



*Report of an
Inspection of the
Jersey Probation
and
After Care Service*

2005

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

Home Office

FOREWORD

We were pleased to be invited to inspect the Jersey Probation and After Care Service and have been impressed by the willingness of managers and staff to be subject to external scrutiny. We see all this as very indicative of the service's innovative approach to the supervision of offenders, improving wherever possible the current levels of performance, and continuing to enjoy the respect of government, sentencers and the various other organisations with which it works.

The service has many strengths. It is well managed, has excellent information systems, and pays significant attention to the outcomes of its work. Examination of work with individual offenders and interviews with the offenders themselves showed a number of examples of good practice.

Our main concern lies with the current arrangements for the assessment and management of risk of harm, which is a recurring theme throughout this report and is reflected in some of the recommendations. The States of Jersey may wish to consider inviting us to return at a future point to undertake a further inspection to assess whether there have been improvements in relation to this important issue.

Andrew Bridges
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

November 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our thanks to the Jersey Probation Board and its managers and staff for the considerable assistance received in enabling the inspection to proceed smoothly. Without their help, most especially in arranging a complicated programme of interviews with case managers, the work could not have been completed successfully.

The inspection also depended on the contribution made by external assessors from the Guernsey Probation Service, who assisted with the case manager interviews. Their participation and commitment were greatly appreciated.

<i>HM Assistant Chief Inspector:</i>	<i>John Hutchings</i>
<i>HM Inspectors:</i>	<i>Julie Fox, Helen Boocock</i>
<i>Practice Assessors:</i>	<i>Jo Bergdahl, Stephanie Mason</i>
<i>Information Manager:</i>	<i>Kevin Ball</i>
<i>Inspection Admin Officer:</i>	<i>Pippa Bennett</i>
<i>External assessors:</i>	<i>Stuart Crisp, Anna Guilbert</i>

CONTENTS

	Page
Glossary	4
Summary and recommendations	5
Scoring summary sheet	8
Inspection arrangements	9
Scoring approach	10
Overview of the area	12
SECTION A	
QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT	14
SECTION B	
QUALITY OF ASSESSMENT	22
SECTION C	
QUALITY OF INTERVENTIONS	25
SECTION D	
QUALITY OF INITIAL OUTCOMES	30
COMMUNITY SERVICE	32
The role of HMI Probation	35

GLOSSARY

ACPO	Assistant chief probation officer
ACT	Aggression Control Therapy
APO	Assistant probation officer
ASG	Alcohol Study Group
BASS	Building a Safer Society (Inter-agency strategy approved by the States of Jersey in 2004)
CHANGE	Domestic Violence programme
CMA	Case management assistant
CPO	Chief probation officer
CS	Community service
CSO	Community service order
DAISy	Data Analysis and Information System
ESI	Effective Supervision Inspection
ETE	Employment, training and education
HMI Probation	HM Inspectorate of Probation
ICMS	Integrated case management system
ISP	Initial supervision plan
JPACS	Jersey Probation and After Care Service
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LSI-R	Level of Service Inventory-Revised
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements
MATRIX 2000	In-depth risk assessment for sexual and violent offenders
MDS	Minimum Data Set
NPD	National Probation Directorate
NPS	National Probation Service
OASys	Offender Assessment System
OINTOC	Offending Is Not The Only Choice (Skills based cognitive behavioural programme for offenders used by JPACS)
PO	Probation officer
RAMAS	Risk Assessment Management and Audit Systems (Inter-agency method for assessing and managing those people most likely to harm themselves or others)
Red Flag	System for identifying and alerting other staff to those most likely to harm others
SARA	Spousal Awareness Risk Assessment
SER	Social enquiry report
SLA	Service level agreement
SMART Programme	Self-Management And Rational Thinking cognitive behaviour programme
SMART	Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bounded
TRMS	Temporary Release Monitoring System (A form of early release in Jersey monitored by JPACS and Securicor)

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Key findings

- **Quality of Management:** JPACS was well managed with clear business planning processes. The introduction of a computerised case management and management information system had been a very positive step, providing ready access to relevant data for both practitioners and managers. The service had achieved most of its KPIs in 2004 and was constantly looking to improve service delivery, arranging evaluations, inspections and reviews of its work, both internally and externally. Standards for the delivery of supervision had been introduced across most areas of practice. The service was also an innovator and had introduced a number of schemes such as mentoring, volunteer tutors and restorative justice to complement and add value to the work of busy probation staff. The extent of partnerships with other organisations – statutory, contracted and voluntary – was excellent, with partners and courts having a positive view of probation as a trustworthy, ‘can do’ organisation. However, benefit would still be gained by introducing more formal arrangements to links with other organisations, for example through inter-agency SLAs. Relationships with sentencers were good, with a high level of satisfaction about SERs and court work generally. Most staff were supervised and appraised, but there needed to be greater attention to monitoring these arrangements, linking them to the business plan, and introducing a training plan that would help to ensure that both staff and the organisation achieve greater benefit from these processes. Risk assessment and management processes required considerable attention. The service recognised that this was a gap in practice and was planning the introduction of a risk of harm assessment and management tool.
- **Quality of Assessment:** There was a high completion of the assessment of reoffending using LSI-R and interventions were targeted accordingly. At the time of the inspection, JPACS had no formal risk of harm assessment tool which impacted on the quality of assessments. Interventions were appropriately identified but the planning of these, through the use of SMART objectives, could be improved. With the availability of the electronic record, files were well organised with good quality recording.
- **Quality of Interventions:** Inter-agency work in terms of liaison with partners and the reinforcement of the work they had undertaken was a real strength, as was the range of programmes available for a relatively small service. There was much positive work on reintegration issues but, on occasions, more direct work on offending behaviour both pre- and post-programmes and with those not undertaking programmes would be desirable. Diversity was sensitively and positively handled in many cases, but the needs of victims and victim work with offenders required attention. CS was well run and offered a good range of appropriate placements. High risk of harm cases needed to be reviewed more regularly, including greater oversight of this by managers. The suitability of RAMAS also required examination. Alcohol has been identified both by the service and our inspection as a significant factor in crime, and we would suggest a review of interventions available for this need.
- **Quality of Initial Outcomes:** There were some good examples of work to reintegrate offenders back into the community, including linking them with partner organisations to achieve this. In most cases resources were being used efficiently and appropriately. The service had an excellent record of measuring progress through reductions in LSI-R scores and was able to both demonstrate success and identify who would be most likely to benefit from intervention. Work had been undertaken with sentencers to try to reduce the number of inappropriate cases being placed under supervision.

