

2004 - 2005

**The Correctional Services
Accreditation Panel Report**



**CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
ACCREDITATION PANEL**

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	3
Diversity Statement	4
Introduction	4
Background	4
The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel	5
The Future	5
Panel Membership	6
Applications Considered	7
Audit	9
Plenary Business	10
Annex A – Schedule of accredited programmes and systems	12
Annex B – Budget Statement 2004/5	13
Appendix 1 – Correctional Services Accreditation Panel – A Stocktake	31

FOREWORD



This report summarises the work completed by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel in its sixth year and includes a statement about the future role of the Panel and the parameters agreed by Ministers for its future development. The Panel's context was changed following the independent review of correctional services by Lord Carter and the creation of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in 2004. It has been an interesting year for the Panel within a changing landscape, and I have worked closely with NOMS to help develop the Panel's role within these parameters.

The Panel has considered applications from the Prison and Probation Services for accreditation, guidance or review and discussed other more strategic issues relating to offender behaviour programmes and integrated systems in the Prison and Probation Services.

During the course of the year a wide range of submissions (including proposals for changes to previously accredited programmes) were made to the Panel. The outcome of Panel consideration of these submissions included the following:

- Four Programmes were fully accredited – two of them were drugs programmes for use in the Prison and Probation Service and had previously received provisional accreditation in 2001.
- Four programmes were approved for implementation (recognised/provisional accreditation) but with the requirement for further work to be undertaken prior to the award of full accreditation on a range of issues including piloting, evaluation outcomes and programme continuity.
- Advice and guidance was provided to programmes currently under development, as well as relating to issues surrounding already accredited programmes.

The Panel spent some time this year considering issues relating to research and evaluation and continued to advise on audit issues brought to it by the two services. In view of the growing portfolio of accreditation programmes the Panel emphasised the need for a stronger focus to be placed on integrating individual interventions through effective case management and welcomed the establishment of NOMS which supported these principles.

On a personal note, I am relinquishing my responsibilities as Chair of CSAP in November 2005, having stayed on to help develop the Panel's future role within the parameters set by Ministers, following an internal review of the Panel and the establishment of the National Offender Management Service. I will, however, be staying within the criminal justice field, by continuing in my role as Chair of the Parole Board for England and Wales.

My role as CSAP Chair has given me a unique insight into the valuable work being developed to reduce re-offending and has enabled me to play a key part in assisting the Prison and Probation Service to embrace "what works". I look forward, with interest, to future developments in this area. Finally, I would like to express my thanks to my fellow Panel members, for their commitment to the programme of work, and for their support.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'D. Nichol', written in a cursive style.

Sir Duncan Nichol

DIVERSITY STATEMENT

The Government is committed to building a fairer, more inclusive society in which public authorities improve links with the community and demonstrate equal opportunities for staff and service users. The Panel is committed to ensuring that diversity is valued and permeates every aspect of its role and responsibility with regard to the What Works agenda and its own practices. The Panel requires programme designers and providers to demonstrate evidence of due regard for diversity and inclusivity in terms of equality of access to programmes on the basis of need.

The Panel is committed to:

- Examining its own practices to ensure that it is accessible, open and responsive to all stakeholders and in particular minority ethnic people;
- Ensuring an environment in which all its members and participants in its business can contribute effectively regardless of gender, ethnicity, ability, age, sexuality, learning style, marital status, national and past and present life experiences.

INTRODUCTION

1. This is the sixth report of the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel, the first three being under the Panel's former name of the Joint Prison/Probation Services Accreditation Panel. It records the outcomes of the Panel's meetings during the year, including advice and decisions on programmes and integrated systems seeking accreditation; the Panel's work in safeguarding the quality of programme delivery by establishing criteria and overseeing audits; and also the Panel consideration and advice given on strategic issues for both Services. It also outlines the parameters for the Panel's future development, agreed by Ministers, following the establishment of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in 2004 and an internal review of the Correctional Service Accreditation Panel. (Paragraph 9). Attached to the report are at Annex A, a schedule of accredited programmes and systems, and Annex B, budget statement 2004/5.

BACKGROUND

2. The Prison and Probation Services in England and Wales are committed to the introduction of What Works to reduce re-offending. They are investing accordingly in the development and implementation of high quality offender programmes; in independent evaluation; and a new joint offender assessment system, known as "OASys", which is now in operation throughout the Probation Service and in a large proportion of the Prison Service. The What Works evidence, based on meta-analytic reviews of large numbers of varied offender treatment programmes evaluated on differing bases, suggests that defined and structured programmes using particularly but not exclusively, cognitive-behavioural techniques can significantly reduce expected re-offending. The meta-analytic reviews do not suggest that there is any single, outstanding approach that is by itself guaranteed to work as a means of reducing re-offending but broadly, the principles associated with effective interventions include:
- Effective risk management
 - Targeting offending behaviour
 - Addressing the specific factors linked with offenders' offending
 - Relevance to offenders' learning styles
 - Promoting community reintegration
 - Maintaining quality and integrity of programme delivery
3. There are demanding principles to meet. There is good evidence about what is effective but large-scale implementation is very difficult. In particular, there are many threats to programme integrity. Accreditation is a mechanism which has been developed to help to counter these threats and to support consistent delivery of effective practice. As such it has a central part to play in continuous quality improvement in both Services, crucially in support of the aim they share to reduce re-offending.

4. This role is no less important in the context of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS), created in 2004 following the recommendations in the Carter Review for Correctional Services, managing Offenders, Reducing Crime and the Government's response, Reducing Crime – Changing Lives. NOMS brings together the work of correctional service, to ensure the focus is on the end to end management of the offender.

THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACCREDITATION PANEL

5. The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel is an Advisory Non-Departmental Public Body This Panel replaced the Prison Service's General and Sex Offender Treatment Programme Accreditation Panels established by the Prison Service in 1996. The first appointments were made in accordance with the Code of Practice on Public Appointments in July 1999 for a period of 3 years. At that time the Panel was called the Joint Prison/Probation Services Accreditation Panel. Sir Duncan Nichol was initially appointed as the Chair by Home Office Ministers in May 1999 and was re-appointed in 2002 for a further 3 years, further extended to end November 2005 to help develop the role of the Panel within parameters agreed by Ministers.
6. In addition to the Chair, the Panel consists of appointed members, who are independent experts, and nominated members, who represent the Prison and Probation Services and the Home Office. The current set of members was appointed in January 2003 for three years following an open competition. The Panel is supported by a secretariat drawn from the Prison Service The Panel has adopted a Code of Practice governing members' conduct.

THE FUTURE

7. Following a stocktake paper (attached at Appendix 1) representing the views of appointed Panel members which fed into an internal review of the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel and in the light of the establishment of NOMS, Ministers agreed the following parameters for the Panel's future development:

Individual programmes for offenders will continue to require accreditation

The accreditation approach is beneficial and should continue for programmes where the evidential and theoretical base is sufficiently robust. However, it is not considered the right model for other more broadly based interventions, such as resettlement activities or basic skills. To ensure that it is accessible to a diverse range of providers – including not for profit and other small providers, NOMS will review the accreditation process to see if the burden can be reduced without undermining its effectiveness.

The final decision on accreditation will be for the NOMS Director of Strategy and Assurance on advice from a panel of experts who will replace the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel. When Parliamentary time allows, legislation will be introduced to remove the Panel's NDPB status, as implicit in section 202 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

In order to preserve the objectivity that has been a key aspect of the accreditation process and critical to the credibility of programmes accredited, it remains essential for decisions on accreditation to be taken independently of those designing and running programmes. The separation of commissioning from operational delivery in NOMS secures the necessary independence from service providers without need of NDPB status or an external chair. Looking forward, the process of accreditation needs to be brought together with the broader work on standard-setting and assurance which the Director for Strategy and Assurance oversees. Decisions on accreditation will need to be informed by advice from those with academic and other relevant expertise, and the detailed arrangements developed for the appointment of a panel of experts to provide that advice will comply with procurement requirements.

In developing a strategy for effective interventions, NOMS will be able to draw on the advice of a panel of experts

NOMS will benefit from the ability to invite members of the panel of experts to contribute to the wider aspect of its work on effective interventions, such as the development of quality assurance arrangements for interventions outside the accreditation model and the range of programmes and interventions required.

