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Introduction by the National Offender Manager

In its response to the Correctional Services Review, the Government committed NORMS to the implementation of “a new approach to offender management” – a single approach.

This single approach has to apply across the wide range of different sentences to which offenders are subject, and has to be flexible enough to respond to the diverse needs, circumstances and motivations of offenders themselves. It needs to embrace the work of the different providers of an offender’s correctional experience. It needs to be “end-to-end”, seamless, and integrated, with a single offender manager responsible for the whole of each single sentence.

But beyond this specification the detail of its design, and the challenge of its implementation, is for NORMS to resolve.

The NORMS Offender Management Model sets out this detail. It was first published in January 2005. Through both our North West Region PATHFINDER, and its roll-out for community orders, the Model has already proven its worth.

It “makes sense” to practitioners. Some have described its offender-centred emphasis as having had a major bearing on the quality of their working lives. Change is always best implemented with the support of those who are required to implement it.

It certainly meets the specification for being universal, inclusive, integrated and flexible. Its agency-neutral language and concepts have already found their way into the vocabulary of both prison and probation services. I cannot emphasise enough how important it is that we have this single concept around which different providers can co-operate. And offenders undoubtedly respond better to the personal continuity which is inherent in the Model.

We face perhaps our biggest implementation challenge in 2006, as we begin to roll-out the Model for sentences with a custodial element. But we also look forward to the promise of C-NOMIS, the communication system designed to support it.

This revised version of the Offender Management Model takes account of changes in policy, new evidence and new learning which has emerged in the past year. It complements the Reducing Re-Offending Action Plan to describe the core of what we are aiming to deliver at the “front end” of NORMS.

It is therefore one of the most important documents in the NORMS infrastructure.
I commend it to all of those involved in the delivery of Offender Management, and of the specific interventions which support it. It will also be of interest to other stakeholders, commentators and observers of criminal justice.

Finally, our Model is not a “tablet of stone”. It exists in a fast-changing world, in which new experience, learning, policy and evidence will continue to shape our approach. We will keep the Offender Management Model under continuous review, and consult and revise as necessary.

Christine Knott

National Offender Manager

May 2006
Introduction

“Language sets everyone the same traps; it is an immense network of easily accessible wrong turnings” (Ludwig Wittgenstein)

The language of case management seeped into the correctional services of England and Wales through the 1990’s, spilling over from its use in health and social services. There were Case Managers, Case Management Teams and case management approaches

Yet in a Home Office survey in 2000, only a handful of those organisations could explain what they meant by Case Management when applied to correctional work, and few had explained it for their staff. Not surprisingly, it had numerous different manifestations in practice

We must not make the same mistake with Offender Management. If we are to implement it effectively and consistently, we must first define it

This document has been prepared by the NOMS Offender Management Team to set out the key ideas which make up the NOMS concept of Offender Management. It is intended to present the rationale behind the development of the model, the fundamental principles upon which Offender Management is based, and some of the standard tools for applying the model in practice

The document updates the initial issue of the Offender Management Model (version 1) issued to Probation Areas in January 2005 and published on the NOMS website
The NOMS Offender Management Model

1 Origins and Development

1.1 The Policy Context

1.1.1 The Correctional Services Review (Carter Report)

i The terminology of “Offender Management” was introduced into the vocabulary of the England and Wales Correctional Services by the Report of the Correctional Services Review (2003). Looking across the correctional services as a whole, and taking a 10 year view, the Carter Report observed that:

“the system remains dominated by the need to manage both Services [HM Prison Service and the National Probation Service] rather than having a focus on the offender and reducing re-offending” and that “No single organisation is ultimately responsible for the offender. This means there is no clear ownership on the front line for reducing re-offending”.

ii It concluded that

“a more strategic approach to the end-to-end management of offenders across their sentence is needed” in which

“Offender Managers would work to the Regional Offender Managers to provide the end-to-end supervision of offenders (in custody or in the community)”

iii The review report concentrated upon the organisational structures considered necessary for delivering this new approach to “offender management”. Beyond its broad observations and recommendations, there was little detail about exactly how an offender’s experience at the front-end would be different, and who would do what differently to deliver it.

1.1.2 Reducing Crime: Changing Lives

i In January 2004, the Government published its response to the Carter Report, entitled “Reducing Crime – Changing Lives”. In that document the Home Secretary of the day wrote:

“I fully support the approach he [the Carter Report] describes….. What we do with offenders will, in future, be managed by offender managers….. who will reduce duplication and join up progress made in prison, with supervision in the community”.

ii During the next 6 months attention was focussed upon the organisational and structural implications of the Carter Report and “Reducing Crime – Changing Lives”. 
iii Then in June 2004, the Minister of State for Prisons and Probation announced:

“I intend at this stage to concentrate on introducing the concept and practice of end-to-end offender management” (our emphasis).

iv This was to herald a shift in emphasis away from the immediate organisational and structural focus, to one concentrating more on the front-end requirements of who was to do what with offenders in the “new approach”.

v But the NOMS’ concept of Offender Management would require defining in rather more detail than either the Carter Report or “Reducing Crime – Changing Lives” had so far done, if it was to be turned universally into practice.

1.1.3 The Development of NOMS

Key aspects of the NOMS environment began to take shape during 2004 and 2005. For example:

- the commissioning role of Regional Offender Managers became clearer;
- a pilot framework of Service Level Agreements between Regional Offender Managers and the main providers was developed for deployment in 2006-07;
- regional Reducing Re-offending Strategies and Plans became the subject of discussion with partners across the country, with regional boards being established to take them forward;
- three important alliances were launched in November 2005; a Corporate Alliance to build on relationships with employers to help more offenders gain and keep work, a Civic Society Alliance to work with local partners to access resources for offenders and a Faith and VCS Alliance to involve local communities in work with offenders;
- coverage of the Drugs Intervention Programme widened substantially;

1.1.4 The Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reducing Re-offending

The Government published its Five Year Strategy for Protecting the Public and Reducing Re-offending in February 2006. Among other measures, this strategy confirms the commitment to implementing Offender Management, as described herein, and announces the development of the Going Straight Contract as a significant contribution to securing offender engagement.
1.2 The Evidence Context

1.2.1 The design of NOMS’ approach to offender management draws upon and reflects learning from other reviews, studies, research and experience, both in corrections and from related fields. Account has been taken of:

- lessons from what is known as the What Works evidence, underpinning the development of evidence-based practice in prisons and probation;
- messages from recent research, literature and studies into the effectiveness of correctional work, including the Social Exclusion Report, various reports of the relevant Inspectorates and of the National Audit Office;
- learning from the case management models and structures developed and deployed in organisations with similar features to corrections, like mental health, child care and social work, and those in other correctional jurisdictions;
- evidence about whole-organisation effectiveness drawn from models like European Excellence;
- knowledge about best practice in project and change management applied to the business of implementing plans with individual offenders.

1.2.2 Taken together, there is a remarkable coincidence of conclusion from this learning about how the case management arrangements for the offender population ought best to be designed.

1.3 The Offender Management Model

1.3.1 The NOMS Offender Management Model is the product of drawing together the policy requirements and the messages from research and other evidence, and defining what these together mean for the principles of how NOMS will go about managing individual offenders. It is the bridge between the broad brush strokes of policy, and the finer detail of practice. It forms part of NOMS’ commissioning framework, setting out the broad specification for the approach it expects those managing individual offenders to deploy, and acting as the basis for the development of Standards and performance measures.

1.3.2 It was developed through 2004, drawing out the implications of the evidence and weaving together ideas, concepts and experience into a coherent, integrated, workable approach. Its conceptual coherence was tested through numerous consultations – both formal and informal – involving thousands of staff. It was first published in January 2005.

1.3.3 A Pathfinder Project was set up late in 2004 in the North West of England. Its role was to test the application of the Model in the real day-to-day world of the correctional services, and to share that learning. The evaluation of its first phase was published in July 2005.

1.3.4 Wider implementation was geared to the phasing of the new sentencing framework in the Criminal Justice Act 2003. This started with the introduction of the generic Community Order from April 2005 onward, and will continue with the introduction of Custody Plus.
1.3.5 A review of the Model a year after its initial publication has concluded that its basic concepts are sound:

- the Pathfinder Project evaluation has reported overall support for the approach articulated by the Model. The roles, structures and processes within it “make sense” to operational staff, managers, partners and offenders. This is not to minimise the fact that there are some significant hurdles to overcome to achieve universal implementation. But achieving change without the support of those required to implement it is doubly difficult;
- probation areas leading on implementation within the context of the Criminal Justice Act report widespread support from practitioners and practice managers for the changes required; managers in the prison service have embraced the concept with enthusiasm;
- partners and stakeholders outside of the statutory correctional services have welcomed the clarification of what “offender management” means and of the inclusive role for them in the Model;
- there is no new evidence or learning which indicates the need for a fundamental re-think.

1.3.6 The Offender Management Model is not a practice manual for handling each individual offender. Neither is it a detailed implementation guide. It describes what has to be delivered but is far less prescriptive about how.

1.3.7 Nevertheless, in its first year its utility has been demonstrated in helping staff and other stakeholders to see the “big picture”, the “wood for the trees”, the “direction of travel”. Understanding the work of the adult correctional services through a single concept, using a universal language and set of frameworks, is already making a significant contribution to what the Carter Report referred to as “breaking down the silos of prison and probation”. Extending the rigour of the What Works approach to the design and delivery of the underlying case management arrangements will ensure that maximum return is secured from the investment in reducing re-offending.

1.3.8 Compared to Version 1, then, this edition elaborates and clarifies in those areas where commentators and stakeholders have indicated a need for further refinement, but makes no fundamental changes to the Model as articulated in that earlier version.
2 Scope of the Offender Management Model

2.1 Same Term – Different Meanings

2.1.1 As NOMS has evolved, the term “offender management” has been used in different ways. This can be confusing:

- the term is used at a high level to refer to the whole network of interlocking structures and processes through which NOMS proposes to manage the entire population of offenders for whom it has responsibility. The introduction of a new approach to managing individuals, the development of regional commissioning from a mixed market of providers, the Reducing Re-Offending Action Plan and the Rebalancing Sentencing initiative together make up this overall approach;

- it is also used to refer to the particular approach (or model) to be applied in managing individual offenders. So an Offender Management approach is now one in which a single Offender Manager “manages” an offender, from one end to the other of his or her contact with NOMS, sequencing and brokering different interventions from different providers, working within an individual-focussed Offender Management Team, in which each member makes a distinctive contribution to the whole process;

- and within that overall approach the term also applies even more narrowly to the unique contribution made by an Offender Manager. Offender Management, therefore, is what Offender Managers do. It is a process which lends its name to the whole approach.

2.1.2 A single term which has three subtly different meanings is almost certain to cause some confusion. This document focuses upon the second and third of these uses. It describes what an “offender management approach” means for NOMS in its work with individuals. It defines in more detail the different distinctive roles which are central to that approach, including what it is that Offender Managers are expected to do in order to “manage” offenders.

2.2 The Ends in End-to-End Offender Management

2.2.1 In referring to end-to-end offender management it is necessary to define where the ends of the process are considered to be, not least because different organisations have different understandings of what “end-to-end” means to them. Different definitions result in significantly different implications for the way in which offender management is designed and delivered.

2.2.2 The Carter Report emphasises that implementing sentences is the core business process of the correctional services. At the very least then, the relevant ends are the point at which any single sentence is passed to the point at which that same sentence terminates.
2.2.3 But for many – perhaps most – offenders, the relationship with the correctional services is rather more complex. It often involves consecutive, and sometimes concurrent phases and sentences, each of which brings with it a change in the legal context, and often in the physical and organisational ones too. For example:

These correctional pathways are unique and varied.

2.2.4 NOMS longer term vision is that the design and delivery of Offender Management should span the whole of any single period of engagement, including periods of remand. Indeed, for complex and riskier cases it may well encompass separate non-consecutive periods of engagement where these occur close in time to one another.

2.2.5 Progress toward this vision will be incremental, and dependant upon available resources. For the time being, the priority for the application of the Model beyond single sentences (and in particular for the allocation of a single Offender Manager) is higher the shorter the anticipated period of engagement and the higher the risks and complexity (tier) of the offender (for details of tiering, see section 13).

2.2.6 Custody Plus will draw over 40,000 new offenders per annum into Offender Management. Offenders subject to Custody Plus will have committed an offence serious enough to merit custody, and will fall under offender management arrangements for no more than 12 months. Within this, custodial periods are expected to be short. It is important therefore, in these cases, that pre-sentence engagement is fully integrated and continuous with implementation of the sentence once passed if the potential of the new sentence is to be realised.

2.3 Work with Victims and Offender Management

2.3.1 Section 69 of the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000 bestows rights upon the victims of certain specified offences resulting in prison sentences of 12 months or more, and commensurate duties upon the National Probation Service and others. This is referred to as Victim Contact.

2.3.2 The discharge of the Probation Service’s duty in this respect is not built-in to the standard specification in this model for the role of Offender Manager. Generally, victims have been shown to receive a better service where the duty is allocated to someone other than the offender’s Offender Manager, usually a specialist Victim Contact worker.
2.3.3 Offender Managers have a duty to provide information and co-operate with any such worker. This includes ensuring that any views which the victim wishes to express about the arrangements for the offender’s release are conveyed to those making release decisions in the appropriate way. Offender Managers also have a duty to ensure that offenders in such circumstances are aware of the victims’ rights in this respect, and of how this might impact upon their sentence.

2.3.4 As part of their public protection responsibility though, Offender Managers do have a duty to assess what risk an offender poses and to whom. In those circumstances where the risk of harm is high, and an individual potential victim, or group of victims, can be identified, one of the protective options open to Offender Managers is to make contact with those individuals and share information about the offender. This is usually done working through local Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA). Assessment of the risks, the weighing of the options, authorisation of and actual disclosure of information, all form part of the public protection role of the Offender Manager.

2.3.5 The actual victim of a specified offence and the potential victim of a future offence may, of course, be the same person. In these circumstances the Offender Manager has a duty to work collaboratively with whoever is responsible for Victim Contact to design and deliver a co-ordinated approach.
3 The Core Features of the Model

» The NOMS Offender Management Model describes an evidence-based, offender-focused approach to work with individual offenders.

» It is a human service approach because the main impact of the correctional services is considered to arise from the personal relationships developed with an offender.

» A single, universal, core, end-to-end process which transcends the separate contributions of the main providers is defined using a single language.

» A one offender: one manager structure is considered to be necessary for its effective delivery.

» Based upon a thorough assessment, an Offender Manager draws up a single sentence plan, in collaboration with the offender and providers of interventions. Resources and interventions, commissioned and purchased by Regional Offender Managers, are engaged, using a brokerage approach. Personal supervision helps the offender to comply and co-operate.

» A transparent framework within the Model ensures that different resources and styles are applied to different cases, producing a highly individualised service capable of adapting to the diverse needs, risks and circumstances of individual offenders.

» In order to deliver the required coherence to an offender, the model incorporates a new concept of teamwork.

» Finally, it is a whole system approach requiring that organisational support functions support the core business process of Offender Management.
4 Building the Offender Management Model

4.1 As illustrated above, in their contact with NOMS most offenders move through a succession of legal, physical and organisational contexts.

4.2 Along these infinitely variable pathways, different people will do different things with the same offender at different times. It is important that these different contributions:

- are designed and delivered so that they complement one another;
- build systematically one upon another;
- avoid duplication and contradiction; and
- resist “stop-start” delivery focussed upon any particular legal or physical environment.

