



*Report of an  
Inspection of the  
Isle of Man  
Probation Service*

2005

The logo features a thick, black, curved line above the text 'Home Office' in a bold, black, sans-serif font.

Home Office

## FOREWORD

We were pleased to be invited to re-inspect the Isle of Man Probation Service, our last formal report being in 1999. We see this continued relationship with the island as being significant in that it demonstrates that the service welcomes external scrutiny of its overall performance. This is especially encouraging as it strengthens the informal links that it has with its counterparts in England and Wales, at a time when greater central accountability is being exercised by the existence of the National Probation Service and National Offender Management Service.

Probation in the Isle of Man has many strengths, including good performance against national standards, strong links with the courts and partnership organisations, and the luxury of being a small organisation where all staff have the opportunity to work closely together as a team. However, the inspection has found considerable weaknesses in the quality of some of the practice seen and we have also been particularly concerned about the absence of sound structures for staff supervision and appraisal. We have noted that the service's response to the report shows that action has already been taken to address these issues.

*Andrew Bridges*  
*HM Chief Inspector of Probation*

*December 2004*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our thanks to the managers and staff of the Isle of Man Probation Service for the considerable assistance received in enabling the inspection to proceed smoothly. Without their help and willingness to discuss their work with us the inspection could not have been completed successfully. We are also grateful to the members of the Probation Liaison Committee and to representatives of the police and partner organisations who agreed to meet with us during the course of our visit.

*HM Assistant Chief Inspector: John Hutchings*

*HM Inspector: Ged Bates*

*Inspection Officer: Peter Carter*

*Information Manager: Kevin Ball*

## CONTENTS

	Page
Glossary	4
Summary and recommendations	5
Scoring summary sheet	8
Inspection arrangements	9
Scoring approach	10
Overview of the service	12
SECTION A	
QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT	14
SECTION B	
QUALITY OF ASSESSMENT	19
SECTION C	
QUALITY OF INTERVENTIONS	21
SECTION D	
QUALITY OF INITIAL OUTCOMES	24
THE DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS REVIEW	26
THE SERVICE'S RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTION'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
The role of HMI Probation	33

## **GLOSSARY**

ACE	Assessment, Case Recording and Evaluation System
ACPO	Assistant chief probation officer
CPO	Chief probation officer
CS	Community service
DAT	Drug Action Team
DIDs	Drink Impaired Drivers
ESI	Effective Supervision Inspection
HMI Probation	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
ISP	Initial Supervision Plan
LSI-R	Level of Service Inventory-Revised
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Assessments
MAPPP	Multi-Agency Public Protection Panel
NPD	National Probation Directorate
NPS	National Probation Service
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OGRS2	Offender Group Reconviction Score
PLC	Probation Liaison Committee
PO	Probation officer
PSO	Probation service officer
PSR	Pre-sentence report
SARA	Spousal Assault Risk Assessment
SER	Social enquiry report
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bounded
SPO	Senior probation officer
SSR	Specific sentence report

## SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Key findings

- Quality of Management:** The structure and size of the management team was appropriate but, especially with one of its members away on long-term sick-leave, it was clearly not operating as an effective cohesive unit. A particular example of this had been the service's failure to implement a number of CS orders and this going unnoticed over several months. Not all the PO staff were receiving regular supervision and this had resulted in insufficient attention being given to the quality of practice, even though there was very satisfactory performance against key elements of national standards, evidenced through an impressive computerised offender database. Work with sex offenders was well resourced but, as part of improving its effectiveness, the service also now needed to review the possible introduction of additional accredited programmes, the allocation of work between different members of staff and the use of its report centre facility. Although relationships with other voluntary and statutory agencies were good on an individual case-by-case basis, including work with the police in relation to high risk of harm offenders, there was still a need for an overall strategic approach to partnership work, with a key gap at the moment in relation to addressing offenders' literacy and basic skills. There were good channels of communication with sentencers who stated that they were supportive of the service's work.
- Quality of Assessment:** Most cases inspected lacked a structured and sufficient assessment and regular review of the offender's risk of harm, despite these being required by the Isle of Man national standard. In contrast, there was almost universal assessment of the likelihood of reoffending. The quality of supervision planning was unsatisfactory in many cases with more attention needing to be given to objective setting, identifying appropriate interventions to address offending behaviour and community reintegration, and enabling the offender to participate in the planning process. More attention also needed to be given to the quality and sufficiency of offender case records.
- Quality of Interventions:** Levels of contact with the majority of cases sampled were satisfactory but could have been substantially improved in some of the remainder. There were also many cases where the supervision provided did not reflect the offender's risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending, did not sufficiently challenge them to accept responsibility for what they had done, and did not fully address victim issues. However, the inspection also revealed several examples of really good practice in individual work with offenders, as well as the successful relaunch of the CS scheme. There was still considerable scope though for improving the quality and degree of pre-release work in prison licence cases and the general management of risk of harm.
- Quality of Initial Outcomes:** Most of the offenders in our case sample had not been convicted of a further offence since the start of the order or licence and most were also complying with its requirements. However, less than half were showing evidence of positive change to date in relation to their attitudes about offending. In most cases the resources allocated to the case were consistent with the offender's risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending. There was also little use made of outcome data so that it was not possible to know whether current methods of supervision were being effective. It was accepted that development of the computer database had overridden the need for measuring outcomes and that the issue now needed to be addressed.

## Recommendations

*The CPO should ensure that:*

1. *there is further consideration of making offending behaviour programmes available in the Isle of Man*
2. *all staff receive regular formal supervision sessions as required by service policy and are subject to an annual appraisal*
3. *systems for the allocation of work to staff are reviewed, including those related to assessing the suitability of offenders to attend the report centre*
4. *expenditure on partnership organisations is regularly reviewed to confirm that they provide value for money and meet the needs of offenders currently under supervision*
5. *all cases have their risk of harm assessed and regularly reviewed as required by national standards, with appropriate oversight by managers to the supervision of high risk of harm cases*
6. *there are improvements in the quality of supervision planning and supervision plan reviews*
7. *victim issues are sufficiently addressed in the supervision of all offenders*
8. *there is improvement in the quality and degree of pre-release work in prison licence cases*
9. *better use is made of outcome data at all levels of the organisation.*

## Next steps

1. This report has been submitted to the Isle of Man Government and the CPO of the Isle of Man Probation Service. Copies have also been made available to the press and are on the website of HMI Probation at:

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/justice/probation/inspprob/index.html>

2. The report makes a number of recommendations which are designed to encourage the service in its work, to take further some of its own good practice and to promote improvements in quality and effectiveness in the future.
3. The CPO has already written a response to the recommendations, and other findings of the inspection, and this is included as part of this report.
4. It is anticipated that the recommendations will normally be implemented within 12 months of publication which should allow sufficient time for integration with existing developments. In due course HMI Probation would be willing to undertake a follow-up inspection to assess whether the recommendations have been satisfactorily implemented. We can also offer continuing advice to the service, both about how best to implement the recommendations, and also about improving the overall quality of its supervision of offenders.

## SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

Section A: Quality of management	
A1: Leadership and planning	Not met
A2: Resource allocation	Partly met
A3: Management and supervision of staff	Not met
A4: Partnership/contracting out	Partly met
A5: Effective communication with sentencers	Partly met

Section B: Quality of assessment	
B1: Assessment of risk of harm	16%
B2: Assessment of likelihood of reoffending	97%
B3: Case management	27%
B4: Documentation	53%
<b>Score for section B</b>	<b>48%</b>

Section C: Quality of interventions	
C1: Managing attendance and enforcement	77%
C2: Delivering appropriate supervision	59%
C3: Diversity needs	58%
C4: Responsivity	48%
C5: Management of risk of harm	53%
<b>Score for section C</b>	<b>60%</b>

Section D: Quality of initial outcomes	
D1: Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes	65%
D2: Improvements are sustainable	63%
D3: Outcomes of interventions are assessed and reviewed using available data	Not met
D4: Interventions demonstrate value for money	64%
<b>Score for section D</b>	<b>64%</b>

<b>OVERALL SCORE FOR SECTIONS B-D (excluding D3)</b>	<b>58%</b>
--	------------



## INSPECTION ARRANGEMENTS

- HMI Probation was invited to inspect the Isle of Man Probation Service and a small team of Inspectorate staff visited the area in May 2004. The inspection was loosely based on the framework used in the current ESI programme of inspections of probation areas in England and Wales, in which areas are being assessed on how well they have met defined inspection criteria focusing on the:
  - overall management of the area
  - quality of the assessments carried out on offenders
  - quality of the interventions carried out with offenders
  - initial results of the interventions, both in relation to criminogenic factors such as employment, accommodation and substance misuse, and also whether there has been any reduction in the risk of harm and the risk of reoffending.
  
- As part of the inspection HMI Probation was also asked by the Isle of Man Government Department of Home Affairs to carry out a review of whether any improvements could be made within the probation service to help avoid future personnel problems and encourage the delivery of the most effective and efficient service. We decided to undertake this as part of the inspection of the service's management arrangements. The terms of reference were to:
  - review the management structure of the probation service
  - identify the skills and competency requirements for the management team within the service
  - identify the most effective communication systems
  - identify the most effective working practices
  - report and make recommendations in regard to the management structure, changed systems and processes which, if implemented, would be likely to improve service performance and working relationships.
  
- During the inspection HMI Probation staff carried out in-depth interviews with case managers in respect of 30 offenders currently under the service's supervision in the community, either on a court order or a prison licence. A small number of these offenders had been assessed as presenting a high risk of harm to victims or the public. In some cases we were also able to talk to the offender or to other people significantly involved in the supervision. Meetings also took place with the CPO and other managers, with all staff of the service, with the police and other partner organisations, and with sentencers sitting on the island's PLC. The inspection concluded with a meeting with the Chief Executive of the Department of Home Affairs.
  
- The same scoring approach was used as in HMI Probation's normal ESI methodology. Assessment of the Quality of Management criteria is based on written evidence provided in advance of the inspection by the probation service and on the meetings that took place during the inspection. A descriptive score is assigned to each of these criteria. Scoring of the Assessment, Interventions and most of the Initial Outcomes criteria has been based on the inspection of work with the 30 offenders in the case sample. A numerical score was calculated for each of these criteria. More detailed information about the scoring methodology is available on the HMI Probation website.

## SCORING APPROACH

Assessment of the Quality of Management criteria is based on written evidence and discussions with Board members, managers and other organisations that work with the probation service in the supervision of offenders. A descriptive score is assigned to each of these criteria. Scoring of the Assessment, Interventions and most of the Initial Outcomes criteria is based on the inspection of work with the offenders in the case sample. A numerical score is calculated for each of these criteria. More detailed information about the scoring methodology is available on the HMI Probation website.

### Quality of Management criteria

- A score is derived from assessment of performance on each of the individual evidence items within the criterion. Scores are defined as:
  - **Very well met:** very strong performance on each item
  - **Well met:** strong performance on each item
  - **Satisfactorily met:** strong performance on the majority of items and at least satisfactory performance on the others
  - **Partly met:** good performance on some of the items and at least satisfactory performance on the others
  - **Not met:** at best only satisfactory performance on some of the items
  - **Poor:** otherwise.
- There is some discretion for lead inspectors for scores to be adjusted if this seems appropriate from other findings or contextual information.
- The same approach is adopted for the Quality of Initial Outcomes criterion D3 'Outcomes of interventions are assessed and reviewed using available data'.

### Quality of Assessment, Interventions and Initial Outcomes criteria

- A score is calculated for each criterion based on the reading of case files, interviews with case managers, contact with others significantly involved in the supervision and, if possible, conversations with the offenders themselves.
- Scores for each of the criteria are weighted as set out below, with the critical criteria being weighted as twice the important criteria.

Quality of Assessment		
B1	Assessment of risk of harm	Critical
B2	Assessment of likelihood of reoffending	Critical
B3	Case management	Critical
B4	Documentation	Important

Quality of Interventions		
C1	Managing attendance and enforcement	Critical
C2	Delivering appropriate supervision	Critical
C3	Diversity needs	Critical
C4	Responsivity	Important
C5	Management of risk of harm	Critical

Quality of Initial Outcomes		
D1	Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes	Critical
D2	Improvements are sustainable	Important
D4	Interventions demonstrate value for money	Critical

- An overall performance rating for the area is then calculated, weighted as follows:
  - Quality of Assessment 30%
  - Quality of Interventions 40%
  - Quality of Initial Outcomes 30%
- The scoring sheet shows the assessment or score recorded for each criterion, plus the overall scores for Sections B, C and D. The assessment and scores are also recorded alongside the relevant criterion in the text.