PANEL MEMBERSHIP

Chair

- **Sir Duncan Nichol**, Chair of the Parole Board for England and Wales and non-executive director of the Correctional Services Strategy Board.

Appointed members

- **Professor Donald Grubin**, Professor of Forensic Psychiatry, St Nicholas Hospital, Newcastle NHS Trust.
- **Professor Michael Gossop**, Head of Research, Drugs and Alcohol Addiction Services, Maudsley Hospital.
- **Sylvia Hikins**, Project Manager of Youth Start (an EU funded project for ex-offenders and young people run across 7 EU countries)
- **Mr David Kennard**, former Head of Psychology Services and Director of Centre of Psychology and Counselling (York)
- **Professor Friedrich Losel**, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Social Sciences Research centre, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany
- **Professor Mike Maguire**, Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Cardiff University
- **Dr Janice Marques**, Consulting Psychologist, California Department of Mental Health.
- **Dr Mary McMurrin**, Senior Research Fellow and Consultant Clinical and Forensic Psychologist, Cardiff University
- **Dr William Murphy**, Professor of Psychiatry, University of Tennessee
- **Dr Frank Porporino**, Senior Partner, T3 Associates Training and Consulting Inc., Ottawa
- **Dr Barbara Rawlings**, Honorary Research Fellow, Department of Sociology, Manchester University
- **Professor Peter Raynor**, Professor of Applied Social Studies, University of Wales, Swansea
- **Mr Colin Roberts**, Lectureship and College Fellowship, University of Oxford

Nominated members

- **Ms Mitch Egan**, HM Prison Service, Area Manager for the North East (up to March 2005)
- **Dr Carol Hedderman**, Assistant Director, Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate (up to September 2004)
- **Mr Andrew Underdown**, National Probation Service, North West Regional Manager.

Secretariat

- Mr Mark May (What Works in Prison Unit, HM Prison Service) – Secretary (until March 2005). The Secretariat now sits within the National Offender Management Service.

Advisors

- During the course of the year, the Panel engaged the services of Dr Randall Kropp, Clinical and Forensic Psychologist, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, to advise in its consideration of domestic violence programmes.

Accreditation Criteria

8. Ministers approved a revised set of programme accreditation criteria and a separate set of integrated systems accreditation criteria in August 2002. In 2003-4 there was a further review of the accreditation criteria which led to minor revisions to the scoring system. Copies of both sets of accreditation criteria are available from the current CSAP Secretary, Carole Wham.

APPLICATIONS CONSIDERED

(Programmes and systems)

9. During the year 2004-5, the Panel considered a range of Programmes, integrated systems and requests for approval of change to previously accredited programmes. In response to these submissions the Panel has fully accredited four programmes two of which were previously granted recognised/provisionally accredited status earlier in previous years.
10. **“Accredited”** programmes and systems will be subject to periodic review as evidence becomes available of their effectiveness. The Panel's criteria allows for programmes to become accredited based on reconviction evidence supporting the general approach and methods used, for newer programmes, reconviction data may not be available for the programme in its present form. In that event, the Panel requires that a basic level of research evidence should be provided to support the general approach and the majority of specific methods used in the model. The model of change should be in the form of a plausible hypothesis. The programme will not be accredited until the hypothesis has been empirically supported through evaluation. The Panel requires an ongoing commitment to the evaluation of outcomes based on reconviction data and will keep accredited programmes under periodic review in the light of up-to-date evidence. In granting “accredited status”, the Panel has also, in all cases to date, identified some specific points for improvement. These issues are identified in the Panel's decision letters which the Panel expects to be addressed. In addition to the audit process, the Secretariat monitors progress on improvements by seeking update reports from the Programme developers.
11. **“Recognised”** (Provisionally Accredited) programmes and systems have received a sufficiently high rating to justify immediate use in the Prison and Probation Services. Within 12 months (unless otherwise specified by the Panel), a further submission will be required to demonstrate that specific changes have addressed the issues identified by the Panel, and to enable the award of “accredited” status.

The following Programmes received full accreditation:

ASRO (Addressing Substance Misuse-Related Offending) (National Probation Service)

12. This programme was awarded provisionally accredited status in October 2001 and came to the Panel for further advice in October 2003. It was awarded **full accreditation** in July 2004. The Panel were impressed with the considerable progress that had been achieved with this submission, particularly the training manuals. However, it did express some concerns in relation to the guidance in the supplementary National Management Model and made suggestions for improvements.

PRISM (National Probation Service)

13. This was another programme aimed at reducing individual substance misuse, which was awarded **full accreditation** in July 2004, having attained provisional accreditation in 2001. Points were dropped on the engagement and motivation criteria and the Panel proposed some revisions to the programme and re-working of materials.

Healthy Sexual Functioning Programme (Prison-Service led)

14. This Programme used behaviour modification techniques to seek to address sexual deviance and sexual arousal problems with a one-to-one approach. The Panel **fully accredited** it in October 2004 with the proviso that it was used solely for offenders who had already completed the core or rolling sex offender programme. The Panel requested further proposals for the use of this Programme and encouraged joint working with the Probation Service to ensure continuity. It had received advice from the Panel on more than one occasion during previous financial years.

Community Domestic Violence Programme (National Probation Service)

15. This programme, which is a moderate intensity version of the Healthy Relationships/Canadian domestic violence programme, adapted for use in the community, was **fully accredited** in December 2004. The Panel commended the quality of the application and the work done to ensure a comprehensive approach. This probation submission had previously received advice in October 2003.

Provisional accreditation was awarded to:

Offender Substance Abuse Programme (National Probation Service)

16. OSAP is a modular group work programme that aims to teach male and female medium to high-risk offenders the skills required to reduce or stop substance misuse. The programme aims to reduce crime by targeting substance use as an important factor in offending. It had been in use in the Canadian Correctional Services, run in Prisons, for a number of years. The Probation Service worked jointly with the Canadian Correctional Services to reshape and update the Programme. It was awarded **provisional accreditation** by the Panel in July 2004. Further work was required on the programme materials and selection of offenders, including how this programme would meet the needs of women offenders.

Juvenile Estate Thinking Skills (JETS) Programme (Prison Service)

17. This was an adaptation by Juvenile Group within the Prison Service of the ETS programme for use with juveniles in custody, combining a group and individualised approach. It was awarded **provisional accreditation** by the Panel in October 2004. The Panel advocated wider piloting of the programme. Further work was required on establishing a central management system and ensuring programme continuity.

Cognitive Skills Booster (CSB) (joint Prison/Probation Service)

18. This programme was designed to boost and refresh learning from the ETS Programme which is aimed at specific cognitive deficits and addresses the thinking process related to problem-solving and self-management. This programme was awarded **continuation of its status as provisionally accredited** for a further 12 months in October 2004. The Panel had concerns appertaining to selection and continuity and asked for greater clarity in a number of areas. They also requested further information regarding evaluation outcomes.

Short Duration Substance Misuse Programme (Prison Service)

19. This programme was designed for use with short-term prisoners and focused on relapse prevention. It was awarded **provisional accreditation** in November 2004. The Panel commented on a number of issues, which included the need for clarification regarding the type(s) of prisoners the programme was appropriate for and whether this programme could be linked to other cognitive behavioural interventions.

The following programmes and systems are under development and were given advice by the Panel:

Approved Premises (National Probation Directorate)

20. Further advice was given at the November 2004 meeting. The Panel recognised the progress that has been made since the integrated system was last submitted. It encouraged and commended the efforts made to improve the skills base of staff working in approved premises and endorsed several features of the submission. However, it considered that there was a need for further development of strategies to upgrade skills and sought further clarification of the case management model to establish relative responsibilities in relation to residents in approved premises.

Revision to Prison Drug Programme Management Manuals

21. At its April 2005 meeting, the Panel received and considered a number of changes to the management manuals relating to a number of Prison Service cognitive behavioural treatment programmes and revision to the audit document. Although broadly content with the changes, the Panel made some suggestions for improvement in the areas of programme delivery, continuity and resettlement, facilitator management and selection and assessment of prisoners. They expressed concern that the requirement to follow up objectives for group members released from prison had been omitted from the audit document and requested clarification in a number of areas.

