Concern, there was limited evidence that this service was being actively monitored to ensure that it met identified need.

(b) In one establishment, staff commented that there was limited mental health provision for BME groups. This was despite the fact that 23% of that prison's population were from diverse backgrounds.

Summary

The management of diversity issues had insufficient profile. There was some evidence of services and resources being dedicated to work with minority groups, but this was not consistent. Prisons needed to ensure that they were paying appropriate attention to issues of disability. Overall, there was a need to ensure that all prisons had undertaken an equality impact assessment on the implementation of offender management.

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) Arrangements for identifying the OASys RoH classification and MAPPA level were in place in some, but not all, establishments. The usual process was to obtain the information from LIDS or OASys and subsequently flag the case electronically. One prison had established the process of sending out a weekly internal memo to all prison staff regarding a prisoner's MAPPA and RoH to other prisoners. This was also available on the intranet and was a helpful communication to staff. The funding for a MAPPA coordinator had been lost in one prison, and this meant that arrangements for advising relevant staff of RoH issues was left to individual resettlement staff, rather than managed through a robust process.
	(b) Offender managers were responsible for identifying the OASys RoH and MAPPA level. However, in one establishment, confirmation of this by offender managers was not always consistent. This was a particular issue for one of the open prisons, where prisoners were out of the establishment most of the time. This meant that prisoners were being released into the community without a clear assessment of risk, which was unsatisfactory. To counteract the lack of accurate information, the case administrators had instigated the process of informing the local police public protection unit of any prisoners who were in community work. This had the benefit of flagging up that placement to the police in the event of any call outs.
	(c) Regular internal risk management meetings were held in all establishments to review cases where there was a RoH to others, including children. Most meetings were multi-disciplinary. We reviewed the minutes from two establishments and, in one case, found no reference to the OASys RoH level although there was reference to the MAPPA level. In the other establishment, the template for recording discussions had recently been redesigned to include the OASys RoH classification.

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) In at least three of the prisons, offender supervisors were not sufficiently involved in contributing to the setting of licence conditions. This was despite their involvement in sentence planning and attendance at internal risk management meetings. In one establishment, licence conditions were explained to the prisoner by

reception staff rather than through a structured process of sentence management. In two establishments, processes for ensuring that accommodation providers had all the relevant information related to a prisoners RoH status were not fully utilised. We were not confident that OASys RoH assessments and risk management/sentence plans were driving the management of RoH to others in the community.

2.2a Specific Criterion:
RoH to others is managed throughout as a high priority. It is thoroughly reviewed within the required timescales (at least every four months) and always following a significant change that might give rise to concern. There is ongoing planning to address RoH to children, the public, known adults, staff and prisoners. For custody cases, the offender manager and offender supervisor provide evidence of engagement with internal risk management processes.

Findings:

(a) The lack of integration between public protection and offender management in some prisons meant that risk management was compartmentalised, and it was not always apparent how information was shared between relevant staff, particularly where there was insufficient attendance of relevant prison staff at internal risk management meetings. Most staff we spoke to saw the integration of the two aspects of work as a beneficial development.

(b) We found evidence of a lack of clarity in how IPP prisoners should be managed under the offender management model. In two establishments IPP prisoners were managed by the OMU. Little had been done, however, to establish whether they had different needs to the general in scope prisoner population. In one instance a lack of resources meant that offender supervisors were unable to carry out their work sufficiently with this group, with most of the work still being carried out by the lifer manager. We were concerned that these arrangements undermined the principle of having a single point of contact for offender management.

(c) There was evidence of ongoing planning to address RoH issues through the internal risk management meetings previously referred to. The structure and management of these meetings varied from prison to prison, with some being chaired by the Head of Offender Management and in others the Senior Probation Officer or Head of PP. The meetings were used to inform decisions about mail and visit monitoring, as well as cell sharing arrangements. In our review of minutes from two of these meetings, it was not always evident what action or decisions were taken after the discussion about the prisoner, except about IT use and triggering other processes concerning children or harassment. Little reference was made to the OASys risk management plan and the actions/interventions identified to manage the RoH the offender presented. Where offender supervisors were not appropriately engaged, critical information about an offender's RoH behaviour in custody, including victim protection issues, was not feeding into the overall RoH

assessment process. Offender managers were rarely invited to attend, and information from these meetings was not shared consistently with them. One possible explanation for this was the way in which minutes were recorded; often they contained information on all prisoners discussed in the meeting, and therefore included information not relevant to the offender manager.