## OVERVIEW OF THE SERVICE

- In terms of its current budget of £1.273 million the Isle of Man Probation Service is far smaller than any of the England and Wales probation areas. The population of the whole island is in fact only 76,315 (as at the 2001 Census), with a population density of 133 per square km, also significantly less than the England and Wales average of 348.
- The Isle of Man census data do not include information about the ethnic origin of the population. However, the number of people from minority ethnic groups living on the island is thought to be very small and some way beneath the average of 9% for England and Wales.
- In 2002/2003 the number of all recorded crimes per 1,000 population was 62, much lower than the figure of 113 for England and Wales. The corresponding figure for violent crime – seven per 1,000 population – was also much lower than the national one of 19. This makes the island comparable with those police areas in England and Wales where the lowest figures of crime are currently recorded.
- The Isle of Man is a separate jurisdiction to England and Wales and, as such, its probation service does not form part of the NPS, is not subject to Home Office targets, nor are its performance data constantly compared with those of other probation areas. Reflecting the size and population of the island, the probation service there is probably best compared with what might be provided by probation in an average sized town on the mainland. At the time of the inspection the whole service comprised only 19 people, including administrative staff, one PO seconded to the DAT, one PO based in the prison, and two officers working in family court welfare (the latter three not directly included in the inspection).
- The Isle of Man Probation Service has developed its own list of national standards which are generally similar to the standards used by the NPS, although a significant difference is that they measure appointments and work sessions actually kept rather than just arranged, which is a tougher test. Against that though the Isle of Man standards allow breach action to be initiated after three unacceptable absences for all types of court orders and licences, rather than the two unacceptable absences allowed for community rehabilitation orders and community punishment orders in the NPS standards.
- The most recent data against key elements of the standards are shown in the table overleaf. In most cases very satisfactory levels of compliance were achieved for the whole of the year 2003/2004.

	April-June 2003	July-Sept 2003	Oct-Dec 2003	Jan-Mar 2004
SERs prepared in 21 days	69%	92%	90%	88%
Offenders sign and have their orders explained within one month of commencement	96%	90%	88%	81%
Supervision plan prepared and explained to offender within one month of commencement	91%	100%	100%	94%
Minimum of 12 face-to-face appointments made in first 12 weeks of supervision	78%	94%	95%	83%
Minimum of six face-to-face appointments made in second 12 weeks of supervision	85%	6%	86%	93%
Minimum of monthly contact takes place from six month period to end of statutory supervision	81%	2%	92%	94%
All failed appointments are followed up within four days	84%	92%	56%	84%
Breach action taken within 14 days of relevant unacceptable failure to comply	67%	100%	100%	100%
Each offender's case is reviewed every four months	84%	98%	99%	94%
All failed appointments are recorded as acceptable or unacceptable on the case records	100%	100%	100%	100%
A final assessment is completed within one month of the end of supervision	100%	100%	98%	96%
All offenders released on custodial licence seen on the day of release or if not practical the next working day	100%	100%	100%	100%

## SECTION A QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT

### A1 Leadership and planning

Not met

#### Description:

*The Board and CO lead the area in the achievement of national targets and implementation of national policies through the production of local policies and procedures which are regularly monitored and reviewed. Areas are enabled to work efficiently and effectively by the NPD who develop national targets and policies in-line with Ministerial priorities and provides guidance and resources. The senior management team is committed to the implementation of national and local targets and priorities, including What Works strategies, risk management and promoting diversity.*

#### **Strengths:**

1. We assessed the management structure as being appropriate to the size of the service. The CPO was responsible to the Chief Executive of the Department of Home Affairs. Beneath him were three Directors with respective responsibilities for operations, planning and development, and monitoring and financial services.
2. Performance monitoring during the past 12 months showed continuing very satisfactory performance in meeting most of the key elements of national standards.

#### **Areas for improvement:**

1. At the time of the inspection the Director with responsibility for operations had been off work sick for several weeks and it was uncertain when he would be returning. This obviously had repercussions on the effective operation of the management team. There were also strong indications that he had not been functioning satisfactorily for some considerable time even before going off work.
2. It was difficult to get a sense of the management group working as an effective cohesive unit from the meetings that we had with both managers and staff. It was also noticeable that the CPO had often been drawn down into dealing with operational matters that should have been dealt with by one of the Directors, this detracting from his necessary strategic role and need to act as an advisor to the Department of Home Affairs. Staff complained about managers reacting to situations rather than thinking strategically, and of issues being discussed by managers but a lack of action as a result. There were also suggestions of managers having taken to functioning in a rather compartmentalised sort of way and not accepting broader responsibility for their colleagues' work as well as their own, for example at times of sickness and leave.
3. A range of policies were in place covering the service's management of its staff and supervision of offenders. However, it was unclear when each of these dated from and the service would benefit from having a formal system and timetable for each of them being periodically reviewed.
4. There was an annual business plan that was also subject to review during the course of the year, but staff did not seem very aware of its contents and were not involved in its review. There was no sense of the business plan being cascaded down through the organisation for it to become part of objectives for individual members of staff.

5. The service's appropriate focus on improving its performance against national standards had led to less attention being given by managers to the quality of practice. It was essential that the two issues should now be given the same priority.
6. A very serious recent failing had been the service not implementing part or all of more than 20 CS orders made by the courts between April 2002 and March 2003. Following the departure of the PSO previously responsible for CS work, these orders had not been followed through by the responsible manager; the true facts of the matter only being discovered by the CPO as result of an enquiry by the High Bailiff in February 2004. The CPO described these events as the most embarrassing piece of mal-administration that had occurred within the service during his tenure. While the principal responsibility for these must lie with the responsible manager, we were surprised that all this had taken place without other members of staff drawing it to the CPO's attention.
7. There was some use of specialist risk assessment tools, such as Risk Matrix 2000 for sex offenders, SARA for domestic violence cases, and the Hare Psychopathy PCL-R test. However, for the main group of offenders there were no satisfactory systematic arrangements in operation for determining the risk of harm they presented at the start of supervision, at regular intervals thereafter, and following any further significant incident that might give cause for concern. This was despite the fact that the service's national standards stated that the above arrangements should operate.
8. Although the service was aware of the development of What Works and accredited programmes within the NPS, it had chosen to date not to try and introduce similar provision in the Isle of Man, instead developing its own sex offender programme and a cognitively based programme for use in the probation hostel. The small size of the service and the island's population partly accounted for this as there would be some difficulties in running a viable group work programme in these circumstances. However, we still felt that the applicability of the Priestley One-to-One Programme should be considered. There would also be an even stronger case for the introduction of the DIDs Programme, given that driving with excess alcohol was a fairly common offence on the island and that sentencers were complaining of imprisonment both failing to deter people from offending and having much impact on their subsequent behaviour.
9. To date issues around race equality and wider diversity issues had received relatively little attention in the service's work.

A2	Resource allocation	Partly met
----	---------------------	------------

Description:

*The area demonstrates a strategic approach in allocating resources to deliver effective performance and shows positive results in relation to value for money.*

**Strengths:**

1. The service operated from good standard premises in the centre of Douglas, the main town on the island. Apart from the one PO based in the prison all staff worked in close proximity to each other with ample opportunity for good communication. We were favourably impressed by the fact that each day began with a short meeting of the Directors, POs and PSOs to deal with immediate operational matters.
2. There had been significant input into developing an impressive computerised database providing easily accessible information about the supervision of offenders to both managers and supervisors.

