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FOREWORD

This inspection of offender management work in West Mercia 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 Trust, 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 Trust 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 82% of the time. The work to make each individual less likely to reoffend – the ‘Help’ and ‘Change’ purposes - was done well enough 81% of the time. Work to maximise compliance and enforcement was done well enough 83% 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. These figures can be viewed in the context of our findings from the English regions that have been inspected to date – see the Table below.

West Mercia Probation Trust has a reputation for developing innovative partnerships to provide a range of local resources to support offender managers in helping offenders to make positive changes in their lives. We found that this was matched by a strong commitment to public protection, which was to the credit of front line staff and their managers throughout the Trust.

Overall, we consider this a very creditable set of findings.

LIZ CALDERBANK
Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Probation
July 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a result of some changes to questions in Section 3, results for inspections since April 2011 are not strictly comparable with previous scores.</th>
<th>Scores from the English regions that have been inspected to date</th>
<th>Scores for West Mercia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Control’ – ‘Risk of Harm to others’ work (action to protect the public)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Help’ and ‘Change’ – Likelihood of Reoffending work (individual less likely to reoffend)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Punish’ – Compliance and Enforcement work (individual serves his/her sentence)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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. 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.

### ‘Control’ – Risk of Harm to others score:

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.

| Score: 82% | Comment: MINIMUM improvement required |

### ‘Help’ and ‘Change’ – Likelihood of Reoffending score:

This score indicates the percentage of Likelihood of Reoffending work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality.

| Score: 81% | Comment: MINIMUM improvement required |

### ‘Punish’ – Compliance and Enforcement score:

This score indicates the percentage of Compliance and Enforcement work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality.

| Score: 83% | Comment: MINIMUM improvement required |

We advise readers of reports not to attempt close comparisons of scores between individual inspections. Such comparisons are not necessarily valid as the sizes of samples vary slightly, as does the profile of cases included in each Trust’s sample. We believe the scoring is best seen as a headline summary of what we have found in an individual inspection, and providing a focus for future improvement work within that Trust. Overall, our inspection findings provide the ‘best available’ means of measuring, for example, how often each individual’s Risk of Harm to others (RoH) is being kept to a minimum. It is never possible to eliminate completely Risk of Harm to the public, and a catastrophic event can happen anywhere at any time – nevertheless, a ‘high’ RoH score in one inspected location indicates that in principle it is less likely to happen there than in a location where there has been a ‘low’ RoH inspection score. In particular, a high RoH score here indicates that usually practitioners are ‘doing all they reasonably can’ to minimise such risks to the public, in our judgement, even though there can never be a guarantee of success in every single case.
SUMMARY

The West Mercia Probation Trust implemented the 2011 National Standards from January 2012. Where cases in our sample started prior to this date, we inspected this period of supervision against the requirements of the 2007 National Standards. Following the Trust’s implementation of the new standards, cases were assessed against the HMI Probation benchmark derived from the Operational Guidance issued by the National Offender Management Service. In practice this means that judgements about ‘timeliness’ are based on whether an assessment, plan or review was completed ‘within an appropriate timescale’.

Assessment and sentence planning {Overall Score = 85%}

Reports for courts were almost always timely, of the appropriate type and format, and were generally based on the required assessment of Risk of Harm to others and Likelihood of Reoffending. Reports contained clear proposals which were often followed by the court. Offender vulnerability was addressed in reports, but did not always feature in outline sentence plans.

Almost all cases had a timely and accurate Risk of Serious Harm screening. A timely and good quality full analysis of the Risk of Harm to others was completed in the majority of cases when required. We agreed with the overall classification of Risk of Serious Harm in almost all cases.

Risk management plans were completed in most cases where required, but many needed to be more specific about the restrictions to be placed on the offender, and the actions to be taken to minimise Risk of Harm to others, particularly when there was a known adult at risk. Management oversight of assessment and planning to deal with Risk of Harm to others and child protection needed attention.

There were timely assessments of Likelihood of Reoffending and most were of sufficient quality. Sentence plans generally contained outcome focused objectives and clearly defined roles and responsibilities, and the great majority addressed both Risk of Harm to others and Likelihood of Reoffending. However, sentence plans needed to be more specific about what work was planned in respect of cases involving child protection concerns, and prolific and other priority offenders.

Many offender managers had assessed diversity factors and how best to engage the offender. However, more needed to be done to involve offenders in the sentence planning process and to establish employment, training and education related needs at the start of sentence.

Implementation of interventions {Overall Score = 81%}

Induction arrangements for offenders were satisfactory, with appropriate levels of contact planned in almost all of the cases we examined. Interventions were generally delivered in line with the requirements of the sentence and the needs of the individual offender, although the delivery of some offending behaviour programmes was delayed.

Offender managers monitored attendance; made appropriate judgements about non-attendance and other behaviour; and the majority of cases were appropriately enforced. Communication between offender managers, other workers and offenders was good, although less so in relation to contact with offender supervisors in custody.
Unpaid work placements were of good quality, although there was insufficient evidence of matching placements to the offender, and attention to skills development.

Most assessments and plans were thoroughly reviewed in line with the timescales set by the then National Standards. However, there was insufficient review of cases following significant changes in circumstances, and more attention was needed to taking appropriate action in cases where concerns had arisen. More effective management involvement was needed in cases with child protection concerns.

Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements; child protection arrangements, and prolific and other priority offender procedures operated effectively. Appropriate priority was accorded to victim safety by the offender manager and other workers in 70% of cases. The quality of the work done with individual victims under the statutory victim liaison scheme, and women’s safety work, was good. Approved premises were used effectively as a restrictive intervention in all cases. Breach or recall action was taken where there were concerns about Risk of Harm to others that warranted such action. Further attention was needed to ensure timely initial home visits in child protection cases and those where there was a high Risk of Harm to others.

Most services provided by others to address offending-related needs were sufficient or excellent, particularly in services dealing with lifestyle, attitudes and emotional well-being. Constructive interventions were challenging in most cases, although greater attention was needed to victim awareness and employment training and education related work.

Offenders were well supported in the community by offender managers and other workers, particularly in relation to retaining or developing community ties. Overall, offender managers and others developed positive working relationships with the offender, although there needed to be better communication in cases where the offender was vulnerable.

Achieving and sustaining planned outcomes {Overall Score = 75%}

Nearly all sentences were delivered as the court intended, and in most cases either the offender complied or necessary action to enforce the sentence was taken.

