A JOINED-UP SENTENCE?

Offender Management in Prisons in 2009/2010

A series of Joint Inspections by

HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Prisons

2011

Foreword

- This report is the first to be published from our joint Prison Offender Management Inspection programme and reflects our findings from the first 13 establishments inspected. In these inspections we have examined how well prisoners are being managed under Phases II and III of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) Offender Management Model. We have also examined a number of cases which fell outside the model. Although in this report we have aggregated our findings, we found that practice varied widely. This is perhaps inevitable given the different nature of the establishments, and it is worth adding here that these 13 were not necessarily representative of all the prison establishments in England and Wales. Nevertheless, some common themes emerged.

- The NOMS model envisaged that offender managers in the community would be responsible for assessing the prisoner and for driving the management of the case. In practice we found that this was rarely happening. Offender supervisors were often expected to take on this role but some lacked the appropriate training and little guidance was available. For those who were prison officers, other operational duties sometimes took priority.

- Some prisons had worked hard to ensure that all relevant prisoners had an OASys assessment, even where these should have been prepared by the offender manager. The quality of these assessments varied, and they were rarely seen as a key document within the establishment. Sentence planning was often driven more by the availability of activities than by the assessment. Objectives were rarely outcome-focused and this meant that progress was measured by the completion of activities rather than by evidence of change.

- We were disappointed to find that few establishments made strategic use of the OASys database to identify and provide for key areas of need in the prisoner population.

- Information about prisoners was held in different locations within the establishment. Worryingly, public protection information was sometimes kept separate from offender management. The fragmentation of records impeded the safe and effective management of prisoners. P-NOMIS had the potential to act as an integrated recording system, but implementation had been delayed and there needed to be a culture shift to ensure that it was used routinely to record significant events and contact with prisoners.

- Despite these criticisms, we found some Offender Management Units which were well integrated into the establishment and where core custodial functions sat effectively alongside offender management. However, there needs to be considerable progress across the custodial estate before the NOMS vision of a 'joined up sentence' is realised and Offender Management Units operate as a hub within the establishment.

ANDREW BRIDGES
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

NICK HARDWICK
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2011

Contents

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

The Offender Management Model

The original idea of the NOMS Offender Management Model was to provide a structure within which every sentenced adult offender (18+) would be managed through either their custodial or community sentence. An offender manager who was employed as either a probation officer or probation service officer in the community would have responsibility for planning and managing both community and custodial sentences. Their role in each case included making an assessment of the offender's *Risk of Harm to others* and Likelihood of Reoffending, and producing a sentence plan based on the assessment. However, the Model had to be introduced in stages, and at the time of these inspections not all sentenced prisoners were 'in scope' of the Model.

By the end of 2006 Offender Management Units had been created in prison establishments to manage the custodial end of the new arrangements. At the time of this inspection the following prisoners were deemed as 'in scope' of offender management: those adults serving 12 months and over who were classified as posing a high or very high risk of serious harm to the public, Prolific and Other Priority Offenders and those serving indeterminate periods of imprisonment for public protection.

For those prisoners in scope of offender management, an offender supervisor was appointed in the custodial establishment to act as a link between custody and the offender manager in the community. The idea of the Offender Management Model was that the offender manager would 'drive' the sentence, and the supervisor would carry out day to day work with or concerning the offender.

The strategic leadership of offender management

The role, importance and profile of the Offender Management Unit within each establishment varied considerably. In some there was a strong strategic lead on offender management that ensured that the unit and its head were integrated into the wider functions of the establishment. However, most Offender Management Units did not have a central place in the life of the prison. Commonly there was a strategic view that offender management was primarily about resettlement and preparation for work that might be done following release, rather than the management of the individual prisoner's whole sentence.

Offender Management Units

Offender Management Units were typically staffed by a mixture of prison officers and seconded probation service officers. There was, however, a wide variety; some Units also included probation officers, administrative staff and, occasionally, a psychologist, while in one establishment the Unit was entirely staffed by prison personnel.

Few establishments had structured or routine links with local Probation Trusts to support offender supervisor practice and skills development. Although some offender supervisors had access to a good range of training, including management of *Risk of Harm to others*, they were unlikely to have undertaken training to support their work with sex offenders, for example, or in relation to dealing with mental health problems.

Staff had often received basic training in how to complete the OASys documentation but not in the interviewing skills needed to elicit the information in the first place. Moreover, many offender supervisors lacked the skills and knowledge necessary to analyse the information they had gathered in order to produce sentence plans and risk management plans. Management checks were usually thorough in relation to auditing the information content, but did not always pick up deficiencies in analysis.

Prison officers were often enthusiastic about their role as offender supervisor, but frustrated by the limitations of the time available to them. A consistent feature of prison life in most institutions was the need, at times, for prison officers to be allocated to other operational duties, leaving little time for acting as an offender supervisor. There was little guidance available to define what supervisors were meant to do in their contact with prisoners. In some prisons their role was unclear. Since the implementation of the Offender Management Model, the role of the personal officer had also become less defined. However, within the time available to them, we found that offender supervisors worked efficiently to refer or signpost prisoners to the interventions available to address offending related needs.

Recording offender management

Nowhere did we find a central record of all of the information available about individual prisoners. Much time was wasted in staff from one area of an establishment trying to find out information from another. This fragmentation meant that no one in the prison had immediate access to all of the information necessary to manage prisoners safely. As an example, the responsibility for the public protection aspects of managing some prisoners, including MAPPA eligible cases, was, in some prisons, held by the security department rather than the Offender Management Unit.

Whilst the implementation of P-NOMIS had the potential to address this, there would need to be a significant culture shift for change to be achieved. Many prison staff did not see the need to record much information or to share it with others.

Assessment and Planning for Offender Management

- In most cases *Risk of Harm* assessments and plans did not make any distinction between the level of risk posed whilst in custody and the level presented by the offender in the community.

- In reality the role of the offender manager was limited in most cases, and the supervisor tended to drive the management of the case.

- The quality of assessment and planning varied from prison to prison rather than between 'in scope' and 'out of scope' cases.

- Little use was made of OASys in decision-making about individual prisoners as the assessments were not sufficiently current; this was not surprising in view of the minimum requirement of an annual review. In several establishments there was a practice of compiling a shorter sentence plan that was not related to the OASys assessment; this was likely to describe current activity, but was not always explicitly linked with the longer term aims and planned outcomes.

