



# Community Justice Social Work: Throughcare Review

Published: September 2021

# CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
1 <b><u>Introduction</u></b>	<b>3</b>
2 <b><u>Key messages</u></b>	<b>4</b>
3 <b><u>Delivery of key throughcare processes</u></b>	<b>5</b>
4 <b><u>Policy, procedures and legal measures</u></b>	<b>9</b>
5 <b><u>Impact and experience of breach/recall</u></b>	<b>10</b>
6 <b><u>Conclusions</u></b>	<b>11</b>
7 <b><u>Next steps</u></b>	<b>13</b>
Appendix 1 <b><u>How we conducted this review</u></b>	<b>14</b>
Appendix 2 <b><u>Quality Indicator Framework</u></b>	<b>16</b>
Appendix 3 <b><u>Terms we use in this report</u></b>	<b>17</b>

## 1. Introduction

The Scottish Government established the national criminal justice Recover, Renew, Transform (RRT) programme in response to the ongoing impact of Covid-19 on the justice system in Scotland. One of the tasks of the Recovery of Community Justice and Prevention of Offending sub-group was to explore breach of licence and recall to prison. This was to further understanding of recall and related processes to reduce the number of people being recalled to custody, where appropriate.

In March 2021, the Care Inspectorate received a request from the sub-group to undertake a focused piece of work relating to breach of licence/recall to custody. The Care Inspectorate is the independent body responsible for undertaking scrutiny, to provide assurance and support improvements in justice social work. This report sets out the findings of a review of throughcare with a primary focus on community justice social work practice.

The scope of the work was relative to the recovery status and available resources of the sector, the resources of the scrutiny team and the timescales for reporting. As a result, while recognising that community justice social work does not operate in a vacuum, wider scrutiny of the throughcare process from point of sentence to conclusion was not considered. The review considered community justice social work practice across four local authority areas. These areas were selected based on size of available sample, service model and geographical spread. Selection was not based on any concerns regarding perceived service delivery risk.

As part of the review, we also gathered the views of individuals from across Scotland who had been recalled to prison following a breach of their throughcare licence conditions. Details of the methods used to complete the review are included in [Appendix 1](#).

The review sought to:

- identify potential barriers to reintegration; and
- seek assurance that community justice social work contributions to breach and recall processes were operating as they should.

Sincere thanks to everyone who contributed to the review.

## 2. Key messages from practice

- Community justice social work services have a coherent and consistent understanding of their statutory duties under the full range of national guidance and relevant legislation pertaining to the various throughcare release licences and orders.
- Staff are clear in their role and committed to protecting the public and supporting individual change. They feel their contribution to throughcare practice is valued by their service.
- In collaboration with community partners, community justice social work services are making a significant effort to overcome systemic barriers to reintegration faced by individuals, particularly relating to securing suitable accommodation on release.
- The management of risk is a significant strength. Risk management plans are of a consistently high standard. Planning and collaborative working to manage or reduce risk is equally strong. When risk can no longer be managed safely in the community, breach procedures are robust. When recall is deemed appropriate, individuals are swiftly returned to custody.
- While community justice social work staff view the LS/CMI (Level of Service/Case Management Inventory) system as usefully informing and supporting practice, there are barriers to using its full functionality.
- Parole Board oral hearings are impacting on service capacity and staff morale. Social work staff are required to commit significant time and are often experiencing hearings as adversarial in nature.
- Staff and services do not always have the access they feel they need to key learning and development opportunities to support best practice.

### Key messages from individuals with a lived experience of breach and recall

- Forming trusting and transparent relationships with supervising social workers who know them, alongside a clear understanding of manageable licence conditions were viewed as central to supporting a successful reintegration.
- Individuals often received the support they needed to secure accommodation and address problematic drug and alcohol use.
- Timely access to mental health provision and purposeful use of time were viewed as key for reducing the likelihood of recall.

### 3. Delivery of key throughcare processes

**In this section, we look at the extent to which the justice service recognises the need for help and support and provides this at the earliest opportunity. We consider the quality of assessment and planning and the range and quality of different types of intervention.**

#### How well do staff provide help and support?

Community justice social work staff were fully aware of the barriers individuals encounter when leaving prison and the challenges they face in reintegrating back into their communities. Staff recognised that individuals needed access to a range of support services and in most instances, individuals were referred or signposted to relevant services at the earliest opportunity.

Every individual had a suitably allocated supervising social worker. Upon release from custody, individuals were invariably seen on the day of release unless there was a legitimate reason which was outwith the control of the service. Early engagement with supervising social workers, a standard requirement of licence conditions, also offered timely opportunities to address immediate needs. Where available, some individuals also benefitted from additional support from paraprofessionals and third sector agencies.

Robust efforts were made to remove barriers for the individual. On release, staff worked hard to ensure fundamental basic needs were met, including securing accommodation, supporting benefit claims and facilitating access to food. Where required, individuals were also supported to access other relevant supports, including GP services and drug and alcohol support.

There were systemic barriers, beyond the control of community justice social work which were getting in the way of a successful reintegration. For example, it was not routinely possible for services to reserve the safest, most suitable accommodation prior to release. This meant individuals leaving custody without an address had the anxiety of not knowing where they would be sleeping on the day of release. For others, being accommodated at a distance from support networks disrupted important links to the community, making reintegration more challenging.

Meeting crucial needs was made more difficult when individuals were released on a Friday or some distance from their home area, particularly if they had to present as homeless and had no access to funds. Claiming state benefits such as Universal Credit was described by staff as an exhausting experience for individuals. The process caused stress, anxiety and delays in receiving money acted as a significantly demotivating factor. For some individuals, lack of access to opportunities which supported the purposeful use of time contributed to social isolation and undermined motivation.