4.3 Far too often different contributions have been made independently of one another, duplicating effort, or even resulting in contradiction. To avoid this it is important that these different people understand each individual contribution in its relationship with that of the others, and that those contributions are designed to be complementary to one another. The correctional services of England and Wales have never yet designed and delivered these complex offender pathways as coherent single experiences for the offender.

4.4 During the development of the Offender Management Model it has proved helpful to articulate this “big picture” using an imagery which illustrates how roles, concepts and processes interlock with one another to form a universal, integrated concept of Offender Management.

4.5 The image builds-up in component parts. Firstly, it is always shown as relating to the whole of an offender’s pathway through NOMS, from its commencement to its termination.

The “community-custody-community” icon simplifies the key challenges of these pathways. It provides a continuous reminder to focus upon the offender as he or she moves between different environments, the most challenging of all being the transitions into and out of custody. The introduction of Custody Plus will significantly increase the number of offender pathways which have this overall “shape”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commencement</th>
<th>Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community – Pre-sentence assessment</td>
<td>Custody – Custodial part of integrated sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody – Custodial part of integrated sentence</td>
<td>Community – community part of integrated sentence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 The offender’s experience is then superimposed across the pathway. The role of NOMS is to design and implement an experience which achieves:

- all of the objectives of the sentence
- other objectives to be met through the management of offenders.

It follows then that it is first necessary to be clear about what those objectives are.
The Objectives of Offender Management

5.1 The Purposes of Sentencing

i The purposes of sentencing are copied in to the model from section 142 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. In passing sentence Courts must have regard to the following purposes:

• the punishment of offenders;

• reducing crime (including its reduction by deterrence);

• the reform and rehabilitation of offenders;

• the protection of the public; and

• the making of reparation by offenders to persons affected by their offences.

ii However, the purposes of sentencing do not apply in a simple, universal way to every offender:

• they are the general purposes of sentencing, which apply in a different mix to each individual;

• often courts will spell out the purposes of a sentence, but sometimes they will not;

• sometimes the purposes can be deduced easily from the elements of the sentence....

• but sometimes NOMS staff will have to figure out which ones apply, based upon the elements of the sentence and an assessment of the offender;

• objectives must be set to achieve the purposes of the sentence, but the purposes of the sentence are not the only determinants of the objectives of Offender Management;

• punishment – in some degree or another – will be a part of every sentence....

• reform and rehabilitation of offenders is arguably the priority objective.

iii Offender Management objectives do not fit into a neat hierarchy. Reform and rehabilitation must be pursued within the framework created by the punitive requirements and is often secondary, especially in that minority of cases where there is a pressing public protection issue. The need to provide for safe and secure custody may take precedence over the interests of rehabilitation, in specific cases, or in certain conditions, system-wide.
5.2 Other Objectives to be achieved through Offender Management:

i Whilst the purposes of any sentence provides one set of objectives, there are other objectives to be achieved through Offender Management. These may arise from legislation other than Criminal Justice legislation, or from policy requirements.

ii These objectives include

• protecting the offender from harm from him/herself and others;
• improving confidence in the criminal justice system;
• safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children;
• promoting and celebrating diversity; tackling prejudice and discrimination; and
• meeting the needs of victims through victim awareness work or restorative approaches.

5.3 Compared then, to case management in other organisations, Offender Management is characterised by:

• time spans and legal frameworks which, in most cases, are set to be proportional to the seriousness of the current offending. The overall timespans are sometimes determinate and sometimes indeterminate, and often vary during any period of contact as a result of further offending;
• users who are often damaged by their life experience to date, have multiple needs, are poorly motivated, limited in their capacity to change, and – sometimes – dangerous; and
• users who often view themselves as involuntary, over whom the Offender Manager and others exercises considerable authority.

5.4 Together with the mix of objectives described above, this makes Offender Management a challenging and highly complex activity.
6 Achieving Reform and Rehabilitation

6.1 Nevertheless, within this complex mix, the reform and rehabilitation of individual offenders remains NOMS’ most important objective, albeit that it may not be the immediate priority for every single case. If it can be achieved, further punishment or reparation is not required, crime is reduced below what it would have been and the public is thereby protected.

6.2 Reform and rehabilitation is about change. The dominant approach adopted by NOMS focuses upon both the offender and his/her circumstances.

The key stages in the change process involve creating a change climate, including motivating the offender to change, training in new cognitive, social and life skills, and consolidating that new learning into “routine” behaviours in the offender’s social, family and community milieu. These key stages are mapped onto the offender’s end-to-end experience in the model. For most offenders it is this process which has to be nurtured if reform and rehabilitation is to be achieved.

6.3 All of the evidence about successful reform and rehabilitation concludes that it requires that the right content be delivered in the right way. It is about both what and how, content and process, neither one nor the other, but the two in harmony.

6.4 The What Works Principle of Risk and Principle of Need inform which interventions are to be selected for which offenders in order to try to achieve reform and rehabilitation (the “what”).

6.5 The sequence above (motivate – learn – consolidate) informs how these should be sequenced and the individual’s correctional pathway (community – custody – community) adds the challenge of changes of environment and sentence requirements to the mix of contents (the “what”). It also means that the leverage Offender Managers and others have for securing co-operation and compliance changes with from sentence to sentence and phase to phase.

6.6 The best chance of achieving reform and rehabilitation is when the offender experiences the whole as having particular qualities (the “how”). Different terms are used in the literature for these qualities; the model “borrows” the 4 C’s (see Holt – *Case Management: The Context for Supervision* (2000)) to express the desirable “how” of delivery. These 4 C’s are derived from studies of how offenders themselves experience their relationship with the correctional services and thus provide a valuable user perspective within the model. They are:

- consistency: the offender needs to experience a consistency of message and behaviour, both by the same person over time and by different people working with the same offender at the same time;
commitment offenders need to experience the behaviour of staff working with them as being committed or genuine, not just "going through the motions". As well as individual staff members, systems of offender management need to demonstrate commitment. The prospects for success are greater when an offender develops a sense of reciprocal commitment to the staff working with them;

consolidation gains will be short-lived if new learning is not turned into routine and instinctive behaviour through a process which reinforces and rewards it; and

continuity a pre-requisite to achieving the other three, there needs to be continuity of care or treatment, but also a high degree of continuity of relationship running through the whole of the period of engagement.

6.7 The Offender Management Model, then, sets out an operational framework or "norm" designed:

- to achieve the complex mix of objectives outlined,
- recognising the challenging and diverse nature of offenders themselves,
- through the varied legal, physical and organisational contexts of unique correctional pathways; and
- reflecting the evidence about "what" and "how" is most effective in reducing re-offending.

6.8 Performance Management

6.8.1 It is important that organisations are able to measure the extent to which they are achieving their objectives. But the measures used do not simply reflect an organisation’s behaviour – they also shape it. Targets are chosen specifically for this purpose. These measures and shapers make up the Performance Management Framework.

6.8.2 Which of its many standards and outcomes an organisation uses as its measures is often interpreted by the staff of the organisation as a message about what is important and, conversely, what is less important. The catchphrase “what gets measured gets done”, captures this phenomenon. Its corollary “what doesn’t get measured doesn’t matter” emphasises the point.

6.8.3 Since both the “what” of offender management and its “how” are of equal importance, it is essential that this framework of standards, measures and targets conveys this message and steers behaviour accordingly. Measures of the 4 C’s are being developed to balance those already in use which have tended to focus on the content (the “what”) of Offender Management, rather than its process (the “how”) qualities.
7 The Key Elements in Delivery – Offender Management and Interventions

7.1 The next two elements in building the model represent the way in which

- specific interventions are selected and delivered across the sentence; and
- an end-to-end process of individual Offender Management binds them together into a coherent whole.
8 End-to-End Offender Management

8.1 An end-to-end process provides the integrating framework within which interventions are selected, sequenced and delivered. Ideally (see section 2), it spans the whole of the period of engagement.

The process is understood as being composed of three distinct but integrated threads each of which is next considered in more detail. The three threads are called “management”, “supervision” and “administration”.

8.2 Management

8.2.1 At the level of individual cases, a management process gives the offender’s experience its direction, order, pace and shape. Its “owner” is the Offender Manager, to whom the managing agency delegates both the authority and the responsibility for making discretionary decisions about how to manage the individual. Legislation is currently planned to strengthen this role by, for example, making the preparation of a Sentence Plan a statutory duty. Offenders are “managed” in the sense that they are not permitted to drift aimlessly through the sentence.

8.2.2 In order to provide the required level of continuity and overview of the entire sentence (or pathway) the Offender Manager will always be based in the community:

» for the time being Offender Managers will be probation staff employed by Probation Boards;

» during the middle phase of long term imprisonment, frequent face-to-face work by the Offender Manager is unlikely to be either feasible or necessary. The Model provides a framework within which an Offender Supervisor (see section 8.3.5) will work with the offender, promoting compliance, monitoring progress and holding formal reviews with the Offender Manager at appropriate intervals.

8.2.3 The Tasks of the Offender Manager

The operational role of Offender Manager contains within it the statutory role and authority of Responsible Officer as defined in sections 197 and 198 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. The Responsible Officer has the duty to:

• make arrangements in connection with the requirements of the sentence;
• promote the offender’s compliance; and
• take enforcement action as required.

8.2.4 A sequence of tasks and functions makes up the (offender) management process, and therefore defines the Offender Manager’s role. The human-service emphasis in the approach means that an Offender Manager is expected to discharge this sequence of tasks and functions face-to-face and personally, though the scale and nature of such involvement will vary with the risks, needs and complexity of the case (see Tiering Framework in section 13).
The icon below shows the sequence of these tasks. The imagery of interlocking box shapes is used throughout the Model to illustrate how some aspects of offender management processes are continuous behaviours – like monitoring progress – while others are discrete tasks which flow in a natural sequence.

8.2.5 This core of the management process is captured for ease of reference in the acronym ASPIRE.


8.2.6 The specification for the tasks “assess”, “plan”, “review, re-assess and re-plan” and “evaluate” has already, to a large extent, been set down within OASys. Some refinement is necessary to further improve the fit between OASys and the requirements of offender management.

8.2.7 The assessment process starts by gathering information, from different sources, including from the offender him/herself, and including from other assessments completed by other service providers. A view then has to be formed about what this all means set in the context of the objectives of the organisation. This second component of assessment – forming a view – is important. Dealing safely and effectively with offenders can rarely, if ever, be reduced to a simple set of “if – then” decision rules based upon information alone. It may then be necessary to adjust the objectives in the case, as a result of what emerges from the assessment.

8.2.8 A Sentence Plan is then formulated by setting this assessment alongside:

- the requirements of the sentence (or other legal requirements, like bail restrictions);
- any applicable policies and priorities;
- the resources available …

…to decide who is to do what and when in order to achieve all of the objectives applicable to the case.

8.2.9 The scope of the plan should span the whole anticipated period of engagement, not just the current phase of it;

- in the case of longer and indeterminate sentences, the details of the latter stages of the plan will need to be developed as the sentence progresses;
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- short-term intermediate objectives – sometimes called milestones – should be set, in order to break bigger challenges – like desistance from drug use – into more manageable steps and to convert one large achievement into a series of smaller ones;
- evidence has shown that it is best to limit the number of change objectives to be tackled at once to three or four and “hold” others for sequencing;
- the plan may need to be re-shaped in the event of further offending and re-conviction resulting in a change to the original timeframe and legal parameters;
- similarly it may need to be re-shaped as a result of changes in the offender’s lifestyle, circumstances or risk factors.

8.2.10 The extent of the offender’s engagement in the process of setting objectives and planning is emerging as a vital ingredient in effective practice. Sentence Planning should therefore, wherever possible, be designed as a meaningful event for the offender and others involved in the implementation of the plan. The development of a Going Straight Contract in underway as part of the Government’s 5-Year Strategy. It is intended to support offender engagement through providing a framework of rewards and incentives supporting engagement.

8.2.11 The tiering framework for allocating resources is described in section 13 of this document. It contributes to the Model by converting the principle that resources should follow risk into a consistent operational reality.

8.2.12 Ensuring that the plan is implemented firstly requires setting in place the arrangements for its implementation:

- the Offender Management Team needs to be established; this is the team of people who will be responsible for delivering the plan; more details of the roles, relationships and methods of Offender Management Teams are contained in section 12;
- access to the interventions and resources required needs to be brokered from the range available; and
- the offender and other providers need to be clear who is expected to do what, and how they relate one to another.

8.2.13 Brokerage is a go-between activity. Other than in exceptional circumstances, Offender Managers will not be personally responsible for commissioning resources and facilities which do not already exist, nor will they be purchasers of individual plans for offenders. This will be the responsibility of ROMs and local service managers.
Though covered by the single term “brokerage”, the process of securing and deploying the right interventions is one which varies in complexity and in the authority and competences required for it. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Brokerage</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Competences/Authority Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral into corrections-specific in-house provision</td>
<td>Allocation to unpaid work project</td>
<td>Knowledge of in-house procedures Authority to refer to in-house programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral into corrections-specific, direct purchased external provision</td>
<td>Referral to local employment skills partnership Basic skills work in custody Referral to direct-purchased alcohol programme</td>
<td>Above plus...... Authority to disclose information to other agencies within clear protocol Good judgement about information disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing into mainstream service provision with duty to reach-out to hard-to-reach groups, including ex-offenders</td>
<td>Drug services in the community Basic skills in the community Supported accommodation</td>
<td>Above plus...... Responsibility for agency risk taking Skills in risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing into mainstream provision with no priority for ex-offenders</td>
<td>Mental health day-care provision Health provision in the community</td>
<td>Above plus...... Negotiating skills Ability to lead inter-agency team Authority to commit resources and take risks Ability to provide support for provider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complexity, risks and authority required will determine to what extent brokerage should be undertaken by the Offender Manager in person, and to what extent it can be delegated to someone working closely with the Offender Manager, usually an Offender Supervisor.

8.2.14 Monitoring progress requires that reliable and timely information flows are set up between the Offender Manager and all those working with the offender:

» in particular, information relevant to the assessment of the risks posed by the offender must be continuously gathered;

» the critical risk factors, therefore, must be identified and shared at the outset;

» a view must be formed about the meaning and implications of the incoming information;

» it is the Offender Manager’s responsibility to form this view, but it is best formed in collaboration with others with knowledge and responsibility for the same offender.

8.2.15 Review involves regularly comparing this emerging view to the working assessment and plan, and checking that these are still accurate and relevant, revising as necessary.

- Review is both a continuous process, and a series of deadlines governed by a schedule which ensures that it does not “drift”. Like Sentence Planning, scheduled reviews are best conducted collaboratively, as events involving the offender and others where possible. The Offender Manager’s role is both emphasised and strengthened by chairing and managing review events.
8.2.16 **Enforcement** requirements, largely a feature of the community phase of an offender pathway, are already specified in operating standards and procedures. Even enforcement provides a human-contact opportunity through which the Offender Manager can model the firm, fair and legitimate use of authority and sanctions (see section 11 on Core Correctional Practice).

### 8.3 Supervision

8.3.1 It is the **management** process defined above that gives the offender’s experience its shape, pace and direction. But it is the supervisory process which turns the plan into a reality.

- Most offenders are simply not the kind of people who will comply with, co-operate with or secure maximum benefit from a Sentence Plan simply because they have been given one.
- Most will require a combination of encouragement, modelling, motivation, support, and trouble-shooting; delivered on a face-to-face, day-to-day basis, through a relationship, if compliance is to be achieved and change sustained.
- This is the case whether the offender is in custody or in the community.