3. The supervision of sex offenders had been impressively resourced with good facilities for video-taping interviews and the funding of a consultancy to the PO specialist from a psychologist based in England. It was unfortunate that the sample of cases selected for the inspection did not give more opportunity for sex offender work to be scrutinised.

***Areas for improvement:***

1. Processes for the equitable allocation of work between POs were unclear and there was certainly a feeling among some staff that their colleagues operating in a specialist role, for example in domestic violence or sex offender work, were receiving more favourable treatment and were carrying lower workloads. These feelings were having a negative effect on staff relationships. Managers needed to address these issues if the team was to function effectively, establish whether such inequalities really existed and take any appropriate action. It was also of concern that one of the largest caseloads appeared to be that carried by one of the least experienced POs.
2. The service operated a report centre in which low risk of harm offenders would be seen relatively briefly by one of the POs, so that greater time could be given to offenders with more insoluble problems or at current higher risk of reoffending. However, during the inspection we discovered several examples of offenders being transferred to report centre supervision at an inappropriately early stage of supervision and apparently without a satisfactory level of assessment of their degree of risk. There was an urgent need to establish guidelines to govern the sensible allocation of offenders to this facility.

A3	Management and supervision of staff	Not met
----	-------------------------------------	---------

Description:

*The Board and CO have human resources planning strategies that ensure delivery of effective supervision to offenders.*

***Strengths:***

1. At the time of the inspection the service was fully staffed for the first time in a number of years. The majority of the POs in the team were experienced staff who had previously worked in probation areas in England and Wales.
2. Both the service's PSOs were relatively newly appointed and impressed with their enthusiasm for the work they had taken on, one in CS, the other in victim reparation work. Similarly, administrative staff interviewed expressed considerable satisfaction about their working conditions and about the probation service as an employer. It appeared to us that the service had very good and efficient administrative back-up.
3. We took the view that individual caseloads were relatively low, especially when compared to those of staff working in probation areas in England and Wales. This obviously increased the opportunities for delivering good quality supervision to the offenders concerned. This was further enhanced by there being some degree of specialisation, most particularly in the supervision of sex offenders.

***Areas for improvement:***

1. We were concerned that a number of staff did not receive regular supervision and that their case files were not subject to periodic inspection by managers. This obviously affected the development of an overall organisational structure and culture based on performance management and where staff were held to account for the quality of their work. To some extent



the situation derived from the current absence of one of the Directors on long-term sick leave, but it appeared that the situation had not been much different when he had actually been at work. Some staff reported long gaps of going between five and nine months without a formal supervision session. This was despite the fact that the service's supervision policy stated that formal supervision should take place every four weeks and that the interval should never be less than eight weeks.

2. Not all members of staff had received a recent annual appraisal of their work.
3. The one first-year officer in the team had only had the one formal meeting with her supervisor since starting work nine months before the inspection and was not aware of any appraisal system in operation to assess her performance. This was unacceptable.
4. The lack of supervision must have contributed to some of the shortcomings in practice that will be described later in this report, including the direction-less nature of some of the work. However, given that most POs had come to the Isle of Man after previously working in England and Wales probation areas, it was still surprising that much of the practice seen was not of a higher quality.

A4	Partnership/contracting out	Partly met
----	-----------------------------	------------

**Description:**

*The Board and CO have strategies and procedures in place to ensure that the area's partnerships with both voluntary and statutory agencies support service delivery and are value for money.*

**Strengths:**

1. The small size of the island and consequent limited number of external organisations the service needed to relate to, were a strong positive factor in the development of good working relationships.
2. There was a Memorandum of Understanding with the police in relation to dealing with sex offenders and other potentially dangerous offenders, which was the equivalent of MAPPA. This appeared to be working well and was positively endorsed by the island's Deputy Chief Constable in a meeting during the inspection. The fact that the same small group of people from both police and probation attended risk management meetings contributed to the effectiveness of the arrangements.
3. There was evidence of very good working relationships with the Salvation Army in relation to the provision of offender accommodation at David Gray House and with Victim Support. There was also a full-time secondment of a PO to work in the DAT with individuals with drink and drugs problems. This work was not just restricted to offenders which was an additional bonus in the arrangement.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. While good relationships clearly existed between case managers and voluntary organisations on an individual case-by-case basis, it appeared that these had been developed on an ad hoc basis without an overall strategic approach to partnership work by the management of the service. There was a key gap for example at the moment in relation to addressing offenders' literacy and basic skills.
2. Although expenditure on partnerships currently formed 20% of the service's budget, there were no formal systems in place to review and monitor these arrangements and assess whether they were delivering value for money.

3. There was a particular issue on the island about the provision of services for mentally ill offenders.

A5	Effective communication with sentencers	Partly met
----	---	------------

**Description:**

*There is high quality, proactive communication by the area, supported by the NPD, with local sentencers and clerks to the justices about the supervision of offenders and the provision of reports.*

**Strengths:**

1. Most offenders in the Isle of Man were sentenced by the Second Deemster (equivalent of a Crown Court Judge) or by the High Bailiff (equivalent of a District Judge). When we met with them, both expressed considerable support for the work of the probation service and stated that they welcomed any new initiatives for the supervision of offenders that it might want to propose. We considered that the fact of working in the main to just the two sentencers to be a very significant strength for the service as regards its communication with the courts. Although there were no written protocols between probation and the courts in relation to the services to be provided, this did not seem to be a serious omission, given that both main sentencers were on the PLC and also often communicated directly with the CPO outside the meetings' structure if they needed to raise issues urgently.
2. There was a regular structure of quarterly meetings between probation service managers and the two sentencers through the PLC, also attended by two lay magistrates. These had been supplemented by presentations on specific subjects such as sex offender work and reparation orders, given also to a broader legal audience. Detailed up-to-date information was provided to each PLC meeting about the service's national standards performance.
3. Sentencers commented positively on the improved quality of SERs, especially the offence analysis and the identification of work that would be done if the offender was placed under supervision. Although there were still occasions when reports repeated too unquestioningly the offender's account of events, they had become far more objective documents.
4. Favourable comments were also made about the contribution of probation staff on duty in the courts.

**Area for improvement:**

1. The main and significant area of dissatisfaction from sentencers had been the service's failure to enforce the CS orders and the fact that this had only been announced to them when a number of the order had already been running for several months. The CPO had informed both the PLC and the Department of Home Affairs as soon as the matter had come to his attention. This had clearly had a considerable negative impact on their confidence in the service's management team, which the latter still needed to redress.

