



CRIMINAL JUSTICE SOCIAL WORK
DEVELOPMENT CENTRE *for* SCOTLAND

Towards Effective Practice: Paper 2

December 2002

‘Work in Progress’ - An Audit of Criminal Justice Social Work Provision in Scotland 2001-2002

Bill Whyte

Introduction

One of the first tasks carried out by the CJSW Development Centre in 2001 was to undertake an audit of Criminal Justice Social Work provision in Scotland. This was updated at the end of 2002. The aim of the audit was to establish a national picture of the main areas of structured activity in community based programme and service development in Scotland.

As with any survey the data returns provide only a snapshot of structured provision at the time of the survey and cannot be seen as an up-to-date or accurate picture of an ever changing landscape. While systematic and structured intervention approaches are essential to work aimed at reducing offending, structured programmes are not the only important ingredient in assisting offenders sustain change and desist from offending. The focus of the audit, however, was primarily on identifying structured and systematic programmes and not on other areas of provision that may be equally important to reducing offending. The survey schedule did not attempt to define ‘programme’ in any restrictive way and the data reflect respondents’ views of a systematic and structured programme of intervention.

All of the data gathered and analysed is available in an electronic version to registered members through the Development Centre’s internet portal at www.cjsw.ac.uk. We hope this will allow agencies to comment on the accuracy of the data as well as assist colleagues share existing expertise and pool resources in generating evidence of effective practice provision. Table references in the summary below, relate to Tables in the electronic version, which provide full spread sheets of the raw data collected.

All local authority criminal justice social work managers and key agencies in the independent sector were invited to complete a questionnaire. The initial audit provided a snapshot of provision in the summer of 2001. A brief up-date was carried out in May/June 2002. In total, replies were received from 35 agencies representing 30 local authorities and 5 voluntary agencies, some of whom provided more than one return for individual projects.

The audit has served as an aid to establish priorities for the Centre’s development activities. The data will also be used as a baseline to generate information over time about the changing needs of agencies and to share information on provision.

Intervention Programmes

The audit returns indicate that a wide range of intervention programmes (Table 1 electronic version) are in operation across Scotland having been developed by local authorities and independent agencies, often in partnership. Most programmes are aimed at personal change and skill acquisition as well as focusing directly on offending behaviour. This reflects a very significant change in the operational approach and style of criminal justice social work provision since the introduction of National Objectives and Standards for Social Work Services and the Criminal Justice System in 1991.

Programmes are operating or being developed in the field of addictions, both alcohol and drug related work, anger management, alternative to custody programmes, general offending behaviour, employment and social skills acquisition, sex offences, car crime and domestic abuse (Figure 1). A number of programmes are available specifically for women and young offenders, however relatively few programmes are aimed at specific age, offence or risk groups. One programme was identified as aimed at anti-racist practice. Most programmes are relatively all embracing 'general offending' programmes and have been designed to suit most offenders although they may contain many specialist elements within them. The majority of programmes are aimed at medium to high risk offenders.

Figure 1. Areas of Programme provision*

Addictions (25)	Domestic violence (17)	Restorative measures (1)
Anger management (11)	Employment skills (4)	Sex offenders (14)
Anti-discrimination (2)	Female Offenders (7)	Victim Awareness (5)
Car related offences (5)	General Offending (88)	Young Offenders (9)
Custody Alternatives (3)	Life skills (11)	

**The data may not include programmes delivered by one local authority but available to another. Some programmes may be delivered across more than one authority.*

Table 2 (electronic version) provides the same data organised by agency and outlines the programme provision available in each Local Authority and independent agency at the time of the audit. Every local authority who responded reported some structured programme work in operation either on an individual (1:1) basis or delivered as a group work programme.

The most noticeable feature of the data on programmes is that over 80 general offending programmes are reported in operation across the country. A number of 'off the shelf' programmes are also in operation on a 1:1 or group-work basis. For example, general offending programmes such as *(Effective) Targets for Change* was reported in use in some form by twenty eight agencies mainly for male offenders; *Stop Think and Change* (STAC) by ten agencies; the *Change* programme (a domestic abuse programme) and *Constructs* (a general offending programme) by four agencies for both males and females; the *Grampian Drug and Alcohol Pack* in four agencies; *Offending is not the Only Choice* in six agencies and *Reasoning and Rehabilitation* in four. Many of these programmes have been customised and adapted to suit local circumstances and to suit the Scottish context. A large number of the available programmes (45) were described as having been designed 'in-house'. Monitoring the use of these programmes and their potential for meeting the likely criteria for accreditation would seem important.

The greatest area of specialist activity seems to be in the development of programmes for sex offenders with 14 agencies reporting 16 programmes in operation. Only one programme was identified as specifically available for young people. The data suggest that a wide range of experience is developing. The work of the Development Centre's 'champion' group on sex offenders has built on this growing expertise to assist in the promotion of programmes, both group work and individual (2:1), to meet future accreditation requirements in both criminal and youth justice.