Recommendations

The Probation Board should ensure that:

- 1. regular reports on performance against service objectives and budget expenditure are received throughout the year and remedial action taken where necessary*
- 2. diversity data are routinely collected and monitored for discrimination*
- 3. family court welfare arrangements are reviewed to identify the most effective and efficient way to undertake this work*
- 4. while retaining the first line manager/team leader post, there should be a review of the supervisory responsibilities, overall workload and lack of additional remuneration*
- 5. supervision, appraisal and training arrangements are linked to the business plan and are monitored*
- 6. SLAs are agreed with partner organisations to clarify expectations and internal and external policies*
- 7. a recognised risk assessment tool and risk management system are introduced that satisfy both internal and external needs and receive support from all relevant agencies to protect the public*
- 8. risk management and supervision plans are integrated*
- 9. supervision plans and reviews include SMART objectives*
- 10. CS staff are trained in health and safety practices*
- 11. victim issues are sufficiently addressed in the supervision of all offenders*
- 12. the Board and CPO continue to work with the Home Affairs Committee and States to reinstate the trainee PO posts*
- 13. it along with the CPO and Prison Governor continue to work together to develop joint assessment processes, electronic recording, sentence planning, offending behaviour programmes, temporary release, suitable restricted accommodation and establish permanent funding for the prison PO post*
- 14. the probation service continues to work with partners to support legislation for a release on licence scheme, the supervision of sex offenders and MAPPAs.*

Next steps

- This report has been submitted to the Bailiff with copies provided to the Probation Board and CPO. Copies have also been made available to the press and are on the website of HMI Probation at:
<http://www.inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprobation>
- The report makes a number of recommendations which are designed to encourage JPACS in its work, to take further some of its own good practice and to promote improvements in quality and effectiveness in the future.
- It is recommended that the Board consider the development of an action plan, within three months of the publication of the report. It is anticipated that the recommendations should be implemented within 12 months of publication which should allow sufficient time for integration with existing developments.
- HMI Probation no longer undertakes routine follow-up inspections unless there is an issue of serious concern that needs to be addressed quickly. Whilst the JPACS inspection has not revealed any such issues, the service may wish to consider inviting us to return at a future point to look solely at the assessment and management of offenders' risk of harm.

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

Section A: Quality of management	
A1: Leadership and planning	Satisfactorily met
A2: Resource allocation	Partly met
A3: Management and supervision of staff	Partly met
A4: Partnership/contracting out	Satisfactorily met
A5: Effective communication with sentencers	Satisfactorily met
Section B: Quality of assessment	
B1: Assessment of risk of harm	60%
B2: Assessment of likelihood of reoffending	87%
B3: Case management	60%
B4: Documentation	83%
Score for section B	71%
Section C: Quality of interventions	
C1: Managing attendance and enforcement	79%
C2: Delivering appropriate supervision	73%
C3: Diversity needs	89%
C4: Responsivity	83%
C5: Management of risk of harm	67%
Score for section C	78%
Section D: Quality of initial outcomes	
D1: Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes	69%
D2: Improvements are sustainable	75%
D3: Outcomes of interventions are assessed and reviewed using available data	Well met
D4: Interventions demonstrate value for money	80%
Score for section D	75%
OVERALL SCORE FOR SECTIONS B-D (excluding D3)	75%

INSPECTION ARRANGEMENTS

- HMI Probation was invited to inspect JPACS and a small team of Inspectorate staff visited the island in July 2005. The inspection was loosely based on the framework used in the current ESI programme of inspections of probation areas in England and Wales, in which areas are assessed on how well they have met defined inspection criteria focusing on the:
 - overall management of the area
 - quality of the assessments carried out on offenders
 - quality of the interventions carried out with offenders
 - initial results of the interventions, both in relation to criminogenic factors such as employment, accommodation and substance misuse, and also whether there has been any reduction in the risk of harm and the risk of reoffending.
- During the inspection HMI Probation staff and external assessors carried out in-depth interviews with case managers in respect of 49 offenders currently under the service's supervision in the community, including some assessed as presenting a high risk of harm to the public. In some cases we were also able to interview the offender and other people significantly involved in the supervision (e.g. programme staff or representatives of other organisations involved in providing a service to offenders in relation to drugs, alcohol, employment, etc). Meetings also took place with managers and staff of the service, with its volunteers, and with sentencers, Centeniers, and members of partnership organisations. The inspection concluded with a meeting with the President of the Home Affairs Committee.
- Because inspections of England and Wales probation areas are currently focusing additionally on Enhanced Community Punishment/Unpaid Work we also decided to include in the inspection some specific examination of the JPACS CS scheme. The findings of this are detailed at the end of this report.

SCORING APPROACH

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

Quality of Management criteria

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

Quality of Assessment, Interventions and Initial Outcomes criteria

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

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

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

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

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

OVERVIEW OF THE AREA

- JPACS has had a static budget (other than for pay awards) since 1999. The main revenue budget was £1.26 million in 2004, reduced to £1.25 million in 2005. The island has a total population of some 91,000 with a population density (persons per square km) of 782, higher than the England and Wales average of 348.
- The latest available data show that 8% of the population are from minority ethnic groups, predominantly Portuguese, but with Venezuelan, Thai, Kenyan and Polish people also coming to Jersey in recent years.
- In 2004 the number of all recorded crimes per 1,000 population was 64 which was much lower than the equivalent England and Wales figure of 113. The corresponding figure for violent crime – 13 per 1,000 population – was also beneath the England and Wales figure of 19.
- Jersey consists of 12 parishes that have responsibility for the welfare of their parishioners. There is no social security system and those in need through unemployment must seek support from the parish. Sickness and incapacity benefits and pensions are administered centrally, with payments dependent on the length of residence in the island.
- Each parish has number of Centeniers – voluntary honorary police officers who undertake enquiries as a prosecutor in relation to alleged offences. Where the offence is denied, it must go to court, but where there is an admission of guilt, the Centenier will give the offender an opportunity to tell them about the offence and then decide whether to award a caution, a fine, compensation, or supervision by the Probation or Children’s Services. The Centenier may also defer the decision or refer the case to the Magistrates’ Court or Youth Court.
- JPACS is a department of the Royal Court (the equivalent of the Crown Court in England and Wales) but is funded by and works closely with the Home Affairs Committee that deals with criminal justice business, including the making of new laws. The Royal Court is represented by a subgroup of Jurats which form the Probation Board.
- The service has a CPO, ACPO, team leader (temporary without remuneration), CS manager and two assistant CS managers. The staff complement consists of a mixture of full- and part-time positions, including ten POs, six CS supervisors, four APOs, a court liaison officer, a research and information manager, an office manager and six CMAs.
- JPACS has delivered various offence-related programmes, either in a group work or one-to-one format depending on the individual’s circumstances. These are OINTOC, SMART programme, ACT, ASG, CHANGE and Family Problem Solving which is for families of juveniles.
- Data collected by JPACS on performance on its main KPIs are shown in the table overleaf.

