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FOREWORD

This inspection of offender management work in Essex took place as part of our second programme of Offender Management Inspections. We have examined a representative sample of probation (adult offending) cases from the area, and have judged how often the work with each case was done to a sufficiently high level of quality.

The purpose of offender management has been usefully characterised as to ‘Punish, Help, Change and Control’ each individual offender, in accordance with the need of the individual case. Although our detailed inspection findings can seem rather technical for the general reader, our headline findings can be related to those ‘plain language’ purposes. We have given particular attention to the ‘Control’ purpose – the Public Protection aspect of the work – since this is where independent inspection can add the most value. Our ‘Risk of Harm to others score’ measures how well this has been done.

Over the area as a whole, we judged that the work to keep to a minimum each individual’s Risk of Harm to others – i.e. the ‘Control’ purpose’ - was done well enough 65% of the time. The work to make each individual less likely to reoffend – the ‘Help’ and ‘Change’ purposes - was done well enough 64% of the time. Work to maximise compliance and enforcement was done well enough 70% of the time. A more detailed analysis of our findings is provided in the main body of this report, and summarised in a table in Appendix 1.

We found clear strengths at a strategic level in terms of planning and working in partnership with other agencies to reduce the likelihood of reoffending in local communities. The emphasis on meeting national targets needed to extend to increasing the quality of offender management, in particular to manage better the Risk of Harm to others more often.

Overall, we consider this a somewhat disappointing set of findings. Some of the deficits had already been identified by the area and recent initiatives had the potential to help middle managers and staff to address them.

ANDREW BRIDGES
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

March 2010
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SCORING AND SUMMARY TABLE

This report provides percentage scores for each of the ‘practice criteria’ essentially indicating how often each aspect of work met the level of quality we were looking for.

Accordingly, we are able to provide a score that represents how often the Risk of Harm to others and Likelihood of Reoffending aspects of the cases we assessed met the level of quality we were looking for, which we summarise here. We also provide a score for how often compliance and enforcement was done well enough.

Additionally, we give a headline ‘Comment’ by each score, to indicate whether we consider that this aspect of work now requires MINIMUM, MODERATE, SUBSTANTIAL or DRASTIC improvement in the immediate future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Control' – Risk of Harm to others score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This score indicates the percentage of Risk of Harm to others work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality. This score is significant in helping us to decide whether an early further inspection is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Help' and 'Change' – Likelihood of Reoffending score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This score indicates the percentage of Likelihood of Reoffending work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Punish' – Compliance and Enforcement score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This score indicates the percentage of Compliance and Enforcement work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We advise readers of reports not to attempt close comparisons of scores between individual areas. Such comparisons are not necessarily valid as the sizes of samples vary slightly, as does the profile of cases included in each area’s sample. We believe the scoring is best seen as a headline summary of what we have found in an individual area, and providing a focus for future improvement work within that area.
SUMMARY

Assessment and sentence planning {Overall Score = 72%}

There were good working relationships with courts. Almost all sentencers who expressed a view said that they were satisfied with the quality of reports submitted. In most reports, we found clear proposals that were commensurate with the seriousness of the offence. Where there was a proposal for a community order, reports included an outline sentence plan with relevant objectives.

Risk of Serious Harm screenings and analyses were completed, and on time, in the majority of cases. However, only just over half of the analyses were of a sufficient quality. Some offender managers did not have the experience to understand how to use all relevant information, including about previous offending behaviour. Risk management plans were completed but did not describe often enough how an offender’s Risk of Harm was to be managed. Involvement by middle managers was not found to be effective in many relevant cases.

Sentence plans were completed on time and most were appropriate to the needs of the case. There was confusion around planning for prolific and other priority offenders due to a lack of clarity and communication about their status.

Offender managers routinely assessed offenders’ level of motivation and capacity to change. They were less likely to identify the methods most likely to be effective with individuals. Plans were put in place to address potential barriers to the successful completion of supervision. Despite a clear system for referral to assessment for employment, training and education provision, this happened in just over half of the cases where it was necessary.

Implementation of interventions {Overall Score = 65%}

The score in this section was lower than at the assessment and planning stage. In two-thirds of cases, interventions were delivered as the court intended, although this was at a much lower level for licence cases. Offenders received a full and timely induction after sentence; they were made aware of expectations and there was a positive emphasis on compliance. Offender managers were committed to their work with offenders; they coordinated the input of other staff and maintained a good level of communication between themselves and with offenders. The demand for programmes exceeded supply, although the number of programmes had been increased in an attempt to address this. There was a good level of matching of offender to placement in unpaid work; most of the work was seen to be demanding and to be of benefit to the community.

The Risk of Harm to others was not actively managed as a high priority often enough. We found that the approved premises were used effectively to contribute to the management of offenders who posed a high Risk of Harm. Victims of crime, who responded to the victim liaison team, were provided with a good level of service.

When offenders were referred to interventions they were prepared thoroughly in most cases. Offenders were not encouraged and challenged to take responsibility for their actions and decisions sufficiently often. Suitable arrangements were made to support or protect vulnerable offenders.
Achieving and sustaining planned outcomes \{Overall Score = 51\%\}

Sentence plan objectives were fully or partly achieved in over two-thirds of cases. There was continuity of offender management in the majority of cases.

Offenders attending the domestic abuse programme were prioritised according to the Risk of Harm posed; they told us about the positive impact the programme had had on their attitudes and behaviour. Multi-agency arrangements to protect adults and children and young people from harm were judged to be effective in just over half of cases, in some this was due to a lack of follow-up after initial referral.

We saw evidence of positive change in offenders’ lifestyles over the period of supervision. Some gained educational qualifications and others employment. Offenders attending the Bridge Project made progress on several fronts including substance misuse.

Leadership and strategic management

The Essex Probation Area bid for trust status had been successful earlier in the year. Business planning reflected Local Area Agreement priorities as well as those of the National Offender Management Service. Targets to reduce reoffending were included in the Local Area Agreements, a reflection of the positive contribution of the probation area to local strategic partnerships. Effective liaison with magistrates’ courts as well as the Crown Court had been re-established earlier in the year. There was a clear performance monitoring system in place for activity contributing to national targets and all staff were aware of their responsibilities. However, inconsistencies in other areas of practice suggested that the implementation of procedures was not thoroughly managed.

The use of resources to manage offenders was informed by the changing profile of need. There was an acknowledgement that the workload management tool in place needed to be replaced. External funding was used to establish the Bridge Project and despite the poor level of referrals, the area had access to a good range of external provision for the employment, training and education of offenders.

Offender managers were not always able to manage their workloads safely, due to their inexperience and they were not always supported effectively by middle managers. In some units caseloads were not manageable. The span of control of middle managers was greater than the average reported in February 2009, but the recent creation of staff development officer posts had the potential to ameliorate this situation. Sickness absence levels were well below the level of the previous year.

Learning from serious further offences was disseminated and systems had been put in place to keep any required changes under review. Exit questionnaires were routinely administered to offenders and outcomes used to suggest change.

There was a contract unit in place to ensure that area commissioning arrangements and service level agreements were fully monitored. Services were also commissioned within local partnerships e.g. the Drug and Alcohol Action Teams.
Each of the criteria in the Leadership and Strategic Management section has been graded below, according to the four-point scale described in Appendix 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY</td>
<td>Sufficiently effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 EFFECTIVE RESOURCE DEPLOYMENT MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY</td>
<td>Sufficiently effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 EFFECTIVE WORKFORCE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY</td>
<td>Not Sufficiently effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 AN EFFECTIVE REVIEW AND EVALUATION REGIME MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY</td>
<td>Sufficiently effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 EFFECTIVE PROVISION OF ACCESSIBLE SERVICES MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY</td>
<td>Sufficiently effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ofsted

Offenders had access to a well developed information advice and guidance service, which was provided by skilled staff who successfully helped offenders improve their employment prospects. The process for initial assessment of offenders needs was not sufficiently thorough.

The range of provision was good with effective working relationships in place, with a wide range of providers. Essex Probation Area and its partners had worked hard at developing flexible provision across a large county. Some good opportunities were in place to enable offenders to gain accreditation of work skills development in their community payback schemes; however, in most cases offenders’ skills were not being sufficiently recognised. Offender managers had insufficient understanding of the range and type of employment, training and education provision provided by the area.

Offenders’ achievements on courses were good and they developed effective work skills. In some areas too few offenders, referred to activities, successfully completed courses. Leaders had developed particularly innovative strategies to improve courses for persistent offenders. The management restructuring had raised the strategic profile of employment, training and education within Essex Probation Area. The provision had improved since the last inspection in 2007; however, quality assurance systems remained underdeveloped. The overall self-assessment process was insufficient to be an effective tool for continuous improvement.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Changes are necessary to ensure that, in a higher proportion of cases:

1. a good quality assessment of the individual’s Risk of Harm to others is completed at the start, as appropriate to the specific case
2. as a consequence of the assessment, the record of the sentence plan is specific about what will now be done in order to make them less likely to reoffend, and to minimise any identified Risk of Harm to others, including children and young people
3. assessments and plans are thoroughly reviewed, particularly following a significant change
4. there is evidence in the file of regular quality assurance and effective involvement by managers, as appropriate to the specific case
5. the improvements brought about by the recommendations above are applied equally to relevant offenders in custody and those on licence as well as to those subject to community orders
6. victims’ issues are integrated into all aspects of offender management
7. Furthermore, action is required to ensure that work is allocated as appropriate to the skills and experience of offender managers.