Delivery of sentence plans

- The level of resources available to work with prisoners' offending behaviour varied considerably from prison to prison.

- Overall, participation in activities to reduce Likelihood of Reoffending was not related to whether a prisoner was 'in scope' or 'out of scope' for offender management but on the availability of resources and on individual need.

- In most of the cases we inspected insufficient relevant resources had so far been allocated to work with the offender's *Risk of Harm to others* or Likelihood of Reoffending. A key aspect of this was the lack of capacity on relevant accredited programmes.

- Whilst prisons were attempting to do more to address individual prisoners' reoffending than in the past, the probation service was doing less than it had done in previous years. In the past, a 'home probation officer' would be allocated to a prisoner who would be subject to statutory supervision on release – although in practice, contact was often limited during the custodial part of the sentence. Since the introduction of the Offender Management Model in 2006, provision for many 'out of scope' cases appeared to us to have actually reduced. Although there was some variation between Probation Trusts in the extent to which such cases were allocated to an offender manager, in some areas, statutory cases who were 'out of scope' got little or no contact.

Provision of accredited and non accredited programmes

- The level of provision of accredited programmes was inadequate to meet the range and frequency of the needs of sentenced prisoners overall.

- Despite having a more up to date needs analysis, in most establishments decisions about which programmes to offer had been made several years earlier and sometimes it appeared that these were no longer relevant to the current profile of prisoners.

- Local prisons had to manage large numbers of convicted sex offenders who needed to undertake the sex offending treatment programme before they could progress within the system. Places were simply not available in the establishments that provided these programmes; as a consequence we read files where prisoners, including IPPs, had been housed for up to two years in local prisons, having undertaken no relevant offending behaviour work. A similar picture emerged in relation to programmes to address domestic abuse.

- Recognising the gaps, prisons often sought to provide non-accredited alternatives through education provision, but they recognised that these were not a direct equivalent and that offenders would still need to undertake the accredited version at a later date.

Public protection

- There were some good examples of cooperation between prison and community based staff to protect victims of crime from further offending. This included preventing prohibited contact by prisoners with former partners and children.

- Overall, however, more action could and should be taken in order to keep to a minimum the (future) *Risk of Harm to others* presented by many of the cases we examined. In particular, it is important for there to be effective communication between prison departments and with the offender manager, to ensure that information about the prisoner is appropriately shared. This information should inform assessments and risk management plans, both during the custodial sentence and in preparation for release.

Work with PPOs

- Some establishments worked closely with community based multi-disciplinary teams to provide an integrated approach to work with PPOs.

- The majority of PPOs did not receive an enhanced level of intervention.

Recommendations

We recommend that NOMS should work with custodial establishments and providers of probation services to ensure that:

- an up to date OASys assessment, of sufficient quality, is in place at the start of sentence; where available this should be used in the process of categorisation and allocation, and to determine sentence plan objectives

- sentence plan objectives are outcome focused, and reviews identify progress in reducing the Likelihood of Reoffending and the *Risk of Harm to others*

- classifications of *Risk of Harm to others* indicate the level of risk posed by the offender *were they to be released into the community immediately*

- details of significant contact and communication relating to each case are recorded in a single record within the prison; this should be available to any subsequent prisons following a transfer and should contain copies of all assessments undertaken and details of all interventions delivered

- individual prisons make better strategic use of OASys and other assessments in their analysis of the prisoner population; this would enable the profile of accredited programmes and other interventions to match the identified needs

- in the light of these inspection findings, the role of the offender supervisor in offender management is clarified, and supported by appropriate training in assessment and interviewing.

1. Offender Management and the Prison Offender Management Inspection

Origins of Offender Management

1.1.   The terminology of "Offender Management" was introduced into the vocabulary of Prisons and Probation in England and Wales by the report *Managing Offenders, Reducing Crime* (December 2003) which followed the review of correctional services by Patrick Carter, also known as the Carter Report. It was felt that continuity of case management was essential for effective work to reduce reoffending, but that at the time no single organisation had responsibility for the required 'end to end' management of sentences where this included a custodial element. Accordingly, NOMS was created to 'join up' responsibility for both Prisons and Probation.

Offender Management Model

1.2.   The original idea of the NOMS Offender Management Model was to provide a structure within which every sentenced adult offender (18+) would be managed through either their custodial or community sentence. A key feature of the model was the identification of the *Risk of Harm to others (RoH)* and Likelihood of Reoffending (LoR) - and the allocation of resources that were proportionate to the assessment. In other words, the more work the case needed, the more resource should be provided in order to make the offender less likely to reoffend, and to minimise any *RoH*.

1.3.   An underlying principle of the model was the continuity of offender management throughout sentence; an offender manager was to be appointed to the case when the offender first came within scope of the model, and was to retain responsibility until the sentence was completed. This offender manager was to be located in the offender's home area or resettlement area. Their role included making an assessment of *RoH* and of factors related to offending, and producing a sentence plan based on the OASys assessment. If the offender was in custody, an offender supervisor in the custodial establishment was to act as an important link between custody and the offender manager in the community. For those prisoners who were 'in scope' of the model, it was intended that the offender manager would 'drive' the sentence.

1.4.   It had been intended that a NOMS wide case database – C-NOMIS – would underpin the model by establishing a common data base that would be accessible from prison and the community. In reality, this had to be abandoned due to over-running costs, and was instead limited to

the prison estate as P-NOMIS; this was being rolled out to establishments during this inspection period.

Implementation of Phase I

1.5.   The Offender Management Model was introduced in England and Wales in April 2005, but implementation was phased. Phase I focused on offenders in the community who were subject to community sentences and post-release licences. At this stage, responsibility was broadly located within the remit of the probation service; there was no requirement to establish OMUs in custody.

Implementation of Phase II

1.6.   In Phase II, the model was extended to offenders serving certain custodial sentences. From November 2006 it included adult offenders serving a determinate sentence of 12 months or more, who were either assessed as posing a high or very high *RoH* or who had been identified by local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships as PPOs. Prisons were required to set up OMUs by September 2006 and to deliver the offender supervisor role in custody.

Implementation of Phase III

1.7.   In January 2008, the model was further extended to include those sentenced to indeterminate periods of imprisonment for public protection, requiring probation areas to appoint an offender manager to take responsibility for the whole sentence, including the sentence planning and review process and the parole review.