The audit identified a small number (7) of specialist programmes specifically for young offenders available both for young people in the Children's Hearing system and the Criminal Justice system. Since the audit was undertaken there have been significant developments in this field. The requirements on local authorities to

audit youth justice provision is likely to assist in better co-ordination of provision across the interface of the Children's Hearings and Criminal Justice system to support the sharing of expertise and the avoidance of duplication. Similarly a relatively small number of community based programmes specifically designed or operated for women (6 - Table 1) were reported. This may be an under-reporting. It may equally suggest that, to date, there is limited systematic and structured programme work in this area.

SACRO was the only agency to report the provision of restorative justice approaches. Recent government funding has seen the development of such approaches developed in all authorities across the whole of Scotland.

Respondents were asked to identify programmes or elements of programmes subject to ongoing evaluation. Twenty one agencies indicated some ongoing evaluation in 40 programmes (Table 11). This was mainly in-house or between partners and informal; a small number (4) were reported as subject to ongoing external academic evaluation. A few agencies indicated they were using evaluative data to profile the characteristics of individual offenders and to begin to establish progress/outcome measures that could be made more widely available to others. The findings of twenty one evaluations were reported as available in writing.

Programmes Required

Respondents were asked to identify existing gaps in provision. While a wide range of programme provision was reported across the country, agencies also reported a wide range of areas that require to be developed further in order to meet the needs of those for whom no appropriate programmes are currently available in particular areas. All of the agencies identifying 'need' indicated that they were working on developing provision in these areas. These included, in the short term, the need to develop programmes in the following areas (Table 3 electronic version - short term gaps):

Figure 2. Short Term Needs

Car related offences (2)	Learning Disability (2)	Restorative measures (2)
Cognitive behavioural (2)	Literacy (1)	Relapse prevention (2)
Diversion/arrest referral (2)	Mediation/reparation	Interface CHS- CJS (4)
Domestic violence (2)	Mental health problems (4)	Sex offenders (7)
Drug/alcohol (11)	Multi-agency prov. (2)	Supported accomm. (1)
Employment (1)	Outdoor/leisure (2)	Rural programmes (3)
Evaluation (4)	Out of hours progs. (1)	Women offenders (9)

The list of long term requirements (Table 4 electronic version - long term gaps) reported, were very similar to short term requirements with the additional issues listed in Figure 3 below.

Figure 3. Additional Long Term Needs

Accredited programmes	Family work	Prevention
Case management	Fire raising	Racist offences
Consultancy	Integrated provision	Through care provision
Deferred sentence provision	High risk & violent offenders	

Data returns shown in Figure 1 suggest that many, if not most, of the short term 'areas of need' identified in Figure 2 are being responded to by some agencies and that programmes are running or being developed in most of the 'areas of need' identified. The potential for pooling and sharing experience and expertise both within the criminal justice social work groupings and across local authority groupings is clear. The size and scale of some agencies and groupings will allow them to develop expertise and to move towards accreditation more easily than others. It is our hope that developing national groups to 'champion' good models of practice and to support designs suitable for accreditation may provide an effective mechanism for linking those with programme 'experience' to those with programme 'need'.

Respondents also identified clientele they considered less suitable or possibly unsuitable for structured

programmes. These included individuals with mental health problems, with personality difficulties, some sex offenders - particularly those with learning disabilities, chaotic drug users and those non consenting offenders under imposed supervision, such as non parole licences. These categories of offenders present major challenges to supervisors. Practice frameworks would assist practitioners manage individuals who present high levels of risk or who present individual characteristics that cannot readily be responded too within a more routine structured programme framework. Risk management frameworks may begin to provide assistance in this direction. A very practical difficulty, reported by a number of agencies, was the challenge of adapting group work programmes for 1:1 or 2:1 supervision, particularly in rural settings.

Assessment tools

A range of standardised assessment tools were reported in use to assist professional assessment of 'risk' and 'need' (Table 5 electronic version). Table 6 (electronic version) provides the same data organised by agency and outlines the range of assessment tools in use in each Local Authority and independent agency. As with programmes, all respondents reported the use of some structured assessment tools. The use of standardised tools now seems common place and indicates a very marked and positive change in practice across the country, since the introduction of National Objectives and Standards in 1991.

Two standardised tools were most commonly reported in use. *Dunscore*, developed in Dundee University in the early 1990s, was reported in use by 19 agencies. It uses past history and unchangeable or 'static' factors to establish a measure of risk of custody. *Level of Service Inventory – revised* (LSI-r), a commercial tool developed in North America, was reported in use by 21 agencies. It identifies changeable or 'dynamic' factors associated with criminality as an aid to establishing a measure of risk of re-offending and to identify the areas of priority focus for intervention.