Key Performance Indicators		
KPI 1: Increase the proportion of non-custodial outcomes at the Royal Court	Partially achieved	There were a smaller proportion of actual custodial sentences imposed than in 2003; however, if suspended sentences are included (not available in 2003) then the proportion is identical.
KPI 2: Increase the percentage of offenders who have a basic skills assessment completed	Achieved	
KPI 3: Reduce the percentage of probationers unemployed at the end of their order		Of those offenders who completed their probation orders in 2004, 46% were unemployed. It has not been possible to compare this to the 2003 figure as Livelink was not operational during that period.
KPI 4: At least 65% of 'normal completion' probationers will have attended at least one structured programme during their supervision	Achieved	
KPI 5: Achieve a statically significant reduction in probationers' LSI-R scores as measured at the beginning and end of the order		Of those probationers who completed their probation orders in 2004, 60.5% reduced their LSI-R score during the course of the order. A further 12.3% showed no change in the initial level of risk of reoffending.
KPI 6: Place at least 30% of CS workers in individual placements	Achieved	
KPI 7: Achieve an average work rate of at least three hours per week for at least 75% of CS cases	Achieved	3.8 hours average work rate in 2004.
KPI 8: Achieve a statistically significant reduction in LSI-R scores for offenders on the TRMS scheme		From a sample group of 20 offenders who were tagged, 55% reduced their risk of reoffending as measured by the LSI-R. A further 15% showed no change.
KPI 9: All Red Flag cases of over three months duration will have been through a Minimum Data Set or full RAMAS procedure.		Not achieved in 32% of cases.
KPI 10: At least 75% of victims participating in restorative justice will express satisfaction with the process	Achieved	92% of victims were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied'.
KPI 11: To operate within the agreed cash limit without cutting services	Achieved	£3k overspend, less than 0.25% of budget.

SECTION A QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT

A1 Leadership and planning

Satisfactorily met

Description:

The Board and CPO lead the area in the achievement of targets and implementation of policies and procedures which are regularly monitored and reviewed. The senior management team is committed to the implementation of targets and priorities, including What Works strategies, risk management and promoting diversity.

Strengths:

- JPACS had produced a Five Year Plan (2002/2007) and annual business plans that incorporated both the previous year's annual report and the business plan for the next year. The aims of the service had been outlined with actions detailing how they would be achieved, pulled through from the five year plan into the annual plans. All documents were clearly and succinctly laid out, cross-referenced to the States of Jersey Strategic Plan and contained KPI achievement information. Well-presented statistical data on offending behaviour, court outcomes and throughput had been outlined with brief information about the budget. Overall, the documents provided a quality corporate image of the service and its achievements and plans.
- Service managers had been active in working with the Home Affairs Department to develop the first Jersey Criminal Justice Strategy. This was a comprehensive document with a framework of a key aim and nine pillars, these being values, criminal justice statistics, looking after victims, joint working, early intervention, enforcement, prosecution, dealing with offenders and rehabilitation. Each pillar contained a policy statement and action plan. The consultation document on this strategy was issued in June 2005.
- Although small, the management team of JPACS was a committed and innovative group, constantly looking for better ways to undertake the work. It was alert to wider international developments and current issues, often evaluating new provisions to assess whether they could contribute to the work of JPACS and, if so, how they could be adapted appropriately to the local context.
- An example of innovation had been the introduction of DAISy with the service officially becoming paperless from April 2005. DAISy was a bespoke version of the UK's ICMS adapted to JPACS's needs. Whilst there had been a number of teething problems (such as the time it took to scan some material), the system was an excellent example of both a case management system and a management information system. The case management facility had also been made available in the prison although, unfortunately, it was being rarely used there. Probation managers had easy access to the management information to obtain a wide-range of data, including workload and caseload information for supervision. The potential for strategic planning was still in its early stages, but the facility was available and could provide very useful data for a range of purposes such as Board reports, BASS or the Home Affairs Committee.
- One of the aims of the service (Aim Six) was 'to ensure that all sections of the community have access to our services'. A diverse range of activities were directed to achieving this. They included accessible buildings through the provision of long awaited new premises, general delivery of services, language issues (Portuguese speaking members of staff and a

Polish speaking mentor) and strategies to promote social inclusion. Examples of the latter were participation in the Supported Housing Group, provision of the Jobs in Jersey website in the waiting room and the development of access to The Prince's Trust funds.

- As a public service of the Jersey States, JPACS had access to and was bound by a number of policies and procedures on Recruitment and Selection, Equality and Diversity, Performance Review and Appraisal, and Succession and Career Management.
- DAISy also incorporated an excellent electronic manual of policies, procedures and information accessible for all staff. Internal policies, such as standards for probation and CSOs and Red Flag and RAMAS, had been updated and entered onto the system. The material was attractively presented and easy to access.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

JPACS had teamed up with Jobs in Jersey to provide a special computer terminal in the reception area waiting room which linked directly to the Employment and Social Security website. Offenders entered details of their skills and job interests. The computer then matched these against current vacancies and provided them with a list of details such as job title, job description, reference number and method of application with contact details. The individual could then print off this information to take away.

Areas for improvement:

- There was an urgent need to develop a robust risk of harm assessment and management process, with committed local inter-agency support that was also capable of managing inter-jurisdiction transfer. The service was in fact in the process of introducing the risk assessment framework used by Glasgow City Council that undertook an assessment of static and dynamic criminogenic needs, a screening process, and a risk analysis, with a final matrix to locate the offender according to risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending. The process appeared to be thorough, but its suitability and support in the external environment needed to be assessed before wholesale implementation. It may be worth considering importing the table from OASys risk assessment analysis which identifies different possible victims, while risk of harm management should include both restrictive and constructive interventions. A computerised system of scale of risk of harm rather than just stating whether or not the offender is a risk should also be considered.
- MDS/RAMAS had been designed as a tool for mental health assessment and management. Whilst it was very useful for that purpose, particularly in relation to self-harm, there was considerable confusion amongst case managers about the resulting offending behaviour management plans in relation to their content, timing, links with the Red Flag system and the actions planned and completed. In addition, some other agencies did not seem to be committed to the process, demonstrated by their lack of attendance at meetings. Completing the risk management plan within 30 days was also much too long a period for high risk of harm offenders and should be considerably reduced, as should the time between reviews.
- The lack of suitable accommodation and little post-release supervision were major obstacles to public protection for high risk of harm offenders. There was a need for the prison and probation services to work together to propose the development of supervised restricted accommodation such as Approved Premises, as an intermediate step between prison and community living.
- Whilst the statistical data in the annual report were particularly well presented, they primarily focused on items relating to offenders at the start of supervision, for example

previous convictions, criminogenic factors, length of orders, etc. It would have been useful to extend these to include information on the interventions provided by the service and their outcomes.

