

## **Inspection of Adult Offending Work: How we score the case sample**

The Inspection of Adult Offending Work (IAOW) report is based on the examination of work with a representative sample of cases in the inspected area. In each case we interview the responsible officer/ offender manager and others involved, and we read case records. The judgements made about the work in each case contribute to five aggregate scores which denote the proportion of relevant work overall which was judged to be satisfactory.

The IAOW scores are:

- Assisting the Sentence [AS]
- Delivering the Sentence of the Court [DSC]
- Reducing the Likelihood of Reoffending [LOR]
- Protecting the Public by Minimising the Risk of Harm to Others [ROH]
- Delivering Effective Work for Victims [EWV]

The questions that make up these scores sometimes contribute to only one score and sometimes contribute to two or three scores. In each instance these questions reflect judgements by the case assessor.

Below are listed the questions which contribute to each the IAOW scores. Scoring tags are attached to each question so that question appearing in multiple scores can be identified.

### **Assisting the Sentence**

A.1.1.3 Was there a written copy of the report if delivered orally? [AS]

A.1.1.4S Overall, was the report based on sufficient information for this court appearance? [AS]

A.1.1.5S Overall, was the content of the report of sufficient quality? [AS]

A.1.1.6S Overall, was the language and style of the report clear and accessible? [AS]

A.1.1.7 Did the report contain an appropriate proposal for a community sentence? [AS]

A.1.1.8 Did the report state intended outcomes or objectives appropriate to the proposed sentence? [AS]

A.1.1.9a) Did the report indicate the offender's motivation and capacity to comply with the proposed sentence? [AS] [DSC]

A.1.1.9b) Did the report indicate how any particular barriers to compliance and engagement will be addressed? [AS] [DSC]

A.1.1.12 Was the proposal for the type of sentence broadly followed by the court? [AS]

## **Delivering the Sentence of the Court**

A.1.1.9a) Did the report indicate the offender's motivation and capacity to comply with the proposed sentence? [AS] [DSC]

A.1.1.9b) Did the report indicate how any particular barriers to compliance and engagement will be addressed? [AS] [DSC]

B.3.1.2 Was the offender actively and meaningfully involved in the assessment of their likelihood of reoffending? [DSC] [LOR]

B.3.1.2.U Was this taken account of sufficiently in the assessment? [DSC] [LOR]

B.4.1.15 Was the offender actively involved in all plans and arrangements to manage their own risk of harm, including constructive and restrictive interventions? [DSC] [ROH]

C.2.1.1 Was the case allocated to the correct tier of service at the start of sentence or release on licence or transfer into the area, in accordance with NOMS guidance? [DSC]

C.2.1.2 Was a valid reason recorded for any departure from the indicative tiering? [DSC]

C.2.1.3 Was an appointment arranged for the offender to meet the allocated offender manager/ responsible officer within a reasonable timescale after sentence or release on licence? [For high & v high RoSH cases first appointment within two days. For licences first appointment on day or release or following day if impracticable] [DSC]

C.2.1.4 Is there evidence the offender was offered a full, timely and individualised induction following sentence or after release on licence? [DSC]

C.2.1.5 Was the offender informed of their commitments, obligations, opportunities and rights in relation to their order or licence in a clear and accessible way? [DSC]

C.2.1.6 Was there a sufficient assessment of actual and potential barriers to offender engagement, and any other individual needs, including offender vulnerability? [DSC]

C.2.1.7 Was the offender actively and meaningfully involved in the sentence planning process? [DSC]

C.2.1.8 Was initial sentence planning (at the start of sentence or release on licence or transfer into the area) timely and informed? [DSC] [LOR]

C.2.1.12s Overall, did sentence planning pay sufficient attention to factors which may promote compliance? [DSC] [LOR]

C.2.1.13 Were actions to minimise the impact of potential barriers to offender engagement, and any other individual needs, including offender vulnerability, taken or included in relevant planning documents? [DSC] [LOR]