8.3.2 **Supervision** is the term used in the model to describe these day-to-day, face-to-face tasks and activities. They are represented schematically below.

Those tasks which are sequenced (like, broker – prepare – support – consolidate) apply both to the sentence as a whole and as a wrap-around sequence for any given intervention.

![Supervision Diagram](https://example.com/supervision-diagram.png)

8.3.3 The **scale and intensity** of supervision will vary with the risks posed by the offender, the offender’s needs and complexity of the plan, the timeframe available and the motivation and capabilities of the offender. The exact mix of **tasks** will be informed by an assessment of what each case requires. This reflects the “Responsivity Principle” in the What Works literature.

8.3.4 In most cases while the offender is in the community, efficiency and effectiveness requires that the Offender Manager will also provide supervision. Indeed, the management tasks, such as planning, provide an ideal vehicle for some of the supervisory processes, like forming a relationship. Combining the two processes in one role avoids the risks associated with the fragmentation of delivery, the extra costs of communication, and the likelihood of some duplication.
8.3.5 But it nevertheless remains important in the model to define these two processes separately:

- Supervision becomes a specific requirement under the Criminal Justice Act 2003, separate from the general duties of the Responsible Officer. It is therefore necessary to define it differently if courts are to be able to judge whether a supervisory requirement should be included in the sentence. Offender Managers responsible for cases in which there is no supervision requirement need to be clear which tasks are intrinsic to the role of Offender Manager and which are not.

- There are circumstances in the NOMS environment in which the two processes of “management” and “supervision” need to be split into roles for two different people. Where this is done, the term “Offender Supervisor” should be used for the person responsible for supervision (or for that part of supervision delegated by the Offender Manager). The most common of these circumstances are:
  
a  **Custody**

  When offenders are located in custody it is not feasible or cost effective for the Offender Manager in person to deliver the day-to-day, face-to-face supervision necessary for most offenders. In these circumstances, an Offender Supervisor will be appointed, to work in close harmony with the Offender Manager, implementing the Sentence Plan.

  An Offender Supervisor may be a Prison Officer, Prison Custody Officer or other member of staff with appropriate skills, including seconded probation staff.

  Offender Supervisors in custody will need to use their skills to engage and motivate offenders toward achieving their Sentence Plan objectives and to liaise with residential staff to ensure that compliance with the Sentence Plan is recognised in the application of the Incentives and Earned Privileges scheme.

  During the middle phase of longer periods of custody, the focus is often simply on helping the offender to cope with the length of the sentence. In such circumstances, the role of the Offender Supervisor becomes central, acting as agent for the Offender Manager, while the direct involvement of the Offender Manager may be reduced to a minimum.

  Governors/Directors of prisons will have some flexibility to organise and manage offender supervision to suit local circumstances and Service Level Agreement requirements, within the standards set by NOMS.

  **b Intensive programmes**

  In community programmes which require several contacts per week it is not feasible for one person to deliver both the “management” and “supervision” processes. The tasks in the two processes will need to be shared. This will often occur within cross-grade, cross-agency teams.
It is more important in such arrangements that staff are clear about their roles. While supervisory tasks may be shared, reserving the tasks in the ASPIRE sequence above to the designated Offender Manager will avoid confusion about who carries the overall authority for managing the case.

c Balancing supply and demand

Also in community settings it has sometimes proven valuable to be able to separate the role of Offender Supervisor from that of Offender Manager in order to match staff capacity with demand. Offender Supervisors (there are different terms currently in use for this role) (typically Probation Service Officers) work in close partnership with Offender Managers (typically qualified Probation Officers).

Whilst there are risks associated with the fragmentation of the end-to-end Offender Management function this way, carefully designed and implemented, such arrangements can work well.

8.3.6 In general terms, though, it is a key principle of the model that the more a through-process, like Offender Management, is split into tasks, and the separate tasks are allocated to different people, the more risks there are of it going wrong.

There are stark lessons to this effect from the catalogue of Serious Further Offence Reviews in probation, and from the succession of child death inquiries stretching back to Maria Colwell in 1974.

With the exception of the circumstances above, therefore, the Model expects that the Offender Manager will also provide the necessary supervision in a case.

8.3.7 Effective supervision requires more than common sense. Securing not only compliance but also active co-operation in rehabilitation from both offenders and providers, within a correctional setting, requires a high level of knowledge and skill. It merits the same level of research, design and delivery rigour as has so far been applied to the delivery of accredited programmes and to the "assess – plan – review" sequence in OASys. In short:

- the bedrock of supervision is the ability to form and maintain a trusting working relationship with the offender and through it to model pro-social behaviour and attitudes. Forming and maintaining relationships goes beyond simply being civil. It requires an understanding of the sorts of experiences many offenders will have been through, and what this means for how best to forge relationships;

- pro-social modelling likewise goes beyond setting a good example. It involves the routine and conscious use of a set of behaviours, responses and psychological rewards which mould pro-social behaviours and attitudes and erode anti-social ones;
• **motivating offenders** – to both co-operate and to change – is complex. At a basic level it requires the development of a climate in which co-operation and change are encouraged and rewarded. Different responses will be effective with different people at different times. At a more technical level it requires skills in creating and exploiting ambivalence, and in responding differently when an apparent absence of motivation is the consequence of – say – inertia, as opposed to anxiety. The Prison and Probation Services are jointly developing a motivational skills strategy;

• the nature of **brokering** is addressed above (paragraph 8.2.13). When brokering requires referring or booking an offender in to a provision, this can be delegated to an administrative level. But supervisors may well need to be able to negotiate access to services and selectively disclose risk information to secure access to facilities in more complex cases;

• offenders engage more constructively with interventions of all kinds when they are well prepared for them. **Preparation** might be both practical and psychological. It might involve the de-construction of practical barriers – like transport or child care – or of psychological ones – like acute self-consciousness, lack of confidence, poor social skills. Familiarity with what is likely to happen and rehearsal of some of the expectations is almost always a valuable component of preparation; this, of course requires a reasonable working knowledge of the services and facilities to which an offender is to be referred;

• providing **support** involves the supervisor in having an awareness of how the intervention may be experienced by the offender, showing an active interest, being understanding, empathetic and encouraging if progress is slow or commitment variable, and providing praise and validation when there is good progress. Intervention providers may need support as well as offenders;

• **coaching** is a particular approach to helping people to acquire new skills. The focus is on the learner to practice the skills while the role of the coach is to prompt, model, guide and steer without taking over. It is a relevant supporting activity to interventions designed to teach new skills;

• **contextualising learning** requires the ability to help people take lessons learned in one place or one environment (for example, a prison classroom, or a community-based Group Programmes Unit) and apply them in another (the offender’s real-world network of relationships and temptations). The ability to transfer learning directly to family, peer group and employment settings in the community is one of the features which makes some community-based interventions, like-for-like, more effective than those based in custody;

• **consolidation** is the process by which new skills, attitudes and behaviours are internalised so that they become the routine, intuitive way in which the individual responds and behaves. It requires the repeated rehearsal of skills, the de-construction and re-construction of behaviour, praise and reward regimes, all sustained over time. Without consolidation, the attrition rate on new learning is likely to be very high;
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- **reducing relapse** recognises that the process of leaving behind a criminal lifestyle and behaviours will not always be achieved at the first time of trying. It requires active intervention to step-up supports when relapse factors rise, and the ability to re-frame relapse as positive learning, rather than failure. It is part of the consolidation process;

- **liaison** is about maintaining a constructive and open working relationship with the provider of a service or intervention. It requires an understanding of the sensitivities and anxieties provoked by working with offenders and the ability to develop and maintain constructive communication links so as to alleviate these. Good liaison helps providers feel supported and less inclined to discontinue service if things go wrong; and

- **advocacy** requires both the negotiating skills to argue the case on the offender’s behalf and sound judgement to be able to recognise when to do so is inappropriate, futile and or likely to damage the prospects for the offender in question and, possibly, all other offenders.

8.3.8 This specification for supervision provides the template for a significant investment in staff training and development, and will, in the medium term, permeate other human resource management processes, like recruitment, qualification, deployment and promotion.

8.4 **Administration**

8.4.1 The implementation of sentences and the management of offenders is bound-up in a complex web of standards and procedures. Crisp, reliable **administration** is required if all of its objectives are to be met. It is administrative processes which set-up the recording and communication infrastructure and which ensure that the right things get done at the right times.

8.4.2 The timeline below isolates a typical end-to-end administrative process for a community sentence.

8.4.3 In the community, the introduction of National Standards, from 1993 onward, required a far higher degree of reliable and consistent administration of sentences. This was too often simply allowed to fall directly upon case managers. Isolating those tasks in the delivery of a sentence which are administrative enables them to be clustered into a separate role and allocated to staff with the right administrative aptitudes and competences.
8.4.4 The Partridge Report *Examining Case Management Models in Community Sentences* (RDS OLR 17/04) showed how performance improvements can be achieved if the role of Case Administrator is well defined, and organised so that Case Administrators, Offender Managers and Offender Supervisors are working in tight, small-team arrangements.

» Many probation areas have begun to re-design their delivery of Offender Management based upon such cross-grade small-team configurations;

» process improvement projects have also contributed to improving some aspects of performance in the NPS.

8.4.5 The administrative processes underpinning the custodial part of sentences are most often centralised in separate departments within prisons. The introduction of Offender Management gives prisons an opportunity to redefine where administrative work is best located to support Offender Supervisors and the offender management function; the small-team cross-grade working arrangements which have been successful in improving performance in community settings should be considered for custodial ones.
9 Sequencing Interventions

9.1 The term “intervention” is sometimes used to refer to the whole of what goes on between an organisation and its user, which would not have gone on had the user not had some sort of relationship with that organisation; it is sometimes used this way in corrections.

9.2 Within the Offender Management Model the term “intervention” has a specific meaning. It refers to those activities and resources selected by an Offender Manager to deliver specific sentence requirements or address specific criminogenic or public protection needs. It does not apply to the bedrock of Offender Management (management, supervision and administration as above) which provides the context or framework within which interventions fit:

- the oversight of an offender on an unpaid work site or project forms part of the intervention; the process for deciding what sorts of needs the placement might seek to address, or whether there are risks which limit the placement options is part of the process of Offender Management;

9.3 The dividing line between Offender Management activities and interventions is not always crystal clear. The main characteristics of interventions are:

- they are focussed upon one, or a cluster, of requirements or needs;
- they rarely span the whole of the offender’s pathway through NOMS;
- they are usually time-limited;
- they are often specified by a requirement in the sentence.

9.4 Some activities may even be either an intervention or an aspect of Offender Management depending on the precise circumstances;

- mentoring which focuses upon motivating, guiding and supporting an offender through all the requirements and expectations of the Sentence Plan is plainly a form of supervision, and needs to be very closely integrated with the role of the Offender Manager. Mentoring which is a wrap-around service for – say – basic skills tuition is a component of the basic skills intervention.

9.5 Interventions may be either mandatory or discretionary in respect the Offender Manager and either mandatory or voluntary on the part of the offender:

- a programme of basic skills tuition is mandatory for both, if covered by an Activity Requirement. It may be included on a discretionary basis as part of the Sentence Plan by the Offender Manager but mandatory on the part of the offender or it may be both discretionary and voluntary if an offender is to be referred to it as part of his/her reintegration but no requirement to that effect is incorporated into an order or licence.
9.6 Some interventions are mandatory in type, with a degree of discretion about the form:

- a period of Unpaid Work is a mandatory intervention in a sentence with an Unpaid Work requirement, but there is discretion about where and in what conditions it is discharged.

9.7 Part of the role of the Offender Manager is to decide which discretionary interventions are to be deployed in the context of those which are mandatory. Which interventions are selected and drawn down for each offender will depend in part on the requirements of the sentence and in part on the assessment of the needs of the offender.

- The Offender Management Model does not define the detailed specification, or the delivery requirements of specific interventions. This is the role of the Interventions Departments of the National Probation Directorate and Her Majesty’s Prison Service.

- They also currently provide guidance about which interventions should be matched to which offender characteristics, validated through the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel.

- Approving the specification for the delivery of interventions will transfer, in time, from the Interventions Departments of HMPS and NPD to the NOM and ROMs.

9.8 But sequencing of the selected interventions is a matter which requires the Offender Manager’s authority and whole-sentence perspective. Several factors weigh in the balance to determine the precise sequencing in each case:

- the sequence of change interventions needs to map onto and support the change process;
- the complexity of the sentence;
- the capabilities of the offender and his/her ability to cope with multiple, concurrent demands;
- some interventions are better delivered in custody and some in the community;
- there are some natural sequences to some interventions e.g. detoxification before relapse reduction.

9.9 The model provides a typology of interventions, into which all the most frequently required interventions fit. It then provides an idealised and universal sequence of those interventions and shows how a custodial period can be accommodated in the delivery of them. The typology groups interventions by their primary function or purpose but many interventions will achieve outcomes other than those for which they are primarily deployed.
9.10 The typology of interventions is illustrated in the table on page 36. It provides NOMS with a common language, which maps well against the language in the Criminal Justice Act 2003 and that used in the What Works Strategies of both Prison and Probation Services. The idealised sequencing of interventions is illustrated thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commence</th>
<th>Terminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punitive Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions to Support Protective Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions to Reduce Barrier Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions to Achieve Personal Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions Promoting Community Re-integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.11 **Punitive interventions** will always form part of the structure of the sentence itself. They will usually need to be implemented immediately, or almost immediately, after commencement. In one shape or form, they will normally span the whole sentence:

- the minimum contact requirements for community orders and licences take effect immediately after sentence or release and failures are followed up swiftly with enforcement proceedings;
- imprisonment, hostel placements and curfews must take effect immediately; Unpaid Work, Intermittent Custody and Attendance Centre attendance take effect after a short delay for arrangements.

9.11.1 There are some interventions which are almost exclusively punitive, like a standalone curfew or Attendance Centre requirement. There are others – like attendance on an Accredited Programme – which are primarily designed to meet other objectives, but where compliance achieves a punitive outcome by restricting the offender’s liberty. Conversely, interventions which are primarily punitive, for example Unpaid Work, may nevertheless contribute to meeting other objectives, like reform and rehabilitation (in the form of Enhanced Community Punishment) or reparation (in the form of Community Payback).

9.11.2 If the punitive elements in the sentence are not put into effect briskly and delivered effectively, the credibility of NOMS – and all of its other objectives – is put at risk.

9.12 Where they apply, or as soon as and for as long as the risk is apparent **restrictive interventions** for public protection must be implemented immediately too. Prohibitions and exclusions take immediate effect. Other provisions designed to manage or suppress the risk an offender poses must also be put into effect as soon as the relevant arrangements can be made. These will often be managed through Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements.

9.13 **Rehabilitative interventions** are sequenced to support and drive the “motivate – learn – consolidate” change process.
9.13.1 It is vital that action is taken as soon as possible to stabilise and promote those positive factors in an offender’s situation likely to promote desistance from crime and pro-social behaviour. These are referred to as “protective factors”.

» Where custody is an element in the sentence, it is particularly important that the fact of being in custody is prevented, as far as practicable, from making the offender’s situation worse. Hence, the immediate focus is upon supporting protective factors. Typically the role of prison Reception processes, First Night and Induction facilities is to support protective factors.

9.13.2 Secondly, certain factors have been shown to seriously reduce the effectiveness of change programmes. These are referred to as “barrier factors”:

• typical of barrier factors are chronic, involuntary homelessness, all-engulfing drug or alcohol misuse and certain mental health conditions.