- Although service objectives, performance and the budget were reviewed on an annual basis, there was limited evidence of these being formally reviewed throughout the year, either by the management group or the Board.
- Diversity data (such as race and ethnicity) were not routinely collected, nor was the service evaluated against them. This made the assessment of Aim Six difficult to measure.

A2

Resource allocation

Partly met

Description:

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

Strengths:

- Jersey was suffering from a difficult financial situation with reducing public sector funding. This had resulted in JPACS receiving a lower budget in 2005 from 2004, ostensibly covering some efficiency savings, but in real terms representing a significant cut. However, in its usual innovative way and working with other partners, JPACS had been successful in a project bid in BASS to fund drug and alcohol and court liaison workers as part of a longer-term strategy.
- The service had contributed to the development of a multi-agency Youth Action Team by seconding staff to undertake work with children and young people.
- Supervision resources were targeted according to the individual's likelihood of reoffending, with programmes allocated to those with whom they were anticipated to be most effective.
- A report from the consultants KPMG Channel Islands, commissioned by the States of Jersey to undertake benchmarking across all departments, had found that due to differences in jurisdictions it was difficult to compare Jersey's Probation Service with others. However, the evidence that was assembled suggested that the service was well run and achieved strong outcomes.
- The two services involved in family court work (JPACS and Children's Services) had developed clear policy and practice guidance in relation to consistency around family court work.

Areas for improvement:

- Although the Probation Board considered various expenditure items, we did not find evidence of regular budget or resource monitoring.
- A major difference between the NPS and JPACS was that the latter's resources were targeted at those with a higher likelihood of reoffending, whereas in the NPS they were also targeted according to risk of harm. If JPACS is to achieve two of its aims (Aim Two 'To protect the public from further offending' and Aim Four 'To consider the needs of victims') then it should consider a shift in emphasis to incorporate risk of harm more clearly into its work.
- Although JPACS policy was to use its resources appropriately on those cases most at risk of further offending, approximately a third of the cases in our sample had LSI-R scores of 20 or

under, which suggested a relatively low risk of their reoffending. Whilst LSI-R is not always an accurate predictor for domestic violence or sex offending, this issue needed more exploration.

- Staff turnover, due to the lack of long-term strategy both within the service and more significantly within the States funding arrangements, had resulted in short-term and expensive contingency arrangements to cover vacant posts. This impacted on all staff as the time taken to train new staff was often disproportional, particularly if they then left after a relatively short period. For the service to be able to operate effectively and more efficiently, there was a real need for the staff group to become more stable and permanent, including the reinstatement of the previous trainee PO scheme.
- The ACPO had needed to devote a considerable amount of time to inter-agency work related to the development of services for those children and young people with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. This was now likely to reduce as a result of the appointment of the Youth Action Team manager and, in the future, when the post of Chair of the Children's Executive was relinquished in January 2006.
- Whilst recognising the considerable benefits of the team leader post as a first line manager, we were concerned about the breadth of her responsibilities and the lack of additional remuneration for management tasks.
- The probation service had continued to undertake family court welfare work, including adoption reports. This was shared with the Children's Services who undertook all First Directions hearings, work then being divided between the two services. In JPACS, all POs participated, some of whom were inexperienced in this area, particularly if they had joined from England and Wales probation areas. In order to build up expertise, the service could usefully review these staffing arrangements and consider alternative ways of undertaking the work, for example allowing particular staff to specialise and exploring reciprocal arrangements with Guernsey.
- The victim notification protocol indicated that the PO working with the offender would be the same officer working with the victim. We take the view that these tasks should be undertaken by different people to avoid confusion of role and responsibility. The protocol also did not make clear the detail of what information the victim could be given. We saw no evidence of the training for victim work which we would expect, nor of victim-specific support systems available for those involved in this potentially emotionally demanding activity, although some support would be offered in supervision.
- The KPMG report had outlined that staffing and other costs were not apportioned to various activities undertaken by the service. It recommended that further work on quantifying and eliminating the differences between Jersey and UK performance indicators should be carried out so that comparisons on a like-for-like basis could be undertaken.
- There was a high frequency of meetings taking place, for example daily allocation meetings, management meetings, practice meetings and the CPO's briefing meetings. Communication between staff was good, and outputs were apparent, but it would be helpful for JPACS to consider the purpose, frequency and timing of all these activities to ascertain whether there are opportunities to reduce time spent in them whilst remaining effective.

Description:

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

Strengths:

- ▣ A States Succession and Career Management Policy provided clear aims and procedures as to what was expected from the service in terms of succession planning. Overall, the purpose of the policy was to have appropriately skilled people in public service to meet future demands and to minimise recruitment from outside the island.
- ▣ Supervision of staff was case focused, undertaken regularly (predominantly monthly), and recorded in detail using consistent headings. There was evidence of links between sessions (e.g. case management action planned and then undertaken), clear objectives for the staff member concerned before the next session, and details of training planned. Access to the Department of Health Psychological Services was provided for those who had experienced trauma or emotional problems in the course of their work.
- ▣ The Performance Review and Appraisal Competency Framework developed by the States provided sound information about the behaviours expected for particular competencies within grade.
- ▣ Workload data were easily available through DAISy and produced comprehensive information for each member of staff and the service as a whole.
- ▣ There were a number of excellent examples of performance data produced such as programme waiting lists, progress and completions.
- ▣ The development of the mentoring and basic skills tutor schemes had utilised the community through voluntary activities which added value to the work of the service. Volunteers were positive about the induction training they had received.
- ▣ Both training needs and opportunities were discussed regularly in supervision. Staff had access to States in-house training events.
- ▣ There was a States Equality and Diversity Policy which clearly outlined that employees had a responsibility not to discriminate unfairly. JPACS had undertaken a number of actions that aimed to tackle discrimination such as new premises which would be accessible to disabled people, having a Portuguese member of staff and a Polish speaking mentor, and work with The Prince's Trust to combat social exclusion. The service had also worked with partners to combat the inherent discrimination in a system where obtaining benefits relied on individual negotiation with the parishes, by ensuring that prisoners on release received sufficient benefit to discourage them from reoffending.