- C.2.1.16 Was sentence planning sufficiently clear about what the offender had to do to achieve the objectives? [DSC] [LOR]
- C.2.1.17a Was the planned level and pattern of contact recorded (in the sentence plan or elsewhere)? [DSC]
- C.2.1.17b Was the planned level and pattern of contact appropriate to the case? [DSC]
- C.2.1.18S Overall, was there clear indication of when the sentence plan would be reviewed? [DSC]
- C.2.1.19 Was the planned review period appropriate to the case? [DSC]
- C.2.1.20 Was there a clear record of the contribution to be made by all workers involved in the case to achieve sentence planning objectives? [DSC] [LOR]
- C.2.1.21 Was there evidence the relevant parts of the sentence plan were clearly communicated to all relevant others involved in the case? [DSC] [LOR]
- D.2.2.1 Were interventions delivered according to the requirements of the sentence? [DSC]
- D.2.2.2 Were interventions delivered in line with sentence plan objectives? [DSC]
- D.2.2.5 Was motivational work done to help and encourage the offender to engage fully with the work undertaken during their sentence? [DSC]
- D.2.2.6 Were relevant diversity factors taken into account in the delivery of services? [DSC]
- D.2.2.7 Was sufficient work directed at overcoming barriers to engagement? [DSC]
- D.2.2.8S On balance, was the level of contact arranged with the offender sufficient? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]
- D.2.2.9S Overall, was an appropriate level of resource allocated throughout the sentence? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]
- D.2.2.10 Was there evidence that the offender manager/ responsible officer took a leading role in the management of the sentence in relation to other workers? [DSC]
- D.2.2.11 Did the offender manager/ responsible officer monitor offender attendance across all parts of the order or licence? [DSC]
- D.2.2.12 Did the offender manager/ responsible officer take a timely and investigative approach to instances of non-compliance? [DSC]
- D.2.2.13 Was effective action taken by other workers/ agencies to secure compliance with, or support enforcement of all interventions? [DSC]

D.2.2.14 Was effective action taken by other workers/ agencies to engage with the offender to increase motivation and promote future engagement and compliance? [DSC]

D.2.2.16S Overall, were professional judgements about the acceptability of absence and other offender behaviour appropriate? [DSC]

D.2.2.17 Was a clear and timely formal warning given to the offender? [DSC]

D.2.2.18 Were enforcement proceedings or recall used appropriately in response to absence or other offender behaviour? [DSC]

D.2.2.19 Was sufficient effort made to re-engage the offender with their sentence plan, and encourage their commitment to continued engagement? [DSC]

D.2.2.22S Where required was the review of work with the offender used to promote compliance and support desistance? [DSC] [LOR]

D.2.2.27S Overall, was the transfer from the originating organisation handled appropriately? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]

D.2.2.28S Overall, was the transfer into the receiving organisation handled appropriately? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]

D.2.2.30S Overall, was the offender moving geographical area handled appropriately? [DSC]

D.2.2.31 At every point in the transfer process was there clarity about who was managing the case? [DSC]

D.2.2.32S Overall, did the overall case record contain sufficient information to support offender management tasks? [DSC]

D.2.2.33 Is there evidence that relevant case information was accessible by or communicated to all those involved in the management of the offender, including third parties? [DSC]

D.4.2.6S Were enforcement proceedings or recall used appropriately, if required specifically in response to an increase in the offender's risk of harm? [DSC]

D.4.2.7.A Was sufficient effort made to re-engage the offender with their sentence plan, and encourage their commitment to continued engagement? [DSC] [ROH]

E.2.3.1 Were the requirements of the sentence delivered as intended? [DSC]

E.2.3.2 Were the reporting instructions given (appointments arranged) sufficient for the purpose of carrying out the sentence of the Court? [DSC]

E.2.3.3 Did the offender comply with the requirements of the sentence, without the need for the offender manager/ responsible officer to take action to promote compliance? [DSC]

E.2.3.4 Was action taken to promote compliance (including any punitive requirements)? [DSC]

E.2.3.5 Was breach or recall used on all occasions when required? [DSC]

E.2.3.7 Was the order terminated early for good progress? [DSC]

### **Reducing the Likelihood of Reoffending**

B.3.1.1 At the start of sentence or release on licence or transfer into the area, was there a sufficient assessment of the likelihood of reoffending? [LOR]

B.3.1.2 Was the offender actively and meaningfully involved in the assessment of their likelihood of reoffending? [DSC] [LOR]

B.3.1.2.U Was this taken account of sufficiently in the assessment? [DSC] [LOR]