» Change programmes are likely to be rendered ineffective if barrier factors are not tackled before referral to the programme.

» Offenders may, of course, already be engaged with services designed to promote protective factors or tackle barrier factors. Many offenders will, for example, be engaged with the Drugs Intervention Programme before a sentence is passed. Offender Managers should aim to agree a co-ordinated approach between these providers and meeting the requirements of the sentence.

9.13.3 Personal change programmes are those specifically intended to alter the way the offender functions both cognitively and behaviourally. Though there is a focus upon the teaching of new skills – cognitive, social or life skills – there also needs to be an element through which the new skills are applied in the risk situations which give rise to the offender’s offending. The ongoing personal relationship developed between the Offender Manager or Supervisor and the offender provides the context in which the commitment required to convert learning in new behaviour can be achieved and applied.

9.13.4 Community re-integration interventions are those designed to establish or re-establish the offender to full citizenship. There is liable to be a high level of attrition of learning from a change programmes if the offender emerges from it to face the same overwhelming life pressures which gave rise to his or her offending in the first place. Re-integration programmes focus upon such issues as employment, family dynamics and accommodation.

9.14 Restorative interventions

9.14.1 Some sentences may include a restorative or reparative intervention in an Activity Requirement. Plainly, in these cases, the deployment of the specified restorative intervention is mandatory. This will be rare for the time being, since the availability of such schemes for adult offenders is not widespread.
9.14.2 Beyond any specific restorative requirement, Offender Managers are expected to work to increase an offender’s victim awareness. This may be achieved integrally within the supervision process, or by referral to a specialist provision. In addition, they are encouraged to pursue a restorative outcome:

- in any case where the offender’s engagement in it is judged as likely to contribute to his or her rehabilitation, and
- provided facilities exist or resources can be made available to ensure that victims needs and offenders needs can be simultaneously met, and
- where the risks and needs in the case merit such an intervention, or
- where the needs of a victim can be met without incurring additional risks or substantial additional costs, or
- where an indirectly restorative approach can be deployed without direct contact with a victim (such as Unpaid Work (Community Payback) or voluntary work during custody).

9.14.3 There is some encouraging, if inconclusive, evidence about the rehabilitative effect of restorative measures, but the labour costs can be high. Pending more conclusive research, this encouragement stops short of an expectation that Offender Managers should seek to achieve a restorative outcome in all cases. There is no obvious sequencing guideline for restorative interventions, beyond the general principles in paragraph 9.8 above.

9.15 The diagrams below superimpose a release phase on this end-to-end sequence, illustrating how interventions might sensibly be planned for delivery during custody and in the community.

- This may require some modification since some interventions are easier to deliver in custody (e.g. basic skills) whilst others are more effective if they can be delivered in the community (e.g. accredited Offending Behaviour Programmes).
- Increasingly, the introduction of end-to-end Offender Management, and the requirement for community and custodial services to work more collaboratively together should mean that interventions can be commenced in custody and completed in the community, and that community-based offenders can access resources available in custodial settings

9.16 Accessing the Interventions Required

9.16.1 The Offender Management Model is predicated on the assumption that, over time, most of the interventions required for most offenders will be available and accessible, and that Offender Managers will broker and sequence them but not deliver them.

9.16.2 The National Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plan, and its associated regional strategies and plans, is the key vehicle for ensuring better and more consistent access for offenders to mainstream services.
9.16.3 However there will always be offenders:

- with minority needs such that the relevant interventions do not exist locally, either commissioned by the Regional Offender Manager, or available in local communities, or
- who for one reason or another are not suitable for those interventions available or cannot access them.

In these cases Offender Managers or Offender Supervisors will be expected to undertake appropriate work with the offender to address the unmet need or risk, as an integral part of the Offender Management process, using their own training and skills. Some adjustment may need to be made to the local resourcing of offender management in individual cases in order to enable this to occur.

9.16.4 Offender Managers should report instances of needs and risks which cannot be met through existing provision to service managers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punitive Interventions</th>
<th>Constructive Interventions</th>
<th>Restrictive Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To implement the punitive element of the sentence</td>
<td>To protect or promote the positive desistance factors in an offender's life/situation</td>
<td>To control behaviour for public protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum contact requirements of Community Orders and Licences</td>
<td>Maintain family ties</td>
<td>Increasing Victim Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curfew</strong></td>
<td>Retaining work</td>
<td>Prohibited Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance Centre</strong></td>
<td>Retaining accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid work</td>
<td>Maintaining good health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment</td>
<td>Sustaining engagement with existing services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Protective Factors</th>
<th>Reducing Barrier Factors</th>
<th>Change Programmes</th>
<th>Re-Integration</th>
<th>Restorative Interventions</th>
<th>Restrictive Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To protect or promote the positive desistance factors in an offender's life/situation</td>
<td>To reduce or eliminate factors which stand in the way of change</td>
<td>To learn new, pro-social attitudes and ways of behaving</td>
<td>To consolidate the new learning and promote citizenship</td>
<td>To make good the damage done by the offending</td>
<td>To control behaviour for public protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining family ties</td>
<td>Tackling involuntary homelessness</td>
<td>Accredited Offending Behaviour Programmes</td>
<td>Independent living support</td>
<td>Increasing Victim Awareness</td>
<td>Prohibited Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling chronic lack of motivation</td>
<td>Address engulfing mental health issues</td>
<td>Benefits, Debt and Money management</td>
<td>Indirect or direct mediation or apology</td>
<td>Mobility Restriction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Reparation</td>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>Shaded interventions cross-reference to inter-agency Pathways in National Reducing Re-offending Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Quality Relationships

10.1 The Model now represents the focus on the experience of the offender (1), as he or she moves along an individual correctional pathway (2), frequently involving the changes of environment from community to custody and back (3). The end-to-end offender management process has been specified (4), including its role in selecting and sequencing interventions across the whole of the pathway (5).

10.2 The remaining building-blocks of the Model are the relationships through which consistent messages, continuous processes and commitment are transmitted, and risk is continuously assessed and managed.

10.3 There are two important networks of relationships to understand and design:

- the face-to-face relationships which the different staff have with the same offender, at different stages of the sentence (6), and
- the network of relationships between those different staff, often working in different organisations (7).
10.4 This next – and final – stage of the build-up of the core model adds-in these networks.
11 Relationships with the Offender – Core Correctional Practice

11.1 This section examines the requirements of the face-to-face relationships which different staff will have with the same offender as he or she moves along his or her unique correctional pathway.

11.2 A recent re-working of the core What Works research evidence (see Dowden and Andrews *The Importance of Staff Practice in Delivering Effective Correctional Treatment: A Meta-Analytic Review of Core Correctional Practice* (2004)) has shown that programmes based upon the What Works principles are most effective when the staff delivering them deploy a set of behaviours which researchers have labelled "core correctional practice".

11.3 It is now becoming clear from research that these behaviours are at least as important in delivering successful outcomes as the technical content of the interventions:

» Correctional work is at its most effective when offenders are involved in their own assessment, engaged as “active collaborators” in deciding and implementing their own plan, and come to see themselves as being able to control their own futures, rather than being the victim of circumstance. This is called “agency”. Core correctional practice describes the staff behaviours which are most highly associated with securing the high level of engagement and collaboration necessary to help offenders achieve a sense of agency; the proposed Going Straight Contract aims to provide a further tool which supports this process.

11.4 But this is not an “either/or” – a “what” versus “how”. Effective outcomes are the product of quality offender management combined with quality interventions.

11.5 Dowden and Andrews identify Core Correctional Practice as consisting of 5 behaviour clusters. These are:

- the firm, fair and clear use of authority
- modelling pro-social and anti-criminal attitudes, cognition and behaviours
- teaching concrete problem solving skills
- using community resources (brokerage)
- forming and working through warm, open and enthusiastic relationships
11.6 There are different configurations of this behaviour set in the literature, but a consistency about its core. However configured, it establishes a basic standard for the behaviour of all staff engaged in the delivery of the plan, or in providing the environment in which the plan is delivered (e.g. prisons and approved premises). It is the minimum requirement for Offender Managers, Offender Supervisors and those delivering longer-term interventions.

11.7 Such a specification is now being converted into competences and embedded in NOMS’ human resource management processes, like selection, training and development, and deployment. It will also need to become part of the delivery specification for elements of Offender Management which may in the future be contracted to agencies other than the statutory correctional services.
12 Relationships between Staff – A New Concept of Teamwork

12.1 Offender Management involves different people from different agencies, doing different things with the same offender, at different stages of the offender’s pathway (see diagram on page 8). The Offender Manager (and to a lesser extent, the Offender Supervisor) provides the thread of personal continuity, binding issue-specific interventions into a coherent whole across the whole of the pathway. But if all of the contributions need to impact upon the offender with consistency, continuity and commitment, how is this to be achieved? The answer lies in teamwork.

12.2 The concept of teamwork in the correctional services is most often employed in managing case loads. In the Offender Management Model teamwork is re-focussed upon the individual offender. An Offender Management Team is defined as that group of staff, from whatever agency, who need to work together to implement a single Sentence Plan for an individual offender.

12.3 The graphic below illustrates the roles and their relationship to one another in a model Offender Management Team.
12.4 The model defines 4 universal roles in an Offender Management Team:

- the Offender Manager;
- one or more Key Workers;
- an Offender Supervisor;
- a Case Administrator.

12.5 The Offender Manager is the team leader, at the hub of the team. This is expected to be a collaborative form of leadership, not an authoritarian or charismatic one. He/she needs to work closely with those delivering interventions, with whoever is responsible for case administration, and with any separate Offender Supervisor.

12.6 Model role descriptions for these roles, together with the task lists which accompany the roles, are reproduced in Appendix 3, and can be used to construct job descriptions and to underpin training programmes.

12.7 This second version of the team model illustrates how existing familiar roles fit into the universal approach.

12.8 In understanding how the individual-focused “virtual” Offender Management Team is expected to function, it is important to understand the concept of role:

- the same person may occupy different roles with different offenders, or more than one role with the same offender;
- indeed, for the most part the model expects that the roles of Offender Manager and Offender Supervisor will be performed by the same person in relation to any given offender, except where the circumstances outlined in paragraph 8.3.5 a, b or c prevail.
12.9 It is important that staff understand what role they are expected to perform in relation to any individual offender, what is required of them in that role, and how that role relates to the roles of others. That is, a sound grasp of task, role and relationship.

- Tasks are what you do; roles are what you are; relationships are what you have.
- Tasks need to be clustered and allocated to support roles; roles need to be designed to be complimentary.
- Service design almost always attends to task and sometimes to role, but is often less attentive to ensuring that staff understand the relationship of their role to those of others. This often results in duplication, with two (or more) people doing the same thing.

12.10 The Sentence Plan is the vehicle around which the Offender Management Team coheres. Through it the authority of the Offender Manager is delegated to others performing their different roles. It is through adherence to the Sentence Plan that continuity and integrity of treatment is achieved.

12.11 It is important, then, that all members of the Offender Management Team, including the offender, are fully conversant with the content of the Sentence Plan, not just to understand their own contribution to delivering it, but also to understand how their contribution knits in with others’.

- This can most easily be achieved by distributing copies of the plan, unless there is some overriding issue of confidentiality;
- consulting the providers of services in the process for agreeing the plan is an effective way of securing better “ownership” of it;
- conducting shared case reviews (like MAPPA reviews), face-to-face or virtually, is a good way of preventing effort diverging.

12.12 Co-ordination and fine-tuning of the delivery of the plan is achieved through accurate and timely communication between members of the Offender Management Team and between members and the Offender Manager:

- this requirement obviously lends itself to an electronic solution through which the Offender Management Team for any given offender can be enabled to read and write in real time to a single case record. This facility is being developed in C-NOMIS;
- in the meantime there is scope for adapting existing electronic, personal and manual communication systems to achieve the same objective.

12.13 The Interface between Different Case Management Approaches

12.13.1 Offender Management does not exist in a vacuum. Offenders’ circumstances are rarely tidy. Concurrent with their engagement in Offender Management, offenders are likely to be the “clients”, “cases”, “users”, “patients” (or whatever terminology the relevant service provider uses) of other case management approaches. They are likely to have other assessments, case managers, action plans and records.
12.13.2 The relationship between a Key Worker, providing an intervention, the Offender Manager and the Sentence Plan is straightforward enough in those circumstances where NOMS is either the provider or the commissioner of the intervention. But many of these other service systems have their own legitimacy. Offenders are patients, students, job-seekers because they are ill, learning or looking for work, not because they are offenders.

12.13.3 Relationships with these service providers may pre-date Offender Management, straddle it, or continue beyond it. A drug user, for example, may be engaged with the Drugs Intervention Programme at the arrest and remand stage, and cease to be engaged during the currency of a sentence; he or she may become engaged during a sentence and remain engaged beyond the end of that sentence.

12.13.4 There is potential here for duplication, or even tension between different case managers with different sources of legitimacy, different objectives and different priorities. The risk is greater when interventions targeted at a particular issue adopt a “wrap-around services” approach, aiming to provide an holistic service. Accommodation providers who provide drugs services to those learning to live independently, drugs service providers who provide educational services to drug misusers, employment service providers who assist people with locating accommodation……….the scope for duplication is obvious.

12.13.5 There is no simple formulaic solution to avoiding the waste and managing the tensions caused by these interlocking systems. What is important is that:

- the staff engaged in different case management approaches dealing with offenders understand and respect the legitimacy of others, and the models they employ;
- Offender Managers and service providers are committed to collaborating to eliminate wasteful and ineffective (indeed, counterproductive) duplication;
- arrangements are in place (protocols, joint and team working and disclosure consents are options) for the sharing of information, for arriving at co-ordinated assessments and plans and for working together on implementation of those plans; and
- lines of communication are open to resolve inter-agency issues, on a no-blame basis.

12.14 Every Case as a Project

12.14.1 The model encourages Offender Management Teams to think about each offender’s period of engagement with NOMS as a project. This is not to objectify the offender but to apply contemporary project management wisdoms to the challenge of achieving change in a fixed time period, by working in a team. Thus, the Sentence Plan is the Project Plan.
12.14.2 Other key best practice themes in Project Management are:

- all team members believe in the value of teamwork and are committed to making it work;
- there is mutual respect for the different contributions of different people and organisations to the business of the project;
- team members share a vision about what has to be achieved;
- the Project Manager provides visible, enthusiastic, interested leadership;
- there is an overall plan with critical activities properly costed;
- everyone in the team has a good understanding of the overall plan;
- there is clarity between team members about who’s doing what and by when and how each relates to the others;
- there is good day-to-day communication between team members;
- the risks are well understood and action is taken to mitigate them;
- there are sound arrangements for monitoring progress and trouble shooting;
- all team members share in regular reviews of progress;
- at the end of the project there is a de-brief of what worked well and what didn’t work so well in order to improve next time.

12.14.3 The challenge is to apply these best practice principles of change management to the project of achieving objectives with an offender. There are implications here for the person-specification of staff, for the way in which Sentence Planning is conducted and Sentence Plans are used, for teamwork practices and communication systems.

12.15 Partnership

12.15.1 The role of partnership is represented in the Model. Partnership is about the relationship between organisations. This is not the place to explore the important features of good partnership. Good partnership, though, creates the environment in which teamwork at the level of the individual offender can flourish. Staff are expected to work in harmony in Offender Management Teams, and will be facilitated in doing so if they observe that their respective parent organisations are likewise working in harmony.