Areas for improvement:

- ▣ We did not see evidence of a workforce planning/succession review process, although staffing issues were evident in some detail in the Board meetings. To fulfil the succession planning aim as outlined in the States policy, workforce planning should be incorporated into the business planning process.
- ▣ Annual appraisals were undertaken on a rolling programme that made them difficult to integrate into the business planning cycle. A number were outstanding and most objectives in completed appraisals were not SMART. The States template was being updated to focus

on competencies and would hopefully be word processed as the existing handwritten forms were not easy to read. There was no evidence as yet of staff training or discussion to undertake this new process which would require joint evidence gathering over the 12 month period. As this was a long period of time, the service should review at the halfway stage to ascertain whether progress is being made on the development plan elements (with SMART objectives) of the appraisal process. The appraisal completion process should also be tightened and monitored by senior managers.

- Although enthusiastic and very supportive, the officer coordinating the tutors and mentors was very stretched for time. Individual support was provided, but mentors said they would like to have group meetings two to three times a year, organised on a variety of days of the week so that different people could attend, to share experiences and learn from each other.
- There was evidence of training opportunities being offered and although it was indicated that these were linked to the business plan, there was no training needs analysis or written training plan.
- Whilst we found many examples of enthusiastic staff who were committed to high standards in the supervision of offenders, there was also evidence that the many demands on the service and the uncertain staffing situation meant that people were questioning their ability to produce good quality work, which, in turn, had an adverse effect on staff morale. Managers needed to be alert to these issues and take appropriate action.

A4	Partnership/contracting out
----	-----------------------------

Satisfactorily met

Description:

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

Strengths:

- Excellent relationships between partners and JPACS existed, including partner agencies attending the probation office directly to see offenders in relation to such issues as drug and alcohol misuse and employment problems. Partner agencies such as the police, housing and mental health cited several examples of joint working and responsiveness by the service. This positive view of partnership working was endorsed by the JPACS staff group.
- The local further and higher education establishment, Highlands College, delivered programmes on behalf of JPACS, an arrangement which both parties felt was working well as it also introduced offenders to the education setting. The quality of the programme delivered was assessed by the Cognitive Centre Foundation with feedback provided to the service. The college had also facilitated basic skills training for offenders, staffed by volunteers, which was working very well.
- The housing department, probation and prison had worked together to provide a number of studio apartments for discharged prisoners. Out of 50 individuals so accommodated to date, only two had returned to prison.
- Police and probation representatives had jointly hosted a reception for Polish people to outline the Jersey criminal justice system. It had emerged that in the past people had come to the island from other countries and committed offences because they were not aware of Jersey law.

- There were examples of good liaison with the police regarding domestic violence and exchange of information about offenders generally.
- Volunteer trained tutors and mentors impressed as very committed to the work they undertook for the service. Tutors felt that the move to work from Highlands College had been positive and provided a better environment, access to computers and help from the basic skills teacher. Their periodic three-way meetings with POs were also felt to be valuable.
- The service had undertaken an inspection of the Drunk and Incapable Unit at the Shelter (which was jointly run by the voluntary sector and the States of Jersey Police) to ensure it was offering a safe and effective diversion from prosecution for drunk and incapable offenders. The results showed that the provision was generally well run and provided a caring and professional service in a situation where the number of referrals had almost doubled. However, the report recommended that there should be better liaison between the manager and the police and set out a number of ways in which this could happen.

Areas for improvement:

- Because business in Jersey had traditionally been undertaken informally, SLAs did not exist between partner organisations and JPACS. Some underlying or sub agreements were in existence, but several partners felt a SLA would be useful to clarify the understanding of each other's role and the expectations of service delivery, including exchange of information and data protection issues.
- The Rehabilitation of Offenders Act had been introduced to Jersey in 2001, but representatives of partner organisations identified that there was still little understanding of what this actually meant for offenders and more particularly employers. It was suggested that JPACS should work with offenders and others to develop a better understanding of the implications of this law.

A5 Effective communication with sentencers

Satisfactorily met

Description:

There is high quality, proactive communication by the service with local sentencers about the supervision of offenders and the provision of reports.

Strengths:

- SERs were positively received by sentencers who felt they were usually well written and consistently and logically presented with appropriate recommendations. Occasionally they were felt to be too long and contain probation jargon. Generally, sentencers trusted the judgement of probation staff and felt that they offered a very professional service. If a report was poor, the magistrates would draw this to the attention of the ACPO or CPO. Magistrates also appreciated the access to information about defendants provided via the probation presence in court.
- Magistrates felt well informed about the work of the probation service through the quarterly meetings with the ACPO.
- Probation, CS and SER standards were presented to the courts for discussion and approval and prior to implementation.

- Sentencers felt able to raise and discuss issues openly with the CPO, ACPO or the Board President.
- Different Centeniers had had varying amounts of contact with the probation service. Those who had worked with staff in Parish Hall Enquiries had found their background information inputs of value. An information leaflet produced by the probation service was provided to the parents of children and young people appearing at these meetings.
- A well researched seminar ‘Children who offend – what works’ had been delivered to sentencers by the CPO and information manager.

Areas for improvement:

- Probation meetings with Youth Panel members were described as open and helpful, but panel members wanted more information about the work of the service, including staffing structures, interventions (especially programmes), CS, parenting programmes and Children’s Services work on prevention. They also wanted to know more about breach policy and the effectiveness and outcomes of interventions.
- Meetings with sentencers raised issues about the consistency of breach practice and there was evidence of differential policies on breach between probation and CSOs. JPACS could usefully amend its procedures to ensure that breach processes were operated consistently across all types of supervision and discuss the issue with sentencers.
- There was limited evidence of the service seeking feedback about its work from sentencers, e.g. through a questionnaire or SER feedback forms.
- Although all Centeniers had heard of the probation service, had received a copy of the annual report, and some knew individual POs through court or Parish Hall Enquiries, none of them felt they understood what ‘being put on probation’ meant. They would like to know more about the service, the supervision of offenders, and how this impinged on their own work. This might easily be achieved through further training or open day events.

SECTION B QUALITY OF ASSESSMENT

B1 Assessment of risk of harm

60%

Description:

Risk of harm is satisfactorily assessed using approved instrument specialist assessment tools, where relevant, and draws on RAMAS, other agencies' and previous probation service assessments.

Strengths:

- There was a close fit between the interventions planned and the assessed risk of harm in 81% of cases.¹
- A satisfactory risk of harm assessment had been undertaken in ten of 14 cases where there had been a further significant event that might give rise to concern. Whilst this was considerably higher than that recorded in many of the probation areas we have inspected in England and Wales, the content of these assessments still required attention.