1.8.   In 2010 'Layered' offender management was being piloted in prisons within the Yorkshire and Humberside region, with consideration being given to a tiering system similar to that deployed in Probation Trusts to identify resource allocation based on an analysis of *RoH* and LoR.

1.9.   However, during this period of inspection, the majority of prisoners were still not 'in scope' of the Offender Management Model. Either their sentence was too short, or they were neither a 'PPO' or a high or very high *RoH* offender.

Inspecting offender management in custodial establishments

1.10.   HMI Prisons aims to ensure the independent inspection of places of detention, to report on conditions and treatment, and promote positive outcomes for those detained and the public. HMI Prisons' methodology focuses on what goes on in a custodial establishment and the impact on all prisoners. HMI Probation methodology incorporates a detailed

assessment of the quality of service delivered over a period of time to a sample of individual offenders to prevent reoffending and protect the public from harm. The two methodologies are complementary. During 2009 'Specialist Criteria for Prison Offender Management Inspections' were drawn up; these incorporated extracts from the current Expectations set by HMI Prisons and the Criteria set by HMI Probation for its Offender Management Inspection second programme. From September 2009, HMI Probation joined HMI Prisons' teams in every full announced prison inspection.

1.11.   As part of these inspections, inspectors from both organisations received evidence in advance (including survey data), undertook assessment of a small sample of prisoners and held meetings with OMU leaders and staff. HMI Probation findings have been incorporated in the Resettlement section of the final HMI Prisons report for each institution. In addition, where ten or more prisoners in a sample were from one Probation Trust, we sent a more detailed findings letter to the home area. Five such letters were produced; in other inspections the cases inspected were from a range of Probation Trusts and few were from the local area – a reflection of the limited alignment between prisoners' home areas and their location within the prison system.

1.12.   This is the first report using as its base the data from case file reading, prisoner survey data, findings presented earlier to HMI Prisons and findings letters sent to Probation Trusts. We plan to produce such reports periodically.

1.13.   This report is based on the findings from our inspections of Kirkham, Hewell Cluster, Nottingham, Swansea, Bristol, Exeter, Liverpool, The Mount, The Wolds, Guys Marsh, Feltham, Brinsford, and Foston Hall. This included in total the assessment of 107 cases 'in scope' of offender management and 72 'out of scope' cases.

2. Offender Management in Custodial Establishments

Summary

The role, importance and profile of the OMU within each establishment varied considerably and this was reflected in resettlement strategies. In some there was a strong strategic lead on offender management and this ensured that the unit and its head were integrated into the wider functions of the establishment. In others there was a narrower view of what offender management encompassed. Important elements of the prisoners' lives were managed and recorded in a fragmented way. There was a variation in the quality of OASys completion; some staff in OMUs needed to develop further their skills in interviewing, assessment and analysis of information.

Probation Trusts had reduced the level of contact with prisoners who would be subject to statutory supervision but were 'out of scope' of the model. However, in many cases there was little to distinguish work done during the custodial phase of a sentence between prisoners who were 'in scope' and prisoners who were 'out of scope'.

Available OASys data was not being used well enough to enable effective allocation of resources. The level of provision of accredited programmes was inadequate to meet assessed needs, particularly in relation to convicted sex offenders. The degree to which release on temporary licence was used to facilitate activities aimed at reducing the LoR and *RoH* varied considerably, even between different open prisons.

The strategic leadership of offender management

2.1   The role, importance and profile of the OMU within each establishment varied considerably. Some prisons had a separate offender management strategy but the majority did not. In most prisons the OMU was located within the resettlement department of the establishment rather than being a department in its own right. This reflected a strategic view that offender management was primarily about resettlement and preparation for work with the prisoner that might be done following release, rather than the management of the whole sentence.

2.2   Where there was a strong strategic lead on offender management, the unit and its head were integrated into the wider functions of the establishment. For instance, in HMP Swansea implementation of the offender management strategy was overseen by the deputy governor

and it was reviewed at the monthly Resettlement Policy Committee meetings. The OMU had responsibility for a range of functions and various staff – case administrators, resettlement and accommodation staff, public protection, HDC/ROTL and OCA staff – were co-located within the unit. This facilitated the exchange of information and day-to-day work with prisoners.

2.3   Conversely, in others, whilst we were assured of the importance of the OMU by senior managers and told that they wanted it to be central to the work of the prison, this was an aspiration that was not supported by activity. Some aspects of practice could have been easily improved; for example, by including an overview of the work of the unit in the prison staff induction programme. Some offender supervisors indicated that their role was not well understood.

2.4   Most OMUs did not have a central place in the life of the prison. They were not involved in key elements of the prisoner's experience, e.g. in induction or decisions about classification. There was often an artificial spilt between offender management and public protection; this meant that files relating to public protection – an important element in offender management – were sometimes held in a different part of the prison. This indicated a narrow view of what offender management encompassed.

2.5   Prisons and the probation service shared responsibility for completion of OASys. The P-NOMIS electronic case database being rolled out at the time of the inspection was capable of recording information to support offender management. However, in most establishments there had been little consideration of what needed to be recorded, and by whom; this mirrored the fragmented management of the different elements of the prisoner's life.

The structure/make up of Offender Management Units

2.6   OMUs were typically staffed by offender supervisors, who were a mixture of prison officers and seconded probation staff. They were usually supported by a number of administrative staff. In a few establishments there were no seconded probation staff, yet in others there could be a whole team. Some OMUs had a psychologist working within the unit or had access to a psychologist elsewhere within the prison.

2.7   The probation staff were either probation service officers or probation officers (or a mixture of both). In some areas a senior probation officer worked across several prisons. The probation service officers (who did not hold a probation officer qualification) were usually experienced and trained in offender management before secondment. Frequently their work as offender supervisors was in mixed teams and they worked with prisoners posing a higher level of *RoH*. Two of the establishments used their probation staff to undertake OASys assessments on 'out of scope' prisoners or to work as offender supervisors in these cases. This meant

the better trained staff worked almost exclusively with low and medium RoSH cases which was an inefficient use of a scarce resource.