Ofsted recommendations

To improve further the area needs to:

1. improve the understanding of the purpose of employment, training and education interventions with offender managers to ensure an appropriate level of referrals
2. raise its expectations in relation to the quality of the learning experience to
   - improve the number of offenders who progress to employment, training and education interventions
   - improve the recording of skills developed by offenders on non-accredited unpaid work
3. improve the rigour of the quality assurance processes in learning and skills.

NEXT STEPS: An improvement plan addressing the recommendations above is needed four weeks after publication. Once finalised, the plan will be forwarded to the Director of Offender Management in the region to monitor its implementation.
SHARING GOOD PRACTICE

Below are examples of good practice we found in Essex Probation Area:

**Referral to MAPPA:**

OMI 2 Criterion: 1.2.d

Agreement had been reached with the key agencies involved in MAPPA to establish an information exchange meeting for all MAPPA Level 1 and potential Level 2 cases. This was a good use of resources to ensure a thorough first assessment and contributed to defensible decision making.

**Enhanced level of contact with PPOs:**

OMI 2 Criterion: 2.2.c

This offender, aged 36, had been a long term drug user and prolific offender. Attending the Bridge Project entailed seeing his drug worker, attending educational classes, reporting to the police three or four times per week and membership of a gym. This all gave a focus to his life. He was supported by a volunteer mentor and was being trained himself to be a mentor. This wide range of interventions, support and guidance had helped him change his life after many wasted years.

**Preparing offenders for interventions:**

OMI 2 Criterion: 2.3.e

The programmes team was well resourced. They were able to use a wide range of techniques to enhance offender engagement and compliance. For instance, they held meetings jointly with the offender and their offender manager and undertook individual motivational work in preparation. Time was taken to sequence other interventions that needed to be completed first. In some cases they took the offender into the group work room to familiarise them with the layout. They were able to point to cases where offenders posing a high RoH to others who had a programme requirement, but who had initially failed to participate fully, had been shown the benefits of compliance and had then cooperated.

**Promoting the safety of victims:**

OMI 2 Criterion: 3.2.c

A woman who continued to receive unwanted and threatening text messages from an offender contacted the women’s safety worker, who subsequently provided support and arranged, with the victim’s consent, to inform both the police and the offender manager in the case. A joint meeting between police and probation was set up to investigate and address the offender’s behaviour. This made the victim feel more secure as the offender had stopped sending the texts.
Improvement in factors linked to offending:

OMI 2 Criterion: 3.3.c

Unemployment had been identified as the factor most likely to propel this offender back into offending. He thought that if he did not have the income from work he would need to steal, as it was the only way that he could keep his family together. However, he had completed work on understanding the consequences of offending behaviour in sessions with his offender manager. When he was made redundant he accepted a referral to information, advice and guidance and from there was enrolled on a mechanics course at the local college. He had access to benefits to support him during his training and was on course to gain a practical qualification, likely to lead to more stable employment.

Developing resources for frontline delivery:

OMI 2 Criterion: 4.2.a

The area continually reviewed costs and services and this had enabled it to maintain investment in front line offender management. Staff had submitted ideas for efficiency savings, some of which had been acted upon, e.g. in relation to car parking and a better use of the relative roles of administrators and offender managers.
SERVICE USERS’ PERSPECTIVE

**Offenders**

Twenty-two offenders completed a questionnaire for the inspection and we met with a further 20 during the inspection week. Ofsted inspectors met with offenders in the probation area and as learners in outside provision.

- Almost all of the offenders remembered having a clear induction and explanation of the expectations of supervision. All of those completing the questionnaire recalled discussion of their sentence plan, two-thirds said they felt involved in drawing it up and all said progress had been reviewed with them. Approximately half of the offenders that we spoke to recalled a sentence plan.

- Of those who had been in prison, half had received a visit from their offender manager.

- From the questionnaires, 17 offenders thought they were less likely to reoffend as a consequence of being supervised. Comments included: “*my basic skills have improved. I don’t go out that much anymore so I avoid getting into trouble and I have cut down on my drinking*” and “*I have stopped drinking, also changed my way of thinking for the better. I have also seen my offence from my victim’s side, and that has made me feel very sad for her.*”

- Three of the eight offenders undertaking the integrated domestic abuse programme enthused about the offender manager they had in common “*she goes the extra mile for us...*” All were positive about their offender manager, but less so about programme tutors, due to staff changes.

- Offenders interviewed at the Bridge Project were enthusiastic about the changes it had meant for them; one described himself as having been “*challenged with care.*” All of the offenders resident in the approved premises and undertaking programmes were also taking advantage of educational activities.

- Offenders in the approved premises, who were subject to extra curfews to manage their RoH, were not happy about it, but were prepared to cooperate and most could see why this was necessary.

**Victims**

Two questionnaires were completed by victims for the inspection and we met with nine victims of crime during the inspection week.

- Some of the statutory victims contact cases, where victims came to meet us, had commenced many years earlier and contact had not always been initiated promptly. In the more recently started cases contact had been established quickly. All felt that their VLO kept them well informed about the offender in the case.
• There were examples where victims had been subjected to repeat victimisation from within prison. Victim liaison staff were able to intervene swiftly and the prison took appropriate action.

• All said that they felt supported and that their liaison officer could always be relied upon. This was a typical comment: “It has personalised the support, I know someone has a handle on what is going on. They are professional and supportive. If they had not been there I would have been unaware of so much which would have increased my stress and alarm”.

• We met five victims of domestic abuse, whose partners were attending the accredited programme. All felt that their women’s support worker gave high priority to their safety. They gave examples of how this worker had contacted other agencies, e.g. the police, to assist with security measures. All were very positive about the support and assistance received and felt that the workers were sensitive to their needs.

Courts

Nine questionnaires were completed by sentencers for the inspection and we met with a further nine during the inspection week.

• Formal liaison arrangements with magistrates had been reinstated in 2009; and those present at the meeting and those who completed the questionnaire were very positive about these. They felt that it was a good opportunity to learn more about local resources. They also valued the regular newsletter.

• Judges and magistrates thought that most PSRs were of good quality.

• They were all concerned about the availability of programmes, particularly those to address domestic abuse and sexual offending. They were unhappy that they were not given a start date before passing sentence and concerned about examples of offenders who had breached their order and been returned to court and who sometimes had not started a programme, even after many months post-sentence.

• Probation staff in court were seen as knowledgeable and very helpful with information being provided in a timely manner. The one complaint voiced by several sentencers was about the need for offenders to be given an appointment for a PSR interview before leaving the building, which did not happen everywhere.
1. ASSESSMENT AND SENTENCE PLANNING

1.1 General Criterion: PREPARING FOR SENTENCE

High quality reports are produced to inform sentencing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) A PSR was prepared for sentence in 82 of the community orders in the sample. The majority of them were SDRs; we thought that six of these should have more appropriately been FDRs. All reports were prepared using the correct format for the report type and all but two of the reports were completed on time. Where an assessment of the LoR was required, this was done in 91% of cases.

(b) In this sample, 82% of reports were found to be suitably concise. The majority also presented an analysis of the LoR (86%) and RoH (71%), as distinct from a description of events.

(c) We found a clear proposal in 93% of reports and this was proportionate to the seriousness of the offence in all but four. A community sentence was proposed in 70 reports and was followed by the court in 59 (84%). A requirement to keep the RoH to a minimum was proposed in 81% of relevant cases.

(d) All but two of the outline sentence plans contained some objectives appropriate to the proposed sentence; and three-quarters of them specified the desired outcomes of the sentence.

(e) Sentencers who came to meet with us said that overall they were satisfied with the quality of reports prepared by Essex Probation Area staff. In addition, the nine sentencers who completed our questionnaire were satisfied with most of the reports received.

(f) Where present, issues of offender vulnerability were clearly recorded in the body of the PSR.

(g) In 74% of the reports where a community order was proposed there was an outline sentence plan. Plans took account of the assessed LoR 76% of the time and the RoH in 80%. Whilst these were encouraging proportions, it meant that there were gaps in objectives that were not likely to be addressed in later plans and reviews.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) Reports were not based on the required assessment of RoH in 14 cases, these included four oral reports where there was no evidence of a screening having been done. In these and in a further seven reports (22 in all) the RoH analysis was not judged to be accurate.
Objectives were set in outline sentence plans to address offender vulnerability in only 40% of the relevant cases. They were missing in 18 cases.

### 1.2 General Criterion: ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING TO MINIMISE RISK OF HARM TO OTHERS

*RoH is comprehensively and accurately assessed. Plans are made to keep to a minimum the individual’s RoH.*

| Score: 73% | Comment: SUBSTANTIAL improvement required. |

### Strengths:

(a) A RoSH screening was completed in 93% of cases at the start of order or release on licence. It was completed on time in 81% of them, but was judged to be accurate in 74%.

(b) The RoSH classification was accurate in 88% of the cases; we found that it was too high in seven cases and too low in 11. There were concerns in these cases about the quality of planning to manage the RoH, as the level of resources allocated to them reflected the assessed level of RoSH.

(c) A full RoH analysis was completed in 91% of cases where required, with 80% being done on time. Despite the comment in the ‘Areas for Improvement a)’ below, the analyses did correctly identify who was at risk in the specific groups (children, known adults etc), in around three-quarters of them, but did not always specify the nature or level of risk.

(d) In 45 cases there were additional restrictive conditions or requirements. In around 90% of cases these were judged to be proportionate to the assessed level of RoH and to the protection of victims.