Areas for improvement:

- Other than sexual, violent and domestic violence offenders, risk of harm assessments did not utilise a general recognised structured tool. Not all staff were trained in the use of specialist tools (MATRIX 2000 and SARA) and it was expected that trained personnel would be consultants for other staff. Unfortunately, some cases that warranted a specialist assessment did not receive it.
- Only 59% of cases had had a satisfactory risk of harm assessment undertaken at the start of supervision, and of those subject to RAMAS less than half were of sufficient quality.
- There was a need to review risk of harm regularly and after any significant change in the offender's circumstances.
- There was no confidential section in case files for risk of harm management and victim information.
- Only four out of ten relevant cases showed appropriate management involvement in the risk assessment.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

An officer who had responsibility for offenders whose first language was Portuguese and did not speak English sought out newspaper articles, TV programmes and articles from the internet in Portuguese which referred to offending related issues in the offender's country of origin. He found that by demonstrating that, for example, alcohol misuse or domestic violence were also issues in Madeira, he could more easily gain the offender's interest and engagement. He also encouraged them to look for articles themselves.

¹ We addressed risk of harm assessment by the JPACS according to the current practice on the island. This differs considerably from that in England and Wales.

B2	Assessment of likelihood of reoffending	87%
----	---	-----

Description:

The likelihood of reoffending and criminogenic factors are satisfactorily identified and assessed using an approved instrument.

Strengths:

- In 78% of cases LSI-R had been used to produce a satisfactory assessment of the likelihood of reoffending and the criminogenic factors in the case. In 84% of these the content of the assessment was appropriate to the needs of the offender.
- A likelihood of reoffending score was calculated in 96% of cases, again a better figure than the average for probation areas we have inspected in England and Wales.

B3	Case management	60%
----	-----------------	-----

Description:

The case is managed effectively and interventions coordinated to enable criminogenic factors to be addressed and any risk of harm managed. The ISP or CSO assessment takes account of the SER, and describes an overall plan of work for each offender, in line with the assessments of risk of harm and need and the likelihood of reoffending.

Strengths:

- In three-quarters of cases appropriate interventions had been identified to address offending behaviour and community reintegration.
- The ISP was sensitive to diversity issues in 73% of relevant cases.
- 94% of cases had evidence on file to show that the case manager had taken steps to explain the requirements of the order to the offender – this was aided by the positive requirement for the offender to sign the order in court.
- Parents or carers were involved in the assessment in six of eight cases where the offender was aged under 17.

Areas for improvement:

- Only 59% of ISPs met JPACS policy with regard to content, reflecting the plan in the SER, and making reference to the offender’s level of skill.
- It is good practice for risk management plans to be integrated with supervision plans so that it is clear that they complement each other, and work with the offender is contributing to the reduction of risk of harm to the public. In the majority of relevant cases this was not happening.
- SMART objectives were present in only 50% of ISPs. However, this was not surprising as SMART standards in objective setting had only been introduced by JPACS in May 2005.
- In 68% of cases the plan was communicated to the offender so that they could participate actively in the planning process. This showed some scope for improvement.
- Whilst contact with other agencies was good, liaison responsibilities were not clearly defined in the plan in 57% of cases.

- There were considerable opportunities to develop joint work with the prison on sentence planning and temporary release so that, subject to various safeguards, serving prisoners could also attend community programmes. Both the Prison Governor and the CPO were keen to develop a range of joint and complementary arrangements. This work should be developed further as a high priority for both services.

B4	Documentation	83%
----	---------------	-----

Description:

All relevant documentation is available and has been satisfactorily completed.

Strengths:

- DAISy information was easily accessible and user friendly.
- The use of electronic records was excellent; records were well organised and complete in 80% of cases, with recording judged clear and sufficient in 86%.

Areas for improvement:

- As a result of a backlog of scanning documents into the computer, a number of case files were incomplete which was impacting on practice. Missing information also included Red Flag information in a small number of cases.
- Considerable efficiencies could be made by the joint use of DAISy by prison and probation staff. However, the system did not provide other functions that the prison needed and hence some joint work was required to establish how the systems could be integrated.

SECTION C QUALITY OF INTERVENTIONS

C1 Managing attendance and enforcement

79%

Description:

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

Strengths:

- In 86% of cases offender attendance was monitored across all interventions by the case manager with appropriate action taken, where necessary, to ensure compliance.
- Appropriate judgements about the acceptability or unacceptability of absences were taken in 78% of cases. However, this was still a lower figure than that which we would expect to find in many England and Wales probation areas.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

JPACS had introduced the idea of a compliance meeting, which was a meeting between the offender, the case manager and the line manager with the purpose of achieving compliance. The reasons for non-compliance were discussed including a look at how obstacles might be removed. The offender was left with a clear understanding about why compliance was important and what the consequences would be if it was not achieved.

Areas for improvement:

- The frequency of appointments or work sessions adhered to JPACS standards and was considered to be sufficient to meet any risk of harm considerations in 57% of cases. This was again a lower figure than we have found on average in probation areas in England and Wales.
- A home visit had taken place in only 12 cases.
- Breach action had taken place in line with the service's policy in 67% of cases. However, as already mentioned, the policy was confusing between different orders and would benefit from review.

Description:

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

Strengths:

- In 94% of relevant cases additional requirements in orders had been implemented satisfactorily.
- Work was directed at community reintegration issues (such as accommodation, ETE, drugs, alcohol and family relationships) in a very high proportion of cases (88%), with excellent liaison with others providing interventions (91%). This demonstrated positive use and coordination with statutory and voluntary partnership organisations to engage with the offender.
- In several cases, inspectors commented on the evidence of active liaison between the case manager and partners. This was confirmed by the interviews with significant other workers which showed a very positive attitude towards the work of the case manager. Several of the questions that we put to them scored the highest level of satisfaction. These included their views of the liaison arrangements with the case manager and whether their intervention had been appropriate to the risk of harm.
- The service had produced a restorative justice leaflet for offenders which outlined what they could expect if this opportunity was provided. Unfortunately though, both the leaflet and our contact with staff suggested that this was predominantly only an option for children and young people.
- Mentoring had been established for two years with an active number of trained volunteer mentors. Each mentee met with their PO and mentor to determine the aims of the intervention and sign a contract. This was periodically reviewed, although it may be that the frequency of reviews could be increased.
- In conjunction with the partnership work, we judged that 85% of case managers demonstrated excellent practice in motivating and reinforcing the work undertaken by others involved and engaging with the offender to prevent reoffending.
- CS work was considered to occupy the offender fully and be demanding in all eight CSO cases.
- Examination of the files of a small number of voluntary supervised cases showed some good examples of restorative justice and family problem solving having taken place.

Areas for improvement:

- Reviews of progress against ISP objectives did not take place in line with JPACS policy in 60% of cases.
- In 54% of cases SMART objectives were absent from the supervision plan review.
- Like much of England and Wales, work on victim issues was poor. Only 40% of cases showed evidence of these being addressed. Similarly, only 45% of cases where there was a

direct victim showed work having been undertaken to raise the offender's awareness of the impact of the offence on the victim.