All reasonable action to keep Risk of Harm to others to a minimum had been taken in just over three-quarters of cases. Risk of Harm to identifiable victims or potential victims was evidenced as having been effectively managed in just under two-thirds.

Sentence plan objectives were at least partly met in the great majority of cases. We noted sufficient progress against those factors making the offender more likely to reoffend, in the majority of cases. There was evidence of positive learning and skills development in just under half of all relevant cases and we noted a number of positive outcomes in relation to offenders gaining and keeping employment. In many cases, offender managers were taking steps to ensure that positive outcomes achieved were sustainable beyond the end of the sentence.
Information, advice and guidance support was good. Advisers paid good attention to offenders’ risk assessments for planning realistic goals. Education, training and employment referrals had started to increase in 2012 following a three-year decline to only 202 being referred in 2011.

Teaching and learning activities were good, with some outstanding aspects. A good range of community payback placements provided good learning opportunities. Care farm provision provided good support for priority offenders’ individual needs. West Mercia Probation Trust’s targets for offender employment were exceeded at most trust offices. In some activities, offenders’ new knowledge and skills were insufficiently recognised and recorded for the promotion of self-confidence and progression into employment. Skills for self-employment were not adequately promoted. Literacy and numeracy provision was too inflexible to support adequate take-up. The number of offenders achieving accredited awards was low.

Strategic planning for 2012-2013 was good. Managers were well informed by some useful data analysis and by offenders’ and providers’ feedback. Equality and diversity and Safeguarding were satisfactory with appropriate arrangements in place to support offender vulnerability. Offenders living in more rural, isolated locations in Shropshire had limited access to support and interventions.

West Mercia Probation Trust’s capacity to improve was satisfactory. It had maintained the majority of its key strengths from the last inspection in 2008, but too many key areas for improvement remained. A good review of the impact on offenders of changes in funding and delivery in 2011 had provided good awareness of the education, training and employment provision. Processes to adequately and systematically quality assure the education, training and employment interventions were being revised. West Mercia Probation Trust had recorded key points for action planning in 2012-2013, both centrally and in local delivery units.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

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

1. a timely and good quality risk management plan is completed where one is needed
2. assessments of the individual’s Risk of Harm to others are thoroughly reviewed following any significant change
3. there is evidence in the file of regular quality assurance and effective involvement by managers, as appropriate to the specific case.
Ofsted recommendations:

1. Increase the referrals to ETE (education, training and employment) and improve the achievement and recording of accredited awards and of other outcomes for offenders. Provide support, training and information to ensure offender managers have accurate and easily accessible ETE information for use with offenders. Provide structured opportunities across the Trust for staff to share ideas and best practice.

2. Encourage better take-up of provision to support the development of offenders’ literacy and numeracy skills. Ensure the provision is sufficiently flexible to enable offenders with an identified need to have a good, equitable access, across the Trust’s area.

3. Further develop quality assurance arrangements, including annual self-assessment. Ensure further data analysis and user feedback are used effectively as tools to evaluate and action plan, with SMART targets to support effective and well-monitored quality improvement.

NEXT STEPS: An improvement plan addressing the recommendations above is needed four weeks after publication. Once finalised, the plan will be forwarded to National Offender Management Service to monitor its implementation.
MAKING A DIFFERENCE

Here are some examples of work in West Mercia that impressed us.

**Offender Engagement:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMI 2 Criterion: 1.4a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Roman had been in a prison that was too far away for regular visits. However, his offender manager wrote letters to him, which were supportive, motivating, and, importantly, regular. This had a very positive effect on Roman’s confidence and trust in his offender manager and meant that, on release, he was much more open to discussing his problems and participating in activities designed to help him stop offending.

**Delivering restrictive interventions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMI 2 Criterion: 2.2a, b and g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Tony had served a long prison sentence for arson, having been refused parole due to concerns that he posed a very high RoH. His offender manager arranged for him to reside at approved premises with stringent licence conditions. After release, there was an intensive three month period where the offender manager, police and approved premises staff monitored Tony’s behaviour and challenged his negative attitudes. Initially, he pushed the boundaries but gradually accepted that there were restrictions on his freedom and he developed more positive attitudes. Tony’s offender manager referred him to Pathways who secured training and a vocational qualification that led directly to employment. Pathways also found suitable housing and supported him in moving into his own flat. As a result, not only were the offender’s risks being monitored but Tony was being helped to improve those areas of life that were important in avoiding reoffending.

**Delivering restrictive interventions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMI 2 Criterion: 2.2a and i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Martin had been made subject to a community order for sexual offences against a family member. His offender manager skilfully developed a working relationship with him, which encouraged honesty. Shortly after the order was made Martin said that he was due to start a job soon but had not disclosed his conviction. The offender manager encouraged Martin to take the initiative. Martin told the employer and was allowed to take up the post. Later, Martin disclosed that he had committed other sexual offences some years previously. The offender manager discussed this with Martin, who then went to the police. The offender manager, supported by good advice from his manager, then liaised directly with investigating officers, to assist the investigation. The offender manager had adopted an approach which included help and advice for Martin, whilst also being clear about boundaries and public protection.
Delivering constructive interventions:

OMI 2 Criterion: 2.3d

Den had assaulted his partner. His offender manager knew that he had been diagnosed with Asperger’s syndrome and looked for ways to help him understand his offending, asking a psychologist to advise her. As a result, the offender manager made extensive use of pictures to illustrate emotions that Den found difficult to understand, and regularly encouraged Den to repeat his understanding of work they had covered. T2A, a service commissioned by the Trust, provided the extra support and mentoring that Den needed. As a result, Den had been able to understand his behaviour better and the choices that were open to him in life.

Delivering constructive interventions:

OMI 2 Criterion: 2.3e

Lucy, 18, was sentenced to a community order with unpaid work and supervision. She attended her pre-placement work session and was allocated to a placement at a charity shop. She attended regularly, sometimes twice a week, and always got positive feedback about her work. She completed all of her hours within three months and enjoyed the work so much that she continued to volunteer there. Whilst doing this voluntary work she had been successful in getting a job at a local bar, and was doing well. Prior to doing unpaid work Lucy had never had a job. Her experience of unpaid work and support from her offender manager had been really important in helping her into employment.