12.15.2 NOMS then needs to pay careful attention to how it establishes and maintains a real sense of partnership between those agencies delivering offender management and interventions. Partners from outside of the main correctional services need to feel that they are more than simple contractors, and those within need to develop a genuine mutual understanding and respect for one another’s contributions. The national-level Corporate, Civic and Faith/VCS Alliances and national and regional Reducing Re-Offending Plans provide a framework through which sound partnerships are being established, developed and maintained.
13 Allocating Resources – The Universal Tiering Framework

13.1 Introduction and Context

13.1.1 NOMS is unlikely ever to have sufficient resources to do everything it would like to do to the highest standard possible. Resources have to be prioritised. The basis for prioritisation must be clear, transparent, rational and consistently applied. A “Least Necessary” principle has to apply if scarce resources are to be used to best effect.

13.1.2 The What Works Risk Principle has established that the overall scale of intervention should be proportionate to the likelihood of the offender re-offending. Indeed, it argues further that unnecessarily high levels of resource allocation to low risk cases may actually be counterproductive for some offenders.

13.1.3 “Resources follow risk” is also a general principle of organisational management which is used widely in organisational resource allocation. Most resource drivers can be re-interpreted as risks of one kind or another:

- there are several different kinds of risk associated with Offender Management and different resources need to track these different risks in different ways;
- correctional decision-making and resource allocation must take account of the likelihood of re-offending, the risk of harm, the complexity of some cases, risks which some cases pose to the organisation, investment risks etc;
- if the framework does not reflect and incorporate the different risks which are weighed and balanced in the real world of correctional practice, it will be of limited value.

13.1.4 It remains the case, though, that the first call upon NOMS resources is related primarily to the seriousness of an offender’s current offending, as represented by the degree of restriction inherent in the sentence. NOMS’ challenge is to blend a risk-based approach into a proportionality-based system.

13.1.5 Offender Management draws upon the wider concept of case management for its design. Case management is an imprecise term, encompassing a wide range of different approaches, from a hands-off administrative one to some services through to a hands-on intensive one in others. Case management itself then, requires different resources for different cases.

13.1.6 A recent research study has shown how, without a clear framework for resource allocation, the effort and energy put into different corrections cases can tend to drift into a “one size fits all” middle ground (see, for instance, Bonta, Rugge, Sedo and Coles Case Management in Manitoba Probation (2004)).

13.1.7 Accordingly, and drawing all this together, the Offender Management Model includes within it a framework for matching resources and styles to different offenders. This gives operational effect to both the “resources follow risk” and the “least necessary” principles. This is called tiering.
### 13.2 The Relationship between Resources and the Different risks and drivers

13.2.1 The different risks and resource drivers, and their different relationships with resources are illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Relationship with Resource Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirements of the Sentence</strong></td>
<td>The implementation of the minimum punitive requirement of the sentence is the first call upon resources. This is non-discretionary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Risk of Not Meeting the Public’s and Sentencers’ Expectations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Decency</strong></td>
<td>Custody must be delivered in such a way that the potentially negative impact of it is mitigated as far as possible. Prisoners must be safe, with proper attention paid to their basic human needs. They should have access to as wide a range of universal services as is possible commensurate with the facts of custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Risk of Infringing the Standards of a Civilised Society)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk of Harm</strong></td>
<td>In addition to resources targeted at reducing their re-offending, offenders who represent a high risk of harm will require a higher level of accountability, the deployment of a discretionary framework of restrictions and surveillance (often over and above the minimum requirements of the sentence itself) and the mobilisation of scarce inter-agency resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Risk to a victim of serious harm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likelihood of Re-offending</strong></td>
<td>The higher the likelihood of re-offending, the more entrenched the behaviour pattern and – in a cognitive learning model – the more input (volume or dosage) will be required to achieve change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Risk of Further Offending)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity of Intervention Plan</strong></td>
<td>The more numerous the criminogenic needs and requirements, the more complex will be the sentence plan, and the more skilled will the Offender Manager need to be to implement it effectively. Additionally the more supervision is likely to be needed if the plan is to stay on course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Risk of failure by not investing sufficiently in a case)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk to Organisational Security or Reputation</strong></td>
<td>Notwithstanding all other factors, there are some cases which demand a higher resource allocation than would otherwise be the case. These are typically “low likelihood/high impact” cases, like lifers, notorious cases, high seriousness/low risk cases and vulnerable offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(risk to the organisation’s reputation and security)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prospects for Achieving Objectives</strong></td>
<td>A judgement has to be made about the prospects of achieving the desired objectives in the time-frame allowed by the sentence. All things being equal, there is little point in investing heavily where there is little prospect of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Risk of wasting scare resources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local or National Priorities</strong></td>
<td>From time-to-time local or national priorities will require an allocation of resources to a case which is higher than the other factors might otherwise require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Risk of loss of confidence by sponsors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Notwithstanding the needs or requirements in a case, resources can only be allocated if they exist. A provision (like drug treatment) may be in short supply, or there may simply be no provision at all in some localities to address some needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.2.2 The risk mix for each individual offender and sentence is therefore complex, as is the relationship between that risk mix and the allocation of resources. It is also dynamic.

13.2.3 A 4-tier framework has been devised into which all cases can be mapped. Interestingly, the case management frameworks in many other public service organisations have also evolved 4-tier frameworks.

13.3 The Four Offender Management Approaches

13.3.1 From across the wide range of case management approaches referred to in paragraph 13.1.5 above four broad styles (or modes) have been identified as applicable to work with offenders. Each has been given a one-word ‘label’ beneath which is a more detailed description. What is required of the Offender Manager and Offender Management Team varies from mode to mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode Label</th>
<th>Description of Mode</th>
<th>Offender Management Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUNISH</td>
<td>Arrangements made for the implementation of the sentence requirements, with due regard for decency, health and safety and the preservation of citizenship; monitor risk factors; “signpost” to helping resources</td>
<td>Hands-off; administrative, organising, monitoring, signposting to resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELP</td>
<td>Motivation; referral to resources providing practical help addressing circumstances or situation – typically employment, accommodation, basic and life skills; support and encouragement of participation</td>
<td>Hands-on; motivating; encouraging, referring; supporting; problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>Implementation of carefully planned programme designed to achieve personal change, typically, including Offending Behaviour Programmes, drug and alcohol treatment; some social skills</td>
<td>Hands-on; treatment (usually) to complement or as part of specialist treatment programme; co-ordination of all inputs to complement one another. Sometimes refered to as “therapeutic”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>Intensive, inter-agency, multi-faceted programme to control and monitor behaviour, including surveillance and intelligence work. Typically, Prolific Offender Schemes and dangerous offender MAPPA ‘packages’</td>
<td>Hands-on; risk management; inter-agency co-ordination; high level of teamwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.3.2 In modelling correctional practice it is clear that these styles, or modes, are not applied as mutually exclusive alternatives, but in a tiered framework. Punish mode applies as a basic minimum to all cases. It ranges, at its lowest level, from simply making sufficient appointments to meet the required standard of contact in the community, to full-time custody at the maximum. Most offenders will require help in addition, a proportion will require change as well as help, and a few – the dangerous and the very prolific – a system of social or physical controls.
13.4 The Tiering Framework – Relating Risks to Resources

13.4.1 The relationship between the different approaches and the risk mix presented by the offender is illustrated as follows:

13.4.2 The framework thus creates 4 broad categories of case:

- **Tier 1 cases** = **PUNISH**
- **Tier 2 cases** = **PUNISH** and **HELP**
- **Tier 3 cases** = **PUNISH** and **HELP** and **CHANGE**
- **Tier 4 cases** = **PUNISH** and **HELP** and **CHANGE** and **CONTROL**

13.4.3 Applied to custody it is helpful to distinguish between regime services and targeted interventions:

- regime services refer to those facilities which every prison provides, to which prisoners have access, regardless of their risks and criminogenic needs. Library and health care facilities are good examples. Access to these facilities forms part of the baseline of **punish**. It meets the requirement to provide for humane and decent treatment for offenders;
- targeted interventions are those which are designed to tackle specific issues, which have narrower access criteria, which are not appropriately offered to all prisoners on a voluntary basis, to which offenders may need to be referred as part of the individual plan for their rehabilitation. These will form part of **help**, **change** or **control** approaches;
- some facilities may straddle both categories. They may be targeted in a more intensive way as determined by individual Sentence Plans. Education is an example of a regime service available to all offenders, but to which specific offenders may be more determinedly referred by an Offender Manager/Supervisor as a consequence of an assessment.
13.4.4 Beneath this high-level framework, there are more detailed descriptors of the profile of offenders suited to each approach, and the nature or form of the Offender Management involved in each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Offender Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Medium or low risk harm cases  
|      | Low likelihood of re-offending cases  
|      | Low intervention cases requiring monitoring of risk factors only  
|      | Compliant offenders who are well motivated to complete the sentence  
|      | Offenders who present no manageability problems  
|      | Cases in which punishment is or has become the main objective  |
| 2    | Rehabilitation cases in which the focus of work is on the offender’s situation  
|      | Rehabilitation cases with less complex intervention plans  
|      | Reasonably motivated, reasonably compliant offenders  
|      | Medium or low risk of harm  
|      | Resettlement/re-integration cases where practical help is the intervention approach  |
| 3    | Medium/high likelihood of re-offending cases with multi-factor intervention plans  
|      | Medium risk of harm cases  
|      | Cases with personal change as the primary objective  
|      | Cases requiring high levels of integrative work  
|      | Cases in which mishandling would have significant organisational consequences  
|      | Vulnerable offenders  |
| 4    | High and very high risk of serious harm cases – public protection priorities  
|      | Cases requiring the highest level of skill, qualification and organisational authority  
|      | Cases requiring unusual or exceptional resource allocation  
|      | Cases requiring very high levels of inter-agency work  
|      | High local and national priority cases (policing and/or persistent offenders)  |

n.b. offender descriptions are illustrative “sketches”. The complexity of factors and variables means that the definitions at the margins between levels are a matter for professional and local judgement.
13.4.5 The decision-making process for weighing together all the factors to be considered in allocating an offender to a tier is not a straightforward one. A decision-making algorithm has been agreed and was issued in 2004 under cover of Probation Circular 65/2005. It provides the starting point for the exercise of professional judgement. It will, in due course, be built in to C-NOMIS.

13.4.6 What approach is the most appropriate for any offender, based upon assessed offender-factors, and what resource level would ordinarily accompany it, has to be tempered by what the legal framework – the sentence factors – governing NOMS’ relationship with that offender both allows and requires.

13.4.7 Tiering provides a logical and consistent framework for the allocation of Offender Management time, priority and competence to individual cases. It also has utility in resource modelling at a national level, resource management at a local level, in workforce planning and the setting of delivery standards.
13.5 The value in using this universal method of case categorisation is that it:

- captures the evidence and policy base in a systematic approach;
- ensures that agency resources are used to best effect;
- assists staff and managers in resisting resource drift;
- backs agency staff when cases go wrong despite appropriate provision;
- assists in allocating finite resources;
- assists in allocation of staff and in defining role boundaries;
- assists in developing resource models;
- provides a common currency for a mobile user population;
- helps an understanding the complexity of our business processes;
- supports training.
14 Offender Management – A Whole System Approach

14.1 Sentence implementation in a way which achieves reduced re-offending and protects the public is NOMS’ core business process: it is the single most important thing it has to do. Offender Management is the term used to refer to both the whole approach to implementing individual sentences, and to that important ASPIRE process within it (see paragraph 8.2.5), which gives it cohesion for each individual offender. The model so far has outlined the approach at the level of each individual offender – the operational level.

14.2 A well-accepted understanding of organisations – drawn from evidence-based models like European Excellence – emphasises that in order for core business processes to deliver organisational objectives, the whole organisation must be designed to support them.

14.3 So the last element of the model is the Whole System Approach.

14.4 Quite simply, this tells each key support function of the organisation what needs to be done in order to support, maintain and develop effective Offender Management.

14.5 As with earlier stages of building the model, this Whole System Approach is layered. Each domain on the above model is a significant subject in its own right. Examples of the kind of detailed attention necessary are:

- **Leadership** leaders at all levels need to support and promote the model. They need to value those who implement it, in word, deed and through the performance measures they choose (what gets measured gets done; what doesn’t get measured doesn’t really matter).
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- **Human resources** all staff need to be clear about task, role and relationship. Roles and responsibilities need to be matched against grade and pay. Quality training and personal development for all roles is essential. Workforce planning needs to ensure the right supply of the right competences.

- **Resources** a brokerage model requires that there are adequate, accessible resources into which offenders can be referred. The offender management process itself also needs adequate resourcing – it is not, de facto, a low-cost, hands-off way of delivering a complex service.

- **Partnership** co-operative working relationships with key partners must be developed and sustained, to provide the environment in which teamwork can flourish. Operational partners need to understand the Offender Management model within which they are working.

- **Policy and strategy** there should be a plan for the continuous development of offender management and relevant policies to support the model. That plan, and associated policies, need to be well communicated to all those involved in delivery. A one offender: one manager model has wide-reaching policy implications.

- **Systems** the development of a single case record, incorporating OASys, and of a communication system which provides all members of each Offender Management Team with read and write access is an absolute priority. A case management system should also automate timeline processes, monitor process and measure outcomes.

- **Structures** a better understanding is required about which local structures best support effective delivery of the key process. Evidence supports the one offender: one manager default. In the community 3-role small team working can have significant effects upon performance. Probation Circular 83/2005 provides further guidance about the organisation of Offender Managers; the Implementation “toolkit” issued in March 2006 assists with structuring Offender Management Units in prisons

- **Monitoring and evaluation** key stages in the process need to be monitored. Short-term outcomes need to be carefully chosen to support the right balance between the “what” and the “how”. Different approaches need to be properly evaluated.

- **Research and development** important knowledge gaps need to be identified and research commissioned to fill them.

14.6 This Whole System perspective needs to be applied at national, regional and operational levels.
15 Anticipated Benefits

15.1 An analysis has been undertaken of the benefits which are expected to flow from a rigorous and universal implementation of the Offender Management Model.

15.2 The implementation of Offender Management, as defined herein, is expected to contribute to NOMS’ ability to meet all of its objectives. Indeed, the assumptions made about the effectiveness of many interventions and, indeed, OASys, take for granted that a form of case management, like that described by the Offender Management Model, already exists.

15.3 These benefits have been converted into a money equivalent, in order to establish the case for investing in the changes required. They fall into 4 categories as follows:

15.3.1 Improved Reduction in Re-offending

The Model is based upon the best available evidence about what is most likely to secure maximum offender compliance. The expected effectiveness of many specific programmes is predicated upon an assumption that the underlying offender management process already has the qualities which this Model describes. Additionally, better compliance will be associated with reduced breakdown rates and improving sentence confidence. This will contribute to the Rebalancing Sentencing strand of the NOMS programme upon whose success, to a certain extent, the adequate resourcing of Offender Management is predicated.

15.3.2 Better Public Protection

Frequent changes of key personnel, fragmentation of processes and poor information flow are recurrent features of a high proportion of those cases in which offenders under NOMS supervision go on to commit further serious offences. The implementation of Offender Management will contribute to reducing the prevalence of these features.

15.3.3 Reduced Waste

An Offender Management approach, as defined in this document, can reasonably be expected to secure better compliance from offenders, since it is based on research evidence and the views of offenders themselves. This will reduce the unit cost of interventions, the overall cost of expensive enforcement activity, and the cost of the further imprisonment or community punishments which results from it. The teamwork proposals can be expected to reduce the costs associated with unnecessary duplication of effort.