(e) There were 51 cases that met the criteria for referral or notification to MAPPA. Most were referred to MAPPA in a timely manner. A referral was made by the offender manager to the MAPPA information exchange, a panel chaired by the MAPPA coordinator and attended by representatives from the responsible authorities and duty to cooperate agencies. This panel acted as a gate keeping mechanism that ensured management at the correct level by either confirming management at Level 1 or referral to Level 2. We thought that this was a model of good practice. (There were no Level 3 cases in the sample; we understood that those cases were managed in the same way) We agreed with the initial level of management in all but five cases.
(a) A full RoH analysis was completed in 118 cases; only 55% of them were of sufficient quality. The assessment drew on all available sources of information in 64% of cases and previous relevant behaviour was considered in 70% of cases where this was present. Typically, the analysis did not contain information about relevant previous offending; in discussion with some offender managers it was apparent that they were not aware of the detail of previous offending or the significance of this, as an indicator of a pattern or of escalating RoH. At the start of licence, we often found that the analysis had been replicated from the prison OASys without being updated.

(b) RoH issues were not effectively communicated to all staff involved in 33% of cases.

(c) There was a high level of completion of risk management plans (90%), where required. Of these, 76% were completed on time and 83% were completed using the correct format. However, only 34% were found to be comprehensive for the case. Most plans were limited to a list of names or activities under the prescribed headings; they could not be described as a plan to protect potential or actual victims. Nor did they link to the sentence plan objectives in 64% of the 98 cases where plans were present. There was evidence that risk management plans were shared with others involved in 64% of relevant cases. Proposed actions from MAPPA were incorporated in 49% of risk management and sentence plans; there was evidence of them being communicated to all relevant bodies in 69% of cases.

(d) We inspected 42 cases where the assessed level of RoSH indicated a need for management involvement (including some cases assessed as posing a medium RoSH); in 31% of these, management involvement was judged to be effective. In a further 48% there was evidence of involvement that was judged not to be effective. In some of these cases, poor work was countersigned when it ought to have been sent back and others were countersigned two or three months late. In nine cases (21%), there was no evidence of manager involvement where it was indicated.

(e) In 46 cases child Safeguarding was an issue and in most of these it was the offender under supervision who posed a RoH. In the majority of these cases (73%) we saw no evidence of management involvement. In most of those where managers were involved (9 of 11) this was judged to be effective.
1.3 General Criterion: ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING TO REDUCE THE LIKELIHOOD OF REOFFENDING
The LoR is comprehensively and accurately assessed. Plans address offending related factors needs to reduce the LoR.

| Score: 74% | Comment: MODERATE improvement required. |

**Strengths:**

(a) Allocation of 92% of the cases was done on time and to the correct tier, as identified in national guidance. In a further two cases there was an acceptable reason recorded for departing from the guidance. All but one of the prisoners in the custody sample were also allocated an offender supervisor on time.

(b) In 96% of the cases where an assessment of LoR was required it was completed and 85% of these were done on time.

(c) A sentence plan was completed in 91% of cases at the start of the order, release on licence or transfer into the area. Of these, 78% were done on time and were judged to be appropriate to the needs of the case. They made use of all relevant information 75% of the time. In over 80% of these objectives were set that addressed both the RoH and LoR.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) Whilst the quality of assessment of LoR was sufficient in 71% of cases there were gaps in the rest, often due to the information being incomplete or to the score not matching the information presented. In licence cases the LoR on release was quite different to that in the custodial phase, but the assessment was often pulled through without being updated.

(b) A number of elements in sentence plans were judged to be insufficient. Objectives to manage child Safeguarding were present in only 31% of relevant cases and insufficient attention was paid to sequencing of objectives in 53%. Objectives were expressed with a clear outcome in 35% of plans; described the planned levels of contact in 60%; and defined the roles of the different workers in 47%. Where other workers were involved in a case there was evidence of the plan being shared with them in 59% of cases. In our meetings with programmes and approved premises staff, however, we were made aware that plans were routinely shared with them.

(c) There were 20 PPOs in the sample. The sentence plan included details of an enhanced level of contact in only half of these cases; and an enhanced level of interventions was found in 39%. In a number of these cases we found confusion around the offender’s status as a PPO, which would explain some of these gaps.
1.4 General Criterion: ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING FOR OFFENDER ENGAGEMENT

*Individual diversity needs are taken fully into account at the earliest opportunity. Plans are put in place to minimise the impact of potential obstacles to engagement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) Offender managers were able to assess the level of an offender’s motivation and capacity to change; and to reflect this in their planning in 73% and 72% of cases respectively. In other cases there needed to be better attention paid to the methods most likely to be effective. Despite this, we read cases where a great deal of careful work was undertaken to get this right with offenders, particularly with those due to attend programmes. Unpaid work staff spoke eloquently about the attention they paid to offender’s learning style, which helped with allocation to appropriate placements.

(b) Where offender managers identified factors that could impinge on an offender’s capacity to complete supervision effectively, actions to address these were taken in 85% of cases. These included, arranging for an individual unpaid work placement near to home or for women offenders to undertake a programme with other women.

(c) Offenders attending interventions, including programmes, the Bridge Project, Keep Project; or those who were resident in the approved premises, were routinely offered access to ETE activity by workers in these facilities. We met a number of these offenders during the inspection week and found that take-up was high.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) Evidence of offenders’ involvement in sentence planning was found in 49% of cases (although offenders completing the HMI Probation questionnaire had a more positive experience). Self-assessment questionnaires were also not used routinely. Plans were not written in such a way that offenders could readily identify what they needed to do, to achieve their objectives. The area had invested in a regional programme ‘Stepping Stones to Success’ to improve sentence planning, but the inspection took place too soon after implementation for us to find evidence of it being used.

(b) The area had a clear system for service support officers to undertake a basic skills screening with offenders who attended for an SDR appointment. This led, where scores indicated, to a timely referral to in-house ETE workers, who were qualified to carry out information, advice and guidance. Offender managers were required to conduct the assessment on all other offenders. There was evidence that 141 offenders in the sample required the initial screening, but it was carried out in 55% of these cases. Thereafter, only 36% of those with relevant learning and skills needs had a full
diagnostic assessment. We found that offender managers knew little about ETE screening, referral and provision.

(c) A learning plan was developed for 18% of those with relevant needs (16 cases). In half of these, the plan was included in the sentence plan as an objective or method.

(d) Offender managers did not routinely use the assessment and planning process to identify potential barriers to successful completion of supervision. Assessment of such factors was found in 51% of cases, although action was taken in a greater proportion.

**COMMENTARY on Assessment and sentence planning as a whole:**

A positive relationship with sentencers and the ability to produce information quickly created a positive working relationship with courts. The early promise of good quality reports did not carry through sufficiently often into the planning process.

The area had systems in place to check that work was being undertaken at the right time, but we saw an emphasis on processes rather than on quality. We met a number of highly skilled offender managers, whose work is represented in our findings. However, we also met inexperienced offender managers (in some offices with unmanageable workloads), who were not experiencing the level of support they needed from their managers at this stage in their career. The impact of this is seen in the level of need for improvement in assessment and sentence planning. The span of control for middle managers was greater than the average reported in February 2009. This was being partially addressed by the creation of part-time staff development officers; it was planned that their role would develop to offer support as well as coaching.

The level of referral to ETE resources was disappointing, as there was a good level of provision available and systems in place to access it once a referral was made.
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERVENTIONS

2.1 General Criterion: DELIVERING THE SENTENCE PLAN (INCLUDING THE PUNISH ELEMENT).

*Interventions are delivered in line with the requirements of the sentence and meet prescribed standards.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) For custody cases, offender managers were able to contribute to sentence planning boards in 72% of the 18 relevant cases, sometimes by video or telephone link.

(b) All but two of the custody cases were able to start programmes, where required, in time to complete them before release. We read four cases where prisoners were transferred from one prison to another in order to access a programme. Offender managers were notified promptly of transfers in most cases.

(c) Offenders were offered a full and timely induction after starting an order or licence in 84% of cases. There was evidence in 82% of cases that offenders were given clear information about expectations of behaviour and their responsibilities and rights in relation to their sentence.

(d) The frequency of contact met or exceeded the national standard in 80% of cases and was consistent with the requirements of the sentence in 82%. We thought that the level of contact took full account of the level of RoH and LoR in 81% and 82% of cases respectively.

(e) In the majority of cases the right level of resources was allocated throughout the sentence.

(f) The area prioritised offenders for inclusion in IDAP and the sex offender programme, according to RoH; whilst it had increased provision for IDAP, the demand continued to exceed supply. We met with offenders undertaking IDAP, all of them said that they had started the programme quite soon after their order or licence had started.

(g) Offender managers coordinated the input of other workers in 73% of relevant cases. They were able to ensure delivery of all elements of the sentence plan in 65%. They told us about problems with the agency providing alcohol treatment that the area was addressing for the next financial year (see Section Four) and this was found in the cases read.
A good level of communication between offender managers and other workers was recorded in 74% of cases. Communication between workers and the offender was sufficient in 70%.

There was a strong emphasis on compliance. In almost all cases we found evidence that the offender manager monitored attendance across all interventions. Where necessary, they responded in a timely way in 78% of the cases that needed action to secure compliance. Judgements about the acceptability of absences were appropriate, consistent and clearly recorded in almost 90% of cases. Mentors were deployed by the Bridge Project to support offenders for whom compliance threatened to turn into breach or recall; there was evidence that this was effective and that offenders continued at the project on a voluntary basis, to complete educational qualifications.