(d)   In the open prison we inspected, sentence planning boards also considered a separate assessment (known as a release on temporary licence form) to decide whether prisoners could be allowed outside work without an escort. Where there were direct victims, all offenders were escorted unless information from the offender manager and victim liaison officer indicated otherwise.

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.

Finding:

(a)   There was a proactive commitment to attending MAPPA Level 2 and, especially, Level 3 meetings by OMU staff. Where attendance was not possible, staff were required to make a written contribution. We saw evidence in one prison of reports prepared by prison staff for MAPPA meetings and also staff attending MAPPA meetings and contributing to them. However, in another prison we were told that they were not always informed about MAPPA meetings in advance and this hindered their ability to contribute.

4.1f Specific Criterion:
An appropriate strategic contribution is made to public protection.

Findings:

(a)   All prisons had a risk management and child safeguarding policy although, in one establishment, these were not current. Of the small number of RoH policies reviewed, not all stated clearly that the OASys RoH assessment and subsequent management plan was the key document for assessing and managing RoH within the prison. While most policies provided procedural guidance on how staff should work with prisoners, they included a plethora of staff roles and responsibilities and it was sometimes difficult to establish how roles related to one another and linked with the overall management of the prisoner. In some cases it was not clear who had overall responsibility for coordinating and implementing the risk management plan.

(b)   Strategic links to MAPPA were generally made at Deputy Governor level. There was no strategic representation at MAPPA by the high security estate. In three of the establishments inspected there was no representation on the Local Children Safeguarding Board.

4.3b Specific Criterion:
Resources follow risk, with RoH to others a clear priority, and PPOs given proportionate resource.

Findings:	(a) We saw evidence of resources following risk in some cases, through the use of differently qualified staff to manage more complex cases and the prioritisation of IPP prisoners for interventions. In all prisons, internal risk management meetings were a clear priority and appropriately resourced.
	(b) There was little evidence of prioritising PPOs aside from one establishment. PPOs were identified using J-Track, and monthly reports were sent to offender managers in the local probation area – about 60 a month. Staff indicated that they received positive feedback from offender managers regarding the content of the reports.

Summary

RoH and MAPPA classifications were, in most cases, clearly identified although not always consistently communicated to staff. We found evidence in two prisons of inconsistent management of IPP prisoners. Further work was needed to ensure the specific needs of this group were being appropriately addressed. All prisons had procedures in place to manage the ongoing planning for RoH and child safeguarding issues. While we were pleased to see that this important area had been given priority, the processes for communicating the outcomes from meetings to offender supervisors and offender managers needed formalising to ensure a consistent approach. Furthermore, the links between the internal risk management meetings and the OASys RoH assessment and management plan were underdeveloped. Offender supervisors were not always contributing to the setting of licence conditions; the scope for them to contribute to MAPPA meetings was better. Not all prisons had strategic links to MAPPA SMBs and representation at child safeguarding boards was underdeveloped.

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 all prisons there were procedures to promote greater victim protection. All prisons had a policy on mail and visit monitoring. In some prisons, victim safety had not been sufficiently integrated into the role of the OMU and, as such, did not hold sufficient prominence in wider sentence planning processes. In one prison where parole, HDC and end of custody licences were administered from the offender management group, offender supervisors had a specific responsibility, along with probation colleagues and discharging officers, for ensuring licence conditions were fully explained.

(b) We came across an example of effective joint work between the offender supervisors, offender manager and police in an establishment where there were a high number of domestic abuse cases - a meeting had taken place with the victim to promote greater protection. Overall, however, victim safety was not given sufficient attention by offender supervisors.

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) There was evidence of victim work being carried out by some OMU staff working with seconded probation staff to deliver victim awareness on a one-to-one basis and resources, such as Targets for Effective Change, being used. Generally, this was limited and did not feature highly in offender supervisors' contact with offenders. In other prisons the Sycamore programme was available. In most cases, however, the delivery of victim work was managed through accredited programmes.

(b) There was considerable scope for improvement in the amount of direct victim awareness work delivered to offenders, and staff had failed to capitalise on the potential of this. Most staff we met agreed that there should be a greater focus on promoting and reinforcing victim awareness in offenders. 24% of those surveyed said that

they had received work on victim awareness and, of these, 62% described the work done with them as useful.

Summary

There were adequate procedures to protect victims, managed through the internal risk management meetings. Opportunities were being missed to integrate victim protection into the wider role of offender management. There was some evidence of direct victim awareness work being delivered, but this was not seen as a key role of the offender supervisor. Specific victim-focused interventions were a gap in almost all prisons inspected.