During the course of the year the Panel also gave advice to the following Programme which had been awarded full accreditation previously:

RAPt (Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust) (drugs programmes – Prisons)

22. This Substance Dependency Treatment Programme was granted provisional accreditation in 1999, and full accreditation was awarded in 2000. At its meeting in November 2004, the Panel considered the submission of a full set of manuals which had been revised to reflect programme development. The Panel commented on a number of issues, including the suitability of the programme for different types of prisoners and requested further information on design and delivery.

AUDIT

23. At its December 2004 meeting the CSAP representative, Professor Mike Maguire reviewed the audit of Offending Behaviour Programmes in 2004-5. A number of audits were presented to the Panel and 17 full audits were provided. The Panel noted that the new audit system, which was more facilitative and had been in operation for a year had worked well. They also noted that in order to improve quality a system had been set up for each programme to allow for interim feedback on the qualitative elements of the audit throughout the year. Results had shown the quality of delivery of these programmes was improving and there had only been one failure. Putting treatment managers in place had been key and it was felt that there was a need for more team-working within establishments. Professor Maguire recommended that a summary of the audit findings against each individual site should be included in the future.

24. Professor Michael Gossop represented CSAP at the March 2005 meeting. Reports were received from the Prison Service on the Drug Treatment Programmes for the year 2004-5. It was noted that it had not been possible to audit all of the sites currently delivering accredited drug treatment programme owing to delays in delivery. This year, the quality of delivery had been separated from the systems audit. The Prison Service gave an overview of performance and issues arising, in particular throughcare, continuity and resettlement and the need for establishments to work more effectively in teams, and the actions being taken to address these problems. The Panel expressed concerns about resettlement scores and encouraged support visits as a means of helping establishments to prepare for audit and to help them improve quality of delivery. They noted that multi-disciplinary teams were in place to ensure effectiveness and that constructive feedback was provided to help establishments to draw up action plans to address problem areas. Trends and outcomes would also be frequently monitored and reviewed. Changes to the scoring process of the audit were being drawn up, which would mean that a failure to score 60% or more in any section of the audit would result in failure. Proposals would be put to the panel in April 2005 for consideration.

PLENARY BUSINESS

JANUARY 2005

National Offender Management Model

25. The Offender Management Team, NOMS delivered a presentation on the structure of the National Offender Model. Although this was in the early stages of development, the Panel gained an insight into the concept of end-to-end offender management and the implications of it for operational practice. The model was still evolving. The Panel were concerned that this model may be seen to be promoting a silo approach. As this would intrinsically link in with the Panel's future way working they expressed an interest in being kept updated on developments, in particular on the implementation and quality assurance side. They would also welcome an insight into the concept of effective brokering and what this would look like. In their view brokering might bring efficiency gains but not necessarily better outcomes.

HM Prison Service/National Probation Directorate (HMPS/NPD) "Continuity Guide"

26. HMPS and NDP gave a joint presentation to the Panel outlining their proposals for a continuity guide, which would be circulated to practitioners. The aim of the guide was to:

- Integrate programmes into the NOMS Offender Management Model
- Provide generic guidance to offender managers and programme staff on how programmes can effectively be delivered
- Form part of any future submissions to the Panel

27. The Panel supported the proposal. In their view continuity was a priority area which had not always been addressed in the past. They welcomed this document as a contribution to improve practice in this area and made suggestions on title, content and context. It was agreed that a draft of the guide would be sent to the Panel for comments.

New ways of working

28. The Panel discussed the new ways of working which had been introduced following the publication of the Carter Report and subsequently the creation of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in 2004. They also looked back over the last 5 years. Although the Panel appreciated there was a need to operate differently, in their view the new way of working had merits but also some drawbacks. They could see the value in moving towards task-based accreditation and operating in sub-panels, which facilitated more effective working. However, Panel members felt this would limit their broader involvement in audit, delivery, evaluation and quality assurance issues. At the time of this meeting the Panel's future role was under review.

National Offender Management Service (NOMS) Research Strategy

29. NOMS updated the Panel on progress to date on the new research strategy and emerging findings and thanked the Panel for the contribution they had made to its development. NOMS gave a brief overview of the work being done to strengthen the evaluation process, including:

- The introduction of a high level knowledge strategy (3-10 years) being corporately led;
- Implementing the right research designs, including randomised control trials;
- Incorporating a holistic approach to all systems;
- Engaging with customers throughout the whole process and effectively disseminating information.

30. The Panel expressed their support for the emerging strategy but reinforced their view that accreditation should be based on sound and realistic evaluation techniques. They were encouraged by the increasing number of data sources coming on stream, the progress made on Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction and the intention to evaluate a mixed range of interventions.

The Impact of Corrections on Offending: “A Review of What Works”

31. The Panel also discussed a recent Home Office research study - The impact on re-offending: a review of “what works”, published by the Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate in December 2004. The Directorate had asked for the Panel’s view on this study and asked them to identify any gaps in their research based on their knowledge and experience. The Panel made the following observations:

- Established science methodology should not be the only tool used to measure the quality of research. It was important to clearly define the purpose of interventions which would facilitate evaluation. There was a need for more research into the level of practitioner skills and case management approaches.
- Limited information was available on the reasons underlying the failure of some offenders to complete programmes. This issue should be addressed, using a range of methodologies which could include cohort studies, process evaluation and qualitative studies of offenders.
- Programmes should be reviewed against basic skills criteria. Widening the focus could result in a reduction in reconvictions.
- A more outward looking approach was needed to interrogating and understanding complex data. Research should be focused on key strategic questions and use methodologies that give reliable answers to those questions.
- Co-ordination of research was key.

ANNEX A

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACCREDITATION PANEL: BUDGET 2004/5

ITEM	TOTAL SPENT	ALLOCATED	DIFFERENTIAL
Fees: Chair	£6,580.87	£10,000.00	-3,419.13
Fees: Members	£55,952.30	£70,000.00	-14,047.70
Travel and Subsistence	£14,435.33	£20,000.00	-5,564.67
Accommodation for Panel meetings	£15,391.18	£30,000.00	-14,608.82
Administrative costs/contingency	£4,005.00	£20,000.00	-15,995.00
Total	£96,364.68	£150,000.00	- 53,635.32

NB. New working methods were introduced in mid-2004.

This led to reduced costs and the profiled budget was underspent in 2004/5.

ANNEX B: SCHEDULE OF PROGRAMMES AND INTEGRATED SYSTEMS CURRENTLY ACCREDITED OR RECOGNISED BY PANEL

General Offending programmes

PROGRAMME	ENHANCED THINKING SKILLS	THINK FIRST	REASONING AND REHABILITATION
Description of Programme	Address thinking and behaviour associated with offending. Through a sequenced series of structured exercises designed to teach inter-personal problem solving skills.	A sequence of exercises designed to teach participants a number of social problem-solving skills; these are then applied to aspects of offences and situations in which they occur. The main components of the programme are drawn from four principal areas of cognitive-behavioural work: problem-solving, self-management, social interaction training and values interaction.	Aimed at medium to high risk of reconviction. R&R is a cognitive behavioural programme focusing on replacing maladaptive thinking with skills that promote pro-social behaviour – it teaches offenders how to think NOT what to think.
Designer/ Development history	Developed by the Prison Service, adapted by the Home Office for use in the community.	Originally designed by James McGuire. Developed in collaboration with the Home Office for use in the community.	First developed and tested in Canada by Robert Ross and Elizabeth Fabiano; revised by T3 Associates.
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	20 sessions, 2-2.5 hours each	22 sessions, each 2 hours. Extended programme of 30 sessions (Think First Inside) was used in prisons	38 sessions of between 2 and 2.5 hours each.
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	Accredited, September 2000	Accredited, September 2000	Accredited, September 2000
<i>Prison</i>	Accredited 1996	Accredited 1996	Accredited 1996