There was a good level of matching of the offender to unpaid work projects in 73% of the cases in the sample. Placements took account of offender’s level of RoH in 86%, we found that work was sufficiently demanding in 86% of cases and of benefit to the local community in 94%.

There were eight cases that had been transferred into the Essex Probation Area, four of which were high RoSH cases. The sending areas had updated sentence plans but not the risk management plan except in one case. The high RoSH cases each had an appointment made for them within five days of notification although none of the other cases did. A home visit was undertaken in two of the cases within ten working days but none of the risk management plans was updated.

Areas for Improvement:

There was an inconsistent approach to delivering interventions. They were delivered as the court intended in 66% of the cases. They were delivered in line with the sentence plan in 59%; in a timely manner according to the RoH in 58%; and LoR in 60% of cases. Interventions were sequenced appropriately in relation to RoH and LoR in 57% of the cases that required sequencing.

In licences and custody cases where offenders had been released, interventions were delivered as planned in 23% of cases.

In 42 cases (25%), there ought to have been more contact in order to promote achievement of all of the objectives set.

There were 60 cases in the sample where delivery of an accredited programme was part of the sentence plan (including custody cases and licences pre-release). In 40%, the programme was delivered as planned, with another 17% starting later than planned. A further 43% had yet to start the programme; in several cases there was insufficient time for the programme to be completed. In half of the cases where there was a delay, it was due to the unavailability of a programme. Other reasons for delay included the need for sequencing and offender employment. In addition, offenders who
dropped out of one programme were able to restart following motivational work in some cases.

(e) Breach action or recall had been instigated on time in 61% of cases, where required, and resolved in line with required timescales in 55%. Despite this finding, sentencers and court officials reported to us (in a meeting and in responses to our questionnaire) that they were satisfied with arrangements for breaching offenders. In some of these cases offenders were given a last opportunity to avoid recall by attendance at the Bridge Project.

(f) It was disappointing that, with the level of provision for ETE available, we only saw placements that could facilitate skills development or educational attainment in 8 cases (36%) of the unpaid work sample. Out onsite we found that existing skills were not sufficiently recognised or recorded; and offenders themselves did not recognise how these skills could enhance their employment prospects. Most of the offenders interviewed by us said they were unaware of the availability of 20% of their hours for ETE work, despite inclusion in the standard induction session.

(g) Sentence plans were not reviewed, as required by the standard, in 35% of cases. They were also not reviewed in 61% of the 75 cases where there was a change in circumstances that justified a review.

(h) The quality of sentence plan reviews was not of a sufficient standard in the majority of cases. RoH and LoR assessments were not reviewed on time in 42% and 34% of cases respectively; and were only reviewed following a change in circumstances in 41% and 42% of relevant cases. Most reviews were pulled through from the original assessments and plans and were not actually updated. As a consequence, they informed planning for the next period in only 38%. For example, this included offenders on licence whose objectives were still related to gaining enhanced prisoner status, or to undertaking a prison based programme. There was evidence of offender involvement in the review in 39% of cases.

(i) Recording and file keeping was insufficient in some cases. Whilst 70% of files were well organised overall, there were documents missing in 44% of cases. The area had implemented CRAMS as their case management system approximately one year earlier; and we found a number of staff who felt that they had not got to grips with the system. In 67% of cases we found that recording was clear and reflected the work actually carried out. The work in PPO cases was particularly poorly recorded. Where enhanced provision related to contact with the police, this information was often missing from the record and could not be evidenced.

(j) Communication between some workers and PPOs was unsatisfactory. The communication between workers in some cases was also not as frequent and thorough as it should have been. We read several cases where the offender had not been informed that they were being designated as a PPO and were unaware of this until police. Sentence plans were not reviewed, as required by the standard, in 35% of cases. They were also not reviewed in 61% of
the 75 cases where there was a change in circumstances that justified a review, designation ceased without explanation. Opportunities were missed to begin PPO work whilst the offender was still in custody.

2.2 General Criterion: DELIVERING RESTRICTIVE INTERVENTIONS (THE CONTROL ELEMENT OF THE SENTENCE PLAN)

All reasonable action is taken to keep to a minimum the individual’s RoH.

| Score: 58% | Comment: SUBSTANTIAL improvement required. |

Strengths:

(a) In a majority of cases, decisions taken in MAPPA were clearly recorded and reviewed appropriately. There was evidence that probation service staff contributed effectively to MAPPA 74% of the time.

(b) There was an enhanced level of contact with 70% of the 20 PPOs in the sample. We found an appropriate level of restrictive interventions in only 40% of the cases. On the other hand, there were examples of a good constructive work being undertaken with PPOs, particularly at the Bridge Project, where they were assigned a mentor and had access to a range of services to address ETE and substance misuse issues amongst a wide range of resources.

(c) Our sample included 34 cases where statutory victim contact had to be offered. Whilst the initial contact was not always timely (57% of the time they were), this progressed positively once contact with the VLO team was established. We saw evidence of regular information exchange between the VLO and offender manager in 75% of cases. All victims, where the offender was released or was applying for release, had had the opportunity to provide their view about proposed licence conditions and to see the relevant part of parole reports. In all but one case the victim had been kept appropriately informed about the offender’s progress in prison. Victims who came to meet us and responded to our questionnaire were very positive about the support and information provided to them. We were also given examples of where prompt action was taken to prevent further offending, by liaison between the victim, offender manager, VLO and prison staff.

(d) Once home visiting in a case started, it was likely to continue as part of the regime to manage the RoH. This was evidenced in all of the child Safeguarding cases that required continuing visits; 65% of the high or very high RoSH cases; and 77% of other relevant cases, e.g. domestic abuse.

(e) There were eight cases where offenders were resident in the Essex Probation Area approved premises. In seven of these there was
evidence of the regime being used effectively to control the RoH. We found routine use of extra curfews, to restrict residents’ opportunities for potentially risky behaviour, sometimes as a result of a MAPPA decision.

Areas for Improvement:

(a) Offender managers did not actively manage RoH sufficiently often in 56%; changes to RoH were anticipated and were identified swiftly in 64%. In 73 cases, changes, e.g. reoffending, indicated a potential increase in the RoH, but offender managers took appropriate action in only 49% of these. Appropriate action that should have been, but was not taken, included recall to prison, contact with children’s social care services and referral to MAPPA.

(b) Despite the effective use of the panels themselves, MAPPA more widely were judged to have been used effectively in 59% of the relevant cases. In several custody and licence cases, an initial referral was not followed up in a timely manner towards the end of the custodial element of the sentence. We were told that MAPPA cases, who were serving prisoners, could be automatically relisted when appropriate, without the need for re-referral. However, we did not see evidence of this; cases in the sample had to be re-referred, which did not always happen. There were other community cases where changes within the home in domestic abuse cases suggested a re-referral to MAPPA, but where none was made.

(c) Where the RoH to children was managed within multi-agency child Safeguarding procedures (46 cases), this was seen to be effective in 49% of cases. Decisions taken were clearly recorded in 46% of cases; were followed through and acted upon in 59%; and reviewed appropriately in 51% of cases. Offender managers often had a passive approach to this work. They were required, under their own procedures, to check with children’s social care services about the welfare of children in the family of offenders. We found a number of cases where, having sent off the query, the offender manager took no further action, even when there was evidence of concerns.

(d) Restrictive conditions or requirements were fully monitored in 70% of relevant cases.

(e) We saw evidence of appropriate priority given to victim safety, by the offender manager and other workers, in 64% of the cases, where this was a factor (85 cases).

(f) Home visits were not made routinely where necessary; in high and very high RoSH cases they were carried out 65% of the time; and in child Safeguarding cases this was done in 36%. In other cases where a visit was indicated, e.g. in some domestic abuse cases, this was carried out 55% of the time.

(g) Where expedited breach or recall was required, when an offender’s RoH increased, this action was taken promptly in five of the ten relevant cases and was taken late in a further two cases. In three licence cases and two community orders no action was taken. Following recall to prison there was evidence of an explanation being
given to the offender for their further imprisonment in half of the cases; and efforts to re-engage them with the sentence plan in only one.

(h) Management oversight of the quality of work with high and very high RoSH and in child Safeguarding cases was, too often, either non existent or of insufficient quality. In the first category (RoSH) there was effective oversight in 29% of cases; ineffective oversight in 45%; and no involvement apparent in 26%. In respect of children’s safety the proportions were 14%, 10% and 76% respectively.

(i) It was clear that middle managers did not use ViSOR. We confirmed this with relevant staff. They were therefore unable to support their teams in either inputting vital intelligence, or in using it in planning to keep to a minimum the RoH posed by offenders.

2.3 General Criterion: DELIVERING CONSTRUCTIVE INTERVENTIONS (THE HELP AND CHANGE ELEMENTS)

Interventions are delivered that address criminogenic needs and the reduction of LoR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths:

(a) Following sentence, offender managers identified supportive factors in the life of 87% of offenders, where they were present. In 69% of relevant cases, they ensured that the offender was sufficiently supported in retaining or developing community ties and relationships throughout the sentence.

(b) In the small number of cases in the sample (25), where an ETE intervention was delivered, it was seen to be proportionate to the offender’s need in 92% of cases, relevant to their abilities and aspirations in 88%; and delivered in line with sentence plan objectives in 68%.

(c) Where offenders undertook an intervention, they were prepared thoroughly for it in 69% of cases. We heard of positive examples in case discussions and in our meetings with offenders where this was done. The programmes team was specifically resourced to undertake pre-programme motivational work, to boost the likelihood of successful completion.