15.3.4 Higher Productivity

The evidence-base suggests that higher levels of staff job satisfaction are likely to be associated with the end-to-end responsibility, and small-team cross-grade working arrangements proposed in the Model. Accordingly, productivity is expected to rise, absence and turnover to fall.
15.4 In addition, Offender Management supports NOMS commitment to diversity.

This document makes no reference to the particular needs of each of the different groups which make up the offender population. Rather, it provides for a highly individualised approach set within a consistent, transparent and accountable framework. It specifically rejects the kind of “one size fits all” philosophy, associated with discrimination. It promotes one which is responsive to individual needs, subject to them being associated with NOMS outcomes and it casts the concept of needs widely to embrace personal and social ones.

It is implicit, therefore, that part of the specification for staff competence requires an understanding of how different people with different cultural and social backgrounds are likely to have quite different needs and to experience and respond to the same circumstances differently. Likewise it is part of the specification for monitoring outcomes that care is taken to ensure that the approach does not impact unfairly upon any particular group.

The Model has been the subject of a Diversity Impact Assessment.

15.5 As NOMS evolves further, measures of these benefits will be developed, as will measures of the extent to which offenders are, or are not, experiencing Offender Management. Whilst it will remain a challenge to establish a tight cause-and-effect relationship between Offender Management and NOMS’ outcomes, over time a higher degree of correlation can be expected.
16 Implementing Offender Management

16.1 The above completes the modelling of the core process in Offender Management. It provides a comprehensive, all-embracing framework, expressed in a universal language, which can be applied consistently but individually to each offender under NOMS jurisdiction.

16.2 The concepts embedded in it will continue to evolve incrementally as research evidence and practical experience informs them. Further editions of the Model will therefore be issued as and when new learning impacts sufficiently on it to merit an upgrade.

16.3 This document is not an implementation handbook or Action Plan. However, there are three concurrent themes in the implementation of Offender Management worthy of note here.

16.4 The Scale of the Challenge

16.4.1 At one level, Offender Management is a remarkably simple concept: a remarkably simple concept, remarkably difficult to implement properly. It aims to replace a fragmented model of case management, in which "managership" transfers in and out of custody with the offender, and from one offender manager to another depending on the sentence type, with one better designed to match the evidence-base, to provide cohesion and continuity. Though rarely articulated, the fragmented model is deeply embedded in the language, processes and procedures, structure, infrastructure and culture of the two key providers – the National Probation Service and HM Prison Service. For example:

- in the OASys infrastructure “ownership” of the assessment and plan for an offender transfers in and out of custody with the offender;
- the notion that there are two fundamentally different kinds of sentence – community ones and custodial ones – is captured in the language and behaviours of the main providers. Applying the albeit cumbersome term “sentences with a custodial element” refocuses attention on a whole sentence and away from any single element of it;
- a cultural theme in pre-sentence report writing is that authors aim to persuade the courts of the efficacy of a non-custodial disposal and to outline what action would be proposed were such a disposal to be agreed. In the new model, an Offender Manager needs to determine what measures will best reduce re-offending and protect the public, advise a court accordingly, but take responsibility for trying to deliver them, whatever the structure of the sentence emerging from the sentencing process;
- most probation areas organise Offender Management around sentence types, so that the core relationship with an offender changes as he/she moves from pre-sentence stage to post-sentence, and from sentence to sentence. Personal Officer schemes in prisons aim to establish a personal relationship between a prisoner and a member of staff, but these relationships rarely transcend moves within establishments, let alone between them.
16.4.2 Arriving at the point where 70,000 in-house staff and 1,500 partners all understand and are committed to a different model, using a new language, contributing to a single process, presents a massive communication challenge, the scale and importance of which should not be under-estimated. It is not likely to be achieved quickly or easily. Unless the change initiative is pervasive, determined, persistent and sustained the nature of organisational culture means that short-term gains are liable to be clawed back.

16.4.3 A pre-requisite for success is that leaders at all levels are committed to the change, can and do articulate its rationale, benefits and requirements persuasively. Without this, the programme is likely to stumble at its first hurdle.

16.5 Embedding the Model in the Infrastructure

16.5.1 Offender Management is, ultimately, about what happens at the interface between providers and offenders. But operational staff cannot reasonably be expected to implement a new model of working if the organisational infrastructure in which they are trying to do it, and the “tools of the trade”, are based upon a different one.

16.5.2 An important dimension of implementation, then, is to embed the model into the fabric of the provider organisations. Ongoing examples of the way this is being approached are:

- the formal adoption of a new, agency-neutral language code;
- building the new communications infrastructure – C-NOMIS – around the Model;
- embedding the Model in the revised Standards for the Supervision of Offenders in the Community and, in due course, in HMPS and generic NOMS Standards;
- developing the NOMS Performance Management Framework to drive key features of offender management, like continuity and the quality of the offender’s experience;
- capturing the model and its language in inspection criteria;
- framing the resource deployment, like the probation Workload Management Tool (WMT), around the tiering framework in the Model; and
- developing staff competence frameworks, training and qualifications around the new roles in the Model; this has begun with the design of the induction programme for PSO grade Offender Managers.

16.5.3 Working in partnership with the main providers, NOMS HQ is taking the lead in these developments.
16.6 Phased Operational Implementation Linked to the Criminal Justice Act 2003

16.6.1 At the operational level, the implementation of Offender Management is pegged to the implementation of the enabling sentencing provisions in the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

16.6.2 The Offender Management Model has been applied to community orders and licences by the probation service from April 2005 onward. It will be applied to priority high risk of harm and prolific offender cases from September 2006, to the new Custody Plus sentence from the autumn of 2006 onward, and to other sentences which have a custodial element through 2007-8.

16.6.3 Offender Management will have been established as the normal operating model for all sentenced offenders by April 2009.
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Sources and Further Reading

Bonta, Rugge, Sedo and Coles *Case Management in Manitoba Probation* (2004)


Criminal Justice Act 2003


HM Inspectorate of Prisons/HM Inspectorate of Probation *Through the Prison Gate* (2002)

HM Inspectorate of Probation *An Independent Review of a Serious Further Offence Case: Damien Hanson and Elliot White* (2006)


Social Exclusion Unit *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-Offenders* (2002)
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Key Implementation Milestones – Correspondence and Circulars

11.01.2005 Letter to Probation Chiefs the National Offender Manager and the Director General of the National Probation Service

The letter confirmed the adoption of version 1 of the Offender Management Model as the working model for implementation; provided a self-assessment template for probation areas to assess their state of readiness for implementing Offender Management from April 2005; and introduced the Offender Management Model

13.01.2005 Descriptive Document

Document translating the implications of the Offender Management Model into custodial settings

19.01.2005 Offender Management Model Version 1

First working draft of the OM Model issued to probation areas and published on the National Probation Directorate website, to support the self-assessment exercise.

09.05.2005 NOMS Board

OM Model approved as the NOMS case management approach, subject to review and, if necessary, revision, on a periodic basis


Publication of the detailed decision rules for allocating offenders to tiers of service within the OM Model. Also includes guidance on handling changes in risk factors during periods of supervision


Clarification and guidance on the implications for probation delivery structures of the OM Model. Support for person-based rather than task-based specialisation


Guidance on the implementation of Offender Management in custody, including issue of the “toolkit” for planning prison Offender Management Units
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Role Description – Offender Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Accountable Officer</strong></td>
<td>The Offender Manager is the person who has overall operational responsibility for the offender/sentence in question. He/she is accountable for delivering the sentence’s objectives, to the extent that these are not delivered on a corporate basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Assessor</strong></td>
<td>The Offender Manager is responsible for assessing the offender’s risks, needs and potentials and for weighing these together with the requirements of the sentence, any relevant policies, priorities and resource issues. Wherever possible this should be done with the offender. Once a plan has been formulated, the Offender Manager becomes the hub of the team’s communications, and adjusts the assessment and the plan in the light of incoming information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Planner and Plan Owner</strong></td>
<td>The Offender Manager is responsible for drawing up the Sentence Plan. This should span the whole sentence. Wherever possible this should be done in collaboration with others whose co-operation will be required to deliver it. The process of formulating the plan should engage the offender as an “active collaborator”. Only the Offender Manager may change the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Team Leader</strong></td>
<td>The Offender Manager is the team leader of the Offender Management Team for the case in question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Director</strong></td>
<td>The Offender Manager is responsible for ensuring that the arrangements are in place for delivering the plan, and for continuously overseeing that delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Synthesiser</strong></td>
<td>The Offender Manager is the person who straddles all aspects of the case and who helps the offender make the links between the different interventions. He/she makes arrangements to ensure that the offender experiences the sentence as a single, coherent whole, and that its whole is “greater than the sum of its parts”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Enforcer</strong></td>
<td>The Offender Manager is responsible for ensuring that those punitive elements of the sentence which are not “automated” are in place and delivered, and that the offender complies with them (insofar as his/her co-operation is required), and that relevant action is taken to enforce the sentence if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Evaluator</strong></td>
<td>The Offender Manager is the person responsible for evaluating the impact of different contributions and of the sentence plan as whole, and for informing the commissioners of resources/interventions about the performance and impact of specific interventions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task List – Offender Manager**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undertake case assessment</strong></td>
<td>Use OASys and supplementary assessment formats to assess individual assessment sentence requirements and the relationship between these two, policies, priorities and resource considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formulate Sentence Plan</strong></td>
<td>In collaboration with offender and resource providers, draw together assessment of individual, offending history, requirements of sentence, relevant policy/priority requirements and resources available into single sentence plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocate resources to plan</strong></td>
<td>Allocate the case to a resource level using the tiering framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set in place arrangements for implementation of plan</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that everyone knows role and responsibilities and that arrangements are in place to implement plan; broker resources as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead case-specific Offender Management Team</strong></td>
<td>Act as hub for information sharing and joint working. Chair “team” to plan and monitor progress. Ensure that communication functions between team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitor implementation of plan</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that information flow systems are in place in order to be able to adequately track progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitor the risk factors</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that intervention providers and any supervisor are aware of key risk factors in the case. Receive incoming information from interventions, supervision and third parties about progress, issues and associated risk factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review progress of plan, re-assess and adjust plan as necessary</strong></td>
<td>Review working assessment in light of incoming information and adjust plan incrementally and, periodically, more formally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate impact of plan against objectives</strong></td>
<td>Complete overall evaluation of outcomes at end of case, in prescribed format; feedback to Service Managers on impact and quality of service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Make enforcement decision in the event of breach</strong></td>
<td>Make enforcement decisions if required; trigger enforcement procedures and prosecute as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NOMS Offender Management Model

Offender Manager – Some Design Questions

| Who may perform the role of Offender Manager? | Someone who understands the model in which they're working and their relationships with others in a systemic approach  
A Team Worker  
Someone who will – all things being equal – be able to see the case through from sentence to termination  
Someone with the required knowledge and skills  
Someone whose context enables them to function effectively in the offender’s resettlement locality |
|---|---|
| Different specifications of Offender Manager for different cases? | Yes, most certainly  
Within the 4 tier framework:  
- DipPS (or CJ equivalent)/NVQ 4 or equivalent for Tier III and Tier IV cases  
- Cert in CJ/NVQ 3 or equivalent for Tier II and Tier I cases |
| Should the Offender Manager also be the Offender Supervisor? | Yes, generally. Varies by tier – recommended for higher tiers  
Overall model – not envisaged that Offender Managers will be simply the "assurers of the process"; need to be Community Justice qualified/experienced and to have enough "hands-on" contact with offenders to maintain knowledge, skills and confidence |
| How should a local Offender Manager structure be designed? | Structure needs to be offender focussed, not function focussed.  
Cases will need to be streamed  
Design should avoid fragmenting the end-to-end process; small group work provides insurance against unavoidable discontinuity  
Different streaming criteria have different pros and cons  
In general, beyond streaming by geography, risk (of harm and re-offending) and dominant criminogenic factor offer the best prospects |
| Are Offender Managers an in-house or outsourced provision? | Constrained to in-house for time being  
Pilot projects in future to outsource to other agencies or selected individuals? |
| Offender Manager quality assurance? | Framework needs to be developed for the monitoring, supervision and development of Offender Management and Offender Managers  
Need to match output measures (National Standards compliance, programme completions) with process or quality measures (consistency, commitment, consolidation) |
| What Offender Manager support infrastructure is required? | Effective leadership which understands and values the role  
Electronic real-time communication and case recording system, which automates much of process  
Appropriate range of resources and interventions, with easy access |

Role Description – Offender Supervisor

This role has various role titles at present. "Case Supervisor", "Case Co-ordinator", "Case Worker", "Mentor" and "Personal Officer" are all terms in current usage which cover all or part of the role. The proliferation of role titles will be rationalised over time.

The role may be combined with that of Offender Manager in a single person; it may also be split between – say – an Offender Manager and an Offender Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Continuous Human Link</th>
<th>The Offender Supervisor provides the continuous human link between the sentence framework and the offender. This has been shown to be important in the effective implementation of sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Motivator-Encourager</td>
<td>Through personal behaviours, and applied techniques, the Offender Supervisor is responsible for generating enough motivation in the offender to – at least – co-operate, and – at best – strive to achieve the objectives of the sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Preparer</td>
<td>The Offender Supervisor prepares the offender for the different interventions which make up the Sentence Plan. He/she maximises the likelihood that the interventions will have the desired outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Dismantler of Obstacles | The Offender Supervisor "oils the wheels" of engagement between the offender and the providers of specialist services and interventions  
The Offender Supervisor monitors the offender’s attitude and circumstances, is sensitive to changes which may become obstacles to engagement, and works to de-construct them, be they practical, emotive or cognitive |
| The Coach | The Offender Supervisor works with the offender to link learning from one intervention to another, and into his/her daily environment. He or she models new skills and attitudes, helps the offender practice them, praises achievement, supports through setbacks and thereby consolidates new learning into "normal" behaviour |
| The Progress Monitor and Reporter | Acting across the plan as a whole, the Offender Supervisor collates and co-ordinates information, sharing it with the Offender Manager, with particular reference to when information emerges which appears to be at odds with the existing "operating assessment", or when significant progress has been made |
| Offender Management Team Member | The Offender Supervisor works together with other team members to implement the plan in such a way that it coheres for the offender  
He/she communicates key information to other team members and the Offender Manager  
Participates in and contributes to team reviews and evaluations |
### Task List – Offender Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form and maintain effective working relationship</strong></td>
<td>Show genuine interest in offender. Be reliable. Be responsive. Skilful use of “tell – guide – support” communication modes. Appropriate use of authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model pro-social behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Consistently praise pro-social behaviour and attitudes; challenge anti-social behaviour and attitudes. Behave pro-socially in own behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broker resources in accordance with plan</strong></td>
<td>Make arrangements for delivery of services; negotiate with providers; achieve cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivate offender</strong></td>
<td>Deploy brief motivational techniques to increase ambivalence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepare offender</strong></td>
<td>Rehearse expectations; deconstruct barriers to engagement; ensure offender not inhibited by mythology or misconception. Practice attendance routines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support offender</strong></td>
<td>Show interest in progress; praise compliance; counter inertia; intercept barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coach offender</strong></td>
<td>Revisit new learning. Model and guide offender in skills application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liaise with service providers to co-ordinate services</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing communication between Offender Manager, offender and interventions to co-ordinate plan delivery; ensure everyone knows whole picture as far as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocate on behalf of offender</strong></td>
<td>Argue the case for the offender if intervention providers reluctant or set-backs encountered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link and contextualise offender</strong></td>
<td>Help offender understand links between learning in different interventions; help offender make links between new learning and day-to-day environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rehearse new learning and skills</strong></td>
<td>Make sure that new skills are practised; resist learning attrition; repetition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidate new learning</strong></td>
<td>Persistence; once is not enough; check regularly that new skills and behaviours are still being deployed; repeat until new behaviours habitualised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevent relapse</strong></td>
<td>Be aware of relapse risk factors; intercept as they rise; react with support if risk factors rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work collaboratively with other members of the Offender Management Team</strong></td>
<td>Attend and contribute to case reviews. Ensure relevant information flows between team members. Support other team members’ contributions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Offender Supervisor - Some Design Questions