General Offending programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	PRIESTLEY ONE-TO-ONE	COGNITIVE SKILLS BOOSTER	THE JETS LIVING SKILLS PROGRAMME
<p>Description of Programme</p>	<p>The One-to-One is premised on the notion that offending is learned behaviour which is influenced by personal and social factors and triggered by environmental events. The goal therefore is to change the behaviour and the accompanying thoughts, attitudes and values which inform it.</p>	<p>The Cognitive Skills Booster (CSB) programme can be delivered either in prison or the community and can be repeated. The CSB programme is a short programme consisting of 10-12 sessions of 2.5 hours each which can be delivered at the rate of between one and three sessions per week, with no more than one session being delivered on any one day. The Cognitive Skills Booster programme does not teach offenders new skills but reinforces and consolidates the learning from the offender's attendance at the earlier General Offending Behaviour Programme which they must have completed successfully before undertaking this programme. By doing so, the programme aims to restore treatment gains to the same level as post the original GOBP and by doing so delay further the onset of recidivism.</p>	<p>JETS is a cognitive behavioural programme, based on principles of cognitive behaviour theory. It is targeted at male juveniles aged 15 to 18, who have a medium to high risk of re-offending. It aims to teach younger offenders how to behave and think in more pro-social ways by changing maladaptive thinking patterns, and providing opportunities for practising new more effective ways of thinking and behaving. The programme targets the thoughts feelings and behaviour, for change, recognising that these interact in complex ways, affecting and reinforcing each other.</p> <p>The programme is based on the premise that cognitive deficits prevent offenders from achieving their goals in pro-social ways. They lack skills in a number of key areas, which are associated with styles of thinking and attitudes. The programme is designed to teach juvenile offenders skills in problem solving, including thinking of alternative appropriate solutions and consequential thinking; social perspective-taking; self control; a more flexible cognitive style; critical reasoning and moral reasoning.</p>
<p>Designer/ Development history</p>	<p>Developed by Philip Priestley in partnership with the Home Office.</p>	<p>Developed jointly between the National Probation Directorate and HM Prison Service in 2003.</p>	<p>JETS has been written specifically for the juvenile age group. This is operationally defined by HM Prison Service as 15 to under 18, although some 18 year olds are present in juvenile establishments. The programme is targeted at males and is suitable for use with participants with diverse ethnic backgrounds. It is primarily aimed at groups of juveniles who are at risk of anti-social behaviour, not just offending and who have been assessed as having significant deficits in their cognitive abilities. The methods used by the Programme include cognitive behavioural techniques that have shown to be effective with offenders. The research includes the work of Meichenbaum and Goodman (1971) Goldstein (1981), Gibbs (1992), De Bono (1991) Ross and Fabiano (1990) Kohlberg and Ellis (1971).</p>

General Offending programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	PRIESTLEY ONE-TO-ONE	COGNITIVE SKILLS BOOSTER	THE JETS LIVING SKILLS PROGRAMME
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	20 sessions, each estimated to take 1-1.5 hours	10-12 by 2.5 hours	25 sessions of approximately 2 hours each, plus 7 individual sessions.
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	Accredited, March 2001	Recognised/Provisionally Accredited, September 2002 for use both in prison and in the community	
<i>Prison</i>	Not accredited for use in prisons		Provisional accreditation 2004 for use in prisons

Violence programmes

PROGRAMME	AGGRESSION REPLACEMENT TRAINING	CONTROLLING ANGER & LEARNING TO MANAGE IT	COGNITIVE SELF CHANGE PROGRAMME
Description of Programme	Aims to reduce aggressive behaviour through teaching social skills, anger management techniques and improved moral reasoning.	Canadian cognitive behavioural programme: teaches skills in managing anger and emotions and is aimed at offenders for whom anger/aggression features as a component in current or previous offending	US-based but adapted programme designed for adult offenders with a history of violence who are motivated to change their pattern of behaviour. Participants must have 12 months or more left to service in prison. Consists of 6 blocks, the final one of which takes place in the community after release.
Designer/ Development history	Developed by Wiltshire Probation Area in collaboration with the Home Office/National Probation Directorate	Written by B Winogron, M van Dieten and L Gauzas in Canada.	Originally developed by Jack Bush in USA
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	18 sessions, 2 hrs per session	24 sessions, 2 hours each	The programme utilises a rolling format thus total number of sessions is variable. 4 sessions per week, 75 minutes in length; additional fortnightly one to one sessions.
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	Fully accredited for males, Recognised/provisionally accredited for females, October 2001	Accredited, March 2004	Block 6 only, accredited for use in the community.
<i>Prison</i>	Not accredited for use in prisons	Accredited, September 2000	Fully accredited for use with males. Accredited, October 2000

Violence programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	HEALTHY RELATIONSHIPS PROGRAMME (HRP)	INTEGRATED DOMESTIC ABUSE PROGRAMME	COMMUNITY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAMME (CDVP)
Description of Programme	Uses a range of techniques, such as lectures, guided learning exercise and case studies, group debates, mental imagery, role playing and modelling to enable offenders to take responsibility for their behaviour and to develop skills in order that they may eliminate violent and abusive behaviour from their intimate relationships. The programme is available in a high and moderate intensity format specifically targeted at respective levels of risk presented in the area of domestic violence. Both programmes are made up of modules addressing among others, areas such as motivation, awareness, autobiographies, culture, social skills, problem solving skills and relapse prevention.	Integrated groupwork and individual session programme, for convicted adult male perpetrators of domestic abuse committed in the context of a heterosexual relationship. Programme includes interagency risk management and work with known victims.	Integrated domestic abuse programme for male perpetrators of domestic abuse including interagency risk assessment and risk management, contact with known victims, proactive offender management and core group work with men.
Designer/ Development history	Originally designed by Lynne Stewart and Natalie Garboro for CSC (Correctional Service of Canada) in 1998 and adapted for use in England and Wales in 2002.	Developed by NPD based on Duluth model of integrated response to domestic abuse. Piloted in West Yorkshire and parts of London.	Based on the Canadian Correctional Services: Family Violence programme, the moderate intensity version of this programme was previously accredited for delivery in the prison setting.
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	High intensity programme – 68-70 sessions of 2.5 hours. Moderate intensity programme – 24-26 sessions of 2.5 hours.	Rolling modular programme of 27 group work sessions preceded by 4 pre group sessions and followed by a minimum of 4 post group sessions. Must include proactive contact with known victims and interagency risk management.	26 sessions of group work plus 9 individual sessions
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	Not accredited for use in the community	Accredited, March 2004	Accredited
<i>Prison</i>	Accredited, October 2003	Not accredited for use in prisons	Not accredited for use in prisons

Programmes exclusively for women

PROGRAMME	WOMEN'S ACQUISITIVE CRIME PROGRAMME
Description of Programme	Motivational approach to offending by adult females who have committed a range of index offences in the context of acquisitive crime.
Designer/ Development history	Designed by T3 Associates for NPD this was the first programme to seek accreditation designed specifically for the needs of female offenders. Piloted in South Wales, Herefordshire and West Midlands.
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	Sequential 31 session groupwork programme building on the stages of change model.
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	Recognised/provisionally accredited, October 2003
<i>Prison</i>	Not accredited for use in prison

Substance Misuse programmes

PROGRAMME	ASRO	PRISM	DRINK IMPAIRED DRIVERS	RAPT SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMME
Description of Programme	Modular group work programme. Aims to teach offenders the skills required to reduce or stop substance misuse.	Programme for One to One delivery. Aims to teach offenders the skills required to reduce or stop substance misuse.	Programme combines cognitive behavioural work and education. Aims to reduce the risk of future drink related driving offences.	<p>Predominantly 12-Step programme, based upon a residential programme developed from the Minnesota Model, combined with elements from therapeutic communities, group therapy and cognitive strategies of behaviour modification.</p> <p>A medium to high intensity programme aimed at prisoners with severe and entrenched drug and offending behaviour. The 12-Step philosophy is abstinence. Believing that addiction is irreversible, the aim is to manage rather than cure the problem; the route to recovery is abstinence from all mood-altering substances.</p>
Designer/ Development history	Written by Dr Mary McMuran and Philip Priestley. Piloted in London, Beds, Lancs and Glos. Pilots involve both Probation and Partner staff.		Developed by South Yorkshire Probation Area in collaboration with the Home Office	Developed by the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust; based on the 12-step concept developed by Narcotics/Alcoholics Anonymous and designed to meet the needs of the individual within the prison environment.
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	20 sessions of 2.5 hours.	Twenty sessions: between 45 and 120 minutes each.	14 sessions of 2 hours.	<p>Pre-admission (assessment and education phase) – 2 sessions of 90 minutes each per week for 4 to 6 weeks</p> <p>Primary phase (covering first five of the 12 steps) – 12 weeks; five days per week; session of between one and two hours am and pm.</p> <p>Aftercare phase (focusing on skills training and relapse prevention) – 12 workshops of 2 hours, delivered once or twice per week.</p>