(d) Appropriate constructive interventions were delivered to the majority of the residents, of the approved premises, whose files we assessed. ETE activity was available in the premises and accessed by those residents who met with us. In 60% of these cases the interventions featured in the sentence plan.
(a) There was sufficient information, advice and guidance provided to 48% of those offenders who needed it to address their learning or skills development. Ofsted found that there was an effective service on hand in-house to deliver this, but it clearly was not being made use of sufficiently often. Arrangements for an appropriate intervention to be delivered were made in 47% of cases and it was actually delivered in only 27% where a learning need was identified.

(b) In 44% of cases in the sample there was insufficient work directed at overcoming practical obstacles to community integration and promoting and achieving key life skills. To a certain extent, this related to the provision of ETE, but also in a number of cases to the lack of access to provision to address alcohol misuse. We met a number of offenders, who gave positive examples of assistance offered to access services for housing needs and to tackle illegal drug misuse.

(c) Offenders were not encouraged and challenged to take responsibility for their actions and decisions, related to offending, sufficiently often; we saw evidence of this being done in 66% of community and 27% of custody cases. There was evidence of victim awareness work being undertaken with half of the offenders, where it was required; the area had developed a programme to deliver this, but we came across it being used in one office only.

(d) Where offenders did engage with interventions, arrangements were put in place to reinforce new skills with them 51% of the time. This was corroborated by offenders attending a general offending behaviour programme, who complained to us that their offender manager did not seem to have contact with programmes staff, or to be aware of what they were doing on the programme. However, this was the opposite of a very positive picture given by offenders in a programme to address domestic abuse.

2.4 General Criterion: MANAGING DIVERSITY AND MAXIMISING OFFENDER ENGAGEMENT

*The management of offenders’ diversity needs facilitates effective engagement with the sentence.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths:

(a) Arrangements for interventions took account of the diverse needs of offenders in 71% relevant cases across the sample; and in 100% of the approved premises cases. We did not, however, see evidence that the information was shared with other staff in 33% of cases. Transport was a regular factor and clear efforts were made to either provide transport directly or to support offenders in using public transport.
(b) We met a number of very committed offender managers, who were prepared to persist with people in difficult circumstances. This was evidenced in their work in 76% of the cases we read; they motivated and supported the offender throughout the sentence and reinforced positive behaviour. Other workers were equally supportive and positive and, as a consequence, we saw evidence of a positive and productive relationship developed between offenders and 72% of their offender managers; and 64% of other workers in the case.

(c) There were 50 offenders in the sample identified as being vulnerable to some degree. In the majority, suitable arrangements were made where necessary to support or protect the offender. The detail of the vulnerability was not always well communicated, however, and was not apparent in 39% of cases.

COMMENTARY on Implementation of interventions as a whole:

Overall, offender managers were better at assessment and planning for managing the RoH and LoR, than at arranging for the delivery of appropriate interventions. Conversely, they were better at engaging with offenders than was suggested by the quality of their planning.

There was, overall, an inconsistent approach to delivering offender management within the area, with variation between the practice of individual offender managers or 'clusters'. A number of good resources, that were intended to address offending behaviour and underlying needs, were not being well used. ETE was the clearest example of this. Where offenders did access one intervention they were more likely to be referred on to others by that facility, rather than by their offender manager.

The level of performance in relation to keeping offenders’ level of RoH to a minimum was a concern.
3. ACHIEVING AND SUSTAINING PLANNED OUTCOMES

3.1 General Criterion: ACHIEVEMENT OF INITIAL OUTCOMES (INCLUDING THE PUNISH ELEMENT)

Offender manager adhere to the prescribed standards for requiring, promoting, and where necessary enforcing the order or licence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) The sentence plan had been delivered as the court intended, up to the current point in the sentence, in 70% of cases. Sentence plan objectives were partially achieved in 57% and fully in 15% of the sample.

(b) Attention to promoting offender compliance was good in 83% of cases; and 71% of the offenders were seen to be complying with the requirements of the sentence.

(c) Offender managers tended to supervise cases where they had prepared the PSR, so that 78% offenders in the sample had had no change or only one change of offender manager. Those offenders we met commented on how important this continuity was to them. Delivery of offender management supported the achievement of planned outcomes in 68% of cases. Where there was only one change, we saw that delivery of the sentence plan tended to be maintained.

(d) The reparative activity undertaken in local communities was almost universally regarded as beneficial. This included environmental projects, as well as producing goods in a workshop for the benefit of community groups.

(e) Since being sentenced 5% of the sample (nine) had been cautioned for an offence and 24% (41) had been convicted of an offence. There was evidence of a reduction in the frequency of offending in 44% of cases and in the seriousness of offending in 46%, of those in the sample who were not first offenders.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) As described in Section 2, where enforcement was required it was not always followed up appropriately: 67% of cases where enforcement was necessary met the national standards.

(b) Only four cases had been terminated early for good progress, but we did not find other cases where such an application could be justified.
3.2 General Criterion: MINIMISING RISK OF HARM TO OTHERS (THE CONTROL OBJECTIVE)

All reasonable action has been taken to keep to a minimum the individual’s RoH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) We heard specific examples from offenders attending IDAP of how attendance at the programme had taught them to understand their previous abuse and learn techniques to control their behaviour as a consequence.

(b) The level of restriction imposed in the approved premises had contributed to the management of RoH in all but one case assessed.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) Whilst all reasonable action had been taken to keep RoH to a minimum in 72% of cases, this left 47 cases where the evidence did not support this. In 73% of cases the level of RoH was static, or had increased.

(b) There was evidence of a reduced threat to victims from individual offenders in 34% of relevant cases. Offenders demonstrated an increased awareness of the impact of their offending on the victim in 31%.

3.3 General Criterion: REDUCING LIKELIHOOD OF REOFFENDING (THE HELP AND CHANGE OBJECTIVES)

There is a measurable reduction in the LoR and/or the achievement of other positive outcomes that are known to promote the reduction of LoR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) There was evidence of positive change in 42% of the offenders’ lifestyle. Twenty-two offenders in Essex Probation Area completed an HMI Probation questionnaire and gave examples of positive change including: getting their driving licence back, finding somewhere decent to live and stopping drinking.

(b) Other tangible benefits of supervision were that 12 offenders had gained a qualification and 24 had obtained and sustained employment for 16 weeks or more. In the ETE courses visited by us the pass rates were generally high; and most offenders working towards an accredited qualification improved by one level or more.
The Bridge Project supported PPOs and other offenders through a programme of personal development and social integration, in addition to employability training. They used volunteer mentors to assist with the programme and we read about a number of offenders whose lives had been turned around. We met one who said the programme had brought order and routine to his life, after many years of substance misuse, and who was training to be a mentor himself. Most offenders attending ETE provision, at the project, successfully completed the course.

Some unpaid work projects provided opportunities for offenders to have the skills they developed recognised by a formal accredited qualification. Offenders were developing good work skills, such as working as a team, taking instruction and problem solving, which could enhance their potential employability.

In relation to factors linked to their offending (in our view), 50% had made some or substantial progress in relation to the highest priority. There was progress against second priority factors in 48% of cases; and against 50% of factors assessed as the third priority in relation to offending. Top priorities were, most often, thinking and behaviour, alcohol misuse and drug misuse. Less frequent priorities were financial management and health.

Where relevant, 44% of offenders in the sample had demonstrated a positive change in their attitudes and 49% in their behaviour.

Areas for Improvement:

Whilst offender management had had a positive impact in a number of cases, 43% of offenders, with needs relating to community reintegration, had not had sufficient attention paid to these. In 44% of cases, where offenders had continuing offence related needs, offender managers had not encouraged future engagement of the offender with community organisations.

There was evidence of progress in the case of 27% of those offenders with a need in relation to learning and skills development.

We thought that resources had been used efficiently to achieve these results in 61% of cases; and that full use of the resources available could have improved outcomes for other offenders.

COMMENTARY on Achieving and sustaining planned outcomes as a whole:

Results in this section were encouraging, in relation to managing and improving factors linked to reoffending, and they showed what the area could achieve with a more consistent approach. Less so in relation to managing the RoH, but this was consistent with the findings in earlier sections.
4. LEADERSHIP AND STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

4.1 General Criterion: EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY

Strong leadership contributes to public protection and reduction in LoR.

Comment:

SUFFICIENTLY effective in making good quality offender management more likely.

Strengths:

(a) Essex Probation Area made a successful bid for trust status earlier in 2009. The plan put forward, at that time, emphasised the area’s capacity to deliver services efficiently, within the local delivery unit structure specified by NOMS. The plan was comprehensive and gave an emphasis to developing services for women offenders.

(b) Key business risks were identified centrally and kept under review by the board audit committee. Area directors were required to present a formal business case, in relation to any proposal for change; these routinely included identification of associated financial and other risks.

(c) The format of the current business plan ensured that it was accessible to local partners and residents. Probation area and NOMS objectives were expressed within LAA targets and set against the 2007 local government national indicators. The links between offender management and reducing local reoffending were clear and relevant indicators were included in the LAAs in their turn. Planning for 2010/2011 was underway, with the intention to devolve further authority and responsibility for service delivery to local units.

(d) There was a clear performance framework, which ensured that all staff members were aware of, and held to account for, achieving their share of area targets; this was supported by the work of a performance improvement manager. Good use was made of the formal internal audit process and the area was able to evidence that changes were made as a consequence of findings.