2.8   In other establishments the OMU was staffed entirely by prison service personnel. Whilst they were seen as broadly equivalent to the probation service officer grade staff, their training and experience was primarily as prison officers. They had received training in how to complete the OASys documentation, but not in the interviewing skills needed to elicit the information in the first place, or in how to analyse the information they had gathered in order to produce sentence plans and risk management plans. In most of the units, managers undertook quality checks of OASys. Whilst this was very thorough in relation to auditing the information content, it did not always pick up deficiencies in analysis. The variation in quality of OASys was not surprising, given the lack of benchmarking within the prison system and between prison and probation services.

2.9   Few establishments had structured or routine links with local Probation Trusts; such links could help to support offender supervisor practice and skills development. Some offender supervisors had access to a good range of training including *Risk of Harm* management but were unlikely to have undertaken training to support their work with sex offenders for example, or in relation to dealing with mental health problems. Initiatives in some establishments had had a positive impact on the quality of offender management. HMP Hewell had been involved in piloting an Offender Management Quality Assurance Tool. In HMP Swansea an offender management quality assurance process had developed from being a management led audit process, to one where selected prison and probation OMU staff were paired in 'buddy' arrangements. Those staff reviewed cases and drew learning points from case studies focusing on OMU joint working practices.

Arrangements for the assessment of prisoners out of scope of the offender management model

2.10   We did not find a clear distinction between work with prisoners who were 'in scope' of the Offender Management Model and those who were 'out of scope'. The main difference was that prisoners who were 'in scope' were subject to sentence planning boards that, according to the model, the community based offender manager was expected to convene and chair. Other elements of the model that were intended to apply to 'in scope' prisoners only, e.g. allocation of an offender supervisor, were often applied to all prisoners.

2.11   As will be shown in the next section, all 'in scope' prisoners were meant to have an OASys assessment and sentence plan, and in most cases this had been completed. However, there was variation in the timeliness and quality and the relevance of the plan to what the prisoner was doing during his or her sentence. In several establishments there was a practice of compiling a shorter sentence plan that was not related to the

OASys assessment, but which was more likely to describe the activities undertaken by the prisoner in their current establishment, often expressed in short phrases – for example, 'SOTP' or 'victim awareness'. The lack of linkage between the plans contributed to the view that OASys and offender management were concerned with the post-release phase and had little bearing on the custodial phase.

2.12   At the same time, where activities were not explicitly linked with the longer term aims for the prisoner and with the expected outcomes of interventions, the opportunity to monitor and report on changes in behaviour and attitudes was missed. This in turn meant that offender managers had little evidence of the impact of the period in custody – both positive and negative – and were therefore less able to drive the sentence in the way envisaged, or to review accurately the *RoH* or LoR prior to release.

2.13   Many prisoners had a relevant OASys which had been prepared before sentence, either from another recent period of supervision or from the court appearance for that sentence. In cases that were out of scope for offender management, where no OASys had been completed before sentence, an offender supervisor would normally complete an OASys. Given the different levels of training of staff preparing the documents – for example, between prison and probation staff - it was not surprising to find that there were wide variations in the quality of assessments and sentence plans.

2.14   Five of the establishments we visited had introduced a form of layered offender management – in advance of the planned national roll-out of this model - whereby all prisoners, including those on remand, had some form of assessment. HMP Guys Marsh was working towards a position in which the OMU would be the hub of the work of the prison – as in the NOMS model. The unit's work was well developed and included strong links with the local Probation Trust.

2.15   Whilst prisons were attempting to do more to address individual prisoners' reoffending than they had in the past, the probation service was now doing less than it had done in previous years, especially with those prisoners who were now 'out of scope' cases. As a general rule, prior to the introduction of the offender management model in 2006, prisoners who would be subject to statutory supervision on release were allocated to a probation officer or probation service officer (now called offender manager) on sentence. A variable level of contact in person or by letter would then take place with a view to establishing a sentence plan for release. The presumption now was that there would be no contact with prisoners who were 'out of scope' for offender management by a community based offender manager until around the time of release.

The region

2.16 During the first six months of inspecting offender management in prisons our schedule meant that we did not visit enough establishments in any single region to enable us to comment in detail on regional activity. In one inspection we noted that there was no regional division of responsibilities between prisons for delivering particular interventions. There was, however, a regional strategy to get prisoners in prisons close to home, in order to facilitate resettlement.

Analysis of prisoner needs

2.17 All of the prisons were using an analysis of prisoner need to inform their planning. The basis of these analyses varied, and a few were out of date. In HMP Guys Marsh a self-disclosure questionnaire had been administered and was being used as the basis for the needs analysis. This was unusual; in most prisons there was little evidence of prisoners' views being used to inform planning.

2.18 In HMP The Mount, the psychology department had done an inventory of individual needs and used a record of the sentence plan objectives to monitor levels of demand. This prison was working with outside agencies to develop additional services, and these analyses had been successfully used to procure them e.g. a citizens advice bureau surgery on finance and debt.

2.19 None of the prisons we visited were using OASys data, though one said it was planning to start doing so. Unlike Probation Trusts, prisons were not able to interrogate the OASys management information database and construct their own reports. However, they were able to request risk and needs reports from the OASys Data Evaluation and Analysis Team (O-DEAT), but this facility was rarely used. This was a missed opportunity to use a rich source of evidence about prisoners' needs and offending related factors, using a nationally benchmarked approach.

2.20 Two of the prisons conducted surveys prior to prisoners leaving their establishment to record what interventions they had undertaken and what unmet needs they still had. HMP Kirkham attempted to follow up what happened to prisoners after release as a measure of success; they sent out questionnaires after release and monitored if any respondents returned to custody at a later stage.

Provision of accredited and non-accredited programmes

2.21 The level of provision of accredited programmes often did not meet the range and frequency of the identified needs of sentenced offenders overall. Despite having a more up to date needs analysis, in most establishments decisions about which programmes to offer had often been made several years earlier and sometimes these appeared no longer relevant to the current changing profile of prisoners.

2.22 Most, but not all, establishments had access to a general offending behaviour programme. We found that funding for this and the victim awareness programme had been withdrawn in one local prison. This was

Prison Offender Management: A Joined-Up Sentence?

of concern, particularly in relation to those prisoners who would serve their whole sentence there. In another local prison there were just 40 places per year for the thinking skills programme, and in many prisons visited, the capacity of those programmes which were provided was insufficient to meet the likely current levels of demand.

2.23   The lack of sufficient programmes to address alcohol misuse and domestic violence was a clear gap. In one prison men with a history of domestic abuse were undertaking programmes designed to address violent behaviour and anger management since they were available, even though such programmes are usually unsuitable for use with perpetrators of domestic violence. This meant that not only was there insufficient provision, but some prisoners were actually undertaking the wrong programme.