Substance Misuse programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	THE PRISONS PARTNERSHIP 12-STEP PROGRAMME (LANCASTER CASTLE)	PASRO	NORTH WEST AREA (FORMERLY GARTH & WYMOTT) THERAPEUTIC COMMUNITY	LEY PRISON PROGRAMME
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	Accredited, 2004	Accredited, 2004	Fully accredited for males, March 2001. Provisionally accredited for females, March 2004	Not accredited for use in the community
<i>Prison</i>	For use in the community	For use in the community	Not accredited for use in prisons	Accredited, September 2000

Substance Misuse programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	THE PRISONS PARTNERSHIP 12-STEP PROGRAMME (LANCASTER CASTLE)	PASRO	NORTH WEST AREA (FORMERLY GARTH & WYMOTT) THERAPEUTIC COMMUNITY	LEY PRISON PROGRAMME
<p>Description of Programme</p>	<p>This is a high dose, tailored twelve step programme which targets medium to high risk drug dependent offenders for whom there appears to be a link between their offending and problematic drug use. The programme is based on the Minnesota Model assuming addiction can be arrested but not cured with the philosophy that a combination of spirituality and pragmatism along with peer support are the primary means for achieving sustained sobriety. Abstinence from all mood-altering substances, not just the individual's substance of choice, is the overall aim of the programme.</p>	<p>Prison – Addressing Substance Related Offending (P-ASRO) is a low intensity cognitive behavioural therapy intervention designed to assist prisoners address drug use and related offending, learn and enhance skills and thinking patterns required to reduce or stop drug misuse and offending.</p>	<p>This hierarchical therapeutic community is designed to address drug offending behaviour needs of medium to high risk sentenced male prisoners who are substance dependent as defined by the DSM-IV criteria.</p> <p>Using a combination of social learning theory, cognitive behaviour skills and relapse prevention prisoners are encouraged to learn new behaviours, attitudes and values reinforced through peer and community modelling and support.</p>	<p>Cognitive behavioural therapy intervention delivered in a therapeutic milieu. Designed to address drug and offending behaviour needs of medium to high risk sentenced male prisoners who are substance dependent.</p> <p>Using a combination of social learning theory, cognitive behaviour skills and relapse prevention prisoners are encouraged to learn new behaviours, attitudes and values reinforced through peer and community modelling and support.</p>
<p>Design/Development History</p>	<p>This 12-Step model of change was designed and developed for the Prison Service by Anton Ashcroft, with considerable input from Paul Bevan and Chris Berry.</p> <p>It is a rolling programme consisting of three phases: Pre-admission phase – assessment and education Primary phase – the main core of the programme covering the first of the twelve steps. Aftercare phase –</p>	<p>This programme was adapted from the probation community based ASRO programme and developed by the Prison Service Drug Strategy Unit Central Model Team to be delivered in a prison setting meeting the specific needs of that environment and prisoners.</p>	<p>This programme was designed and developed for the Prison Service by prison psychologists at Garth and Wymott prisons with specialist input from Phoenix House.</p> <p>Entrants to the TC move through a series of stages; Pre-programme phase identifying suitability for treatment; Stage one- Induction, orientation, assimilating new residents to the community; Stage two – Primary Treatment, the core of the programme where emphasis is made on the values of right living; Stage Three – Re-entry, to prepare residents for release into the community.</p>	<p>Delivered at HMP Bullingdon. Developed by one establishment by external providers, Ley Community, who had prior experience of delivering therapeutic community treatment in the community setting.</p>

Substance Misuse programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	THE PRISONS PARTNERSHIP 12-STEP PROGRAMME (LANCASTER CASTLE)	PASRO	NORTH WEST AREA (FORMERLY GARTH & WYMOTT) THERAPEUTIC COMMUNITY	LEY PRISON PROGRAMME
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	<p>Pre-Admission phase – delivered am & pm 2 day a week for 4 weeks.</p> <p>Primary phase – delivered am & pm 5 days a week for 12 weeks.</p> <p>Aftercare phase – delivered 5 days a week, pm.</p> <p>Session length in all phases vary depending on type and/or content from 90 to 120 minutes.</p>	<p>Twenty-sessions programme divided into four modules delivered over a six –week period at a minimum of 3 sessions per week. Session length 2 hours</p>	<p>This programme can be completed within nine to twelve months depending on the individual's progress throughout each stage.</p> <p>Stage one – approximately 4-6 weeks.</p> <p>Stage two – approximately six month.</p> <p>Stage three – approximately 4-5 months.</p> <p>Number and session lengths will vary depending on type and content from 90 to 120 minutes.</p>	<p>The core programme runs for 32 weeks. Aftercare is delivered over a 4-week period.</p>
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	Not accredited for use in the community	Not accredited for use in the community	Not accredited for use in the community	Not accredited for use in the community
<i>Prison</i>	Accredited, September 2002	Accredited, December 2002	Accredited, May 2003	Accredited, March 2003

Substance Misuse programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	FOCUS	ACTION FOR DRUGS	STOP
Description of Programme	A high intensity Cognitive Behavioural Therapy	This is a medium intensity programme using a Cognitive Behavioural Therapy approach in addressing drug use and offending behaviour. It encourages prisoners to learn and enhance pro-social skills that will enable them to become and remain drug free and reduce risk of re-offending.	A medium intensity programme using a Cognitive Behavioural Therapy approach in addressing drug use and offending behaviour. It encourages prisoners to learn and enhance pro-social skills that will enable them to become and remain drug free and reduce risk of re-offending.
Designer/ Development history	This programme was designed and developed by HMPS High Security Estate. It is targeted at male offenders with a moderate to high risk of re-offending and who experience intermediate to severe substance use problems.	This programme was designed and developed by a consortium of six drug service providers who are currently providing drug treatment in prisons and have many years' experience of providing drug treatment in the community. The programme target group are male adults and young offenders who are medium to high risk of reconviction. The programme was designed and developed for the prison service by the team of staff delivering the programme at HMP Gartree. The programme target group are male adults and young offenders who are medium to high risk of reconviction.	This programme was designed and developed by a consortium of six drug service providers who are currently providing drug treatment in prisons and have many years' experience of providing drug treatment in the community. The programme target group are male adults and young offenders who are medium to high risk of reconviction. The programme was designed and developed for the prison service by the team of staff delivering the programme at HMP Gartree. The programme target group are male adults and young offenders who are medium to high risk of reconviction.
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	62 x 2-hour sessions, held 3-4 times a week. 3 individual sessions take place at the beginning, middle and end of the programme.	There are 48 sessions to be delivered at a minimum of three sessions per week over a period of 16 weeks. The average length of a session is 12 hours.	This programme is broken down into 90 one-hour sessions and 45 two-hour sessions delivered over a period of 12 to 15 weeks.
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	Not accredited for use in the community.	Not accredited for use in the community.	Not accredited for use in the community.
<i>Prison</i>	Accredited, May 2003.	Accredited, November 2003.	Accredited, November 2003.