(e) Essex was a large county, with a complex local government structure. One feature was a lack of co-terminosity between agencies, which added to the challenges of joint working. Over recent years, the probation area had rationalised its office provision and had a presence in each of six major towns, which did share boundaries with courts. There was productive involvement at CO and/or director levels in local strategic partnerships, e.g. LCJB and Supporting People and in the drug and alcohol action teams as commissioners. At a more local level, the area collaborated within CDRPs to develop resources for PPOs and other offenders, e.g. via
the Keep Project, to provide services for drug and alcohol misuse and the Triangle Tenancy Service, for supported housing. Collaboration at a regional level included cross-boundary working, to address the needs of women victims of domestic abuse. Within the NOMS region there was investment to improve the quality of offender management, through development of a planning tool – ‘Stepping Stones to Success’.

(f) The area was well represented at a strategic level in the LSCB’s and MAPPA SMB. Partners who came to meet us during inspection week thought that the area played an active and productive role in public protection. There were a number of jointly funded posts to support the work, e.g. a domestic violence coordinator and the MAPPA coordinator and deputy. Agreement had been reached with the key agencies involved in MAPPA, to establish an information exchange meeting for all MAPPA Level 1 and potential Level 2 cases. This was a good use of resources to ensure that cases were managed at the right level. In addition, there was a regional approach between probation areas to bring consistency and cooperation where appropriate, e.g. in relation to the use and development of approved premises.

(g) Following guidelines introduced by the Senior Presiding Judge in England and Wales, formal liaison between the area and local magistrates’ courts was reintroduced in 2009, after a gap of several years. We met sentencers from the Crown Court and magistrates’ courts during inspection week; they were enthusiastic about the new ‘engagement’ arrangements. Local probation managers had made presentations about interventions available, including programmes, unpaid work and the Bridge Project. There was a comprehensive set of arrangements for liaison between both court levels and strategic and local managers. Strategic liaison was valued and magistrates reported that the local liaison was more obviously and immediately helpful for local problem solving. The regular newsletter was also appreciated by sentencers.

Area for Improvement:

(a) Plans and procedures were clear about expectations and there was a strong performance culture in relation to national targets. However, there was an inconsistent approach to offender management and the use of interventions, as evidenced in this report, that suggested implementation was not thoroughly monitored.
4.2 General Criterion: EFFECTIVE RESOURCE DEPLOYMENT MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY

Strong leadership contributes to public protection and reduction in LoR.

Comment:

SUFFICIENTLY effective in making good quality offender management more likely.

Strengths:

(a) A continuous review of costs and services led to maintenance of investment in front line offender management. This was supported by an enthusiastic response by staff to requests for ideas for efficiency savings, some of which had been acted upon, e.g. in relation to car parking and a better use of the relative roles of administrators and offender managers. There had been no compulsory redundancies in the area and none were planned.

(b) There was evidence of the use of OASys data to inform needs analyses accurately, as well as other examples of information being used to assess local need; for instance, as Essex Probation Area was an area of relatively high employment and there was routine office opening for individual appointments, with offenders in the evening and at weekends. The area had increased its complement of accredited programmes and exceeded the target set by the DOM. This was delivered by an effective programmes team, dedicated to motivating the right offenders to complete them successfully. Despite this investment, however, the area was unable to meet the demands of the courts, even though in response to demand it had increased its provision of IDAP from 9 to 11 programmes per year.

(c) Changes to arrangements for staffing magistrates’ courts had led to a return to court duty, on a part-time basis, by offender managers, who were able to prepare FDR’s. Magistrates were very enthusiastic about this and the staff involved were building up their knowledge and expertise. They were also able to produce information quickly, to assist with sentencing without the need to adjourn. Arrangements in the Crown Court were also seen as satisfactory by sentencers who contacted us.

(d) A partnership with Nacro provided support by volunteer mentors and resources to address offending related needs, for PPOs and other offenders at risk of custody. In addition, the area had developed good working relationships with external ETE partners and made good use of a variety of externally funded agencies, including private training providers and colleges. They also had close links with a number of charitable partners to help extend the provision for offenders, e.g. with the Prince’s Trust. The area had piloted a thinking skills programme in the Colchester Garrison, which was to be repeated in 2010 and would generate income for the area.
It was accepted by the senior management team that the workload management tool in use was not fit for purpose and needed to be replaced; work was in hand to develop a replacement. This was the view of most of the offender managers interviewed by us. They did understand that resources were finite, but felt that the gaps in what was monitored by the tool undervalued their contribution.

### 4.3 General Criterion: EFFECTIVE WORKFORCE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY

There is a workforce strategy that promotes the development of all staff to meet service delivery outcomes.

**Comment:**

*NOT SUFFICIENTLY* effective in making good quality offender management more likely.

### Strengths:

(a) The needs of the organisation were clearly defined in terms of the skills required at each level and recruitment carried out accordingly. Vacancy levels were low and structures were in place to fill most vacancies quickly. The proportion of staff from black and minority ethnic backgrounds was slightly higher than that of the Essex population (as measured in the 2001 census) and slightly lower than in the offender population. All of these proportions were significantly lower than for England and Wales overall. The proportion of the management group with a black or minority ethnic background was 14%, which was very encouraging.

(b) Sickness levels were below the national average and had reduced over the last 12 months. Offender management staff were organised in ‘clusters’ that had responsibility for covering the work of absent colleagues. It was interesting to note that opinion about the effectiveness of this arrangement was split almost 50/50 amongst offender managers and other staff interviewed by us. We saw that continuity of offender management was maintained during planned and unplanned absences, but that some staff were unhappy at having to cover extra cases during periods of long-term sickness absence.

(c) Role boundaries between offender managers and support staff were clearly defined so as to maximise the contribution of each grade to offender management. As a consequence, administrators played an active role at the start and end of orders with direct contact with offenders.

(d) Lines of accountability were clear and were evidently well understood. Corrective action was taken in respect of staff who failed to achieve their individual targets; this included use of the capability procedures and could lead to withholding salary
increments. The area invested in a range of relevant training for all of its managers. We interviewed 77 individual offender managers. Almost all felt that their line manager had the necessary skills and experience to assess the quality of their work, to support them and assist them to develop their work.

There was a core training programme for offender managers organised locally or within the region. There were arrangements in place for staff to undertake relevant NVQs. A new post of staff development officer had recently been created to work alongside middle managers, to provide training and individual coaching. It was too soon to assess the impact of this. ETE staff were well trained and were encouraged to achieve relevant NVQs at level 4.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) Staff or posts were moved around the area to meet demand, when necessary. However, the inspection of case files highlighted an imbalance between the nature of the caseload and the numbers of experienced and suitably qualified staff available to manage it in some clusters. Offender managers grade 3 (PSOs), in particular, in several locations appeared to be overloaded with work; we observed that they also managed ‘top end’ Tier 3 cases and in some offices Tier 4 cases (which was against area policy). We read a number of cases where the actual level of RoH could not be managed safely by an inexperienced member of staff, suitably qualified or not.

(b) Whilst staff were overwhelmingly positive about the ability of their line manager, only 65% said that they had the time to support them. Despite this, 91% said that the quality of supervision (however frequent) had promoted improvements in their practice. A theme, however, that emerged in individual interviews and meetings was that offender managers perceived their managers to be overworked and that they did not go to them for advice as much as they would have liked. The span of control of middle managers, at the time of the inspection, was greater than the average indicated in February 2009. The creation of staff development officers could have a positive impact on this situation in the future.

(c) Of those offender managers interviewed, 60% considered that their training and developmental needs were met; 52% felt that opportunities for their future development were available. Of those who were dissatisfied, 68% said that relevant opportunities were not available, e.g. to undertake training in working with sex offenders. The lack of take up was, however, most often linked to staff, considering that they had insufficient time to take up the training on offer. We did encounter several offender managers who clearly lacked sufficient knowledge about the use of CRAMS and OASys, which was due to their having been appointed recent to the inspection.
4.4 General Criterion: AN EFFECTIVE REVIEW AND EVALUATION REGIME MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY

Outcomes from interventions are evaluated for their impact on public protection and reducing reoffending.

Comment:

SUFFICIENTLY effective in making good quality offender management more likely.

Strengths:

(a) There was extensive monitoring of the processes that contributed to achievement of national targets. These were pursued through the appraisal process and in detail at LDU meetings. Middle managers were supported in performance monitoring and in actions to address shortcomings by the performance improvement manager. Progress was kept under continuous review, through monitoring the SLAs between LDUs and the CO.

(b) We saw evidence of the use of outcome data, in relation to successful completions of accredited programmes and the impact on reoffending rates. It was used, as an example, to inform sentencers in liaison events. OASys data, about offender need, was used to define the services required to prevent reoffending amongst those likely to receive short-term custodial sentences and who were managed at the Bridge Project as an alternative.

(c) Learning from serious further offences was disseminated via team meetings and changes required monitored in LDU management meetings.

(d) There was a system for administrative staff to undertake an exit survey with every offender attending their last appointment. This had been in place for three years and the last report published in 2009 included interviews with almost 1,000 offenders. Comments about the impact of elements of offender management were positive overall and areas for improvement were highlighted.

(e) Measures to share best practice and improve performance consistently were taken forward through the regional public protection and approved premises forum.

Area for Improvement:

(a) There was evidence of some monitoring of the effectiveness of ETE provision with different groups of offender, but it was not used sufficiently by the area to guide referral.
4.5 General Criterion: EFFECTIVE PROVISION OF ACCESSIBLE SERVICES MAKES GOOD QUALITY OFFENDER MANAGEMENT MORE LIKELY

The approach to the commissioning and delivery of services contributes to positive outcomes for offenders and work with victims. Services are accessible and of a high quality.