Dunscore was being used to assist in assessment of risk of custody and for Social Enquiry Report (SER) decision making, gate keeping, targeting and for monitoring SER recommendations. It is now a considerable time since this tool was designed and little systematic development on its use has been undertaken in recent years. If it continues to be widely used, some up-date work on its validity and usage may be required. *Level of Service Inventory – revised* (LSI-r) was the most commonly reported 'dynamic' measure in use. Seventeen agencies indicated that they attempt to use LSI-r to determine the level of service provision on offer to particular risk categories and to assist vary the intensity or duration of programmes to match the measured risks. The majority reported its use for SER decision making and gate keeping for which a 'static' tool would be equally appropriate. While research (Raynor 2000) suggests that LSI-r is an effective risk assessment tool (except for very high risk offenders) its primary strength lies in assisting the targeting of intervention/resources towards changeable or dynamic crime related (criminogenic) need and to measure change and progress over time. One agency indicated it was using the data generated to profile offender-crime related need within their area.

The most frequently reported risk management and risk assessment aid in use was the Scottish Executive's *Risk Assessment Framework* (RA1-4). RA1 is based on static risk factors; RA2 is based on evidenced dynamic risk factors and RA3 & 4 based on known predictors of harm. Twenty nine agencies reported using the framework to assist them in risk management and risk assessment. Forms RA3-4 were reported as commonly completed for higher risk offenders, particularly those released from custody and for serious violent offenders and sex offenders. These seem to be used to complement other tools such as LSI-r or more specialist tools in the case of assessment of sex offenders. The Risk Assessment Framework does not include a scoring mechanism to allow the aggregation of data for analysis and strategic planning purposes.

Eleven agencies reported using *CrimePics* or *CrimePics II*, a commercial problem inventory and attitude measure, as an additional tool, usually in combination with the Risk Assessment Framework, particularly within probation, to establish changes in attitude and problem perception over time.

Agencies reported using more specialised tools for specific areas of practice. Variations of *Matrix 2000* were reported in use by seven agencies for assessment of sex offenders. The *Christo Inventory for Substance-misuse Services* (CISS), a freeware validated tool for assessment and outcome measurement, was reported in use by five agencies for work in addictions; the *Grampian Pack*, developed by the Scottish Executive

and former Grampian region, which provides drug and alcohol preference measures, was reported in use by six agencies. *ASSET*, the Youth Justice Board's (England and Wales) risk assessment tool and *Youth Level of Service Inventory* (YLS), a commercial tool developed in North America, were reported in use by a few agencies in their assessment of young people. Apex were the only agency to report the use of tools used in employment related work (the *Rickter scale* and their own employment pack). Three agencies reported using tools specifically aimed at assessing literacy – a major issue for many offenders.

One specialist project, the Tayside sex offender project, uses its own assessment tool (Tayprep30), likely to be adopted by police across Scotland. Two agencies reported using a self developed car crime questionnaire and anger management schedule to assist in their assessment work. The Scottish Executive commissioned research on the use of assessment tools across professions has subsequently provided range of uses to which standardised tools are put as well as the strengths and limitations of standardised tools, and assist in promoting consistency and quality of use.

In all, thirty one agencies reported classifying offenders broadly into high, medium and low risk for the purposes of gate keeping and targeting the provision of supervision (Table 7 electronic version - classification by risk level); seventeen suggested they used the classification to vary the level of intervention.

Maintenance and Follow-up

The importance of maintaining change over time is well recognised. Equally follow-up data on reconvictions or self reported re-offending is one, though only one, essential element to establishing the impact of interventions on offending over time. Eleven agencies (Table 8 electronic version) reported some exit or follow up strategy. Nine of these related to client satisfaction or self evaluation measures at the end of the programme. None reported follow up over time to establish longer term outcomes. One agency reported using LSI-r to measure change over time at the end of programmes.

Thirteen agencies reported maintenance work (Table 9 electronic version); four of these related to relapse prevention work with sex offenders and offenders with drug problems. One agency continued a reporting 'clinic' after programme completion – no time scales were noted. Two agencies indicated they had the facility for offenders to repeat all or parts of programmes if required although this was not a routine part of programme planning. Two independent agencies working with young offenders reported the provision of after-care support, in one case up to three months after completion. Two agencies noted the need to have Scottish Criminal Records Office (SCRO) or self report data on future criminality but suggested that this is not possible in the present SCRO arrangements – a problem likely to be facing all agencies.

The overall picture emerging suggests that exit measures, follow up planning and ongoing maintenance work is becoming more common place though not yet a routine part of programme delivery. Problems in the availability of SCRO data seem to be a major limitation for all service providers and as a result there seems to be limited routine or systematic attempt to establish re-offending or reconviction rates over time. The issue of follow up and outcome data requires to be addressed at a policy and strategic level.