Substance Misuse programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	SHORT DURATION PROGRAMME	OFFENDER SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAMME (OSAP)
<p>Description of Programme</p>	<p>Cognitive Behavioural Drug Treatment Programme with a focus on Harm Minimisation</p>	<p>A modular programme that aims to teach male and female medium to high risk offenders the skills required to reduce or stop substance misuse. It enhances the motivation to change, resolve ambivalence and explore the relationship between substance use. Offenders are asked to set goals for change. It focuses on understanding and learning how to manage risk, teaching offenders to self-monitor their thoughts about substance use, ways of coping with cravings and to identify high-risk situations. They are also encouraged to look to expand their options, taught 'coping by thinking' and 'coping by doing' skills. Offenders begin to develop their personal relapse prevention plans based on their combined cycle and are introduced to the relapse process. A series of social skills are taught and participants are encouraged to practice them in the group, setting as well as in the community. The programme enables participants to tie together their learning and facilitates the development of good goal setting in each life area, encouraging a non-drug and non-crime future lifestyle.</p>
<p>Designer/ Development history</p>	<p>In order to boost drug treatment provision for prisoners in custody for a short period (6 months left to serve or on remand), a Short Duration Programme (SDP) has been developed. Previously, the main focus of provision for this group was based on clinical support – commonly clinical services (detoxification) and CARATs (Counselling, Advice, Referral, Assessment, Throughcare service). Many prisoners in custody for less than six months do not spend sufficient time in prison to benefit from longer-term intensive drug treatment programmes. There was a risk that many, without this intervention, would continue to misuse drugs and re-offend upon release. As many women tend to be in custody for only a short time, the programme was being developed for women as well as adult males and young offenders.</p>	<p>Designed by the Correctional Services in Canada, this was called the Offender Substance Abuse Prevention Programme (OSAPP) in 1990. It was recently reviewed and amended to provide a programme with 3 levels of intensity (high, moderate and low). The Canadian programme is now called the National Substance Abuse Programme (NSAP).</p>
<p>Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions</p>	<p>There are 20 sessions of 2.5 hours including a 20-minute break. Sessions are to be delivered daily; therefore the course is completed in four weeks.</p>	<p>26 sessions of 2½ hours</p>
<p>Accreditation status for use in:</p> <p><i>Community</i></p>	<p>Adult male and female prisons and Young Offender Institutions</p> <p>Not accredited for use in the community.</p>	<p>Provisionally accredited 2004</p> <p>For use in the community</p>
<p><i>Prison</i></p>	<p>Accredited</p>	

Democratic Therapeutic Communities

DEMOCRATIC THERAPEUTIC COMMUNITY CORE MODEL	
Description of Programme	<p>Democratic Therapeutic Communities provide a holistic residential treatment approach where individuals are required to understand and change their ways of thinking, their feelings and their behaviour. Community structures and boundaries are established in order to encourage identified treatment needs to emerge and to be addressed by the community within the forums of exploring, learning about and feeding back on members' behaviour. This setting also provides the opportunity for residents to demonstrate and reinforce new skills acquired. The multi-disciplinary staff teams operate in a multi-modal way using a combination of theoretical approaches. The staff teams are led and supervised by Therapy Managers specialising in group therapy.</p> <p>Democratic Therapeutic Communities are aimed at those for whom a shorter intervention may be inadequate or where particular emotional and psychological needs may hinder engagement in other programmes.</p>
Designer/ Development history	<p>The Prison Service Panel accredited the Grendon A Wing Therapeutic Community in 1998. The Core Model was provisionally accredited in October 2003 and fully accredited in March 2004. This model supersedes the Grendon A Wing Accredited Model.</p>
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	<p>Treatment occurs during a prolonged residential stay in the TC. Treatment is usually completed after 18 months. However, this may vary depending on the individual. 3 years is normally the maximum time recommended though this can be extended for those with multifaceted needs who are continuing to engage in and respond to this therapeutic environment. The treatment model includes formal group work 5 days a week.</p>
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	<p>Not accredited for use in the community.</p>
<i>Prison</i>	<p>Accredited, March 2004.</p>

Sex offender programmes

PROGRAMME	COMMUNITY SEX OFFENDER GROUP PROGRAMME (C-SOGP)	THAMES VALLEY – SEX OFFENDER GROUPWORK PROGRAMME (TV-SOGP)	NORTHUMBRIA – SEX OFFENDER GROUP PROGRAMME (N-SOGP)
Description of Programme	Programme aims to reduce offending by adult male sex offenders	Programme aims to reduce offending by adult male sex offenders and to provide support to partners of perpetrators	Programme aims to reduce offending by adult male sex offenders
Designer/ Development history	Designed by staff in West Midlands Probation Area, developed in collaboration with the Home Office.	Set up as a joint initiative with health, police and social services. Developed in collaboration with the Home Office.	Developed by staff in Northumbria Probation Area and staff in the Sexual Behaviour Unit, Dept. of Forensic Psychiatry, St. Nicholas Hospital, Newcastle.
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	50 hour induction module. Low risk/low deviancy men then go directly to 50 hour. Relapse Prevention Programme. High risk/high deviancy men undertake full programme (250 hours) consisting of 6 modules. Men can join at the beginning of each module. Men who have successfully completed Prison SOTP can go directly to the Relapse prevention programme. Total length: either 100 hours or 260 hours depending on risk/deviancy profile	10 consecutive day Foundation Block. Victim Empathy block twice weekly sessions of 2 hours (60 hours) Life Skills block twice weekly sessions of 2 hours (40 hours) Relapse prevention weekly sessions of 2 hours (44 hours) Partners programme weekly sessions of 2 hours (36 hours) High risk/high deviancy men do whole programme, low risk, low deviancy men can miss out Life Skills block. Men who have successfully completed Prison SOTP can go directly to the Relapse prevention programme. Total length: either 196 hours for high risk/high deviancy men or 156 hours for low risk/low deviancy men	Offenders assessed as High Risk/Deviancy will attend the Core Group (144 hours minimum) followed by Relapse Prevention (36 hours) giving a total programme length of 180 hours. Low risk/Deviance offenders will normally complete individual preparation work followed by the Relapse Prevention Programme. Offenders released from prison will follow similar routes according to their assessment of risk and deviance. The Core Group is a rolling programme consisting of four blocks of 8 weeks. Sessions of 1.5 hours are delivered either in a block of 3 sessions a day on a weekly basis or 3 sessions spread over 2 evenings per week. Offenders may join at the start of any block. The RP group is a closed group running over a twelve week period of 3 hours per session.

Sex offender programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	COMMUNITY SEX OFFENDER GROUP PROGRAMME (C-SOGP)	THAMES VALLEY – SEX OFFENDER GROUPWORK PROGRAMME (TV-SOGP)	NORTHUMBRIA – SEX OFFENDER GROUP PROGRAMME (N-SOGP)
Accreditation status for use in:	Accredited, September 2000	Accredited, March 2001	Accredited, October 2001
<i>Community</i>			
<i>Prison</i>	Not accredited for use in prisons	Not accredited for use in prisons	Not accredited for use in prisons

Sex offender programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	PRISON SERVICE SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAMME	HEALTHY SEXUAL FUNCTIONING PROGRAMME (HSFP)
<p>Description of Programme</p>	<p>Consists of 5 separate programmes which prisoners are allocated to dependent on risk/treatment need. All programmes aim to reduce offending by adult male sex offenders</p> <p>Core originally accredited by Prison Service panel, but accredited in its present form in March 2000. 86 sessions. Addresses a range of offending behaviour challenging thinking patterns used by offenders to excuse and justify their behaviour, and teaching new attitudes and behaviours, related to positive, offence-free living.</p> <p>Adapted is the equivalent of the Core programme but is for lower functioning offenders.</p> <p>Extended for high risk/high need sex offenders who have already successfully completed the Core Programme.</p> <p>Rolling is for low risk sexual offenders and covers similar areas to the Core programme. The time spent on the programme varies depending on the needs of the individual, but is usually between 45 and 60 sessions.</p> <p>Better Lives Booster for those who have successfully completed the Core/Extended Programmes. Also available in Adapted format. Two versions available. A high intensity version for those close to release and a low intensity version for those who have completed SOTP work early in their sentences and need maintenance/refresher work. Allows prisoners to work on individual treatment needs and plan for release.</p>	<p>Individual programme, designed to help those who have had trouble with sexual fantasies related to offending or illegal behaviours. The programme helps participants think about what makes for a healthy intimate and sexual relationship and teaches techniques to control and change fantasies. Risk factors targeted by HSFP are: sexual preoccupation; sexual interest in children; interest in sexualised violence; other offence-related sexual interests. HSFP targets male sexual offenders for whom assessment, most commonly through SARN, and/or participation in other Sex Offender Treatment indicates that offence-related sexual interest is a significant treatment need.</p> <p>Methods used are: self-analysis and cognitive restructuring facilitated by Socratic questioning and feedback; applied behaviour/functional analysis; modelling of alternative thinking and behaviour; implementation of alternative thinking and behaviour outside the therapeutic context through goal-setting, skills practice and diary keeping; modelling of anti-criminal attitudes and behaviours; some instruction (kept to a minimum); skills building. Behaviour modification methods are also used, including: directed masturbation; modified covert sensitisation; verbal satiation; ammonia aversion.</p>
<p>Designer/ Development history</p>	<p>Developed by Prison Service staff based on effective programmes. Adapted programme developed in collaboration with Janet Shaw Clinic (a Medium-Secure NHS Trust).</p>	<p>Designed in response to the treatment needs of some offenders, particularly high risk, which are not currently met by the existing sex offender treatment programmes. All general methods used are cognitive-behavioural, as recommended by Hall (1995). The behaviour modification methods have been employed in the past by Laws & O'Neil (1981), Johnston, Hudson & Marshall (1992), Marshall and Eccles (1996) and Earls & Castonguay (1989), amongst others.</p>