Managing diversity and maximising offender engagement:

OMI 2 Criterion: 2.4b

Ash was very negative about Children’s Services contact with his children arising from child protection concerns. The offender manager dedicated a session to discussing with Ash why Children’s Services were involved and what the benefits could be for both him and his children. By the end of the session Ash said that he felt much less worried. Later Ash rang to say that he had talked to the social worker; received a home visit and contributed to the core group meeting.

Achievement of constructive interventions:

OMI 2 Criterion: 3.3b

Dudley was released from prison to West Mercia, so he could make a fresh start in a new area. He said that his priority was a job in construction. Dudley was referred to Pathways where he successfully completed a construction course, which meant catching a train before 6 am. He then took a forklift course and a CV ‘master-class’. The offender manager motivated Dudley throughout supervision and also wrote letters marking his progress. Dudley secured a contract working as a labourer locally. Both Pathways and the offender manager had provided Dudley with what he needed to realise his ambitions and stay out of trouble.

All names have been altered.
SERVICE USERS’ PERSPECTIVE

Offenders

Two hundred and thirty-eight offenders completed a questionnaire for the inspection.

- Five offenders in custody responded to our questionnaire. All had been on an induction course within a week of entering custody and only one had not had a basic skills assessment in that period.

- Three of the five had received contact from their offender manager whilst in custody: by letter or phone rather than by a visit. In two cases this was a single contact and in the other case it was monthly. All of those who had been contacted had felt supported by their offender manager.

- Only two offenders felt they had been involved in drawing up their sentence plan. Four offenders said that they had an offender supervisor in custody but only two had met with them to discuss their progress. Half felt that staff from prison, probation and other agencies had worked well together and those who had an offender supervisor felt they had a good working relationship. One offender stated “My offender supervisor was good to talk to and she listened to me any time I needed to see her”.

- All who responded had received help with health and two with ETE, and none felt that there were obstacles to them working with prison or other staff. Four of the five offenders felt they had done work in custody which had made them think more about their offending and how to avoid it in future, although one felt he had not undertaken work to make him more aware about victims of crime.

- Two of the three offenders who were due for release shortly reported that there were plans to achieve all or some of their sentence plan while on licence. Half of the respondents felt that there had been positive things arising from being in custody. One said that he had achieved building skills qualifications and had been acting as a source of support to other prisoners with drug problems.

- Two hundred and thirty-three offenders in the community responded to our questionnaire. Almost all said that the rules covering their supervision had been explained to them. Whilst most said that their offender manager had discussed their sentence plan with them, one in six had not felt involved in drawing up the sentence plan. Most respondents said that they had discussed their progress with their offender manager. One respondent said that he found “doing the risk assessments on a regular basis” helpful “because it makes you think about things, because you keep reviewing. Positive thinking”.

- Half of the respondents reported that other staff from the Probation Trust or from other agencies had worked with them. Of these, most felt that the staff had worked together well. Respondents most commonly reported being helped with attitudes to offending; thinking skills; emotional well-being and alcohol use. Just less than three-quarters of respondents said they had been helped to make links with other organisations to support them in the community.

- There were 22 respondents who said that there were obstacles to them taking a full part in their work with their offender manager or other worker. Common obstacles included ill health and childcare responsibilities, whilst others reported that when doing agency work they would often only know at short notice whether and where they would be working, which could cause problems with
reporting to their offender manager. It was positive that only one reported that this had not been discussed with him or her in order to deal with it. Another respondent stated “I used to drink a lot, I don’t drink at all now, and I’m trying to cut down on my meds as they make me very forgetful which affects my progress here. (My offender manager)... has been very understanding in this part of my life as I have bipolar and I have good and bad days...(she) is very understanding about my illness and how it affects me and my judgement on various things including family matters”.

- Overall, respondents were very positive about working with their offender manager. Only three said they did not have a good working relationship, and only two said that their offender manager did not listen to what they had to say. One respondent spoke highly of his offender manager – “My probation officer is very good at listening to and understanding me. She has also described to me about how my actions can be seen by others and helped me think more about what I do”.

- Almost all said that their work with the Probation Trust had made them think more about their offending and most thought that they were less likely to offend in the future. Almost all said that their work with the Probation Trust had made them more aware of the victims of crime.

- Well over three-quarters of respondents felt that positive things had happened as a result of being under supervision. These included the support they had received from their offender managers, both with practical and emotional problems; stopping or reducing alcohol consumption, and gaining training and employment opportunities. One said “I have stopped drinking alcohol...the curfew I have has had a big effect on me... (Also) getting CSCS card, forklift truck licence, (and) education. Sorting my debts out. Being able to discuss my problems has helped, making me an early morning person instead of lying in bed all day”.

**Victims**

Ten questionnaires were completed by victims for the inspection.

- All the victims who completed the questionnaire were clear about why they had been contacted and that they had a choice about whether or not to be involved in the victim contact scheme. All victims said their particular circumstances had been taken into account in arranging the way victim contact took place. All of the victims said they had been kept up to date about the key points of the offender’s sentence; had been given the chance to discuss any worries they had, and had been provided with an opportunity to say what conditions they would like to see included in the offender’s licence, where relevant.

- Of the ten victims, seven had reported concerns to the Probation Trust and all were satisfied with the response.

- Seven of the victims said they felt safer as a result of their contact with the Probation Trust, and three said there had been no difference. All ten victims were completely satisfied with the service they had received from the Probation Trust. One victim said: “I’ve always had an amazing service whenever I have a concern about the offender’s release and have always been updated every time something changes”. Another said that it was “a valued and appreciated service especially at times when I’ve felt vulnerable”.

---

*Inspection of Offender Management in West Mercia*
Ten questionnaires were completed by sentencers for the inspection.

- All sentencers were satisfied with the quality of court reports and stated that they were prepared within the timescales set by the courts.
- All sentencers said that the arrangements for enforcement worked well, and half said that there were arrangements for fast track enforcement of cases that posed a high RoH, or other priority cases. All confirmed that they had sufficient information from the Probation Trust to aid them in sentencing offenders to the range of requirements and that there were arrangements to review the progress of cases. One sentencer stated “This sort of information is dealt with at the regular probation forums. Probation also supply a list of current accredited programmes for the bench and retiring rooms”. One sentencer regretted that there had been a reduction in the number of accredited programme places.
- Liaison arrangements were described as positive by all sentencers, and eight agreed fully, and two partly, that they received information they needed about current probation policy and practice. All except one sentencer felt that the Probation Trust engaged effectively with the LCJB.
- All sentencers considered that probation staff in court had the knowledge and skills to work effectively in that setting, and all except one thought that staffing levels in their court were sufficient to provide them with appropriate information to aid decision-making. One sentencer stated “We have a great service from the Probation staff but they do seem to be very stretched”.