CJSW Development Centre

One objective of the audit was to elicit agency views on their expectations of the CJSW Development Centre in its early years. The most common request was for assistance in meeting the criteria set for the accreditation of programmes; indeed in some responses the request was for help to understand the criteria as well as how to apply it. Many agencies indicated they would need particular assistance with evaluation methods, as well as advice and guidance on their existing programmes before these could be piloted for accreditation. Specific expectations of the Centre included

- providing a central contact point and list of useful contacts to support a locally based forum/network
- help with evaluation work and the provision of up to date research
- information about innovative practice and what works? in Scotland and elsewhere
- publications including, practical guidance, information bulletins, and resource lists.

Priorities identified for future briefing papers included subjects such as

- Accreditation
- Effectiveness
- Monitoring, evaluation, design and implementation
- Addiction problems
- Legislation and policy
- Mentally disordered offenders
- Learning difficulties
- Risk Assessment
- Sex offenders
- Women offenders
- Youth justice and interface

The Centre's electronic portal (www.cjsw.ac.uk) now provides a Bulletin Board facility to allow practitioners and managers to establish a dialogue on any issue and to share experience and information on service development. A central data base with details of registered members and their interests has also been established. Bibliographic material including reports, journal articles, summaries and references to research is now available in a limited form and will be developed over the coming year. The Centre's briefing paper series is available electronically from the portal.

The CJSW Development Centre will continue to provide ad hoc advice and consultation in addition to its work with 'champion' groups. A number of priorities for advice and development work were identified by respondents. These included

- programme development and accreditation, especially in a rural context
- formation of locally based CJSW forum for practitioners
- evaluation
- effective networking and sharing of skills and experience
- developing links with cognitive/behavioural programmes delivered in prisons
- promoting consistency in assessment and intervention nationally
- diversion
- caseload management
- arrangements for staff secondment
- assistance in identifying appropriate training to meet demands of tasks

Training and Development

The data highlights the range of demands on agencies to provide interventions across a wide range of criminal justice fields. The associated training and development needs of staff are substantial. Table 10 (electronic version) provides a snapshot of the training reported as undertaken between 2000 and 2001. Figure 4 (below) provides a summary of the activity reported and shows that agencies are engaged in providing a wide range of development opportunities for their staff.

Figure 4. Training undertaken

Sex Offenders (16)	Risk management (7)	Specific programme training
Effectiveness -What Works? (7)	Anger & aggression, (2)	e.g. STAC, 1:1, Change, Targets for Change; Managing Change; Values Enhancement, Offending is not the Only Choice
Drug/alcohol (7)	Motivational interviewing (2)	
LSI-r (7)	Personal construct psychology (2)	
Group-work (6)	Pro-Social modelling (2)	Advanced Awards
Cognitive/behavioural work (5)	Youth Crime (2)	
Constructs (4)	Literacy (1)	External consultancy
Domestic abuse (4)	Gender/masculinity	
Mental disorders (3)	Anti-racist Training	

Not all agencies have been able to provide formal training or development opportunities to promote effective practice. Figure 5 provides a summary of the gaps reported. The need for opportunities for staff development and training is wide ranging, although it mirrors the range of activities already undertaken by many agencies.

Figure 5. Training gaps

Effective Practice (what works) (7)	Young offenders (4)	Pro-social modelling (2).
Advanced risk assessment (6)	Drugs and alcohol (3)	Domestic abuse
Group-work skills (6)	Women offenders (3)	Management
Monitoring and evaluation (5)	violence/aggression (3)	Challenging racism
Sex Offender (Advanced) (5)	Mental Disorder	Car crime
especially young people		Literacy

Final Comment

The data available has to be treated with caution both because of the methodology involved in gathering the data and also because the picture is certain to be changing constantly. Nonetheless this audit provides evidence of a dramatic and positive change in practice over the ten years since the introduction of National Objective and Standards for Criminal Justice Social Work. Inevitably any snapshot becomes dated very quickly and it is our intention to update the material at least annually. However we are able to amend the electronic version more frequently and would welcome any updated or additional information to add to the existing electronic database.

Bill Whyte

Find out more at <http://www.cjsw.ac.uk>

The Centre intends to establish an effective network for information exchange, dialogue and dissemination of good practice in Scotland. A 'virtual centre' to link practitioners and managers throughout Scotland and beyond is now available. Please see the website for further details.

Contact CJSW

We want to hear from you! Tell us what you think of the briefing paper and the website. Are you establishing Restorative Justice projects? If you have original data and/or would like to write a briefing paper or to share good ideas or any 'wee gems' about your practice, let us know. You can contact us at cjsw@ed.ac.uk

1FR, 31 Buccleuch Place,
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh
EH8 9LJ

Tel: 0131 651 1464
Fax: 0131 650 4046