Comment:

SUUFFICIENTLY effective in making good quality offender management more likely.

Strengths:

(a) Good use was made of OASys data to identify offender need. As a consequence, provision was made for PPOs and other offenders, including women, at risk of custody at the Bridge Project. The Bridge Project, delivered by the Foundation Training Company in partnership with the area, provided a very effective intensive programme aimed at supporting persistent offenders, who otherwise may have been given a custodial sentence. The programme offered accredited courses in skills for life; employability training; and opportunities for personal development and social integration. Housing support was being provided for a small number of offenders and managed through a contract with Shelter. The demand for accredited programmes was kept under review.

(b) It was acknowledged that in such a large county needs would vary. Local teams were encouraged to develop services accordingly. We heard of an initiative in one district, where an offender manager had developed a programme to address driving offending specifically for Polish residents. There were sufficient numbers, apparently breaking the law through ignorance, to make this a viable option. Investment in transport was made for offenders in rural areas and there was a contract in place for access to interpreters.

(c) There was a best value approach in place to commissioning interventions for offenders. Development of the Bridge Project was successfully put out to tender in 2008; a consortium made up of a regional training organisation and national charity working with offenders won the contract to provide a range of individual mentoring and group work activities. A tendering exercise, for delivery of an accredited programme, was unsuccessful, but improvements to the process were being considered and putting an activity requirement out to tender was underway. A review of unpaid work concluded that retaining the delivery of the intervention in-house would be the most efficient strategy at that time.

(d) There was a contract management unit in place to ensure that commissioning arrangements and SLAs were monitored fully. This was overseen, in turn, by the board contracts and commissioning committee. Where justified by demand, interventions to address the reoffending pathways were implemented.

(e) There was effective partnership working at a strategic level within Essex Probation Area that had improved services for drug misusing
offenders. Access to provision for floating support had been achieved through involvement in Supporting People.

(f) Positive relationships within the prison region led to a number of offenders being moved to the local prison, to access services and retain positive links. This establishment had been selected to pilot the Integrated Drug Treatment Services, due to positive support from the local Drug and Alcohol Action Teams and partner agencies.

(g) The area provided a good range of ETE activities and unpaid work placements. A range of short accredited courses were available to improve offenders employability, such as Children’s Social Care Services, fork lift truck driving, health and safety and courses aimed at self-employment. Provision was available throughout the county to provide help and support with writing *curriculum vitae*, building job applications and how to deal with disclosure. Provision was flexible and was available both in the evening and weekends. However, in some areas within the county, there was insufficient provision for offenders requiring pre-entry literacy and ESOL.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) There was insufficient access to services for offenders with an alcohol problem. Offender managers also reported problems with the service provider of the alcohol treatment requirement. These issues had been addressed for the next year by a change of provider and inclusion in PCT contracts for 2010/2011.

(b) Procedures to ensure the quality of the overall learning and skills provision were underdeveloped. Quality improvement relied mainly on the quality assurance of each of the respective partners, but there was no drawing together of their findings to give a complete picture. Data collected by each of the providers was available, but was not being used as a tool to judge the overall quality of provision taking place within the area. Analysis of data linked to the performance of each of the probation offices was available and used effectively to ensure that the area was meeting key targets, however, this was not sufficiently linked to systems to ensure the quality of the offenders experience. The self-assessment process was not sufficiently formalised, to be effectively used as a tool to drive continuous improvement.
APPENDIX 1: Scoring of sections 1-3:

OMI2 Essex: General Criterion Scores - November 2009

1.1 preparing for sentence: 85%
1.2 assessment and planning to address risk of harm to others: 73%
1.3 assessment and planning to address the likelihood of reoffending: 74%
1.4 assessment of and planning for offender engagement: 56%
Section 1 - Assessment and sentence planning: 72%

2.1 delivering the sentence plan (including the punish element): 67%
2.2 delivering restrictive interventions (the control element): 58%
2.3 delivering constructive interventions (the help and change elements): 60%
2.4 managing diversity and maximising offender engagement: 72%
Section 2 - Implementation of interventions: 65%

3.1 achievement of initial outcomes: 62%
3.2 achievement of restrictive interventions: 50%
3.3 achievement of constructive interventions: 44%
Section 3 - Achieving and sustaining planned outcomes: 51%
APPENDIX 2 Essex inspection sample data

OMI2 Essex: Gender
- Male, 86%
- Female, 14%

OMI2 Essex: Race and ethnic origin
- White, 91%
- Black & Minority Ethnic Groups, 8%
- Other Ethnic Group, 1%

OMI2 Essex: Case types
- Community Order, 42%
- Licence, 36%
- Suspended Sentence Order, 10%
- Custody - still in prison, 7%
- Custody - released, 5%

OMI2 Essex: Terminations
- Not terminated, 48%
- Terminated, 52%
**APPENDIX 3 Essex contextual information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total caseload</th>
<th>6,561</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92% white</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% minority ethnic*</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.2% Male</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8% Female</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding cases for which minority ethnic information is not available

Total revenue budget year ending 2009: **£18.6 million**

Total revenue budget year ending 2010: **£18.1 million**
APPENDIX 4 Integrated Probation Performance Framework: IPPF is the performance framework operated by NOMS. Under this, for each probation area, a score is assigned for each of four ‘domains’ as indicated, based on results for the metrics specified. Using these scores, an overall score for the probation area is also assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Previous year - Q4</th>
<th>IPPF Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Management</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickness Absence</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 &amp; 3 OASys</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Report Timeliness</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender Programme</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Prevention</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4 OASys Final Reviews</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom 2 &amp; 3 Final Reviews</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM Phase 2 &amp; 3 OASys Assess</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off/Rec/Rec/Assess</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC Off 2 &amp; 3 OASys Assess</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4 OASys Final Reviews</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Contact</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims Contact</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment at Termination</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Offending Rate</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Interventions</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Concerns</td>
<td>128%</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Offending Rate</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5 Inspection model and arrangements

Model

The Offender Management Inspection 2 (OMI 2) Programme entails visits to all NOMS Areas and Trusts over a three-year period from September 2009. Its primary purpose is to assess the quality of offender management both in custody and the community, against HMI Probation’s published criteria, in relation to assessment, interventions and outcomes. We inspect work in the community and in custodial establishments.

Methodology

The main strands of our methodology are:

- **Assessment of cases.** We look at a representative sample of between 100 and over 200 individual offender cases approximately nine months old/terminated, made up of licences, community orders and custody cases including a minimum number of the following types of cases: high/very high RoH; PPOs; approved premises residents; statutory victim contact; and black and minority ethnic offenders. Cases are assessed by a team of inspectors and assessors (including staff from the area itself). They conduct interviews with offender managers who are invited to discuss the case in depth and are asked to explain their thinking and to show where to find supporting evidence in the record. Case assessments are the primary source of evidence for OMI2.

- **In addition we hold meetings and interviews with staff and partners.** Whilst the offender manager has responsibility for the supervision of each offender, other people from a range of organisations can contribute significantly to the management of each case. In order to collect representative views about the front-line operation of offender management, we meet with key workers who are delivering an intervention for or on behalf of probation and also case administrators.

- **The supporting management arrangements in each area are assessed via a mixture of written evidence and meetings.** Those who are: chief officers, senior managers, board members, middle managers, strategic heads/leaders of a partnership agency, may be invited to attend a meeting. These meetings are designed to provide HMI Probation with evidence about the management and leadership of the area.

- **The views of users (victims, offenders and sentencers) are gathered by means of questionnaires and individual interviews.**

Publication arrangements

- **Provisional findings are given to the area at the end of the inspection week.**

- **A draft report is sent to the area for comment four to six weeks later.** Publication follows approximately 12 weeks after inspection. A copy is sent to NOMS, including the relevant Director of Offender Management and copies are also made available to the press and placed on our website.

- **Reports on offender management in Wales are published in both Welsh and English.**
APPENDIX 6 Scoring approach

This describes the methodology for assigning the scores to each of the general criteria, to sections 1 to 3 and to the RoH and LoR and compliance & enforcement headline scores. A fuller detailed description is on HMI Probation’s website at: www.justice.gov.uk/inspectorates/hmi-probation

For each of the general criteria in sections 1 to 3 – i.e. those sections based on the scrutiny of the case sample – that is:

Section 1: Assessment and sentence planning
1.1 Preparing for sentence
1.2 Assessment and planning to minimise Risk of Harm to others
1.3 Assessment and planning to reduce the likelihood of reoffending
1.4 Assessment and planning for offender engagement

Section 2: Implementation of interventions
2.1 Delivering the sentence plan (including the punish element)
2.2 Delivering restrictive interventions (the control element of the sentence plan)
2.3 Delivering constructive interventions (the Help and Change elements)
2.4 Managing diversity and maximising offender engagement

Section 3: Achieving and sustaining planned outcomes
3.1 Achievement of initial outcomes (including the punish element)
3.2 Minimising Risk of Harm to others (the control objective)
3.3 Reducing likelihood of reoffending (the help and change objectives)

The score is based on an average, across each of the questions in the Offender Management Tool for that criterion, of the proportion of relevant cases in the sample where the work assessed by that question was judged sufficient (‘above the line’). Further details are given in the description on the website.

The score for each of sections 1 to 3 is then calculated as the average of the scores for the component general criteria.