## SECTION B QUALITY OF ASSESSMENT

### B1 Assessment of risk of harm

16%

**Description:**

*Risk of harm is satisfactorily assessed using an approved instrument (OASys where available), specialist assessment tools, where relevant, and draws on MAPPA, other agencies' and previous probation service assessments.*

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Only one case had been satisfactorily assessed for the offender's risk of harm. In more than two-thirds of the cases the risk assessment was described as poor.
2. Similarly, in almost all cases, there was no evidence of the risk of harm being regularly reviewed during the period of supervision to date.
3. A close fit between the interventions planned and the risk of harm was apparent in only about half of the cases in the sample.
4. Not all high risk of harm cases showed sufficient evidence of management involvement in the assessment, such as the manager countersigning it and approving the type of intervention to be undertaken.

### B2 Assessment of likelihood of reoffending

97%

**Description:**

*The likelihood of reoffending and criminogenic factors are satisfactorily identified and assessed using an approved instrument (OASys, OGRS2, LSI-R, ACE).*

**Strengths:**

1. A recognised assessment tool (LSI-R) was in operation.
2. Reflecting the above, in nearly all cases there had been a satisfactory assessment of the offender's likelihood of reoffending and of the relevant criminogenic factors.
3. In all cases there was a clearly identified likelihood of reoffending score.

### B3 Case management

27%

**Description:**

*The case is managed effectively and interventions coordinated to enable criminogenic factors to be addressed and any risk of harm managed. The ISP or CS order assessment takes account of the PSR, SSR or sentence plan in licence cases, and describes an overall plan of work for each offender, in-line with the assessments of risk of harm and need and the likelihood of reoffending.*

**Areas for improvement:**

1. In 87% of the cases the ISP or CS assessment was considered to be unsatisfactory in terms of its content and meeting the timing requirements of national standards. Some of the supervision

plans seen were extremely pedestrian in nature, doing little more than repeating the concluding paragraph of the SER.

2. None of the cases in the sample contained a supervision plan with SMART objectives.
3. Appropriate interventions to address offending behaviour and community reintegration were only identified in 37% of the cases.
4. Plans needed to give greater attention to spelling out liaison responsibilities with the other organisations that would be involved in the supervision.
5. In about a third of the cases it was not recorded that steps had been taken to ensure that the offender understood the requirements of the order or licence.
6. In more than half of the cases there was no record of work to share the supervision plan with the offender and give them the opportunity to participate in the planning process.
7. In high risk of harm cases more work needed to be done to ensure that supervision plans incorporated the MAPPA or other risk management meeting action plan.

B4	Documentation	53%
----	---------------	-----

Description:

*All relevant documentation is available and has been satisfactorily completed.*

***Areas for improvement:***

1. Case records were assessed as being well organised and containing all relevant documentation in only half the cases in the sample and in nine cases were assessed as poor.
2. Similarly, the quality of the actual recording was considered to have been sufficient in only 57% of the cases.

## SECTION C QUALITY OF INTERVENTIONS

### C1 Managing attendance and enforcement

77%

**Description:**

*Contact with the offender and enforcement of the order or licence is planned and implemented to meet the requirements of national standards.*

**Strengths:**

1. In just over two-thirds of cases the frequency of appointments or CS work sessions arranged conformed to at least minimum national standards, the requirements of the order or licence, the achievement of planned objectives and to any risk of harm considerations.
2. In 87% of cases the case manager sufficiently monitored offender attendance across all interventions, taking action where necessary to ensure compliance.
3. Offenders who had failed to report were required to attend 'catch-up' sessions to ensure that national standards were met in relation to the frequency of appointments.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. In nine cases the frequency of appointments or work sessions arranged was assessed as insufficient and in four of these it was assessed as poor.
2. In about a third of the cases judgements about the acceptability of absences were not always appropriate. We came across cases where a fairly generous attitude had been taken towards offenders who gave illness as reason for not reporting. There were also examples of offenders being allowed to travel to the United Kingdom, sometimes at an early stage of supervision, without arrangements made for them to report to the probation service there while they were away.
3. There were six cases in the sample where breach action had been required. In only three of these had this then been done within the 14 days required by the national standard. Though based on only a small number of cases this was a less satisfactory result than the service's own regular monitoring of the standard was showing.

### C2 Delivering appropriate supervision

59%

**Description:**

*Interventions are delivered to achieve the objectives identified in ISP and recorded according to the requirements of national standards. Supervision is prioritised according to an ongoing assessment of risk and need and takes account of previous reviews and work already undertaken by the area and other agencies. Case managers oversee and coordinate the work of other staff and partner organisations and all staff play an active part in motivating and supporting offenders throughout their supervision.*

**Strengths:**

1. The recent relaunching of CS from a previously unsatisfactory situation, through the appointment of a new and enthusiastic PSO to manage the scheme, had led to a range of placements being available, good assessment of offenders and efficient monitoring that the

hours required were being completed. It had been helpful to the postholder to spend time away observing the operation of CS in a United Kingdom probation area soon after starting in the work.

2. In all but one of the CS cases inspected the work was assessed as demanding and as fully occupying the offender.
3. We saw several examples of really good practice in relation to the supervision of offenders on court orders and licences. These included: close supervision of a high risk of harm sex offender; dedication and perseverance over several months by the DAT-based officer maintaining an offender with a chronic drinking problem in the community; and work by a PO and one of the PSOs to arrange a meeting between a released prisoner and the victim of his previous robbery offence.

***Areas for improvement:***

1. Satisfactory supervision plan reviews were only evident in about a quarter of the cases.
2. As with the original plans none of the supervision plan reviews contained SMART objectives.
3. Appropriate interventions that reflected the offender's risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending were considered to have been carried out in only about 40% of the cases.
4. Relatively few cases showed victim issues being addressed with the offender to a satisfactory standard or work undertaken to raise their awareness of the impact of the offence on the victim.
5. Work directed at community reintegration issues such as accommodation, employment, drugs and family relationships was only assessed as sufficient in just over half the cases.
6. We considered that supervision had challenged the offender to accept responsibility for the offence and its consequences in only just over 40% of the cases inspected. There was the general impression with many cases of the probation service operating largely as a welfare agency, allowing offenders to set the pace of supervision, rather than as an organisation targeted at addressing their offending behaviour.

**C3 Diversity needs**

**58%**

**Description:**

*There is a full range of interventions to meet diverse needs. There is evidence of appropriate support arrangements for women, minority ethnic and disabled offenders.*

***Areas for improvement:***

1. A small number of offenders had problems with literacy or dyslexia. However, in none of the cases was it considered that these issues had been sufficiently addressed during the course of supervision.
2. Interventions had considered whether there were diversity issues in 57% of the cases and, where such issues were apparent, supervision had been sensitive to these in about the same percentage.