- Despite many offenders undertaking programmes to tackle offending behaviour, in 36% of cases we considered that the intervention did not sufficiently challenge them to accept responsibility for their offence and its consequences.
- In only three of nine relevant cases was the review of the supervision plan considered to have integrated RAMAS or the action plan from another risk management meeting. The limitations of RAMAS have already been referred to.
- Discussion with some case managers suggested that the Alcohol and Drug Service tended to prioritise work with drug misusers and that with alcohol abusers was seen as less important. Both internal and external evidence indicated that alcohol was a major criminogenic need. The service should therefore review alcohol interventions, delivered both internally by JPACS staff and by the partner agency, to ascertain whether current provision is sufficiently addressing this issue.
- In voluntary supervised cases formal assessments, plans and recording of outcomes were not undertaken, although some interventions were delivered.

C3	Diversity needs	89%
----	-----------------	-----

Description:

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

Strengths:

- In 88% of cases the arrangements for interventions took account of diversity issues and delivery was sensitive to diversity in 85% of relevant cases.
- Whilst there was no policy on singleton placements for women and minority ethnic offenders, we understand that they would always be asked whether they felt comfortable in a group. If not, the programme intervention would be delivered on a one-to-one basis, or a different CS placement would be found.
- Literacy and dyslexia, which are obstacles to reintegration for some offenders, were satisfactorily addressed in 86% of relevant cases.
- A number of the cases inspected demonstrated particular sensitivity to diversity issues. These included basic skills, possible vulnerability in the group work setting, language and pregnancy.

Areas for improvement:

- There was no policy regarding the placing of lone women or members of minority ethnic groups in either group work programmes or CS.
- We found some instances where gender was an issue (e.g. for a vulnerable woman) but where, because of the gender make-up of the team, there was no choice but to allocate them to a male supervisor.

Description:

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

Strength:

- Consideration had been given to the methods likely to be the most effective with the offender (e.g. the type and pace of work, CS work placement, offending behaviour programme or accommodation provision) in 78% of the cases inspected.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE

Work with children and young people showed a high level of inter-agency contact. In one such example, good casework was evidenced with the offender assessed as needing a programme intervention, although he was not suitable for group work. Instead the male worker engaged pro-social modelling with programme interventions on a one-to-one basis and this seemed to have engaged the young person. Extensive work was done in linking with the school, parents and latterly further education tutor as he had gone on to study at college. Evidence was received from the school that noted a radical change in his attitude and from his mother who reinforced that this was the case.

Description:

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

Strengths:

- In just over three-quarters of cases, interventions and their level were appropriate to the risk of harm. These might include the use of increased contact or surveillance, accommodation provision, communication with partner organisations and dosage of programmes.
- Home visits had taken place in 73% (eight) of the high risk of harm cases.

Areas for improvement:

- Where inter-agency risk of harm management plans were produced they were executed appropriately. However they were not reviewed in all cases, nor was there always evidence of sufficient management oversight.
- Changes in risk of harm had been satisfactorily identified and managed in ten of 16 relevant cases.
- Although the Red Flag procedures identified that high-risk cases would have a pair case manager, we saw no evidence of this happening.
- In a number of cases we found that RAMAS assessments had not taken place when we considered that they should have been done.
- Although discussions had taken place with the prison psychologist and the NPD, the service acknowledged that there was still no programme for work with sex offenders. Nor was there

any structured system for the oversight of sex offenders or high-risk violent offenders by police and probation following their release from prison.

- Despite good cooperation among the statutory agencies to maximise existing facilities in order to protect the public from harm, the lack of suitable accommodation for high risk of harm offenders was also a serious concern.
- Apart from TRMS, and young people discharged from prison, released prisoners were not subject to licence. Therefore, unless offenders chose to move voluntarily, they could continue to live close to their victims.

SECTION D QUALITY OF INITIAL OUTCOMES

D1 Interventions are delivered with the desired outcomes

69%

Description:

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

Strengths:

- 76% of offenders had not been convicted for a further offence committed since the start of their order.
- Where cases had been re-scored on LSI-R, 72% of these cases demonstrated a reduction.

Areas for improvement:

- Case managers identified a range of criminogenic factors (i.e. factors that are considered to be linked to offending behaviour) associated with offenders under supervision. The most significant were substance abuse, personality/behaviour, attitudes/orientation, family circumstances/parenting and education/employment. There was evidence of progress on the most important factor in 61% of cases.
- LSI-R had been re-scored in only 49% of cases. The predominant period between assessments was between seven and nine months.
- In 51% of cases there was insufficient evidence of learning outcomes and skills from supervision having been applied to date.
- In 43% of cases we considered that the offender had not complied sufficiently with the conditions in the order.

D2 Improvements are sustainable

75%

Description:

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

Strength:

- In 77% of cases appropriate attention had been given to identified long-term community reintegration issues to support the offender in a non-offending lifestyle.

D3 Outcomes of interventions are assessed and reviewed using available data

Well met

Description:

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

Strengths:

- The research and information manager had undertaken a great deal of research on the outcomes of the service's work and had developed information systems to facilitate this. The service employed an external consultant from a university to assist her in this. The latter,

interviewed during the inspection, praised JPACS’s strong commitment to assessing the effectiveness of its work in this way and its desire to be a learning organisation.

- The service provided evidence of numerous evaluations and inspections of its work over the years, both internally and by invitation to external bodies. The most recent examples included the Evaluation of the Mentoring Scheme (2005), the Be Consultancy Report into Jersey Offenders’ Basic Skills (2004), Community Sentences in Jersey (2004), Evaluation of Parish Hall Enquiries (2003), Social Enquiry Report Inspection (2003), Inspection of Supervision (2002), and the Report on Inspection of Probation Orders (2001). There was evidence of the results being acted upon to improve the work of the service.
- Effectiveness statistics were produced on an annual basis (more frequently if need be) to assess whether the interventions undertaken had reduced the likelihood of reoffending. For example, because previous figures had demonstrated that interventions for low likelihood of reoffending cases could increase the LSI-R score, the score for eligibility for probation/programmes had been raised to 16 or more for a probation order and 24 or more for a programme. This was used to target appropriate offenders and restrict programme resources to those most likely to benefit. It had also been communicated to the courts, although with mixed results, demonstrated as already mentioned by a number of cases in our sample still having relatively low LSI-R scores.
- The service held regular What Works and programme review management meetings utilising performance data, to assess the success of assessment and interventions, identify gaps and undertake action to fulfil future plans.

Area for improvement:

- There was no system to regularly seek offenders’ views of the work of the service, such as exit questionnaires or interviews.