Sex offender programmes (continued)

PROGRAMME	PRISON SERVICE SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAMME	HEALTHY SEXUAL FUNCTIONING PROGRAMME (HSFP)
<p>Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions</p>	<p>Core, 86 sessions; Extended, 70 sessions; Adapted, 85 sessions; Booster, 32 sessions (Core), 38 sessions (Adapted)</p> <p>Rolling, variable (45-60)</p> <p>All sessions 2 hours each</p>	<p>12-20 sessions lasting between 1 and 1½ hours</p>
<p>Accreditation status for use in:</p> <p><i>Community</i></p>	<p>Not accredited for use in the community</p> <p>All Fully Accredited, as follows: Core (revised), March 2000; Adapted, March 1998; Rolling, October 2001; Extended (revised), February 2002; Better Lives Booster, March 2004 (all versions).</p>	<p>Accredited in 2004.</p>
<p><i>Prison</i></p>		<p>Accredited in 2004.</p>

Accredited integrated systems

PROGRAMME	ENHANCED COMMUNITY PUNISHMENT
Description of Programme	<p>Enhanced Community Punishment covers the whole of a Community Punishment element of a CPRO (rather than providing an additional element to it). It is designed to maximise the opportunities for learning through performing unpaid work in order to enhance the likelihood of reducing reoffending on the part of those subject to it.</p>
Designer/ Development history	<p>ECP capitalises on the high levels of staff contact time with offenders on CP Orders to maximise the opportunities for learning pro social, anti criminal attitudes and behaviours. The scheme has been developed within the National Probation Directorate, together with a modular training programme designed to equip staff in all roles to deliver ECP.</p>
Number & Length of Core Programme Sessions	<p>The Scheme consists of five elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Case Management ensures that the scheme is targeted to appropriate offenders and administered in such a way as to ensure that their needs are addressed. • Placement Quality Standards are used to match offenders to placements most likely to have a rehabilitative effect. • All staff in contact with the offender make use of Pro Social Modelling techniques. • Supervisors make use of Problem Solving At Work techniques to help offenders to acquire employment related skills whilst performing unpaid work. • Guided Skills Learning schemes offer offenders the opportunity to work towards accredited awards in key and employment related skills.
Accreditation status for use in: <i>Community</i>	<p>Recognised/provisionally accredited, September 2002</p>
<i>Prison</i>	<p>Not accredited for use in prisons</p>

APPENDIX 1

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACCREDITATION PANEL: A STOCKTAKE

The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (originally named the Prison Service/ Probation Service Joint Accreditation Panel) has been in existence for about five years¹. However, the organisational and policy environment within which it operates has changed considerably during that time, and it is at present unclear for how long, or in what form, the Panel may continue. Clearly, the establishment of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) may significantly change thinking about the need for such a body and the kind of work it does. More broadly, while the notion of 'evidence led' policy and practice, which is fundamental to the work (indeed, to the very existence) of the Panel, is still endorsed within the Home Office, there is little doubt that it has slipped somewhat in the scale of priorities. This is due to a variety of factors, including new demands for Home Office funds, some disappointing research results (not just in 'corrections', but across a wide range of interventions evaluated under the Crime Reduction Programme²), serious concerns about failings in service delivery (which have driven an increasing focus on performance management rather than research), and arguably a general impatience with the 'academic' strictness of the exercise and the lengthy time-scales required to draw any firm conclusions about 'what works' (which clash with the wish to 'roll out' crime reduction measures as soon as possible). Whatever the reasons, budgets for the whole 'what works' enterprise have undergone cuts, and this has already affected the scale of the Panel's work.

In the light of these changes and uncertainties, it is the feeling of CSAP members that, whether or not the Panel continues in its present form, there are important lessons to be learned from their experiences over the past five years, and that it would be useful to record them (if only briefly) in writing. This paper sets out to take broad stock of the current situation through the eyes of Panel members, commenting on the organisational and policy context in which the Panel has worked, the main dilemmas it has faced, and the extent to which it has achieved its aims. Most importantly, it expresses members' views on how the foundations they have laid can best be built upon in the future. It is not concerned with detail about the work of the Panel or its history, much of which can be found in Annual Reports – especially 'CSAP: A Review of the First Five Years' in the 2003-4 Report. Equally, issues concerning research methodology are dealt with in detail in the Home Office paper 'What Works 2004' to which members have contributed comments.

¹ The Panel built on the prior work in the independent accreditation of offending behaviour programmes in prisons, undertaken by General Accreditation Panel (GAP) and Sex Offenders Treatment Accreditation Panel (SOTAP), which were set up in 1996.

² See Homel et al (2004); also a Special Issue of Criminal Justice (forthcoming 2005).

A brief overview: aims, dilemmas, achievements, disappointments

The Joint Accreditation Panel was set up in 1999 as an Advisory Non-Departmental Public Body, sponsored jointly by the Prison Service and Home Office Probation Unit (transferring subsequently to the National Probation Directorate). It was funded initially as part of the Crime Reduction Programme. Its appointed members – who included a number from North America - were all expert in relevant areas, several of them among the best known internationally in their field.

According to its first Annual Report, the Panel's core aim was to 'ensure that programmes which offenders undergo to reduce the likelihood of their re-offending fully reflect international research on the most effective ways to achieve that aim and that they are indeed effective.' This was to be achieved principally through (a) subjecting all proposed programmes to a rigorous process of examination, whereby only those which met a set of stringent criteria would receive accreditation and be adopted by the prison and probation services; and (b) regular quality audit of the sites delivering accredited programmes.

The accreditation process proved successful in many ways. The standards were set very high, and few programmes received full accreditation on first application. Panel members provided detailed feedback to designers, and major improvements in quality were often evident on resubmission. However, two problems in particular became more evident as time went on.

First of all, the What Works evidence base was limited. Much of the evidence about effectiveness came from North American research, primarily using the technique of 'meta-analysis', by which data and outcomes from numerous small-scale programme implementations can be combined and analysed on a large scale. However, these studies tell us little about how anything 'works' and it was by no means certain that any success would be replicated in system-level implementation of such models in England and Wales. As one of the main criteria for granting accreditation to a particular programme was evidence that it reduced reoffending, the Panel was therefore in the difficult position of either delaying accreditation for significant periods to await reconviction results from British studies, or granting it on the basis of 'plausible hypotheses' and indirect evidence (e.g. that the programme used methods that had been 'proven' elsewhere, or that it produced positive psychometric changes in participants which might be assumed to translate eventually into reduced reconviction rates). In some cases, such as programmes for women and for racially-motivated offenders, not only was there a lack of outcome research, but also no promising psychometric measures that could be used with any confidence. Moreover, several of the research projects which were set up to evaluate the effectiveness of new programmes proved inconclusive owing to poor implementation of the programmes, insufficient numbers of participants, high drop out rates, or large selection effects. Increasingly, therefore – especially as the kinds of interventions put forward for accreditation became more diverse, in some cases involving approaches on which there had been little pre-existing research – the Panel was compelled to make judgements on a poor evidence base.

Secondly, the notion of 'evidence led policy' is a somewhat idealistic one: obviously, there are many factors other than evidence which determine both policy and operational decisions. The Panel could not operate in an 'ivory tower' and had to take account both of the organisational structures within which programmes were to be implemented, and of the considerable pressures upon those charged with strategic management of the Services. For example, it was clear that, although considerable efforts were being made to 'join up' aspects of prison and probation work, there remained in reality major differences in culture and in ways of operating: this affected the Panel's frequent attempts to develop joint standards of delivery and audit procedures, as well as raising concerns about the effectiveness of 'throughcare' arrangements, which are important to the success of programmes. More importantly, the Panel were constantly aware of the operational pressures to 'roll out' programmes quickly: in some cases, a decision to delay accreditation – for example, on the basis of awaiting evaluation results - would have serious implications for the Services' achievement of ambitious targets set by the government (such as the NPD target of 30,000 offenders completing accredited programmes by 2004).