**Description:**

*Offenders' learning style, motivation and capacity to change are taken into account in the assessment and intervention plan.*

**Areas for improvement:**

1. We considered that consideration had been given to the methods likely to be most effective with the offender in only 60% of the cases in the sample.
2. Six of the cases were released prisoners being supervised on licence. In none of these cases were the quality and degree of pre-release work assessed as sufficient, when taking into account the assessment of risk and need, the offender's motivation and their capacity to change. These findings were particularly disappointing in a context where virtually all Isle of Man prisoners served their sentences in the island's prison and the close proximity of the latter to the probation office. In fact it seemed to be very much custom and practice for the first contact by the supervising officer only to come after the prisoner's release, although contact with the service could have taken place prior to this through the prison-based PO.

**Description:**

*Risk of harm is actively managed in consultation with other agencies.*

**Strength:**

1. The availability of an outside consultant and the facility to video-tape interviews were significant aids to the supervision of sex offenders.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Interventions were judged to have been appropriate to the assessed risk of harm in relation to the type and frequency of supervision in only two-thirds of the cases, and there were six cases where management of the risk was considered to have been poor.
2. There were six cases where we considered there had been changes in the risk of harm during the course of supervision. In four of these work to identify and manage the risk, and take any necessary further action to reduce it, was assessed as insufficient.
3. Management oversight of the work was assessed as insufficient in some of the high risk of harm cases.
4. Not all high risk of harm offenders had been visited at home.
5. Although inter-agency risk management arrangements were working well when cases had been assessed as being high risk of harm, the system was reliant on the assessment made by the PO first involved with the case. Lack of management oversight meant that there were no systems for checking whether these original assessments were correct. For example, one of the cases sampled for the inspection had been incorrectly assessed as low risk when clearly this was far from the case.

## SECTION D QUALITY OF INITIAL OUTCOMES

D1 Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes

65%

Description:

*Planned objectives are achieved and the risk of harm/likelihood of reoffending is demonstrably reduced.*

### **Strengths:**

1. In 83% of cases there had been no further court appearance for an offence committed since the start of the order or licence.
2. In 80% of cases the offender had complied with the conditions of the order or licence, including any additional requirements.
3. Of the small number of offenders contacted all said that probation work had at least to some extent caused them to think twice about their offending and made it less likely that they would reoffend.

### **Areas for improvement:**

1. Inspectors identified and prioritised with case managers the factors which had caused individual offenders under supervision to commit offences. Those most frequently identified were alcohol, drugs/solvents, thinking skills and the influence of their peers. There was evidence of progress in relation to only 54% of the first and second priorities.
2. Only 43% of offenders were assessed as showing a positive change in attitudes, beliefs and behaviour in relation to offending and an increased awareness of the effect of the offence on victims.
3. There were five offenders in the sample who had been assessed as posing a high risk of harm to the public and/or victims. In only one of these was it demonstrated that there had been an actual reduction in the level of risk. However, it would be fair to say that in some of the cases the priority would have been to contain and manage the risk rather than necessarily expect to reduce it.
4. Only half the offenders showed evidence of learning acquired during supervision being more generally applied in their lives.
5. Only 60% of the offenders had kept all or nearly all the planned appointments or CS work sessions.

D2 Improvements are sustainable

63%

Description:

*Results are capable of being sustained beyond the end of supervision.*

### **Areas for improvement:**

1. There was a need for case managers to give more attention to long-term community reintegration issues and linking offenders to community resources and their families.



2. There was a similar need to put mechanisms in place to ensure more offenders maintained contact with organisations outside the probation service that might help them avoid further offending after their order or licence had ended.

D3	Outcomes of interventions are assessed and reviewed using available data	Not met
----	--	---------

Description:

*All available data are used to assess the effectiveness of interventions.*

***Strengths:***

1. The service's computerised database was impressive and provided a considerable amount of information on national standards compliance and other offender contact details.
2. The quarterly meetings of the PLC were a very real example of sentencers holding the service to account for its performance. However, the focus was on compliance rather than on the quality of practice and its results.

***Areas for improvement:***

1. While comprehensive data about national standards compliance were available, the lack of performance management, and the fact that many staff had not been adequately supervised, meant that in most cases very little attention was given to whether probation service interventions were effective.
2. The CPO acknowledged before the inspection that the primary focus had been on getting the information system up and running, rather than evaluating and responding to what it produced. This now needed to be an area for further attention. At the moment there was no way of judging whether any of the work done by the Isle of Man Probation Service had had an effect at all on stopping people under its supervision from reoffending.

D4	Interventions demonstrate value for money	64%
----	---	-----

Description:

*Interventions are delivered with efficient and appropriate use of resources.*

***Strength:***

1. In the majority of cases the resources (including partnerships) allocated to the case were consistent with the offender's risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending.

***Area for improvement:***

1. Resources were assessed as being used efficiently in only just over half of the cases in the sample. This reflected more generally the quality of the work inspected in many of the cases in the sample, as commented on in earlier sections.

As previously mentioned, the Isle of Man Department of Home Affairs identified five key issues for us to address as part of the inspection. These are set out below with our responses, some of which repeat findings and conclusions from earlier sections of this report.

### **1. Review the management structure of the probation service.**

We take the view that the structure of the management team is appropriate to the size and tasks of the service. As stated in our inspection criteria, the basic aims of good management in the probation service are to support practice through:

- leadership in the achievement of targets and the implementation of policies
- a strategic approach to the allocation of resources
- effective supervision and management of staff
- good working arrangements with statutory and voluntary sector partnership organisations
- high quality communication with the courts.

We see no reason why a management team structured around the present grouping of a CPO and three Directors should not be more than capable of satisfying these criteria. The poor performance of the service, as described in many parts of the report, has not resulted from its management structure, but from the fact that the management team as a whole has not been able to function effectively within that structure.

It is possible that the appointment of an ACPO grade, supposing a suitable person was found, would both free the CPO from a number of current operational duties, thus allowing him to work more closely with the Department of Home Affairs, and also bring a greater sense of direction and purpose to the service's direct work with offenders. However, there would be the disadvantage of bringing greater hierarchy to a very small organisation where there should already be many opportunities for people to work together in a flatter structure as a team and produce good quality practice. We would also reiterate that the current structure of Directors, if operating effectively, ought to be able to provide the direction, purpose and system of accountability that the service requires.