2.24   Waiting times for programmes were often too long, which meant that some prisoners were released before reaching the start date. However, priority was usually given to prisoners assessed as presenting a high *RoH*, or as PPOs, and those whose release dates were soonest. While some accredited programmes could be accessed by transfer to other prisons, where these were available at category B establishments, category C prisoners were reluctant to move to more restrictive conditions; these establishments were also under pressure not to accommodate prisoners who did not require the category B level of security.

2.25   Local prisons had to manage large numbers of convicted sex offenders who needed to undertake the SOTP before they could progress within the system. Places were simply not available in the establishments that provided these programmes; as a consequence we read files where prisoners, including IPPs, had been housed for up to two years in local prisons, having undertaken no relevant offending behaviour work.

2.26   Recognising the gaps, prisons often sought to provide non-accredited alternatives through education provision, but they recognised that these were not a direct equivalent and that offenders would still need to undertake the accredited version at a later date. Some establishments (for example HMYOI Brinsford, and HMP and YOI Foston Hall) were providing courses in drugs through the Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice and Throughcare team. Others developed their own provision in alcohol awareness, parenting, and in one, a programme to address guns and gangs issues. The Sycamore Tree programme to increase victim awareness was available at a number of establishments. HMP The Mount had adapted a victim awareness programme to create a 'justice awareness' programme that was aimed at Muslim prisoners. This was reported to be over-subscribed.

The use of ROTL to support offender management objectives

2.27   One of the open prisons, HMP Kirkham, was working in partnership with the local Probation Trust to deliver programmes 'through the gate' on a temporary release basis, enabling prisoners to participate in a range of

programmes not available at other prisons. Extensive and appropriate use was made of ROTL for a wide range of activities, all related to the future resettlement of the prisoner, and the prison had developed good links with local employers. The prison had ensured that wherever possible work related training was linked to the attainment of qualifications.

3. Offender Management in practice

Summary

Within the limits of the time available to them, offender supervisors worked efficiently to refer or signpost prisoners to the interventions available to address offending related needs. The role of the personal officer was now unclear. Information about prisoners was not well recorded and was kept in a fragmented manner. The role of the offender manager was limited in most cases and the supervisor tended to drive the management of the case. There was a wide range of quality of assessment and planning which tended to vary from prison to prison rather than between 'in scope' and 'out of scope' cases. Little use was made of OASys in decision making about individual prisoners. The size of the national prison population had a negative impact on the capacity of individual establishments to get prisoners access to the interventions necessary to address their offending. There were positive examples of prison involvement in PPO schemes although many did not experience an enhanced level of interventions.

Allocation to offender supervisors

3.1   In most establishments prisoners were allocated to an offender supervisor within the required two days of reception (in over 80% of all cases in our sample). They were often interviewed on the first or second day. There was no common system for allocating prisoners; some supervisors specialised e.g. in PPO's or high *Risk of Harm* cases whilst others had a generic caseload.

3.2   In some cases, although an offender supervisor was allocated promptly on arrival, we found that they had no contact with the prisoner for some time. The National Standard required a first contact with the offender supervisor within ten days of sentence but did not specify the period between arrival at a subsequent prison and contact with the new offender supervisor. In several OMUs we also found offender supervisors who were unsure about what they should be delivering. There was little guidance available to define what they were meant to do in their contact with prisoners.

3.3   In response to our survey of prisoners 'in scope' for offender management in each of the establishments, there were clear differences in perceptions or experience of the role of the offender supervisor. Only in open prisons and the Women's prison were there clear arrangements

for prisoners to meet a supervisor at least monthly, and there was an overwhelmingly positive view that this was valuable.

3.4   Typically, an interview was undertaken by a member of the offender management team on the day after arrival in the prison; this was separate to the formal induction procedure. At this interview, the prisoners identified the needs they saw themselves as having during the remand period or sentence, against the seven reoffending pathways. Referrals were either made to interventions available in the establishment or prisoners were signposted to resources such as health services, that they could access themselves. It was common to find an early referral to housing and education.

3.5   Prison officers were often enthusiastic about their role as offender supervisor, but frustrated by the limitations of the time available to them. A consistent feature of prison life in most was the need for prison officers to be allocated to other operational duties that meant there was little time left to act as an offender supervisor. Most had caseloads ranging from the mid-twenties to the mid-thirties but could have as little as two days in two weeks in which to carry out their work and contact could be limited to a short conversation once a month on the wing or during work time. However, four establishments had committed themselves to not redeploying offender supervisors to other duties; according to offender supervisors, one had managed to achieve this, and in three others redeployment was relatively infrequent.

Recording offender management

3.6   Nowhere did we find a central record of all of the information available about individual prisoners. Much time was wasted in staff from one area of an establishment trying to find out information from another. Examples included OMU files that did not contain evidence of induction on admission or of interviews carried out by other departments to identify future protective factors that may need early attention, such as accommodation or employment. Information about public protection cases and MAPPA activity was often kept separate from the OMU – sometimes in a different building. Wing records contained entries about day to day activities and the contact wing staff had with the prisoner but where we saw these records, the offender supervisor was not always identified, and there was no reference to sentence plan targets. This fragmentation of records meant that no one in the prison had immediate access to all of the information necessary to manage prisoners safely. As a result prisons were not always making use of all the available information to inform decisions about prison allocation or re-categorisation, and in planning for eventual release.

3.7   Whilst the implementation of P-NOMIS had the potential to address this, there would need to be a significant culture shift for change to be achieved. Many prison staff did not see the need to record much information or to share it with others. This did not just waste time but

significant information did not always reach those who needed it. Offender supervisors did not routinely record the contact they had had with prisoners, or simply wrote 'no issues'. Hence, it was often impossible to see from records what work the offender supervisor had done with the prisoner, although in some cases it was clear from our discussions with staff that they were undertaking work but not recording it. This contributed to the difficulty in assessing the prisoner's progress and the outcomes of work undertaken.

3.8   Two of the prisons had implemented P-NOMIS and a further one had developed its own database that was meant to contain all information. We found that whilst staff had had the necessary 'technical' training to use them, they lacked confidence and did not use it well so that information was still scattered. Ensuring that P-NOMIS was used effectively as a means of recording and communication needed to be more than a technical exercise.