The RoH headline score is calculated as an average, over all the questions in the Offender Management Tool in sections 1 and 2 relating to RoH, of the proportion of relevant cases where work was judged ‘above the line’.

The Likelihood of Reoffending headline score is calculated as an average, over all the questions in the Offender Management Tool in sections 1, 2 and 3 relating to LoR, of the proportion of relevant cases where work was judged ‘above the line’.

The Compliance and Enforcement headline score is calculated as an average, over all the questions in the Offender Management Tool in sections 1, 2, and 3 relating to compliance and enforcement, of the proportion of relevant cases where work was judged ‘above the line’.

For each of the general criteria in section 4, that is:

Section 4: Leadership and strategic management
4.1 Effective leadership makes good quality offender management more likely
4.2 Effective resource deployment makes good quality offender management more likely
4.3 Effective workforce planning and development makes good quality offender management more likely
4.4 An effective review and evaluation regime makes good quality offender management more likely
4.5 Effective provision of accessible services makes good quality offender management more likely

A score of either very/sufficiently/not sufficiently/not effective is assigned on the basis of the performance across the specific criteria which make up that criterion. (Details are given in the description on the website.)
APPENDIX 7 Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice

HM Inspectorate of Probation is an independent Inspectorate, funded by the Ministry of Justice and reports 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
- actively promote 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.

Code of Practice

HMI Probation aims to achieve its purpose and to meet the Government’s principles for inspection in the public sector by:

- working in an honest, professional, fair and polite way
- reporting and publishing inspection findings and recommendations for improvement in good time and to a good standard
- promoting race equality and wider attention to diversity in all aspects of our work, including within our own employment practices and organisational processes
- for the organisations whose work we are inspecting, keeping to a minimum the amount of extra work arising as a result of the inspection process
- while carrying out our work we are mindful of Ministerial priorities and the Strategic Plan for the Criminal Justice System. We work closely with other criminal justice Inspectorates through the Criminal Justice Chief Inspectors’ Group, and also with Inspectorates involved with work with children and young people.
Information on the Role of HMI Probation and code of practice can be found on our website:

www.justice.gov.uk/inspectorates/hmi-probation

The Inspectorate is a public body. Anyone wishing to comment on an inspection, a report or any other matter falling within its remit should write to:

HM Chief Inspector of Probation
2nd Floor, Ashley House
2 Monck Street
London, SW1P 2BQ
APPENDIX 8 Glossary

**ATR**
Alcohol Treatment Requirement: available as a condition in a community order

**CDRP**
Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership: multi-agency partnerships set up in each local authority in England with funding from the Home Office to achieve a community-based approach to crime reduction

**CO/CEO**
Chief Officer/Chief Executive Officer of a probation area/trust.

**CPS**
Crown Prosecution Service

**CRAMS**
Case Record Administration and Management System: Electronic case record used in most probation areas/trusts

**DOM**
Director of Offender Management: National Offender Management Service regional commissioner of services for the rehabilitation and resettlement of offenders from probation areas/trusts and each prison in their region.

**Dynamic factors**
As distinct from static factors. Dynamic factors are the factors in someone’s circumstances and behaviour that can change over time

**ESOL**
English for Speakers of Other Languages

**ETE**
Employment, Training and Education: Work to improve an individual’s learning, and thereby to increase their employment prospects

**Estyn**
Her Majesty’s Inspectorate for education and training in Wales

**FDR**
Fast delivery report: short format Pre-sentence report, as distinct from a Standard Delivery Report

**HMIC**
Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary

**HMI Prisons**
Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons

**HMI Probation**
Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation

**IDAP**
Accredited programme: Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme

**Interventions; constructive and restrictive interventions**
Work with an offender which is designed to change their offending behaviour and to support public protection.

A constructive intervention is where the primary purpose is to reduce Likelihood of Reoffending. In the language of offender management this is work to achieve the ‘help’ and ‘change’ purposes, as distinct from the ‘control’ purpose. A restrictive intervention is where the primary purpose is to keep to a minimum the offender’s Risk of Harm to others. In the language of offender management this is work to achieve the ‘control’ purpose as distinct from the ‘help’ and ‘change’ purposes.

Example: with a sex offender, a constructive intervention might be to put them through an accredited sex offender programme; a restrictive intervention (to minimise their RoH) might be to monitor regularly and meticulously their accommodation, employment and the places they frequent, whilst imposing and enforcing clear restrictions as appropriate to each case.

NB Both types of intervention are important

**IPPF**
Integrated Probation Performance Framework: Operated by the National Offender Management Service. Under this, for each probation area/trust, a score is assigned for each of four ‘domains’ (aspects of their work). An overall score for the area/trust is also assigned

**ISP**
Initial Sentence Plan. All cases should have a sentence plan. Usually this will be contained within the Offender Assessment System format

**LAA**
Local Area Agreement: a structure that brings together the chief executives of the various public bodies in a locality to share responsibility for delivering public services in their area.

**LCJB**
Local Criminal Justice Board. This is a group made up of the Chief Officers of the five criminal justice agencies (police, probation, courts, prisons and the Crown Prosecution Service) in each of the 42 criminal justice areas

**LDU**
Local Delivery Unit: Sub-area level of service delivery, normally co-terminus with local authority or police structures

**LoR**
Likelihood of Reoffending: See constructive interventions

**LSCB**
Local Safeguarding Children Board: set up in each local authority (as a result of the Children Act 2004) to coordinate and ensure the effectiveness of the multi-agency work to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in that locality

**MAPPA**
Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements: Probation, police, prison and other agencies working together locally to manage offenders who are of a higher Risk of Harm to others

**Nacro**
National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders

**NOMS**
National Offender Management Service: The single agency responsible for both Prisons and Probation Areas and Trusts

**OASys/eOASys**
Offender Assessment System/electronic Offender Assessment System: The nationally designed and prescribed framework for both Probation and Prisons to assess offenders, implemented in stages from April 2003. It makes use of both static and dynamic factors
Offender management  
A core principle of offender management is that a single offender manager takes responsibility for managing an offender through the period of time they are serving their sentence, whether in custody or the community. Offenders are managed differently depending on their RoH and what constructive and restrictive interventions are required. Individual intervention programmes are designed and supported by the wider ‘offender management team or network’, which can be made up of the offender manager, offender supervisor, key workers and case administrators.

Offender manager  
In the language of offender management, this is the term for the officer with lead responsibility for managing a specific case from ‘end to end’.

Ofsted  
Office for Standards in Education, Children’s services & Skills: The Inspectorate for those services in England (not Wales, for which see Estyn).

OGRS 3  
Offender Group Reconviction Score 3: A predictor of reoffending based only on static risks such as age, gender and criminal history.

OMI 2  
Offender Management Inspection 2

OMU  
Offender Management Unit

PO  
Probation Officer: This is the term for a ‘qualified’ offender manager who has undertaken a higher education based course for two years. The name of the qualification and content of the training varies depending on when it was undertaken. They manage offenders posing the highest risk of harm to the public and other more complex cases.

PPO  
Prolific and other priority offender

PPU  
Public Protection Unit: Police unit

PSO  
Probation Service Officer: This is the term for an ‘unqualified’ offender manager. Their level of responsibility varies from area to area. This ought to be matched with training, often at NVQ Level 3

PSR  
Pre-sentence report: Includes both Standard Delivery Report and Fast Delivery Report

REM  
Race and ethnic monitoring

‘RoH’, ‘RoH work’ or ‘Risk of Harm work’  
Risk of Harm to others: ‘RoH work’ is the term generally used by HMI Probation to describe work to protect the public. In the language of offender management, this is the work done to achieve the ‘control’ purpose, with the offender manager/supervisor using primarily restrictive interventions that keep to a minimum the offender’s opportunity to behave in a way that is a Risk of Harm to others.

HMI Probation uses the abbreviation ‘RoH’ to mean specifically Risk of Harm to others. We use it instead of Risk of Serious Harm in order to ensure that RoH issues being assessed and addressed by probation areas are not restricted to the definition given in OASys. The intention in doing this is to help to clarify the distinction between the probability of an event occurring and the impact/severity of the event. The Risk of Serious Harm definition only incorporates ‘serious’ impact, whereas using ‘RoH’ enables the necessary attention to be given to those offenders for whom lower impact/severity harmful behaviour is probable.

RoSH (Risk of Serious Harm)  
This is the label used for classifying levels of risk in OASys, where offenders are classified as either ‘low’, ‘medium’, ‘high’ or ‘very high’. Risk of Serious Harm, where serious harm is defined as “an event which is life-threatening and/or traumatic, and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, can be expected to be difficult or impossible.” (Chapter 8 of the Offender Assessment System Manual, July 2006). In this report this term is used solely to refer to this process of OASys classification.

Safeguarding  
The ability to demonstrate that all reasonable action has been taken to keep to a minimum the risk of a child or young person coming to harm.

SLA  
Service Level Agreement

SDR  
Standard Delivery Report: A ‘full’ Pre-sentence report, as distinct from a Fast Delivery Report

SFO  
Serious Further Offence: One of a range of offences committed by an offender who is subject to or who has recently finished supervision

SMB  
Strategic Management Board

Static factors  
As distinct from dynamic factors. Static factors are elements of someone’s history that by definition can subsequently never change (i.e. the age at which they committed their first offence)

TPO  
Trainee probation officer

VLO  
Victim liaison officer: Responsible for delivering services to victims in accordance with the area/trust’s statutory responsibilities

YOS/YOT  
Youth Offending Service/Youth Offending Team