### **2. Identify the skills and competency requirements for the management team within the service.**

A persistent theme of the inspection has been the absence of good supervision for some of the staff of the service. Although it has performed commendably well against national standards, this has not been matched with overall high standards of practice and, in that respect, we would see it as failing to meet the expectations of the Department of Home Affairs, sentencers and indeed the general public. In many of the cases seen during the inspection there was also little sense of case managers really being held to account by the managers for the quality of their practice and of any real performance management culture. The service needs of its managers that they should be able to:

- work together as a team
- provide good supervision that both holds staff to account for the quality of their practice and offers advice, support and consultation about the supervision of

individual offenders, especially those assessed as being at high risk of causing harm to the public or at high likelihood of reoffending

- allocate work to staff in a fair and equitable manner that takes into account both the risk and needs of the offender and the skills and experience of the case manager
- set defined outcome measures to measure the effectiveness of the service's and individuals' activity and influence the allocation of the resources.

### **3. Identify the most effective communication systems.**

Given the size of the probation service compared with England and Wales probation areas, the proximity of most staff to each other in their day-to-day work, the relatively flat management structure, good administrative staff and the impressive information technology available, there is in theory every opportunity to maximise good communication both from managers to staff and vice versa. As stated in the report, we have noted as a strength the existence of the early morning meeting that most staff attended. However, against that, we also received complaints from them about lack of clarity in service policy. There was also the lack of a formal process of communication between some staff and managers through a fully functioning system of supervision and appraisal.

We would identify as the easily achievable aspects of an effective communication system:

- clear methods of communication between staff and managers orally (through supervision and meetings) and in writing
- staff being clear about what their job requires them to do through well-formulated, unambiguous policies, procedures and guidelines, that cover the most important aspects of the service's work and are regularly reviewed and amended as necessary
- staff being held to account for the work they do both through the supervisory process and through monitoring by managers of the more measurable aspects of their work such as achievement of national standards.

### **4. Identify the most effective working practices.**

If the probation service is to function effectively, and in particular provide reassurance to the courts that supervision can reduce offenders' dangerousness and likelihood of reoffending, then greater attention must be given to addressing offending behaviour in all cases, either through individual supervision or through group work programmes. We were concerned in the inspection about the absence of focus and direction in a number of the cases we inspected, and equally the overemphasis on welfare issues, rather than the probation service accepting its role as a public protection agency directed at reducing people's reoffending. Again the development of a performance management culture that clearly defined and reviewed with staff the service's expectations on them, with regard to individual offenders, would go some way towards correcting the present bias.

### **5. Report and make recommendations in regard to the management structure, changed systems and processes which, if implemented, would be likely to improve service performance and working relationships.**

Section A of the report identifies various areas for improvement in relation to the service's management arrangements. It also makes five recommendations that are particularly relevant to the Department of Home Affairs' questions, these being:

*The CPO should ensure that:*

- 1. there is further consideration of making offending behaviour programmes available in the Isle of Man*
- 2. all staff receive regular formal supervision sessions as required by service policy and are subject to an annual appraisal*
- 3. systems for the allocation of work to staff are reviewed, including those related to assessing the suitability of offenders to attend the report centre*
- 4. expenditure on partnership organisations is regularly reviewed to confirm that they provide value for money and meet the needs of offenders currently under supervision*
- 5. better use is made of outcome data at all levels of the organisation.*

## THE SERVICE'S RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTION'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that there is further consideration of making offending behaviour programmes available in the Isle of Man.**

Response:

*Since HMI Probation left we have entered into a formal agreement with the College of Further Education, and Basic Literacy is now assessed in every case and appropriate cases referred on, this includes provision of help for those offenders identified as suffering from dyslexia; funding can be accessed via the local Princes Trust Committee of which the CPO is Deputy Chairman. There was at the time of the inspection a one-to-one sex offender programme, accredited by the consultant psychologist, in use. There was also a cognitive-based programme in use in the probation hostel that was derived from the PEPS Programme in the UK. There was also an internet offenders programme in the process of development. It is accepted that there was no effective drink drive programme, No domestic abuse programme, and no one-to-one offending behaviour programme, neither was there a programme for offenders in the prison. A drink driving programme is currently being developed based on the model used in Hampshire and should be running by the end of the financial year, and the Merseyside domestic abuse programme has been adopted and will be in operation by November. The prison-based PO has developed a modular programme, parts of which are already in operation and the remainder will be in force by the end of the year. The one-to-one offending behaviour programme will need evaluating in terms of cost, support, etc.*

- 2. The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that all staff receive regular formal supervision sessions as required by service policy and are subject to an annual appraisal.**

Response:

*This commenced as HMI Probation left. There is a programme from May to December and the CPO is monitoring the progress via his supervision with his managers.*

- 3. The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that systems for the allocation of work to staff are reviewed, including those related to assessing the suitability of offenders to attend the report centre.**

Response:

*The report centre has had new referral guidelines issued, a sex offender report centre has also been set up with assistance from the consultant, and the SPO and PO agree on appropriate referrals with a set of clear objectives with risk now being regularly monitored. There is ongoing monthly support from the consultant. All offenders now have to have line management consent before they can be referred to the report centre. A more transparent allocation system for both reports and cases now operates in the daily morning meetings which is now chaired by the CPO.*

4. ***The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that expenditure on partnership organisations is regularly reviewed to confirm that they provide value for money and meet the needs of offenders currently under supervision.***

Response:

*The Department of Home Affairs has been requested for advice to identify how value for money will be judged.*

5. ***The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that all cases have their risk of harm assessed and regularly reviewed as required by national standards, with appropriate oversight by managers to the supervision of high risk of harm cases.***

Response:

*As an interim measure new formal risk of harm/dangerousness assessment processes are being adopted, with assistance from the forensic psychologist, using the latest information on what raises risk levels. At the time of the inspection the service did use the PCL-R (Hare psychopathy test) for serious offenders, having had an officer trained in administering the test. Long-term the service will need to evaluate the use of OASys/ACE or similar computer-based system.*

6. ***The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that there are improvements in the quality of supervision planning and supervision plan reviews.***

Response:

*Guidelines and instructions have been issued in relation to what service expectations now are. All Service Standards are now contained in one Service Standards Manual by which staff will be held to account by the SPO.*

7. ***The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that victim issues are sufficiently addressed in the supervision of all offenders.***

Response:

*This is ongoing and will be improved when there is a Victim's Charter on the island which is currently being led by the manager of the Isle of Man Victim Support Scheme – SPO supervision will be looking for victim awareness in all case files.*

8. ***The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that there is improvement in the quality and degree of pre-release work in prison licence cases.***

Response:

*All cases are now allocated and a policy, guidelines and expectations are now in place for the delivery of which staff are accountable – the prison-based PO is in the process of developing a modular-based rehabilitation programme which uses community resources and can be directly linked on an individual case basis to the criminogenic needs of the offender. The DAT is also deploying the PO in its team for one morning a month to assess need for those drug or alcohol dependant offenders; an increase in this resource has been requested through the Government Drug and Alcohol Strategy funding.*

**9. The Chief Probation Officer should ensure that better use is made of outcome data at all levels of the organisation.**

Response:

*Dependant on how the now vacant SPO post is filled, this will be a priority and will inform service resource levels and work allocation in terms of what work is needed. This, however, will not be an instant fix.*

## **OVERALL RESPONSE TO THE REPORT**

The service has accepted the recommendations made by HMI Probation and have begun the remedial work necessary to ensure rapid improvement in the areas identified as being weak. The service does, however, feel that the report did not fully underscore the difficulty that the loss of the operational SPO had upon its performance. The service made a decision not to alter job descriptions despite the missing officer being the operational SPO and, in hindsight, this may have been an error. Since the inspectors left the operational SPO has been retired on health grounds and, at the time of this response, this post is vacant.

Since the inspectors have left the service identified 12 areas of weakness that were contained in the feedback to the CPO upon their departure, these were: supervision, basic file quality, ISPs, subsequent supervision plans, lack of offender involvement, literacy and basic skills, missed appointments, enforcement, travel restrictions, report centre, risk of harm/dangerousness, high-risk case management, offender programmes, throughcare, and partnership work.

In relation to the above areas a very focused and intensive amount of work has been achieved in a very short timescale (by August 2004) which demonstrated the service's commitment to improve.

- In relation to supervision, this is now a priority function of the remaining SPO. Sessions have been forward planned and are monitored by the CPO. Management grade supervision, administrative grade supervision and some probation grade supervision took place throughout the period in question, but it is accepted that 30% of the sessions demanded by the service policy did not take place. A supervision training event by an external trainer took place in September 2004.
- In relation to basic file quality, a series of new guidance has been written and introduced. These all now form a consolidated Service Standards Manual which has been issued to all staff in August 2004.
- In relation to ISPs, guidelines have again been issued and plans are reviewed in supervision. Subsequent plans fall in the same category. Both risk of reoffending and risk of harm criteria now feature (August 2004).
- Offenders are now involved in the assessment process to a much greater extent and this is recorded in offender records. Offenders are now required to sign a contract which clearly sets out expectations of both them and the service and this is coupled with an information sharing document which is case specific.
- Literacy and basic skills are being assessed by a pro forma for each offender and a formal agreement has been reached with the manager of the Basic Skills Service in the local College of Further Education to accept all referrals from the service. The information sharing agreement with offenders allows us to track the progress. Missed appointments and enforcement have both had new guidelines issued to ensure a more standard and consistent

approach and these are matters for supervision review, as is the case with travel restrictions whilst under supervision.

- The report centre has been made the responsibility of a PSO and all cases now have to have a set referral form and management approval before they can be referred to the report centre. This will ensure that all work is done by POs and approved by the SPO before being placed in the report centre.
- In relation to risk of harm/dangerousness, new assessment forms have been drawn up as an interim measure pending evaluation of OASys/ACE or similar computer-based system. The interim assessment tool has been accredited by the consultant forensic psychologist who supports the sex offender programme. These risk assessments will be another focus of supervision.
- High-risk case management has been strengthened by new MAPPP referral processes which not only ensure that only those deemed to be high risk are subject to the MAPPP system, but that all high-risk cases are overseen by the service managers. This will form part of the senior management team agenda.
- Programmes are already in existence for sex offenders, including a recently developed Internet offender programme necessary due to the high numbers in this category of offending. Whilst not being one of the three accredited programmes in use in the UK, it reflects the principles of 'What Works' literature and international best practice in this field. It was necessary to develop a bespoke programme due to the difficulty in progressing group work with sex offenders on the island.
- A cognitive-based programme was already in existence in the probation hostel and a modular programme is being developed within the prison setting and will be delivered in full as from the end of the year. At present certain modules are already being utilised. Some modules are dependent upon inter-agency cooperation and these will come on stream as protocols are developed.
- An improved Drink/Driving Course, based on the Hampshire Probation Area model, is being altered to suit local needs and it is envisaged will be in operation by the end of the financial year.
- A domestic abuse perpetrators programme from Merseyside has been adopted and will be running by November.
- The one-to-one programme relating to offending behaviour will have still to be evaluated and, if not deemed practical, something of a similar nature will be put in its place.
- Throughcare has been improved in its entirety and there is now a policy, standards and guidelines in place for service delivery to prison-based offenders.
- Formal partnership links are being evaluated, a new service level agreement with David Gray House is being discussed and the service already has the link with the college to address basic skills/literacy.



## THE ROLE OF HMI PROBATION

HMI Probation is an independent Inspectorate, originally established in 1936 and given statutory authority in the Criminal Justice Act 1991. The Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000 renamed HMI Probation 'Her Majesty's Inspectorate of the National Probation Service for England and Wales.' HMI Probation is funded by the Home Office and reports directly to the Home Secretary.

### Home Office Aims

HMI Probation contributes primarily to the achievement of Home Office aims to:

- ensure the effective delivery of justice, avoiding unnecessary delay, through efficient investigation, detection, prosecution and court procedures. To minimise the threat to and intimidation of witnesses and to engage with and support victims
- deliver effective custodial and community sentences to reduce reoffending and protect the public, through the prison and probation services, in partnership with the Youth Justice Board.

### Role

- Report to the Home Secretary on the extent to which the National Probation Service for England and Wales is fulfilling its statutory duties, contributing to the achievement of Home Office and Criminal Justice Aims and meeting performance and efficiency targets as required.
- Demonstrate that inspections contribute to improved performance in the National Probation Service.
- Contribute to sound policy and effective service delivery by providing advice and disseminating good practice, based on inspection findings, to Ministers, Home Office and National Probation Service staff and Probation Boards/areas.
- Promote actively race equality and wider diversity issues in the National Probation Service.
- Promote the overall effectiveness of the criminal justice system.

### Code of Practice

HMI Probation aims to achieve its purpose by:

- undertaking its work with integrity in a professional, impartial and courteous manner
- consulting stakeholders in planning and running inspections and regarding reports
- forming independent inspection judgements based on evidence
- the timely reporting and publishing of inspection findings and recommendations for improvement
- promoting race equality and wider diversity issues in all aspects of its work, including within its own employment practices and organisational processes
- developing joint approaches with other Inspectorate and Audit bodies to ensure a coordinated approach to the criminal justice system
- working to minimise the burden of inspection on the National Probation Service.

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

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