3.9   Since the introduction of offender management, the role of personal officers had become unclear in some establishments. Where we had access to wing files they often contained entries about day to day activities and the contact wing staff had with the prisoner. In some the offender supervisor was not identified and there was no reference to sentence plan targets. In others there was a clearer delineation of roles and the personal officer was able to make a separate and distinct contribution to work with the prisoner.

3.10   One good example of recording was in relation to accredited programmes where tutors involved offender supervisors in end of programme three-way meetings and provided good quality post-programme reports.

Assessment of the Likelihood of Reoffending

3.11   In 86% of cases there had been an assessment of the LoR using OASys. This had been done on time in 73% of 'in scope' cases and 77% of those 'out of scope'. A number of establishments receiving prisoners after transfer complained about other prisons not completing OASys including some up to a year post-sentence. Decisions about transfer were therefore not informed by OASys.

3.12   The quality of assessment and planning tended to vary from prison to prison rather than between 'in scope' and 'out of scope' cases. Our sample sizes per prison were small – typically between 15 and 20. In one we found that half of the assessments and plans were of sufficient quality, whilst in another we found that almost all were satisfactory. Overall, 70% of assessments for 'in scope' cases and 67% in 'out of scope' cases were sufficient.

3.13   Some 'out of scope' cases had an offender manager in the community; others had had an OASys completed pre-sentence, usually for a court report, and this remained relevant. In some cases offender supervisors were confident about updating these. As we find in the community, there

were examples of cases where offender managers or supervisors had simply pulled through (copied) an out of date OASys without updating it. Some assessments contained sufficient offender details but lacked analysis of the information presented.

The role of the offender manager

3.14   Within our sample, 79% of prisoners had been allocated an offender manager. The 'in scope' prisoners completing our survey were, in the main, aware that they had a named offender manager in their local Probation Trust. However, overall, in only 55% of in scope cases did the level of contact between the offender manager and prisoner meet the National Standard minimum of one contact per year (for the purposes of reviewing the sentence plan), and the level of contact facilitated and promoted the achievement of sentence plan objectives in only 45% and 36% of cases respectively.

3.15   We found that offender managers tended to receive prompt information about a change of location or offender supervisor; this had happened in 94% of applicable 'in scope' cases. Conversely, offender supervisors expressed frustration that staff in Probation Trusts failed to respond to emails or to advise the prison when the case had been reallocated to a different offender manager. There was little evidence from the case records that offender managers had taken an active lead in the *management* of the case, although they were, in the main, *involved* with them. Instead we saw offender supervisors with a clear overview of the case and directing the work being undertaken. However, in none of the establishments were offender supervisors able to evidence what contact they had had with others involved with the prisoner, with the exception of some emails between some offender managers and supervisors. It might well be that offender managers had had more contact than was apparent to us from prison records.

3.16   Prisoners completing the survey painted a more positive picture: 75% said they had had a visit from their offender manager at some point during their period in custody; (most were serving over two years and we did not ask about the frequency of visits); 57% had communication by letter and 28% by phone. There were 40% who reported a change in offender manager during the sentence. Only 41% thought they had been supported by their offender manager.

3.17   In some 'in scope' cases there was no evidence of initial communication from the offender manager to the offender to introduce themselves or to seek to engage them in the sentence planning process, nor to support any contact from the offender supervisor.

3.18   Sentence planning boards were well used in most establishments. Whilst some Probation Trusts did not routinely prioritise participation by offender managers, most did. Offender managers rarely chaired the sentence planning board but participated either in person or by telephone or, occasionally, by video link. Where there were video conference

Prison Offender Management: A Joined-Up Sentence?

facilities they were most likely to be in use to enable prisoners to participate in court hearings. We observed several sentence planning boards and thought that participation by telephone was satisfactory. Most boards were held on time. In one prison a policy decision had been taken not to hold a board in the absence of the offender manager; this had the effect of securing the participation of offender managers in most although some ran late as a consequence.

Sentence plans in general

3.19   The minimum National Standards for prisoners serving over twelve months required little in relation to assessment and planning and were silent in relation to other prisoners. A sentence plan should be completed 16 weeks after sentence at the latest but only needed to be reviewed annually. None of the OMUs was sufficiently well resourced to review OASys more frequently in 'out of scope' cases. As a consequence, the value of the assessment diminished; where additional needs were identified, referrals made or interventions started or completed, this information was not incorporated into sentence plans until the next annual review.

3.20   We found that several establishments had devised their own system for planning without the benefit of an up to date assessment. In one, all wing files (for 'in scope' and 'out of scope' cases) contained an Individual Sentence Plan document that included both the objectives from the OASys sentence plan and also those set by the personal officer incorporating the Individual Learning Plan. In others, such plans did not address all of the objectives in the existing OASys plan which, in turn, did not reflect work being undertaken.

3.21   In another establishment, in some 'out of scope' cases there were handwritten plans. Most were not SMART or outcome focused but generally identified objectives for purposeful activity in the prison, addressing offending behaviour and substance misuse. In almost all the cases we read this led to employment or education on site, and referrals to the two available programmes.

3.22   Assessment and sentence planning to address *RoH* and public protection is covered in section 4 below.

Sentence plans in detail

3.23   OASys sentence plans were completed in 81% of 'in scope' and 74% of 'out of scope' cases. They were completed on time in 66% and 68% of cases respectively, and were informed by relevant assessments in only 59% and 63% of cases.

3.24   The quality of sentence planning was mixed and varied from prison to prison. There were small differences between 'in scope' and 'out of scope' cases, but overall 86% contained objectives to address LoR However,

these were outcome focused and logically sequenced in only 37% and 45% respectively. Only 25% described the planned levels of contact and only 32% set out the roles and responsibilities for all those involved with the case.

3.25   In the 'in scope' cases we found that a small number of OASys plans did not fully reflect the objectives agreed at the sentence planning board, despite the OMU sending the offender manager a copy of the minutes.

3.26   OASys did not appear to have been specifically reviewed as part of the decision making process for transfer to open conditions in any of the relevant cases. Nor could we see evidence that OASys was used to inform decision making about categorisation or allocation.