C.2.1.8 Was initial sentence planning (at the start of sentence or release on licence or transfer into the area) timely and informed? [DSC] [LOR]

C.2.1.9S Overall, was there a sufficient assessment of the offender's community integration, including personal strengths, social networks and sources of support? [LOR]

C.2.1.10 Where necessary was sufficient action either taken or included in sentence planning to enhance the impact of these factors? [LOR]

C.2.1.12s Overall, did sentence planning pay sufficient attention to factors which may promote compliance? [DSC] [LOR]

C.2.1.13 Were actions to minimise the impact of potential barriers to offender engagement, and any other individual needs, including offender vulnerability, taken or included in relevant planning documents? [DSC] [LOR]

C.2.1.14S Overall, did the sentence plan set appropriate objectives? [LOR]

C.2.1.15S Overall, did the sentence plan set outcome focused objectives? [LOR]

C.2.1.15.T Was the contribution of alcohol to the offence addressed sufficiently in the sentence plan? [LOR]

C.2.1.16 Was sentence planning sufficiently clear about what the offender had to do to achieve the objectives? [DSC] [LOR]

C.2.1.20 Was there a clear record of the contribution to be made by all workers involved in the case to achieve sentence planning objectives? [DSC] [LOR]

C.2.1.21 Was there evidence the relevant parts of the sentence plan were clearly communicated to all relevant others involved in the case? [DSC] [LOR]

- D.2.2.4S Did the offender receive sufficient assistance to improve their community integration, social networks and sources of support? [LOR]
- D.2.2.8S On balance, was the level of contact arranged with the offender sufficient? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]
- D.2.2.9S Overall, was an appropriate level of resource allocated throughout the sentence? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]
- D.2.2.21S Was there a sufficient review of the sentence plan? [LOR]
- D.2.2.22S Where required was the review of work with the offender used to promote compliance and support desistance? [DSC] [LOR]
- D.2.2.23S Where required did the sentence plan review focus on further work to be done with the offender? [LOR]
- D.2.2.24 If required in the light of any review, was there an appropriate reallocation to a different level of service? [LOR]
- D.2.2.27S Overall, was the transfer from the originating organisation handled appropriately? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]
- D.2.2.28S Overall, was the transfer into the receiving organisation handled appropriately? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]
- D.3.2.1 Did constructive interventions encourage and challenge the offender to take responsibility for their actions and decisions related to offending? [LOR]
- D.3.2.2 Did contact between the offender manager and the offender maintain a focus on the behavioural changes required to reduce the likelihood of reoffending? [LOR]
- D.3.2.5 Was the timing of the programme consistent with the sentence plan? [LOR]
- D.3.2.6 Did approved premises offer constructive interventions in line with offender need and sentence plan objectives? [LOR]
- D.3.2.9 Did the Specified Activity make the intended contribution to the planned work with the offender? [LOR]
- D.3.2.10 Was the offender prepared thoroughly for interventions delivered throughout the order or licence? [LOR]
- D.3.2.11 Did the offender manager/ responsible officer routinely review with the offender the work the offender did in other parts of the order or licence, to promote and reinforce learning? [LOR]
- D.3.2.12 Was the offender informed of local services to support and sustain desistance from offending, and rehabilitation in relation to offending related factors? [LOR]
- D.3.2.13 Was the offender referred to such services where appropriate? [LOR]

D.3.2.14 Was sufficient attention paid to helping gang members/ serious group offenders to leave the group and reintegrate into the wider community? [LOR]

D.3.2.15S Was there a sufficient review of the likelihood of reoffending assessment when required? [LOR]

E.2.3.6 Has the offender been convicted, cautioned, charged or received any other disposal since the start of sentence or release from custody? [LOR]

E.3.3.1 Was there a sufficient record of the degree of progress or change made by the offender? [LOR]

E.3.3.5 Had sufficient overall progress been made in relation to the factors identified as making the offender more likely to reoffend? [LOR]

E.3.3.6 Have resources been used efficiently to help the offender achieve the planned outcomes in this case? [LOR]

E.3.3.8 Where relevant was there evidence of improved integration in the community, or improved family relationships? [LOR]

E.3.3.9 Was action taken or were plans in place to ensure that positive outcomes were sustainable beyond the end of the sentence? [LOR]