1. ASSESSMENT AND SENTENCE PLANNING

OVERALL SCORE: 85%

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>90%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) Of the 73 reports in the inspection sample, all but five were of the appropriate type. All reports had been completed using a nationally approved format and all but one had been prepared within the timescale set by the court. We considered that 88% were suitably concise.

(b) Almost all reports were based on the correct OASys layer and the required assessment of LoR, and most were based on the required assessment of RoH.

(c) Reports included an accurate analysis of the RoH posed by the offender in 82% of cases and of the LoR in 93%.

(d) Almost all the reports contained a clear proposal, and in 83% the proposal was proportionate to the seriousness of the offence. In 89% of reports there was a proposal for a community sentence, which was followed by the court in 85% of cases.

(e) There was an outline sentence plan in 90% of the reports we inspected. Plans contained objectives which related to the intended purpose of the proposed sentence (96%); specified the desired outcomes for the case (85%); and took full account of the assessed LoR (89%) and the assessed RoH (85%).

(f) Where there was evidence that the offender was vulnerable this was clearly recorded in the PSR in 85% of cases.

**Area for Improvement:**

(a) Where offender vulnerability was an issue, this had not been clearly recorded in the outline sentence plan in almost half of the reports we inspected.
1.2 **General Criterion: ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING TO MINIMISE RISK OF HARM TO OTHERS**

*RoH is assessed sufficiently well. Plans are made to keep to a minimum the individual’s RoH.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td><strong>MINIMUM</strong> improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) An RoH screening was completed in all but one of the cases we inspected. It was completed on time in 96%, and was accurate in 87%.

(b) Where required, a full RoH analysis was completed in 96% of cases. 91% were timely, and 75% were of a sufficient quality.

(c) The full RoH analysis accurately reflected the Risk of Harm to children (90%), the general public (91%), known adults (86%), staff (93%) and prisoners (88%). We agreed with the overall classification of RoSH in almost all cases.

(d) The RoH assessment drew sufficiently on all available sources of information and took into account previous relevant behaviour in 81% of cases.

(e) A risk management plan was completed in 97% of cases where required. The required format was used in 95%, and was timely in 92%.

(f) RoH issues were effectively communicated by the offender manager to other staff involved in 79% of cases.

(g) Where restrictive requirements or conditions were in place, almost all were proportionate to the level of RoH posed and to the protection of victims.

(h) We identified 37 cases that met the criteria for MAPPA. All had been identified by the Trust as eligible for MAPPA and we assessed that all but one had been assigned to the appropriate management level. All of the eight Level 2 cases and two Level 3 cases in the sample had been referred to MAPPA in a timely way. Proposed actions emerging from MAPPA were communicated to relevant bodies in all cases and incorporated into relevant plans in all but one.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) We assessed 40% of the risk management plans as being of insufficient quality, including some risk management plans on offenders in custody which did not relate to what was being done to address RoH in custody, and some offenders on licence where there was no reference to restrictive licence conditions that had been imposed. Just over one-third of the plans overall did not describe clearly enough how the objectives of the sentence plan, and other activities, would address the RoH posed by the offender and protect actual and potential victims.
There had been effective management involvement in assessment and planning to deal with child protection issues in 25 out of the 38 cases (66%) where it was required. In two cases management involvement had been ineffective and in 11 cases there had been no management involvement.

We assessed that there had been effective management involvement in RoH assessment and planning in 28 out of the 40 cases (70%) where it was required. In six cases management involvement had been ineffective and in a further six cases there had been no management involvement.

1.3 General Criterion: ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING TO REDUCE THE LIKELIHOOD OF REOFFENDING

The LoR is assessed sufficiently well. Plans address offending related factors needs to reduce the LoR.

| Score: 87% | Comment: MINIMUM improvement required. |

Strengths:

(a) The correct tier had been identified at the start of sentence or licence in 92% of cases.

(b) Cases had been allocated to an offender manager within the required time limits in all but two cases. Cases had been allocated to an offender supervisor within the required time limits in six out of eight cases in custody.

(c) Where an assessment of LoR was required, it was completed in all but one of the cases. Almost all the assessments were completed on time, and 88% were assessed to be of sufficient quality.

(d) An initial sentence plan was completed in all except one case. Almost all were timely, informed by relevant assessments and appropriate to the purposes of sentencing.

(e) Sentence plans contained outcome-focused objectives (79%); were sequenced (71%); described levels of contact (76%); and included objectives to address LoR (95%) and to manage RoH (87%).

(f) Sentence plans clearly defined roles and responsibilities of all those involved in the case in 78% of cases, while 71% of the plans were shared with relevant others working with the offender.

Areas for Improvement:

(a) Where there were child protection concerns, objectives to deal with them were not included in the initial sentence plan in 19 out of the 38 relevant cases (50%).

(b) Sentence plans reflected PPO status of the offender by specifying an enhanced level of contact in only two of eight cases, and an enhanced level of interventions in only one.
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>71%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(a) Full attention had been paid to the methods most likely to be effective with the individual offender in 71% of cases.

(b) In 91% of cases, sentence planning took into account the offender’s level of motivation and in 89% their capacity to change. It was clear what contribution the offender had to make to achieve sentence plan objectives in three-quarters of the cases.

(c) In 9 of the 12 cases where a learning plan had been developed it formed part of the offender’s sentence plan.

(d) There was an assessment of potential diversity factors and individual needs in 80% of cases and, where such factors were identified, actions were taken to deal with them in three-quarters of cases.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) Offenders had been actively and meaningfully involved in the sentence planning process in 63% of cases.

(b) A Skills for Life screening had been carried out at the start of sentence in 67% of cases. A diagnostic assessment of learning and skills needs was carried out in just 22 out of the 71 cases (31%) where we assessed it was required. Where relevant, a learning plan was developed in 22% of cases. We noted from our discussions with offender managers that there had been changes in ETE provision in the Trust in 2011 and that many offender managers had been unclear about exactly who would deal with ETE needs in the transitional phase, and how. Most, though not all, considered that the thresholds for referral were now clear.

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

The Trust had made active use of the OASys Quality Assurance process. This had involved middle managers, as well as front line staff assessing the work of their peers, and had been effectively led by an LDU Head with lead responsibility, and monitored by the Trust Board and Senior Management Team.