Engagement of offender in sentence planning

3.27   Given the lack of recording it was difficult to find evidence whether prisoners had or had not been involved in sentence plans. The prisoners completing the survey reported that 74% of their offender managers had discussed their sentence plans with them; this varied from a positive 94% in open prisons to 40% in YOIs. From the files available, we could not see what attention had been paid to their learning styles, motivation and capacity to change. In some establishments, access to interventions was limited so that most prisoners tended to have the same plan, e.g. education. Whilst this may have been a realistic reflection of what was available, it was an example of the lack of outcome focused objective setting.

3.28   Overall, we found insufficient attention was paid to the methods most likely to be effective with the prisoner in 62% of cases, and there was no evidence that the prisoner had been meaningfully involved in the sentence planning process in 50% of in scope cases and 62% of out of scope case.

Assessment of diversity and vulnerability

3.29   In our meetings with OMU staff we discussed their approach to diversity and identification of factors that needed to be addressed to enable the prisoner to participate fully in work to address reoffending. We found that staff were generally aware of diversity issues and gave examples of approaches used in particular cases to address difficulties caused by poor basic skills and prisoners who were not fluent in English. In HMP Swansea, OMU staff were able to offer services in Welsh and the team had access to interpreters for other languages.

3.30   In many files there was no evidence that diversity issues had been actively assessed, but this may be due to the recording issues to which previous reference has been made.

3.31   In all of the cases where a risk of suicide had been identified, actions to address these were included in the sentence plan.

Basic Skills and link with education

3.32   In general, we found that educational resources were available for those prisoners who wanted to use them, but there was not always a systematic approach to basic skills screening that ensured that prisoners who needed it most had access to learning. In several establishments it was the responsibility of the personal officer and not the offender supervisor to address learning needs. It was therefore on wing files that learning plans and information about work undertaken were to be found. This information was therefore unlikely to be made available to offender managers for 'in scope' cases and was not included in sentence plan reviews.

3.33   The needs most likely to be addressed, according to prisoners completing the survey, were related to ETE, with 48% reporting work to address them. Participation varied from 85% in the women's prison to 40% in the local prisons.

Delivery of sentence plans

3.34   The level of resources available to address reoffending varied considerably from prison to prison. Overall, participation in activities to help reduce offending was not related to whether a prisoner was 'in scope' or 'out of scope' for offender management but on the availability of resources and individual need. In most cases inspected insufficient relevant resources had so far been allocated to work with offenders' *RoH* or LoR. A key aspect of this was the lack of capacity on relevant accredited programmes.

3.35   Our sample contained 110 cases where the sentence plan included the delivery of an accredited programme, but the timing of the delivery of these was consistent with the plan in only 40% of the cases. In the majority of cases the programme had not yet been delivered, and in nearly one-fifth it was unavailable at their present institution.

3.36   In some establishments, access to interventions did not appear to be systematic, or driven by the sentence planning process, with prison departments identifying their own referrals through induction.

3.37   The size of the prison population and consequent pressure on resources had a negative impact on the capacity of individual establishments to get prisoners access to the interventions necessary to help them change their offending behaviour. We did see some cooperation at regional level to enable prisoners to be transferred appropriately but this was limited.

3.38   Some Probation Trusts had positive links with prisons in their locality and this helped to support offender management before release. However, in

most cases it was the offender supervisor in one establishment – and not the offender manager - who sought to have a prisoner transferred to another to access an intervention and not the offender manager.

3.39   Victim awareness and other social and life-skills programmes were provided by the education department in some establishments. Although a high percentage of prisoners surveyed reported that they had undertaken victim awareness work, we found evidence of this work in only 29% of 'in scope' and 13% of 'out of scope' cases inspected, and there was little evidence in OMU records of the impact of this work.

3.40   There was little evidence in the cases inspected of ongoing support from offender managers. However, in relation to other staff (including offender supervisors) there was evidence of a commitment to work with the prisoner in 68% of all cases, and support to the offender in 69% of in scope cases (52% of 'out of scope' cases). For 'in scope' cases there was evidence of offender managers having a productive working relationship with the offender in only 28% of cases, but for other workers including offender supervisors the proportion was 73%. We commented earlier that there may have been more contact than had been recorded.

3.41   Where assessments had identified diversity issues these were taken into account in the delivery of interventions in only 40% of cases.

3.42   Overall, we found that sentence plan objectives had been fully or partly achieved in only 49% of the 'in scope' cases inspected, and offender management had supported the achievement of planned outcomes in only 32% of 'in scope' cases.

4. Public Protection

Summary

Some elements of offender management identified as 'public protection' issues were not the responsibility of OMUs. Arrangements were in place to review on a regular basis offenders' *RoH*, although there was some variation in the extent to which offender managers and offender supervisors were involved in the reviews and in the arrangements for them to receive notes arising from the meetings. Prison staff contributed appropriately to some community-based MAPPA meetings. The quality of risk management plans was generally better in the 'in scope' cases.

Public Protection arrangements

4.1   In most of the establishments visited the OMU was not responsible for public protection in relation to individual prisoners. In HMP Swansea, public protection was integrated into the work of the unit and one member of the OMU team had the policy lead for this and held the majority of the relevant cases. This more closely mirrored arrangements for managing high *RoH* offenders in the community. All relevant cases were reviewed within the team on a fortnightly basis. At HMP The Mount a weekly screening meeting was held to identify public protection cases, determine appropriate *Risk of Harm* work and liaise with the police.

4.2   More typically, the responsibility for the public protection aspects of managing some prisoners, including MAPPA eligible cases, was held by the security department. Most, but not all, involved the OMU in regular reviews of prisoners. In some the head of the OMU chaired these meetings. The frequency of reviews varied from as much as once or twice per week to monthly in one establishment. Here, if the prisoner arrived at the establishment after this meeting was held each month, there was no system in place to assess or review monitoring arrangements until the next one.

4.3   The quality of communication between security departments and the OMU was usually satisfactory, although it could be cumbersome to achieve. For instance, in one establishment we were told that minutes from the public protection meetings were held electronically by the security department. They were available to the OMU but not copied to them, and offender supervisors said they would not be personally alerted to any relevant actions arising from them. This implied that offender managers would not therefore necessarily be alerted to concerns. In others, however, offender managers were involved in risk management

meetings, either in person or by telephone. Some establishments, for example HMP Liverpool also had a policy of prison staff going out to community based MAPPA meetings, even outside of the county.