Neither of the above problems, it should be emphasised, are unusual: there are evidence gaps in many other areas of social intervention and medical treatment, producing tensions between the need to implement services and the need for further research. The general view of Panel members is that they developed good relationships with the two Services, in which both 'sides' did their best to find a way through the dilemmas and to satisfy operational necessities at the same time as setting high standards and nurturing effective practice and continuous quality improvement. They also continually emphasised the need to attack 'silo' thinking and for the two Services to work together whenever possible (it should be said that the Service representatives on the Panel were generally very supportive of these goals, but of course had only limited powers to achieve them).

Finally, it should be mentioned that some recent Home Office research has found that, while offenders taking cognitive-behavioural programmes were reconvicted at lower rates than expected, this was also true of control groups who had not taken the programmes. This has led to some questioning of the effectiveness of programmes generally. However, once again it is a common experience in many fields of social intervention that effects become less clear-cut following major expansions from model programmes to routine practice ('going to scale'). It should also be borne in mind that the 'What Works' initiative as a whole has probably had an impact on everyday practice in prison and probation, producing a more positive intervention culture outside as well as within specific programmes: this may partly explain the shrinking differences in reconviction rates between intervention groups and control groups. Even so, it remains likely that outcomes have been negatively affected by the necessary compromises that have been made between on the one hand, high standards of evidence, design and implementation and, on the other, operational and political exigencies. The key challenge, taken up in the second part of this paper, is to find new ways of building on what has been learnt – in terms of evaluation as well as practice without falling prey to the mistake of concluding that disappointing early results mean that this important element of the What Works experiment 'hasn't worked', and as a consequence 'throwing the baby out with the bathwater' (i.e. by abandoning attempts to reduce re-offending through interventions and returning to control and containment alone).

Key lessons for future work

The discussion of key lessons and implications for future work is set out under four headings: integrated systems and case management; research and evaluation; a regional focus; and the future role of CSAP (or its successor) in terms of accreditation, audit and advice.

Integrated systems and case management

One of the most important 'journeys' made by the Panel over the last five years has been its growing conviction that a focus on individual programmes alone is not sufficient to promote effective practice and hence to make a significant difference to reconviction rates. While the quality of such programmes and their delivery remains very important, it is vital that they are delivered within the context of 'end to end' offender-focused systems which integrate individual interventions through effective case management. This includes proper assessment and motivation of the offender, preparation for interventions, support throughout them, and reinforcement afterwards. In the case of prisoners, it demands genuine 'through the gate' case management – one of the elements lacking in much current programme design and delivery which has been most frequently criticised by the Panel as a prime example of the 'silo' thinking which limits the effectiveness of programmes. Such ideas are now enshrined to some degree in the new systems to be set up under NOMS, the basic principles of which are generally welcomed by Panel members. Indeed, well before such ideas were taken up by policy-makers, the Panel promoted them by developing 'system accreditation' in addition to programme accreditation. Enhanced Community Punishment was the first 'system' to gain such accreditation. The Panel has also spent a great deal of time advising on the development of both hostels and resettlement 'systems', which incorporate the same kind of thinking. These are developments which the Panel would wish to encourage. Alongside them, the Panel would also like to see the use of new evaluation methodologies based on tracking samples of offenders through a variety of interventions over time, rather than on simple comparisons between offenders taking part or not taking part in one specific programme (see below).

Research and evaluation

The main 'lesson' to which members would draw attention in relation to research is that it is important to move away from undertaking too many small, ad hoc evaluations of individual interventions, which often fail (through no fault of the researchers) to produce conclusive results. Generally speaking, it is argued that (a) research needs to be planned and conducted in a strategic manner, in full awareness of the level of resources available; (b) (assuming that CSAP continues in something like its present form) Panel members need to play a full part in discussions about the research strategy; and (c) such research needs to be based on different methodologies, including (where appropriate) randomised controlled trials, as well as attempts to track, capture and measure the impact of the 'whole experience' of offenders as they move through a variety of interventions. It is emphasised, too, that these larger quantitative studies can be usefully supported by more qualitative, process-focused research at a local level, which may provide indications of where to seek answers to questions about how and why particular interventions appear to work better in some situations and locations than in others.

The Panel is hopeful that the National Offender Management Service will provide a context in which these ambitions can be achieved and looks forward to working with the new Service to this end. Members also wish to emphasise the potential value to RDS NOMS (the research arm of NOMS) both of expert independent advice – including advice based on knowledge of international research - about overall strategy for 'what works' research, and of independent corroboration of the conclusions drawn from the research they undertake or commission.

A regional focus

One of the core elements of NOMS is its regional focus. Regional Offender Managers (ROMS) will be given considerable autonomy in devising strategy at the regional level, and there are important consequences both for the development of effective local systems of case management and referral (such as regional resettlement systems, as already quite extensively piloted in the South-West and other regions) and experimentation with ideas such as mentoring, regional partnership, and so on. It is also possible that regional strategies may produce more variation in the range of interventions procured and in how they are packaged and integrated together. The Panel generally supports these moves, which have the potential for much better integrated service delivery, as well as for the designing in of evaluation at a regional level.

Future role of CSAP (or its successor): accreditation, audit and advice

The Criminal Justice Act 2003 sets out the purposes of sentencing. These include rehabilitation and public protection. In deciding upon sentence, sentencers will want to be assured that offender managers are proposing interventions that are well informed by current evidence. The Act also includes a reference to 'accredited programmes' as an option on the menu for sentencers, as well as to an 'accreditation body'. This suggests that the principle of accreditation by an independent body is established for the foreseeable future. The existence of the process of accreditation provides some assurance to sentencers that design and delivery has taken account of available evidence. Unless there are strong reasons to the contrary, it seems sensible to continue with an existing Panel which has built up a considerable amount of experience and knowledge in this respect. Equally, quality audit of sites delivering programmes remains an important task, and there appears to be clear value in using the accumulated experience of an independent Panel to examine and approve the methodology and adequacy of any audit processes which are undertaken by the new Service.

It is recognised that, with the proposed move towards 'contestability', current accreditation practices may have to be significantly revised. In particular, attention will have to be given to the potential impact (in terms of costs and risks) upon programme design contractors,

of demanding criteria and lengthy accreditation processes. It may be that more use will have to be made of 'provisional' accreditation, or different levels of accreditation established, to take account of this. In addition, it may be sensible to remove 'evaluation' from the list of accreditation criteria that each individual programme is currently required to meet, and to transfer responsibility for assessing effectiveness to the Research and Evaluation Sub-Panel, which would be able to take a more strategic approach to evaluation, in close consultation with RDS NOMS.

At the same time, while recognising these realities, the Panel holds firmly to the principle that practice should be evidence based. Indeed, 'contestability', it argues, should be as much about seeking the best in terms of quality and outcomes as about seeking cost-effectiveness. Experience of contestability in other countries suggests that, without adequate attention to these issues, there is a danger of its benefits being diluted and standards slipping to unacceptably low levels. For this reason, it is important to pay serious attention to the requirements of evaluation (including the collection of necessary data) in the 'rollout' of interventions, and for an independent body such as the Panel periodically to review evidence on the effectiveness of particular interventions (and of their implementation).

In conclusion, most members see a future role for CSAP (or a successor body with similar expertise) not only in accrediting programmes and approving audits, but as an advisory body (a) to the new Offender Management Service, at both national and regional level, on the kinds of services they should be purchasing; and (b) to RDS NOMS on research strategy and methodology. The key contributions that such a body can make to the new system are to assist in the promotion and assurance of quality in the design and delivery of interventions, and in the maintenance of faith in, and focus upon, evidence-based interventions (albeit in full awareness of practical and financial constraints). It is in these areas that the Panel has already proved its value, and in adapting to the new situation (which in many ways reflects the kinds of changes it has been advocating), it can continue to add important value to the new, integrated approaches to offender management and rehabilitation.

Secretary to the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel
National Offender Management Services
Home Office
3rd Floor, Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