Since 2009 there had been significant organisational change. The Trust had established LDUs and had moved unpaid work and programme delivery within the geographically based teams to deal with changes in funding and workload, and to position the Trust for future changes in the role and scope of Probation Trusts. These developments had involved changes of role for some
staff, and some teams had experienced changes of middle manager which had been unsettling. This was reflected in the range of responses we received to our questions about management, supervision and workload.

Most offender managers (83%) reported having supervision at least six weekly or more frequently and most (87%) felt that this had promoted improvements in their practice. Almost all offender managers were positive about their manager’s skills in assessing the quality of their work; supporting and helping them to develop, and most felt they had been actively supported in their development.

However, less than two-thirds of offender managers felt the culture of the organisation promoted learning and development. Training and skills development needs were viewed by staff as better met in relation to their current role (with 83% answering positively), rather than their future development (68% positive). The main reason for dissatisfaction was lack of relevant training opportunities, with some other staff having insufficient time to take advantage of opportunities.

Of the 56 offender managers we interviewed who said they had specific diversity-related needs, 19 (34%) felt that these needs had not been reasonably met by the Trust.

Just under two-thirds of offender managers felt that there were sufficient formal opportunities to discuss practice issues with colleagues. Some offender managers said that they worked in clusters with regular practice meetings but others said that they did not have similar opportunities although they were able to discuss cases informally. Just under half of offender managers were confident that the process for disseminating the findings from SFO or similar reviews was effective.
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERVENTIONS

OVERALL SCORE: 81%

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

Interventions are delivered sufficiently well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths:

(a) Almost all offenders were offered a full and timely induction upon receiving a community order, and almost three-quarters when sentenced to custody.

(b) In 89% of community and custody cases, the offender was clearly informed of expectations regarding their behaviour and, in 87%, their responsibilities and rights.

(c) Interventions were delivered according to the requirements of the sentence in 88% of cases, and in line with sentence plan objectives in 73%. They were delivered on time in relation to LoR and RoH in 76% and 74% of cases respectively, and sequenced according to LoR in 72%.

(d) Appropriate arrangements were made for offender managers to contribute to sentence planning boards in 11 out of 14 cases in custody. In all four cases where it was necessary, the offender had been moved whilst in custody to access specific resources. Offender managers were notified promptly of any transfers in eight out of nine cases.

(e) The frequency of contact arranged with the offender met or exceeded the national standard in 96% of cases; facilitated the requirements of the sentence in 95%, and took full account of the assessed level of RoH (95%) and LoR (97%). In 91% of cases, it promoted the achievement of sentence plan objectives.

(f) We assessed that appropriate resources had been allocated throughout the sentence to address RoH in 85% of cases; LoR (86%); the purpose of the sentence (93%); and relevant diversity needs (73%).

(g) Offender managers coordinated the input of all workers in 81% of cases and ensured all elements of the sentence plan were delivered in 79%.

(h) There was evidence of good communication between the offender manager and other workers in 83% of cases, and between all workers and the offender in 93%. In the custody sample, there was good communication between all workers and the offender, and
offender supervisor and other workers in the prison, in 11 out of 14 cases (79%).

(i) Offender managers monitored offender attendance across all interventions in 95% of cases, and took effective action to secure compliance in 82% of relevant cases.

(j) Judgements about acceptability of absences and the offender’s behaviour were appropriate in 89% of cases, and consistent and clearly recorded in 93%.

(k) Breach or recall action was taken when required in 76% of cases that required such action. When taken, breach or recall action was both started and resolved in line with required timescales in 84% of cases.

(l) Unpaid work placements were sufficiently demanding and of benefit to the local community in 94% of cases. In all except one case, the unpaid work placement took account of the offender’s RoH.

(m) The LoR assessment was reviewed thoroughly in line with required timescales in 83% of cases, and sentence plans were similarly reviewed in 88%.

(n) The RoH assessment was reviewed thoroughly in line with required timescales in 71% of cases.

(o) In most cases that were transferred either into or within the Probation Trust, there was an up to date assessment, sentence plan and risk management plan provided by the transferring area/office. In 71% of the cases, the offender was provided with an appointment to see an offender manager within five days of notification of them living in the new area.

(p) Recording of information was clear and timely, and the overall case records were well organised, in almost all cases.

Areas for Improvement:

(a) Offenders in the community with a requirement to attend a core accredited programme were instructed to start within six weeks of the start of the order or release on licence in only two out of five cases.

(b) Interventions in custody were not delivered in preparation for release in 8 out of 12 relevant cases. Specifically, arrangements were not made for the offender to undertake an accredited programme that was needed, in sufficient time before planned release, in five out of nine cases.

(c) In custody, there was evidence of good communication between the offender manager and offender supervisor in less than half of cases, and between the offender supervisor and other workers in the prison, in less than two-thirds.

(d) Unpaid work placements were matched to the offender in 61% of cases, and facilitated the offender’s skills development and/or their educational attainment in only one-third.
In just over half of cases the LoR assessment and the sentence plan were not reviewed thoroughly following a significant change. Reviews of the LoR were not used to inform sentence plan reviews in 33% of cases, or to prioritise objectives appropriately in 37%.

The RoH assessment was not reviewed thoroughly following a significant change in 42% of cases. Reviews of the RoH were not used to inform sentence plan reviews in 37% of cases, or to prioritise objectives appropriately in 43%.

In 59% of cases, the offender was able to participate in the sentence plan review process. Although this was better than average, there remained room for improvement.

In only three of the ten cases that transferred area or office was there an update of the risk management plan within five days of contact with the offender or a home visit carried out to the offender’s new address.

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

| Score: 78% | Comment: MODERATE improvement required. |

### Strengths:

(a) Changes in RoH factors had been anticipated in 86% of cases, and identified swiftly in 71%.

(b) MAPPA had been used effectively by the Probation Trust in all except one of the ten cases subject to multi-agency management. In all cases the contribution of probation staff and other agencies had been effective. Decisions taken were acted upon and reviewed in all cases, although in one case the recording was inadequate.

(c) In 20 out of the 22 cases (91%) where multi-agency child protection procedures were used, they were operated effectively. Decisions taken within multi-agency child protection procedures were clearly recorded (82%); acted upon (90%); and reviewed appropriately (86%). Offender managers and other relevant Probation staff contributed effectively to multi-agency child protection procedures in 20 out of 22 relevant cases (91%).