APPENDIX 1
Prisons inspected in this area

HMP Askham Grange	
Task of the establishment	Cat D women's open
Area organisation	Yorkshire and Humberside
Number held	93
Certified normal accommodation	128
Operational capacity	128
Date visited	29th September 2008
Number in scope of Phase II	4
Number in scope of Phase III	1
Last HMI Prisons inspection	25th April 2006
Brief history	Askham Grange has operated as a female establishment since 1950, and presently is an open prison for women and young offender prisoners. It has an emphasis on resettlement and has facilities to allow up to ten mothers to maintain full-time care of their children whilst in custody
Description of residential units	Dormitories (some single rooms, all mother and baby unit rooms are single)

HMP Hull	
Task of the establishment	HMP Hull
Area organisation	Yorkshire and Humberside
Number held	1,038
Certified normal accommodation	723
Operational capacity	1,044
Date visited	10th November 2008
Number in scope of Phase II	288
Number in scope of Phase III	61

Last HMI Prisons inspection	28th November 2005
Brief history	Hull opened in 1870 and began as a prison for holding both men and women. After numerous shifts in function, it became one of the first maximum security dispersal prisons in 1969, though the prison experienced an outbreak of violence in 1976 and was closed for nearly a year afterwards. In 1986, it took its current form as a male local prison/remand centre and in 2002 it was expanded, with four new wings added
Description of residential units	A. First night induction centre B. Sentences and unsentenced adults (drug free) C. Sentenced and unsentenced adults D. Sentenced and unsentenced adults F. Healthcare centre G. IDTS unit H. Vulnerable prisoner unit I. Vulnerable prisoner sex offenders J. Vulnerable prisoner sex offenders K. Other vulnerable prisoner unit/sex offender overflow

HMP New Hall	
Task of the establishment	HMP New Hall
Area organisation	Yorkshire and Humberside
Number held	398
Certified normal accommodation	393
Operational capacity	446
Date visited	10th November 2008
Number in scope of Phase II	39
Number in scope of Phase III	16
Last HMI Prisons inspection	30th July 2007
Brief history	New Hall prison was the originator of the open prison system in 1933. It was in 1987 that it was re-roled to become a women's open prison

Description of residential units	Willow House – main unit
	Maple House – mother and baby unit
	Rivendell – juvenile unit
	Larch House – semi-open unit
	Sycamore House – care and separation unit
	Oak House – first night centre and detoxification/stabilisation unit
	Poplar House 1 and 2 – young adults and long-term sentenced women's unit

HMP Wakefield

Task of the establishment	HMP Wakefield
Area organisation	Yorkshire and Humberside
Number held	731
Certified normal accommodation	750
Operational capacity	752
Date visited	1st December 2008
Number in scope of Phase II	167
Number in scope of Phase III	35
Last HMI Prisons inspection	25th April 2005
Brief history	Wakefield prison was built in 1954 as a house of correction, and after in 1966 being designated a dispersal prison. It remains one of the more long-standing prisons of its type. It is a high security prison for those with categories A and B status, and is mainly a lifer centre, focusing on serious sex offenders
Description of residential units	A–D wings - main residential units
	F wing - segregation unit

HMP Wealstun

Task of the establishment	HMP Wealstun

Area organisation	Yorkshire and Humberside
Number held	522
Certified normal accommodation	505
Operational capacity	527
Date visited	1st December 2008
Number in scope of Phase II	192
Number in scope of Phase III	20
Last HMI Prisons inspection	6th November 2006
Brief history	Wealstun was born out of an amalgamation of Thorp Arch and Rudgate in 1995, incorporating both a Category C (closed) and Category D (open) site within a single prison establishment
Description of residential units	A wing – therapeutic wing B & D wings – normal accommodation units C wing – induction and IDTS unit

HMP Everthorpe	
Task of the establishment	HMP Everthorpe
Area organisation	Yorkshire and Humberside
Number held	672
Certified normal accommodation	603
Operational capacity	689
Date visited	12th January 2009
Number in scope of Phase II	196
Number in scope of Phase III	25
Last HMI Prisons inspection	25th April 2006
Brief history	Everthorpe opened in 1958 as a borstal. Since 1991 it has held convicted male prisoners, and in 2005 it underwent a large-scale expansion that provided two new wings

Description of residential units	A–C wings – main residential units
	D wing – residential unit with CARATs
	E wing – VDT and enhanced IEP level unit
	F wing – residential unit with IDTS
	G wing – induction unit
	separation and care unit

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/hmiprisons