- **Who should be an Offender Supervisor?**
  - People with an active interest in offenders, a “benign curiosity”
  - Relationship people
  - Motivator/encouragers
  - Team workers

- **Should Offender Supervisors be in-house staff or out-sourced?**
  - Could be either, subject to suitable arrangements for training, accreditation, support, accountability and communication

- **How can the Offender Supervisor/Offender Manager relationship be made to work well?**
  - Mutual respect
  - Clear understanding of different roles and relationship between roles
  - Good communication
  - Collaborative approach
  - Offender experiences different staff as complementing one another and working well together

- **Can the Offender Supervisor role be shared between different people?**
  - In theory, yes
  - What’s important is that the different people together understand the role, their relative responsibilities within it, and their relationship with the Offender Manager
  - Also, as above, important that the offender understands the different roles of the different people and experiences them as working cohesively together

- **In which cases is it important that the same person be Offender Manager and Offender Supervisor?**
  - Vital to reduce risks of fragmentation in Tier 4 cases; so, presumption in favour of Offender Manager being Offender Supervisor in these cases
  - Tier 3 cases – also important that Offender Manager is “hands-on” but some supervisory work could be delegated
  - Only in Band 1 cases might the Offender Manager hold no supervisory duties at all (i.e. function purely administratively)

- **Who is the Offender Supervisor in in-custody cases where distance prevents the Offender Manager from also being the Offender Supervisor?**
  - Not yet resolved, but perhaps…..
  - Tier I and II cases, Prison Officers in role as Personal Officer or out-sourced “mentor”
  - Tier II and III cases, seconded PSO or specially trained prison officer (e.g. OASys assessor) or out-sourced “mentor”
  - Tier III and IV cases, specially trained prison officer or seconded PO
The arrangements for the delivery of many interventions will include the nomination of a single point of contact (or Key Worker) to act as the “bridge” between the Offender Manager (Supervisor and Administrator) and the Service being provided. This is not mandatory. Note though the risk involved if responsibility is not clearly designated – everyone’s responsibility can easily become no-one’s responsibility.

### Role Description – Service Provider (Key Worker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverer of Specialist Intervention</th>
<th>Delivering the required intervention, within the framework of the single, governing Sentence Plan, in accordance with the standards and specifications applicable to the provision in question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offender Management Team Member</td>
<td>Working together with other Offender Management Team members to ensure that the sentence coheres for the offender, and that the delivery of each component is set in the context of the rest of the sentence. Communicating key information to other members of Offender Management Team and Offender Manager. Monitoring key risk factors as identified by the Offender Manager and informing the Offender Manager when risk factors change. Contributing to shared review and evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task List – Service Provider (Key Worker)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure understanding of whole sentence plan and different roles within it</td>
<td>The Key Worker should ensure that he/she has a copy of, or is familiar with, the Sentence Plan and is fully aware of whole plan and who does what within it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model pro-social behaviour and attitudes, and continuously motivate offender</td>
<td>Consistently praise expressions of pro-social attitudes and pro-social behaviours; challenge anti-social attitudes and behaviours. Model pro-social behaviours in own practice. Motivate through “corridor conversations”. Support other elements of Sentence Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver specialist service according to service specification or standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate key developments and progress to Offender Manager</td>
<td>Use database or other communication tools to ensure Offender Manager has overall picture of activity, progress and issue in case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate key developments to other members of Offender Management Team on “need to know” basis</td>
<td>Use database or other communication tools to ensure that other service providers within Offender Management Team are aware of significant developments which may impact upon their service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to intervention and overall case review</td>
<td>Participate in required format in reviews of impact of the specific intervention, and the sentence plan as a whole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Role Description – Case Administrator (Community)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that case is set up on database</td>
<td>Enter case onto approved database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoke arrangements for non-discretionary requirements</td>
<td>Organise and/or arrange non-discretionary elements of sentence, pending commencement assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce relevant case documentation</td>
<td>Produce and part-complete relevant case documentation – OASys, Sentence Plan, review documentation, case-specific procedures etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up and administer Offender Management Team</td>
<td>Ensure all members of Offender Management Team are set up with access to case record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribute Sentence Plan to all members, highlighting individual responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor changing OMT membership and adjust access to record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer Sentence Plan</td>
<td>Make practical arrangements (appointments, directions, details) for implementation of sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor compliance and report to OM</td>
<td>Track what should be happening at any one time with offender; monitor that it has, record, exception-report to Offender Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule reviews</td>
<td>Track formal review schedule for case; trigger review process in good time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer reviews</td>
<td>Convene Offender Management Team for team reviews; record, administer paper work for non-team reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer enforcement proceedings</td>
<td>Implement local enforcement procedures after enforcement decision made by Offender Manager; report progress to Offender Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce case monitoring data</td>
<td>Generate required management information at case and caseload levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Case Management: Context for Supervision (Holt – August 2000)

Paul Holt’s monograph doubles up as a literature review and forms part of the research project in the North West Probation Region into implementing What Works. The project was conducted by De Montfort University.

He summarises research more generally into case management (typically in health and social services), and integrates it with corrections What Works research. He identifies a spectrum of case management approaches, differing from agency to agency dependant upon the agency context and purpose and the nature of the client or user group. With varying levels of personal involvement, the role of a case manager is defined by a managerial sequence of tasks (assessing, planning, overseeing implementation, reviewing) supporting a process of linking, boundary spanning and integrating. Holt

Recommended that the Probation Service should:
- clarify the relationship between agency goals and case management’s role in achieving them
- clarify the theoretical model that is to be adopted
- identify its main constituents
- develop an evaluative tool for measuring the effectiveness of the proposed model, in particular the relationship between process and outcome

Suggested that in developing a case management model:  
- attention be given to the integrative process of case management as well as its core functions
- Ross’ work (1980) may provide the basis for the differential development of case management models relevant to the probation setting, to take account of varying levels of offender risk and/or complexity of criminogenic need
- the utility of the supervision plan is recognised for the provision of opportunities for putting learning into practice, based on “task-centred” models of social intervention
- there is recognition of the need for a standardised tool for measuring offender motivation

Noted that any model of case management “must also have utility in furthering a dual agenda, namely delivering effective practice and enhancing compliance and completion rates”

Argued that a model should integrate the core functions in a manner characterised by consistency, continuity, consolidation and commitment.

Mapped out a case management agenda for the Probation Service, which included:
- the design of a clear, unifying national model, with the ability to differentiate supervision between offenders, and focussing on the integrative components
- attention to the evaluation of process as well as outcomes
- attention to supporting structures, IT and training requirements

and concluded that a case management model could be designed for the Probation Service which would greatly enhance its ability to deliver on the effective practice agenda.
"Meeting Offenders' Needs"
Bill Beaumont, Brian Caddick and Hilary Hare-Duke

This research study was published in July 2001 jointly by the School for Policy Studies, The University of Bristol and the Nottinghamshire Area of the National Probation Service.

The fieldwork took place in the Nottinghamshire Probation Area between October 1999 and February 2000. Broadly, the study set out to examine how well the Nottinghamshire "framework for community supervision" (case management arrangements) met the offending-related needs of offenders subject to probation and combination orders. It drew upon 105 offender interviews, 226 ACE assessments, 174 ACE offender self-assessments and selected interviews with both probation staff and staff of organisations in contractual arrangements with probation, to provide specific offender services.

Though not explicitly defined as such, the study might be categorised as a "Compliance Study". All of the offenders interviewed had completed a substantial period of their orders; some had been breached for failure to comply but the orders were continuing. The sample does not reflect the views of offenders who failed to comply and whose orders were terminated as a result. The interviewing schedule sought to identify "characteristics of offenders most likely to consider supervision in general, and the use of specialist resources or partnerships in particular, to be effective in reducing offending". As such, it might be argued that it takes "supervision" as a "given" and assumes that differential rates of reported effectiveness are related to characteristics of the offender.

The study separated out a group of offenders representing the "worst experiences" of supervision and another group representing the "best experiences". These "experiences" related both to the one-to-one "baseline" of supervision and to interventions including groups and partnership projects. The two groups were contrasted. Some of the findings most relevant to case management practice and arrangements were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding (direct quotations)</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As with the &quot;worst experiences&quot;, the &quot;best experiences seemed to reflect the characteristics of contact with the probation service rather than the personal characteristics of our respondents</td>
<td>Effective offender supervision seems to require a strong central co-ordinating thread, based on a one-to-one relationship with a named individual which has certain qualities, around which appropriate interventions can be organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying all these factors (the contrast between the &quot;best experiences&quot; and &quot;worst experiences&quot; groups) the failure to provide our &quot;worst experience&quot; respondents with good quality one-to-one supervision seemed to be the critical failure in most cases</td>
<td>Problem definition and supervision planning should be a participative, clinical process as well as a bureaucratic one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One striking feature of the &quot;best experiences&quot; group is that they almost all seemed to agree strongly with the probation service about the problems they faced and should work on</td>
<td>Design case management arrangements which avoid &quot;institutionalised discontinuity&quot;. Mitigate unavoidable discontinuity with good communication; engage the offender in the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A striking feature of the &quot;best experiences&quot; group was that 12 out of 15 remembered clearly the supervision planning process and had found it helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another very striking feature was that all 15 of the &quot;best experiences&quot; group had a substantial period of working with an individual probation officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study has all the limitations of a self-report methodology. In particular, the offender interviewees were remarkably uncritical of their experience of supervision. It may be that balancing the interviews of compliers with non-compliers would produce a more critical result. Secondly, there was no external validation of the self-reported "best and worst experiences" in terms of the formal outcomes of supervision, such as re-offending rates. Other studies have shown offenders to be overly optimistic about their prospects of resisting further offending, when compared with their actual re-offending rates.

It remains reasonable, though, to assume that there is a relationship between offenders' perceptions of the impact of supervision and the actual impact, even if that association is not as strong as offenders believe. This study is a useful addition to the body of knowledge about what qualities and content supervision requires if it is to impact positively upon offenders.
“The Life-Course of the DTTO: Engagement with Drug Treatment and Testing Orders”
Mental Health Section, SHARR, University of Sheffield

This research study was commissioned by the South Yorkshire Area and published its findings in 2002. The area’s DTTO model was a highly individualised one, in which a complex, multi-intervention, 5-day-a-week plan was developed for each case. Each had an overseeing Probation Officer Case Manager and a PSO mentor (entitled Case Co-ordinator). Given the offender target group, the area found itself achieving compliance rates higher than it had anticipated. These rates were somewhat counter-intuitive. The research was commissioned to examine offenders complying with the regime in an attempt to identify factors associated with that compliance.

Whilst based on relatively small numbers, the study employed a rigorous Grounded Theory approach. In such an approach, open-ended questioning is used in “round 1”. Responses are analysed to develop theories. These are then formulated into structured interviews in “round 2” and so forth, until a round of interviews throws up no new theories. This occurred on the third round.

The study identified a clear 3-stage change process, although the timing of each stage is specific to each individual. In the first stage, structure, order, organisation and the early availability of the critical treatment (in this case, medical drug treatment) was important. A highly structured, individualised alternative was valued by those offenders who had been able to break into habitual behaviour patterns. Consistency, good organisation and effective teamwork were features of the successful delivery of this stage. Delay in implementing the new regime was fatal, and interpreted by offenders as indicative of a lack of real commitment.

In the second stage, the focus of value for offenders shifted from sheer activity to a keener appreciation of the inherent benefits of the activities and interventions. Accredited programmes and other learning interventions had most value in this stage. In the third stage self-actualisation was important. Offenders typically re-interpreted their earlier experiences on the order as less important, and their achievements as being the result of internal resolve as opposed to external influences. The researchers concluded that this was an important process to complete if new behaviour was to become sustained behaviour. The presence of this 3-stage rehabilitation process has some clear implications for the deployment and sequencing of interventions, and for the continuous assessment of offenders.

The quality of relationships with staff was critical throughout. Though the focus of staff activity needed to change with the stages of the order (the “what”), there were consistent messages about style (the “how”). Positive engagement was associated with openness, realism, optimism, commitment. Inconsistency, from the same staff member or between staff members was problematic to offenders. The challenge of responsivity was evident – different offenders experienced the same staff behaviour differently. For example, a clear, uncompromising approach to boundary setting was, for some offenders, evidence of commitment, whilst for others this was evidence of an uncaring approach from staff “going through the motions”.

The research paper itself identifies the limits of the study. It was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, and too small to show up gender or race differentials. It was limited to DTTO cases, who are defined by the persistence of their offending, the assessed treatability of their drug misuse, and the relationship between that drug misuse and criminal behaviour. On the other hand, it might well be argued it is only resources which limit the application of the DTTO approach and that a much bigger “slice” of the offender population would benefit from a similar approach.

In terms of case management, the messages from this research are wholly consistent with other findings about what makes for the effective supervision of offenders. The 3-stage progression supports a notion of the sequencing of interventions to achieve, sequentially, order/structure which then facilitates new learning, which is then subsequently consolidated and “normalised”. The study also reaffirms that the interventions need to be anchored into a sound underpinning infrastructure. This needs to be personal, committed and genuine, responsive and adaptable, skilled at engaging, motivating and sustaining. Its focus must be on end-to-end management of the change process, rather than any specific element of it. Finally, the required intensity and appropriateness of interventions, particularly in the early period of supervision, cannot be achieved without effective teamwork and good organisation, and a whole-system approach to the commissioning and management of intervention resources.
“The Effective Management of Programme Attrition”
Kemshall and Canton, De Montford University, (2002)

This study was commissioned by the Welsh Region of the NPS as one of the first tranche of performance improvement projects following the first probation area self-assessments using the EEM model. It focussed upon the growing problem of pre-programme attrition from the most prevalent general offender programme – Think First, though its findings would inevitably have wider significance.

The study was conducted by area questionnaire followed by a series of regional day seminars. In these seminars, areas pooled any existing attrition databases, teased out for themselves what they saw as the main source or sources of attrition in their area and generated local and regional improvement action plans.

Predictably, perhaps, the study found no single factor to which programme attrition could be attributed. There was no consistent definition of attrition, nor yet a consistent way of monitoring it. This inhibited well-focussed action. There was room for improvement at each stage of the Accredited Programmes process. In some cases targeting was poor, in others pre-programme preparation was inadequate, in yet others insufficient attention had been given to de-constructing logistical barriers to engagement, like transport issues. The study highlighted pockets of good practice in relation to each of these aspects, but a lack of overall consistency.