(d) Six of the seven offenders supervised as part of the local PPO schemes received enhanced levels of contact and interventions.

(e) Restrictive conditions in licences were fully monitored in 94% of the cases and restrictive requirements were fully monitored in 77%.

(f) Where statutory victim contact was required, an offer of face-to-face contact with the VLO was made within 40 days in 82% of cases. In
85% of cases where statutory victim contact proceeded, there was evidence of regular and accurate information exchange between the offender manager and VLO. There was regular and accurate information exchange between the offender manager and prison staff in 92% of cases. In all cases, victims were offered an opportunity to provide views on proposed licence conditions, and informed of any relevant events during the offender’s sentence and their conditions of release. In all but one case, victims were offered an opportunity to see the relevant part of a report and records of meetings were shared and agreed with the victim.

(g) As part of our inspection of cases we assessed the quality of services provided to victims. We found that the service provided by victim contact officers had been excellent or sufficient in all cases, and by the women’s safety worker in all but one case.

(h) An initial and purposeful home visit was carried out in 76% of cases where the offender was classified as high or very high RoSH. Home visits were repeated as part of a regime to manage RoH in 86% of cases and in other cases as appropriate in 15 out of 16 cases (94%). Further home visits took place in all except one of the ten cases where there had been an initial home visit due to child protection concerns and further visits were required.

(i) In all 11 applicable cases, approved premises were used effectively as a restrictive intervention to manage RoH.

(j) Recall to custody for RoH reasons was only needed in two cases. In both cases recall was instigated promptly; the offender was given a clear explanation of the reasons for the recall, and efforts were made to re-engage the offender with their sentence plan.

(k) Breach action was taken through the courts in all 11 cases where such action was needed for RoH reasons. In nine of these cases breach action was taken promptly, and the offender was given a clear explanation as to the reasons for breach action. Efforts were then made to re-engage the offender with their sentence plan in all except one case.

(l) There was effective structured management involvement in 28 out of the 38 high/very high RoSH cases that required such involvement (74%). In a further six cases (16%) there had been ineffective management involvement, and in four cases none (11%).

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) Changes in RoH factors had not been acted on appropriately in just over one-third of cases. These included cases where the offender manager needed to tell the offender of their concerns about their behaviour; it also included cases where further investigation and communication with other agencies was needed and cases where advice needed to be sought from a manager.

(b) In 30% of cases insufficient priority had been accorded to victim safety by the offender manager or other workers.
(c) An initial and purposeful home visit was not carried out in 27 out of the 51 cases (53%) where we assessed that there were child protection concerns.

(d) Initial home visits in cases where the offender was classified as high or very high RoSH, were timely in 67% of cases.

(e) There was effective structured management involvement in 20 of the 38 cases (53%) with child protection concerns that required such involvement. In a further five cases (13%) there had been ineffective management involvement, and in 13 cases none (34%).

2.3 General Criterion: DELIVERING CONSTRUCTIVE INTERVENTIONS
(THE HELP AND CHANGE PURPOSES)
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>75%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths:

(a) In 88% of relevant cases offender managers ensured that offenders were sufficiently supported in retaining or developing community ties and relationships through their sentence.

(b) After sentence, immediate action was taken to identify employment, housing and family ties in 91% of relevant cases, and supportive and protective factors for the offender were identified in 94%.

(c) In 76% of cases, sufficient work was directed at overcoming practical obstacles to community integration and promoting key life skills.

(d) In all cases where interventions related to learning needs were delivered, they were relevant to the offender’s abilities and aspirations, and were delivered in line with sentence plan objectives. In all except one they were proportionate to the offender’s need.

(e) Constructive interventions encouraged and challenged the offender to take responsibility for their offending behaviour in 84% of the relevant cases in the community.

(f) Arrangements were made to prepare offenders thoroughly for interventions in 81% of cases. In 79% of relevant cases, arrangements were put in place to reinforce new learning and/or skills with offenders.

(g) Appropriate constructive interventions were delivered to 9 out of 11 offenders who were residing in approved premises, and featured in the offender’s sentence plan in seven.
As part of our inspection of cases we assessed the quality of services that had been provided by other agencies to deal with the range of problems associated with LoR. Overall we found that services used with each offender were excellent or sufficient in over three-quarters of cases. Positively, accommodation services were rated as sufficient or excellent for 30 out of the 37 offenders who accessed this service and drugs services were similarly rated for 24 out of 26 offenders. Although lower numbers used relevant services to improve their lifestyle, emotional well-being and attitudes, these were similarly rated positively. ETE services were insufficient for 9 out of 39 offenders and alcohol services for 4 out of 17 offenders.

**Areas for Improvement:**

(a) Sufficient information, advice and guidance regarding learning needs were provided to 42% of offenders who required it. Where learning needs were identified, arrangements for an appropriate intervention were made in 45% of cases, and delivered in 39% of cases.

(b) Constructive interventions encouraged and challenged the offender to take responsibility for their offending behaviour in 5 out of the 14 relevant cases in custody (36%).

(c) Victim awareness work was undertaken in 61% of the cases where we judged it was required.

### 2.4 GeneralCriterion: MANAGING DIVERSITY AND MAXIMISING OFFENDER ENGAGEMENT

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

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

**Strengths:**

(a) In over three-quarters of cases, arrangements for interventions took account of offenders’ diverse needs and the offender manager ensured that all relevant staff were aware of these.

(b) When the offender was residing in approved premises, their diversity needs were met in all 11 cases.

(c) In the great majority of cases the offender manager and other workers demonstrated commitment to their work with the offender; motivated and supported the offender throughout their sentence, and reinforced positive behaviour.

(d) A positive and productive working relationship with the offender had been developed by offender managers and other workers in almost all cases, and by offender supervisors in most cases.

(e) Appropriate arrangements were put in place to support and, where possible, protect the offender in 78% of relevant cases.
Areas for Improvement:

(a) In over one-third of custody cases we found insufficient evidence that the offender supervisor in the custodial establishment had demonstrated commitment to their work with the offender, motivated and supported the offender throughout their sentence, and reinforced positive behaviour.

(b) In 58% of cases, information about offender vulnerability was clearly communicated to all staff working with the offender.