D4	Interventions demonstrate value for money	80%
----	---	-----

Description:

Interventions are delivered with efficient and appropriate use of resources.

Strengths:

- In 86% of cases the resources (including partnerships) allocated to the case were consistent with the offender’s likelihood of reoffending.
- In 82% of cases we considered that resources were being used efficiently.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Overview of the Scheme

- JPACS ran a small and uncomplicated CS scheme. The staff complement consisted of a manager, two assistant managers (one of whom was the only full-time staff member) and six supervisors. The assistant manager role was directly comparable to the England and Wales CS officer role before the introduction of Enhanced Community Punishment and included supervision of the supervisors.
- CS operated on both weekend days and on Wednesdays if required for people employed at the weekend and those who needed light duties or presented a risk to the public that could not be safely addressed out in the community.
- It was a credit to the scheme that work groups had never been stood down through lack of a supervisor. This was due to a combination of a relatively good level of staffing for such a small scheme, effective management and a flexible, 'can do' attitude amongst the staff interviewed who were prepared to supervise offenders themselves if needed.
- With approximately 200 commencements per year, the current caseload was around 70 with a small number of women offenders and 15 offenders whose first language was Portuguese. On most occasions there were sufficient resources within the service to cope with the demands of supervising speakers of languages other than English. Whilst three of the supervisors were female, the scheme was too small to offer women offenders the choice of working in a group with other women. However, staff would be sensitive to the needs of lone females on a work party.
- CS in Jersey was only used as an alternative to custody so that offenders, whilst not necessarily presenting a high risk of harm to the public, tended to have committed serious offences. Such offences often attracted a parallel sentence of a probation order where CS and PO case managers liaised about the management of the two orders. They were also able to manage safely offenders who might pose a risk of harm to the public.
- Staff were clear that the purpose of CS was punishment and not rehabilitation or skills improvement. On this basis they limited the range of placements on offer to match the skills of their own staff and the existing skills of offenders.
- JPACS had a wide variety of individual and group work placements in the community. These included a range of charities (e.g. mental health, children's, care homes, animals, environmental, heritage, substance misuse), Jersey Hospice Care, youth clubs, churches and statutory services. A large variety of tasks included cleaning, catering, gardening, housekeeping, fund raising, maintenance, decorating and improving amenities.
- There was a presumption that offenders would be placed in an outside agency placement unless there were contra-indications, including offender availability. In practice this meant approximately one-third of cases were supervised by other agencies.

Strengths:

- This was a well managed scheme with a very clear sense of purpose.
- There was a stable, committed staff group who were prepared to work flexibly to ensure the smooth running of the scheme.
- All staff had attended a one day first aid course in the last 12 months.
- The team of managers met every week to allocate offenders to placements and review the progress of orders.
- Supervisors were employed on permanent contracts.
- At weekends there was a morning briefing to supervisors on both days about offenders and the work in hand.
- Group size was restricted to a maximum of six offenders.
- Records were up to date.
- Offenders interviewed said that they were treated fairly and with respect and that most of the work undertaken was worthwhile.
- Beneficiaries seen were impressed by the quality of work undertaken. They were confident in the ability of CS staff to assess and provide suitable workers. They felt supported by CS staff when they were supervising offenders themselves.
- Every reasonable effort was made to get offenders through their orders including the lending of bicycles, and alarm clocks.

Areas for improvement:

- It was acknowledged that there was a need to introduce a risk of harm assessment and management system in Jersey. Discussion with staff indicated that decisions about the placement and supervision of offenders on CSOs were based on all available evidence, including about risk and dangerousness. However, this could not be evidenced in most of files we saw, including one of the Red Flag cases. In other Red Flag cases the case discussion and decision were recorded in the contact log but not necessarily at the beginning. Despite this, we took the view that the placement of cases we inspected was still appropriate.
- The proposed CS assessment module to the DAISy case record system was seen and discussed. The addition of a box where the choice of placement is noted and explained in terms of risk of harm assessment and other aspects of suitability would seem to address the concerns in the preceding paragraph.
- None of the staff seen held any health and safety qualification and, although there was limited professional advice through training, they were left vulnerable. They were aware of this and were attempting to reduce the scope of placements accordingly. However, this could not be wholly relied upon as a strategy and an example was observed of a potential hazard due to the decision not to provide safety boots for offenders on work parties.
- CS Standards written in 2005 were not prescriptive about when an offender should be breached for unacceptable absences, even after four or more of these. The rationale for this was that it was the aim of the scheme to get offenders through their orders. However, this was potentially discriminatory and overlooked the positive impact of clear and consistently implemented rules.

- There were concerns about ill health issues, working offenders when they were medically unfit, and the difficulties this could pose if medical certificates were submitted. A clear policy about how to operate this practice and any necessary safeguards would be advisable.
- The length of the working day was normally five hours. This was an historical feature of the scheme and could be easily changed by requiring offenders to bring a packed lunch and building in a half hour supervised break. Compliance figures were not seen. Most offenders seen and cases read were subject to two parallel orders with multiple conditions operating simultaneously and were keen to get their hours completed. Some offenders were allowed to work on two or even three days per week to achieve this but this was not available to all that wanted it.
- Exit interviews were not conducted. To achieve this would mean a break with the standard five hour day and the policy of not crediting hours for attending appointments.

THE ROLE OF HMI PROBATION

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

Home Office Objectives

HMI Probation contributes primarily to the achievement of Home Office Objective II:

- more offenders are caught, punished and stop offending, and victims are better supported
- and to the requirement to ensure that custodial and community sentences are more effective at stopping offending. We also contribute to the achievement of Objective III through scrutiny of work to address drugs and other substance misuse, and to other relevant criminal justice system and children's services objectives.

Role

- Report to the Home Secretary on the work and performance of the National Probation Service and Youth Offending Teams, particularly on the effectiveness of work with individual offenders, children and young people aimed at reducing reoffending and protecting the public
- In this connection, and in association with HM Inspectorate of Prisons, to report on the effectiveness of offender management under the auspices of the National Offender Management Service as it develops
- Contribute to improved performance in the National Probation Service, the National Offender Management Service and Youth Offending Teams
- Contribute to sound policy and effective service delivery by providing advice and disseminating good practice, based on inspection findings, to Ministers, Home Office staff, the Youth Justice Board, probation boards/areas and Youth Offending Teams
- Promote actively race equality and wider diversity issues in the National Probation Service, the National Offender Management Service and Youth Offending Teams
- Contribute to the overall effectiveness of the criminal justice system, particularly through joint work with other criminal justice and Government inspectorates.

Code of Practice

HMI Probation aims to achieve its purpose by:

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

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

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