Beneath these breakdowns at particular points in the programmes process were two wider, thematic issues. The first was related to culture. Programme engagement was considered to be better where a whole area had embraced an attendance culture toward programmes. This was evident from the messages of leaders down to an allocation culture in PSR writers. Where areas had been more successful at harnessing all staff behind the corporate vision, attrition was reported as being less of a problem. The potential problems associated with fragmentation of the supervision process, caused by arrangements in which different people dealt with different aspects of the supervision of the same offender, were overcome by each conveying a consistent message, by a pervasive motivational approach, and by all staff modelling pro-social behaviour.

Most fundamentally, though, the study highlighted the way in which a whole-order focus to supervision had been undermined by successive attention to single issues within the case management process. This single-issue focus had resulted, prevalently, in a disconnection between programme delivery and the underpinning case management process.

“Programme integrity has been extensively considered and emphasised, but there has arguably been less attention to the integrity of the overall relationship with the Service…….What is required is a way of structuring the entire supervision period as a coherent and seamless experience designed to reduce further offending” and “….it is reasonable to assume that ‘whole organisation’ commitment should translate into higher performance levels”.

Its most telling recommendations were associated with a shift in focus from single-issue to whole-order performance. The “case management” aspects of the management of each case needed “re-energising” on a par with programme delivery. Leadership needed to promote and model this shift. There should be an initiative to “design and implement a model for the integration of case management and programme work”. Clarity about the role and tasks of case management should be established. The therapeutic/integrative function of case management, rather than the bureaucratic function, should be emphasised in the model.

This was not an empirical study. The rigour of the methodology was limited by the tight timescales. It constitutes more “intelligence” than evidence.
Merrington/West Yorkshire Probation Area (May 2002)

This evaluation study was commissioned by the West Yorkshire Probation Area as an integral element of the implementation of a revised service design, a process which begun in 2001. Revised case management arrangements were defined and four pilot sites were selected as the focus of the evaluation. The supervision of community orders and release licences was included, but community punishment was not.

The key elements of the new case management arrangements were:
- a “re-badging” of supervisory teams as Case Management Units
- the formal designation of probation officers as Case Managers
- a distinction drawn between “management” of a case and “casework”, where “management” describes an overall responsibility, expressed through a sequence of core tasks while “casework” describes the day-to-day, face-to-face work with the offender and providers of specific interventions
- within the overall Case Management mix, a graduated delegation of tasks to PSO grade Case Workers, based upon a risk matrix
- the enhancement of the role of Case Administrators to free-off community justice staff for direct offender or provider-based work
- the appointment of Practice Developers intended to enhance Case Management performance

Nine objectives or standards were articulated. The evaluation sought to determine to what extent the new arrangements had achieved those objectives and standards. Its methodology consisted of structured interviews with personnel in different roles, including staff from intervention providers, interviews with offenders and a case file read.

Predictably, perhaps, at only 6 months into the new arrangements, there were mixed responses to questions about the extent to which the new model was working effectively. It proved impossible to gauge the extent to which responses were related to incomplete implementation, inadequate implementation or flaws in the underlying concepts. Some of the reasons for perceived ineffectiveness related to the design of the model, but most to its implementation. Interestingly, throughout, probation officer grade case managers were less satisfied or convinced by the model than their PSO, administrative or management colleagues. Indeed, they were less satisfied than the offenders themselves.

The design was evidently less than clear about how the division of responsibility for “casework” should be decided. There was no mechanism for monitoring and regulating these decisions. Whilst the decision was supposed to be risk based, it was often found to be driven by personal preference, habitual behaviours or resource availability. There was little distinction between the tasks undertaken by PO and PSO grades. A transparent decision-making process, capable of interrogation, would have helped. Limited attention had been paid to the development of clerical and administrative staff as Case Administrators, and to re-striking the role boundaries between them in this role and the roles of Case Managers and Case Workers. The functions of Practice Developers were not well defined; they were perceived as more associated with auditing practice than developing it. These were all valuable development messages for the designers of the changes.

In terms of implementation of the model, there was evidence of good communication; most staff understood the “top level” model. There was significant criticism of supporting systems. Forms were said to be poorly designed, repetitive and emphasising of bureaucratic functions at the expense of clinical ones. There was little consistency about case file management. The merits of the model itself were often obscured by more general under-resourcing or under-capacity.

Overall, though, this is a commendable attempt to evaluate structural changes designed to support a revised model of case management. It makes useful reading for areas embarking upon such initiatives. The re-organisation of service delivery structures, intended to improve performance, is prevalent in probation. But, short-term output evaluation of this kind is essential if areas are to know whether changes made are achieving their objectives, and how implementation might need to be “tweaked” for effectiveness. Otherwise re-structuring can often be an expensive “leap of faith”.

This study – only available as an on-line report from www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/on-linepubsl.html - sought to examine the relationship between different structures for delivering community sentences, and outcomes. Prior to becoming the NPS, all probation areas were surveyed and their local configurations categorised into 3:

- specialist models
- generic models
- hybrid models

Specialist models broke the end-to-end case management process into functions (assessment, induction, programme attendance, maintenance etc); in generic models the same case manager worked with an offender through the whole sentence implementation process. Hybrid models contained elements of the two.

In terms of stakeholder perspectives, specialist models met the needs of managers. These had developed during the 1990’s. They made resource management easier and coped well with shifting priorities. However, offenders found the repeated changes in responsible officer confusing and unrewarding. Specialist models received a mixed response from staff. For some, the clear focus of expertise helped to narrow the job down to something manageable. For others, such arrangements were frustrating, since a responsible officer rarely saw the eventual outcomes of their work.

In the fieldwork element of the research, local arrangements in which mixed grade groups of staff worked together to manage a small caseload emerged well. These arrangements were better at engaging administrative and clerical staff in the “front end” of the business, and they provided continuity in relationships for the offender, in the event that their “own officer” was not available.

An attempt in the research to identify a relationship between these structures and organisation-level outcomes was unsuccessful. Too many factors were involved. Different measures of organisational performance (HMIP scores, EEM self-assessment scores, performance against targets) did not provide consistent results and there was no clear correlation between structure and outcomes.

This research further supports a case (offender) management approach which delivers continuity of relationship for offenders. Arrangements which fragment the end-to-end process should be avoided. Small-team, mixed-grade teamwork emerges well as an effective and efficient local configuration for delivering offender management, and for realising the full potential of all staff.

This report is an important contribution to the knowledge base about how to configure local services to deliver offender management. It is essential reading for managers in areas considering re-organisation as a performance improvement measure.
"Case Management in Manitoba Probation”
Bonta, Rugge, Sedo and Coles (2004)
Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness - Canada

This study undertook a micro-examination of the behaviour of probation case managers, working with mixed caseloads of offenders in the community. Audio and video tapes of interactions with offenders were analysed line-by-line to provide a profile of what subjects case managers focussed upon, and at what level.

The research found weak relationships between assessed offending-related needs, the content of supervision plans and the focus of case managers’ attentions.

In spite of a clear “resources follow risk” principle, other than a small group of very high risk cases, all cases quickly drifted into a middle ground of attention.

There was a high level of quality relationship building, and consistent praise/reward for the expression of pro-social attitudes and behaviours. However, case managers were much more diffident about challenging anti-social attitudes and behaviours.

There was little evidence of case managers actively supporting referrals to other agencies. Offenders were typically given contact information, but rarely did case managers – for instance – accompany offenders to meetings with other agencies, or support their attendance by other means. The level of use made of community resources was thus limited.

It is, of course, a matter of conjecture to what extent the findings of this study might be replicated in England and Wales. Caseloads seemed high compared to current England and Wales caseloads (varying from 72 to 99 in different districts). Contact levels were also low (average 4.3 contacts in 3 month period). It was not apparent from the study that case management was well supported by a framework of in-house programmes as is the case here.

Notwithstanding these reservations, the report is a timely reminder of the value of creating a default connection between assessment factors and planning (as is done in e-OASys). It also points to the value of having some form of structure around the “resources follow risk” principle.

The research should be of interest to the strategic managers/designers of case management, training managers and those line managing case managers.
"21st Century Social Work
Reducing Re-Offending: Key Practice Skills"
McNeil, Bachelor, Burnett and Knox (2005)
Glasgow School of Social Work for
Scottish Executive’s Social Work Services Inspectorate

This report aims to identify the skills required by staff for reducing re-offending, by working back from the
evidence about what methods and approaches are effective in achieving desistance.

It starts with a useful summary of recent desistance research and literature. It concludes that “desistance
resides somewhere in the interfaces between developing personal maturity, changing social bonds associated
with certain life transitions, and the individual subjective narrative constructions which offenders build around
these key events and changes”. Each of these is an entire subject on its own

It locates this recent perspective in the context of the What Works literature, recalling the original principles of
programme design, and updating these in the light of the implementation of the What Works strategy over the
past decade. It argues that the way in which the What Works principles have been applied in practice has
tended too much toward an homogenising and managerial approach, and has underplayed the diversity of
offenders and their needs, the need for a high degree of individualisation and the role of interpersonal
staff/offender relationships and the skills associated with them.

In order to tease out those required skills the study reviews effectiveness findings from psychotherapy and
counselling. Its rationale for this is that the process of achieving desistance from crime bears many features in
common with the processes of desisting from addictive behaviours, such as alcoholism and gambling. The
common factors or “core conditions” which are associated with the reduction in problematic behaviours are
grouped under the headings of “therapist factors” (accurate empathy, respect or warmth, genuineness),
“relationship factors” (establishing a “therapeutic relationship” or “working alliance”), and “client factors”
(motivation, expectancy, optimism). Approaches which are consistent with these “core conditions”
(motivational interviewing, non-directive, person-centred approaches, client-responsive approaches, pro-social
modelling) are identified and their applicability in a correctional context examined. The section ends with a
useful summary of the key conclusions about desistance, and draws out some of the implications of this for the
roles and skills required by effective correctional staff.

The report next groups these skills into 4 sets. They are:
- Building relationships that support change
- Assessing risks, needs and strengths
- Research-based planning and delivery of interventions, and
- Managing change

It examines each in more detail. The first - building relationships that support change - is seen as a pre-
requisite, or context, for the others.

This configuration is remarkably similar to the “core correctional practice” identified by Dowden and Andrews,
and incorporates Holt’s 4 C’s as the underpinning principles for the design of correctional case management,
albeit adding a 5th – compliance – reflecting the correctional context.

The report’s parting message is that the development of effective services to reduce re-offending requires
political and professional investment in equipping the relevant front-line staff with the key skills required for
effective practice and the creation of contexts for practice that provide them with realistic opportunities to
exercise those skills.

The analysis in this report is broadly supportive of the multi-modal, individualised approach of the Offender
Management Model, delivering an integrated balance between the “what” and the “how” of offender
management, with an emphasis on continuity of relationship. The focus on staff skills and training is consistent
with applying the Core Correctional Practice formulation as a universal competency baseline. The report will
be of particular interest to those involved in human resource management generally and in the planning and
delivery of training to NOMS staff in support of the OM Model in particular.
## The “New” Language of Offender Management

Our NOMS Model of Offender Management is designed to create a single process of sentence management/implementation around which the different providers of different aspects of each sentence can unite. Accordingly, it is important that the model uses a single, consistent suite of terms, selected, as far as possible to be descriptive of the roles, tasks and processes in the model.

### USE | INSTEAD OF | FOR
--- | --- | ---
Offender Management Approach or Model | Case Management Approach or Model | Referring to the whole approach to working with offenders in NOMS, an approach in which one person determines the overall “shape” and direction of the sentence whilst others deliver specific elements of it, within the framework of a single plan.

Offender Management | Case Management | The application of the general concept of case management to the particular of working with offenders in NOMS.

Sentence with a Custodial Element | Custodial sentence | All sentences post CJ Act which (normally) follow a NOMS pre-sentence assessment, begin in custody and are completed in the community. Language draws the focus onto the whole sentence and away from one phase or other of it.

Supervision | (sometimes) Mentoring | The day-to-day, face-to-face processes involved in securing compliance with the plan, motivation to co-operate, and in consolidating the learning from interventions into routine behaviour in the offender’s home social environment.

Supervision | Case Co-ordination | (sometimes) casework

Arrangements or Local Delivery Arrangements | Model or local model | The local operational configuration of staff, roles and services designed to deliver the model.

Offender Manager | Case Manager | The person – of whatever grade and from whichever agency - with allocated responsibility for assessing what each case (offender) requires, for planning its delivery and for co-ordinating that delivery, as far as can be assured, the same person throughout any single period of continuous engagement with NOMS.

Supervising Officer | Responsible Officer | (any of the above +) Probation Officer
### Offender Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caseworker</td>
<td>The person responsible for implementing the Sentence Plan on a day-to-day basis, dealing with the offender face-to-face, enhancing motivation, securing compliance, helping the offender make the links between one intervention and another, and consolidating learning into consistent behaviour in the offender’s social environment. Most likely to be the Offender Manager in person in the community, though in certain circumstances, the roles may be split. Will be a separate person when the offender is in custody. Depending on local arrangements, may be a member of prison staff, seconded probation staff, or independent provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aspects of) Personal Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sometimes) Mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case Administrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Assistant</td>
<td>Person responsible for ensuring that the sentence is implemented in line with specified timescales, procedures, deadlines and Standards. May be the same person as the Offender Manager or Offender Supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punitive Intervention</td>
<td>Intervention deployed to achieve the punitive objective of the sentence, or implement a punitive requirement. Imprisonment, unpaid work, a curfew or Attendance Centre attendance, for instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Intervention</td>
<td>Intervention deployed, discretionary or to comply with a requirement of the sentence, to control the offender’s movement or activity, in the interests of public protection. Exclusion Requirement or surveillance programme, for instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Intervention</td>
<td>Intervention deployed to achieve positive change or improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Protective Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors in an offender’s circumstances which restrain deterioration, or promote improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Barrier Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors in an offender’s circumstances which, left untackled, prevent or seriously inhibit positive change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accredited Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed term and fixed content series of inputs and/or activities “licensed” by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Offender Management Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That group of people, from whichever agency, who need to work together in order to implement a single sentence plan for a single offender in a way such that the offender experiences the sentence as a coherent, cohesive whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sentence Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Plan (and existing use of Sentence Plan)</td>
<td>The single plan, drawn up by the Offender Manager, shared with the Offender Management Team, which spans the whole sentence, and which describes what is to be done by whom and when in order to achieve all of the objectives for which the sentence to be implemented was passed, and any other objectives associated with implementation of the sentence defined by other relevant legislation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

Full size copies of graphics used in the model, for ease of copying in support of communications and training
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The offender interacting with a sequence of interventions and experiences to achieve the objectives of the sentence.
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**Tier 1**
Modality = punish, monitor, signpost

**Tier 2**
Mode = punish, monitor, signpost, help, broker, support

**Tier 3**
Mode = tier 2 + personal change

**Tier 4**
Mode = tier 3 + restrict/control

*Increasing complexity of sentence + risks posed by offender*
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The Offender Management Team

Offender Manager
Responsible for overall plan and direction

Offender Supervisor
Actively implementing the plan on a day-to-day basis

Case Administrator
Keeping things on course and on time

Key Worker(s)
Delivering interventions

Key Worker(s)
Delivering interventions

Key Worker(s)
Delivering interventions

Key Worker(s)
Delivering interventions
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COMMUNICATION
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The Model will remain under continuous scrutiny, and will be revised and upgraded periodically in the light of emerging learning and research findings. Written views and comments related to this process should be forwarded to:

Robin Dickens
Tel: 0207 217 8604
Email: robin.dickens@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

NOMS Offender Management Workstream Team
Third Floor,
Abell House
John Islip Street
London
SW1P 4LH
31 May 2006
The NOMS
Offender Management
Model