COMMENTARY on Implementation of interventions as a whole:

In 2010 West Mercia Probation Trust had commenced a long-term Strategic Partnership agreement with the locally based YSS (formerly Youth Support Services) following a national tendering process. The aim was to make more effective use of the skills and capacity of both organisations, both through services provided directly by YSS and through YSS commissioning services from other local providers. During the inspection we noted cases where offenders had received such services as part of their sentence plan (including ETE, mentoring, accommodation support and work to promote compliance) which we assessed as having contributed to their progress. The Trust was reducing its provision of general offending accredited programmes in favour of more individually tailored interventions, whilst retaining provision for perpetrators of domestic abuse and sex offending.

Other external providers delivered locally based services commissioned by one or more of the four LDUs in West Mercia. Changes in some providers and contracts, and the ending of some staff co-location, had posed challenges for offender managers and other staff as they had to absorb new, and sometimes uncertain, information about changes to referral arrangements, thresholds, recording protocols, etc. In Herefordshire, the Trust had been unable to secure new health funding arrangements for alcohol treatment requirements which meant that some offender managers were using alcohol workbooks as an interim measure which were insufficient for dealing with higher levels of alcohol dependence. Many projects were innovative and engaging. For example, offenders with drug rehabilitation requirements in Telford and Wrekin were able to attend Willowdene Day Care services to take part in Care farm activities leading to NVQ awards in agriculture, welding, etc. There was also a course leading to a Level 2 NVQ Gym Instructors certificate which would assist in achieving work in the leisure industry.

Our inspection of cases indicated that whereas offender managers were generally clear about what was expected of them when assessing cases at the start of sentence there had been less clarity about reviewing cases when there was a significant change in circumstances. In December 2011, staff had been provided with clear guidance on making, and recording, professional judgements about the application of national standards, for use from January 2012 onwards. We noted that such judgements, including whether an OASys review was necessary, were generally being recorded on the case recording system. This provided a sound basis for improvement.

Although we found strengths in delivery of interventions, and many offender managers were positive about the work of the Trust, there were concerns about resources, workload management and dealing with the impact of staff absence. Just under one-third of offender managers we interviewed said that they had access to insufficient resources in order to deliver offender management. A number commented that during 2011 there had been changes to ETE provision which had led to confusion and consequently they had not always felt able to refer offenders for ETE work. Only just over half of offender managers thought that workloads were currently monitored and managed in a fair and transparent way. Three-quarters felt that planned staff absence was adequately managed; the corresponding figure for unplanned staff absence was 62%.
3. ACHIEVING AND SUSTAINING PLANNED OUTCOMES

OVERALL SCORE: 75%

Our inspections include findings about initial outcomes, as set out in this section. In principle, this is the key section that specifies what supervision is achieving, but in practice this is by necessity just a snapshot of what has been achieved in only the first 6-9 months of supervision, and for which the evidence is sometimes only provisional.

We have made some changes to this section, with effect from April 2011. The scores reported here are therefore not comparable with Section 3 results from earlier inspections.

3.1 General Criterion: THE SENTENCE HAS BEEN SERVED (THE PUNISH PURPOSE)

The individual under supervision has either complied sufficiently well, or the sentence has been enforced sufficiently well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) In all except two of the cases inspected, the appointments arranged with the offender were sufficient for the purpose of carrying out the sentence of the court.

(b) Either the offender had complied appropriately with their orders or their sentences had been properly enforced in 96% of cases.

(c) Over half the offenders complied with the requirements of their sentence without their offender manager needing to take action to promote compliance. Where such action was needed, it was taken in 78% of cases, and in over half it had been successful in re-engaging the offender. Where offenders failed to comply and enforcement action was required, this took place in 86% of cases.

(d) In two cases the offender manager had applied for early termination of the order due to the offender’s good progress. We felt that there could have been an application made for early termination in two other cases.

(e) Since being sentenced, 16% of offenders in the sample had been convicted, and a further 9% had been charged with an offence committed since the start of the sentence. In 4% of cases the offender had received another type of disposal relating to their behaviour, for example restraining order, penalty notice or prison adjudication.
3.2 General Criterion: RISK OF HARM TO OTHERS HAS BEEN MINIMISED (THE CONTROL PURPOSE)
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>71%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) All reasonable action to keep RoH to a minimum had been taken in 76% of cases.

(b) In 29 out of 63 cases with a history of domestic abuse, checks by the offender manager had ascertained there had been no further police callouts to further incidents. Callouts were recorded in 18 cases, while in 16 there was no record of the offender manager undertaking further checks. We noted that whereas offender managers were very clear about the expectations of contact with the domestic violence unit at the start of sentence they were less clear about the arrangements for periodic checking.

(c) There was evidence that the Risk of Harm to identifiable victims or potential victims was being effectively managed in 64% of cases. Where we did not find this evidence, this was, in large part, because risk management plans in these cases were not clear about what action needed to be taken to manage Risk of Harm to the specific individual victim over and above the work to manage Risk of Harm to the general public.

3.3 General Criterion: LIKELIHOOD OF REOFFENDING HAS BEEN REDUCED (THE HELP AND CHANGE PURPOSES)
There is a measurable reduction in the individual’s likelihood of reoffending (LoR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Sentence plan objectives had been fully met in 17% of cases, and partly met in 58%.

(b) Of the cases inspected, just over half had been managed by a single offender manager. Delivery of the sentence plan had been maintained in the great majority of the other cases where there had been a change of offender manager.

(c) There was evidence of benefit to the community from reparative activities in 91% of relevant cases.
(d) During the inspection of individual cases, we identified factors that made the individual offender more likely to offend. We then judged the extent to which, at this point in the sentence, sufficient progress had been made against those factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of cases in which this was identified as a factor associated with LoR at the start of sentence/release</th>
<th>% of relevant cases in which sufficient progress had been made (at this point in the sentence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle and associates</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug misuse</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol misuse</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional well-being</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking and behaviour</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - Unpaid work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) OASys had been rescored in two-thirds of cases. Our view was that sufficient progress had been made in relation to the factors identified as making the offender more likely to reoffend in 57% of cases.

(f) There was evidence of progress regarding the offender’s learning and skills development in 33 out of 71 relevant cases (46%). Eight offenders gained a qualification. We found that 36 offenders secured employment following sentence, of whom 20 sustained this for 16 weeks or longer.

(g) Resources were used efficiently to achieve the outcomes planned for the offender in 81% of cases.