Assessment and management of the risk of harm posed to the public

4.4   In the sample as a whole *Risk of Harm* screenings were completed in 88% of cases and were accurate in 75%. They were timely in 75% of in scope cases and 82% of out of scope cases.

4.5   Where required, a full RoSH assessment had been completed in 88% of 'in scope' cases and 81% of 'out of scope' cases. They were completed on time in 74% of all cases, but were of sufficient quality in only 44% of 'in scope' cases and 52% of 'out of scope' cases. Assessments drew on all available sources of information in only 63% of cases and *Risk of Harm* issues were clearly communicated to other staff involved with the offender in only 67%.

4.6   In most cases *RoH* assessments did not make any distinction between the level of risk posed whilst in custody and the level posed in the community. In general offender managers did not analyse sufficiently well the *Risk of Harm* the prisoner may pose to others whilst in custody, including staff and other prisoners. Observation of behaviour in prison was rarely incorporated into assessments, although such insights may be a valuable source of evidence about progress, or may indicate a continuing risk to potential victims in the community. In other cases, where it was important that prison and probation staff worked together to plan for the future, insufficient attention was given to how the case would be managed in the community. We therefore concluded that all reasonable action to keep to a minimum any *Risk of Harm* posed by the offender had been taken in only half of 'in scope' cases.

4.7   Risk management plans were generally better for 'in scope' cases. They were completed in 86% of 'in scope' cases (68% for 'out of scope' cases), on time in 70% (64% for 'out of scope'), and used the required format in 79% (55% for 'out of scope'). However for all cases, only 35% were sufficiently thorough, and only 32% accurately described how the objectives of the sentence plan and other activities would address Risk of Harm issues and protect actual and potential victims. Only 27% of relevant sentence plans contained objectives to protect children.

4.8   *Risk of Harm* assessments were reviewed in line with required timescales in 61% of all cases, and following any significant change in 35% of 'in scope' cases and 63% of 'out of scope' cases.

4.9   Almost of all of the cases inspected that were subject to MAPPA were 'in scope'. We considered that the MAPPA were used effectively in 61% of cases. Good practice included the early identification of MAPPA cases and communication with offender managers at various points during the sentence and prior to release. The involvement of offender managers in inter-departmental risk meetings – either in person or by submission of a

Prison Offender Management: A Joined-Up Sentence?

report – helped to ensure that assessments were fully shared, and prison staff made aware of trigger factors or risk indicators. Where prison staff were able to attend MAPPA meetings held in the community, this provided the opportunity for the meeting to review the offender's progress and risk level in the light of behaviour whilst in custody.

4.10   Where relevant, multi-agency child Safeguarding procedures were used effectively in only 21% of 'in scope' cases and none of the relevant 'out of scope' cases.

4.11   We found good examples of cooperation between prison and community based staff to protect victims of crime from further offending. This included monitoring of a prisoner's telephone calls and sharing the information with the police, preventing prohibited contact by prisoners with former partners and children, and referral to a forensic psychologist. In HMP Exeter, an offender supervisor acted as a single point of contact for domestic violence cases, and had established a database that was used to track information in and out of the prison.

4.12   Overall, however, this good quality work was not done often enough, and we found that victim safety had been promoted in only 57% of relevant 'in scope' cases and 29% of relevant 'out of scope' cases.

5. Work with PPOs

Summary

Although we saw some examples of an integrated approach to the management of PPOs, the majority did not receive an enhanced level of intervention.

Work with PPOs

5.1.   In three establishments we found a comprehensive approach to providing an enhanced level of services to PPOs. There were also attempts to have PPOs transferred there before the end of their sentence if located elsewhere earlier on. Offender supervisors attended relevant meetings in the local area.

5.2.   In HMP Bristol there was an integrated offender management project that formed a partnership arrangement between the prison, the police, probation, the local authority and drugs services. The community based multi-disciplinary team had grown rapidly and staff from the prison and its partners had been co-located (with their IT systems) to a community based venue. The service focused on intelligence led targeting of offenders who were seen as likely perpetrators of priority offences in the city. Senior staff from partner agencies reported that the input of the prison had been invaluable to this initiative, and they commented positively on the approach to working in partnership that had been adopted.

5.3.   In the majority of establishments PPO cases in the sample did not have a noticeably higher level of contact or structured intervention. Overall, these were found in only 22% and 33% of PPO cases respectively.

Glossary

Accredited programme	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.
DOM	*Director of Offender Management:* National Offender Management Service regional commissioner of services for the rehabilitation and resettlement of offenders from Probation 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.
ETE	*Employment, Training and Education*: Work to improve an individual's learning, and thereby to increase their employment prospects
HDC	Home Detention Curfew
HMI Prisons	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
HMI Probation	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
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
ISP	*Initial Sentence Plan:* All cases should have a sentence plan. Usually this will be contained within the Offender Assessment System format
LDU	*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
LoR	*Likelihood of Reoffending:* See *constructive* interventions
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*
NOMS	*National Offender Management Service:* The single agency responsible for both Prisons and *Probation 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*
OCA	*Observation, categorisation and allocation:* The process by which prisoners are allocated to different security categories of prison.
Offender management/ Offender Management Model	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. The Offender Management Model in custody has been implemented in phases; prisoners are described as 'in scope' or 'out of scope' of the model.
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'

Offender supervisor	Staff working within the prison who are assigned to prisoners who fall within the scope of the Offender Management Model.
OMI 2	*Offender Management Inspection 2*
OMU	*Offender Management Unit*
P-NOMIS	*Prison based electronic case recording system designed to support the management of offenders*
Prison Officer	A member of staff employed by HM Prison Service to work directly with prisoners and to contribute to the running of the establishment. As part of their job, they may undertake the role of *offender supervisor.*
Probation Officer	This is the term for a 'qualified' offender manager who has undertaken a higher education based course for two years. They manage offenders posing the highest risk of harm to the public and other more complex cases.
PPO	*Prolific and other priority offender*
Probation Trusts	From 1st April 2010, the 34 probation areas and eight trusts that existed through 2009 became 35 self-governing Probation Trusts accountable to the Secretary of State for Justice.
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.
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 Trusts 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
ROTL	Release on temporary licence
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
Sentence plan	A plan for managing the sentence. The Initial Sentence Plan should identify the *interventions* appropriate for the offender. The Review Sentence Plan reviews and records progress made.
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound
SOTP	Sex offender treatment programme
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)
YOI	Young offender institution