### **Protecting the Public by Minimising Risk of Harm to Others**

B.4.1.2 In your view was this the correct classification? [ROH]

B.4.1.5 Was a sufficient initial RoSH screening completed? [ROH]

B.4.1.6 Was there a sufficient full initial analysis of the risk of harm? [ROH]

B.4.1.7 Was information actively sought as appropriate, from other relevant staff and agencies involved with the offender? [ROH]

B.4.1.9 If restrictive requirements, electronic monitoring, restraining orders or SOPOs were used in this order or licence, was this appropriate? [ROH]

B.4.1.11 Was there a sufficient initial plan in place to manage risk of harm? [ROH]

B.4.1.12S Overall, did the initial risk management plan set out all necessary action? [ROH]

B.4.1.13 Was key risk of harm information communicated between all relevant staff and agencies? [ROH]

B.4.1.15 Was the offender actively involved in all plans and arrangements to manage their own risk of harm, including constructive and restrictive interventions? [DSC] [ROH]

B.4.1.18 Was the initial MAPPA level of management appropriate? [ROH]

B.4.1.20 Overall, for identified MAPPA cases were referral processes used effectively? [ROH]

D.2.2.3 Did the delivery of interventions take account of any risk of harm to others posed by the offender? [ROH]

D.2.2.8S On balance, was the level of contact arranged with the offender sufficient? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]

D.2.2.9S Overall, was an appropriate level of resource allocated throughout the sentence? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]

D.2.2.27S Overall, was the transfer from the originating organisation handled appropriately? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]

D.2.2.28S Overall, was the transfer into the receiving organisation handled appropriately? [DSC] [LOR] [ROH]

D.4.2.1 Was there an appropriate response to changes in risk of harm? [ROH]

D.4.2.2 Were restrictive requirements in licences and community orders monitored fully? [ROH]

D.4.2.3 Were approved premises used effectively as a restrictive intervention to manage risk of harm.? [ROH]

D.4.2.7.A Was sufficient effort made to re-engage the offender with their sentence plan, and encourage their commitment to continued engagement? [DSC] [ROH]

D.4.2.8S Overall, were MAPPA operated effectively? [ROH]

D.4.2.9 Were multi-agency child protection procedures used effectively? [ROH]

D.4.2.11 Was appropriate priority accorded to the safety of current and potential victims by the offender manager/ responsible officer and other workers? [EWW] [ROH]

D.4.2.13 Was there evidence that the actions set out in the risk management plan were carried out as required? [ROH]

D.4.2.14S Was there a sufficient review of the risk of harm assessment? [ROH]

D.4.2.15S Was there a sufficient review of the risk management plan? [ROH]

D.4.2.16 Was there structured management involvement because the case was high/v high RoSH or there were child protection concerns? [ROH]

E.4.3.1 Had all reasonable action been taken to keep to a minimum the offender's risk of harm to others? [ROH]

E.4.3.2 Was there evidence that ALL inter-agency checks had been made by the offender manager/ responsible officer to ascertain if there had been any reports or concerns regarding the offender or their address? [ROH]

E.4.3.3 Was appropriate action taken by the offender manager in the light of this information? [ROH]



E.4.3.5 Had multi-agency work contributed effectively to the management of risk of harm to others? [ROH]

E.4.3.6 Where there was an identifiable victim or an identifiable potential victim, was there evidence that the risk of harm to them had been managed effectively? [EWW] [ROH]

### **Effective Work for Victims**

D.4.2.11 Was appropriate priority accorded to the safety of current and potential victims by the offender manager/ responsible officer and other workers? [EWW] [ROH]

E.4.3.6 Where there was an identifiable victim or an identifiable potential victim, was there evidence that the risk of harm to them had been managed effectively? [EWW] [ROH]

F.5.5.1 Where statutory victim contact was required was an offer of face to face contact with the VLO is made to the victim? [EWW]

F.5.5.1 Where statutory victim contact was required was the offer made within 8 weeks of sentence? [EWW]

F.5.5.2S Overall, was the quality of statutory victim contact sufficient? [EWW]

### **Contact us**

If you want to discuss how the IAOW programme is scored, please contact Kevin Ball (Head of Information & Operations, HMI Probation, kevin.ball@hmiprobation.gsi.gov.uk)