(h) In three-quarters of relevant cases we found that offender managers had taken action or had made plans to ensure that positive outcomes achieved were sustainable beyond the end of the sentence.
COMMENTARY on Achieving and sustaining planned outcomes as a whole:

It was positive that OASys data about the incidence of offending-related factors had been used by LDU Heads in commissioning services. Our inspection findings suggested that further attention needed to be given to achieving positive outcomes in emotional well-being, relationships and finance.
APPENDIX 1 Scoring summary of sections 1-3

OMI 2 West Mercia: General Criterion Scores - March 2012

1.1 preparing for sentence
1.2 assessment and planning to address risk of harm to others
1.3 assessment and planning to address the likelihood of reoffending
1.4 assessment of and planning for offender engagement
Section 1 - Assessment and sentence planning
2.1 delivering the sentence plan (including the punish element)
2.2 delivering restrictive interventions (the control element)
2.3 delivering constructive interventions (the help and change elements)
2.4 managing diversity and maximising offender engagement
Section 2 - Implementation of interventions
3.1 achievement of initial outcomes
3.2 achievement of restrictive interventions
3.3 achievement of constructive interventions
Section 3 - Achieving and sustaining planned outcomes
APPENDIX 2 West Mercia: Contextual Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total caseload at June 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% white*</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% minority ethnic*</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Male</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* excluding cases for which information on ethnicity is not available
APPENDIX 3 Inspection 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 focus of our inspection is the quality of work undertaken with offenders. 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 Trust 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 OMI 2.

In addition we gather the views of users (victims, offenders and sentencers) by means of questionnaires.

Publication arrangements

- Provisional findings are given to the Trust at the end of the inspection week.
- A draft report is sent to the Trust for comment four to six weeks later. Publication follows approximately 12 weeks after inspection. A copy is sent to NOMS, 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 4 West Mercia Probation Trust: characteristics of cases inspected

OMI 2 West Mercia: Case types

- Community Order, 39%
- Licence, 36%
- Custody - released, 5%
- Custody - still in prison, 6%
- Suspended Sentence Order, 15%

OMI 2 West Mercia: Terminations

- Terminated, 41%
- Not terminated, 59%

OMI 2 West Mercia: Race and ethnic origin

- White, 96%
- Black & Minority Ethnic Groups, 4%

OMI 2 West Mercia: Gender

- Male, 89%
- Female, 11%
APPENDIX 5 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/about/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 purpose)
2.2 Delivering restrictive interventions (the control purpose of the sentence plan)
2.3 Delivering constructive interventions (the Help and Change purposes)
2.4 Managing diversity and maximising offender engagement

**Section 3: Achieving and sustaining planned outcomes**
3.1 The sentence has been served (including the punish purpose)
3.2 Risk of Harm to others has been minimised (the control purpose)
3.3 Likelihood of reoffending has been reduced (the help and change purposes)

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, 2 and 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, 2 and 3 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’.
**APPENDIX 6 Glossary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accredited programme</td>
<td>Structured courses for offenders which are designed to identify and reduce the factors related to their offending behaviour. Following evaluation, the design of the programmes has been accredited by a panel of experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved premises</td>
<td>Approved premises provide controlled accommodation for offenders under supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>Work to ensure that all reasonable action has been taken to keep to a minimum the risk of a child or young person coming to harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic factors</td>
<td>As distinct from static factors. Dynamic factors are the factors in someone’s circumstances and behaviour that can change over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETE</td>
<td>Education, Training and Employment. Work to improve an individual’s learning, and thereby to increase their employment prospects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDR</td>
<td>Fast delivery report: Short format pre-sentence report, as distinct from a standard delivery report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMI Probation</td>
<td>Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAP</td>
<td>Integrated Domestic Abuse Programme: An accredited programme which challenges the behaviour of male perpetrators of domestic abuse. The involvement of Women's Safety Workers is integral to the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions, constructive and restrictive interventions</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>Initial Sentence Plan: All cases should have a sentence plan. Usually this will be contained within the Offender Assessment System format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAA</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJB</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDU</td>
<td>Local delivery unit: an operation unit comprising of a probation office or offices. LDUs are generally coterminous with police basic command units and local authority structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoR</td>
<td>Likelihood of Reoffending: See constructive interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCB</td>
<td>Local Safeguarding Children’s 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPPA</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARAC</td>
<td>Multi-agency risk assessment conference: part of a coordinated community response to domestic abuse, incorporating representatives from statutory, community and voluntary agencies working with victims/survivors, children and the alleged perpetrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMS</td>
<td>National Offender Management Service: The single agency responsible for both Prisons and Probation Trusts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASys/eOASys</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender management</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender manager</td>
<td>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’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Office for Standards in Education, Children’s services &amp; Skills: the Inspectorate for those services in England (not Wales, for which see Estyn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMI 2</td>
<td>Offender Management Inspection 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMU</td>
<td>Offender Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO</td>
<td>Prolific and other priority offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSO</td>
<td>Probation Services Officer: This is the term for an offender manager who was originally recruited with no qualification. From 2010 they may access locally determined training to ‘qualify’ as a PSO or to build on this to qualify as a Probation Officer. They may manage all but the most complex cases or those posing the highest risk of harm to the public depending on their level of training and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>Pre-sentence report: Includes both Standard Delivery Report and Fast Delivery Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REM</td>
<td>Race and ethnic monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘RoH’, ‘RoH work’ or ‘Risk of Harm to others’</td>
<td>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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoSH (Risk of Serious Harm)</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate that a child or young person’s well-being has been ‘safeguarded’. This includes – but can be broader than – child protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>Standard delivery report: a ‘full’ pre-sentence report, as distinct from a fast delivery report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFO</td>
<td>Serious Further Offence: when an offender is charged with an offence classified as an SFO (serious sexual or violent offences), the Probation Trust conducts an investigation and review of the management of the case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Service Level Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMB</td>
<td>Strategic Management Board: the duties and responsibilities of the MAPPA ‘Responsible Authority’ (police, probation and prison service) are discharged through the SMB. This consists of senior representatives of the agencies involved in MAPPA and lay advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTP</td>
<td>Sex offender Treatment Programme: there are several different accredited programmes for men convicted of sexual offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static factors</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP</td>
<td>Thinking Skills Programme. A national accredited offending behaviour programme for general cognitive skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLO</td>
<td>Victim liaison officer: responsible for delivering services to victims in accordance with the Trust’s statutory responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7 Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice

Information on the Role of HMI Probation and code of practice can be found on our website:

http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/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
6th Floor, Trafford House
Chester Road, Stretford
Manchester, M32 0RS

Data charts in this report are available electronically upon request.