There were clear messages about gaps in services which are critical to successful reintegration, specifically timely access to mental health support. Barriers related to individuals either not meeting the criteria for a service or experiencing lengthy waiting times resulting in needs not being met.

Effective pre-release planning promoted the likelihood of a successful transition from custody to community. Services prioritised attendance at pre-release Integrated Case Management (ICM) meetings therefore the rate of attendance by community justice social workers was high. Building relationships, communicating release plans and providing reassurance so that individuals knew what was expected upon release was more challenging when individuals were in prisons far from their local community. In such instances, digital connectivity between community and custody was important. However, accessible technology was often not available or did not operate effectively.

Licence conditions were often extensive and complex. This meant they were not always easily understood by individuals. This was exacerbated where there were identified communication difficulties including those linked to acquired brain injury, substance use, experiences of trauma or limited literacy.

### How well do staff assess risk and need?

Staff felt confident to assess and respond to risk and need and there were notable strengths in practice. Almost all home background reports were informed by an appropriate level of partnership working. In terms of quality, the majority were rated as good or better. In most instances LS/CMI assessments were updated in accordance with guidance.

Although numbers were small, the quality of risk of serious harm assessments within the LS/CMI system were of a high standard. In most instances specialist risk assessments, primarily Risk Matrix 2000 (RM2K) and Stable and Acute 2007 (SA07), were completed where required. Staff viewed these tools, including LS/CMI, as supporting them to effectively undertake their role to assess risk and need.

While there were strengths in the overall quality of home background reports, a significant proportion were of an adequate standard. This indicated capacity for further improvement and greater consistency. The overall quality of LS/CMI assessments was variable with services citing the useability of the electronic portal as a key factor impacting on consistent application of the tool. This had contributed to 'workarounds' resulting in the full functionality of the tool not being used as intended. In a number of instances, the need for a Risk of Serious Harm assessment was indicated but was not evident within the LS/CMI system. In the small number of records where the need for an additional specialist risk assessment was indicated but was not undertaken, it related to the assessment of domestic abuse. When considered alongside the results from the staff survey, these issues highlighted a need to ensure that training needs are appropriately identified, addressed and the learning applied consistently.

Staff effectively responded to changes in risk and need. The intensity and frequency of supervision was commensurate with risks and needs. Contact was primarily in person prior to Covid-19. Thereafter, it was a mix of in-person and remote contact via telephone or digital platforms. The method of contact was clearly informed by considerations of the risk posed by the individual. During their period of supervision, most individuals had been visited at home with workers using an appropriate mix of announced and unannounced visits.

There was confidence to address non-compliance and supervising social workers consistently took appropriate action in response. There were examples of social workers making timely use of formal warnings to reiterate expectations and encourage compliance. Where appropriate, applications to vary licence conditions were pursued. This demonstrated flexibility and innovation to strengthen overall management of the risk posed by the individual in the community. Staff felt enabled to exercise their professional judgement and exercised discretion appropriately in the majority of instances.

Robust procedures were in place to ensure that all decisions to breach were discussed and agreed with a line manager. Breach reports were submitted promptly and in accordance with expected guidance. Efforts were also made to engage individuals in discussion prior to breach action being taken where this was appropriate. This demonstrated a commitment to inclusive and transparent practice.

Information sharing as part of Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) was effective. Community justice social work services noted the importance of timely access to the widest possible range of information from across all agencies to inform comprehensive assessment of risk. This included information from the point of sentence at court, during the sentence and when preparing for release. Staff expressed frustration when information was not readily available from partners, including from health and social care colleagues.

Although the number of Orders for Lifelong Restriction within the sample was very small, practice was of a high standard. Community justice social work services were committed to playing a full role in planning and preparing individuals for release and were proactively pursuing opportunities for greater collaboration, co-ordination and joint working. Services highlighted the importance of access to advice, guidance and training in order to confidently fulfil their statutory responsibilities in relation to OLRs. Services did not always feel fully included in decision making processes. To this end, they recognised a need for greater representation within pre-release Risk Management Team meetings. Further consideration should be given to how key throughcare forums are efficiently and effectively exchanging information to support successful reintegration.

### **How well do staff plan and provide effective interventions?**

The majority of individuals had a case management plan within the LS/CMI system, which had been completed within expected timescales. However, the overall quality was variable. There were some lengthy delays in exporting the LS/CMI record from prison to the community. This affected the ability of supervising social workers to update case management plans within expected timescales. It also meant plans were often not sufficiently focused on the individual's risks and needs in a community setting. While the quality of plans was variable, the range of activities to implement the plan were good. In particular, there was evidence of strong collaborative working with partners to address risks and needs.

The quality of risk management plans was a significant strength. Some plans were excellent and a high proportion were of a very good quality. Planning and collaborative working to manage or reduce risk was equally strong.

Consultation with individuals subject to supervision had clearly informed plans, ensuring they were tailored to the individual's circumstances. Disclosure of information to protect others from harm was also a significant strength.

Staff were confident in the role they played in meeting the desistance needs of individuals. They were motivated to develop their knowledge, skills and confidence through additional training and expressed frustration when they experienced difficulties accessing such opportunities. Where positive approaches or interventions were identified, staff sought to extend these to other parts of the service, for example, trauma informed and trauma responsive practice and resources.

Community justice social work interventions were mostly having a positive impact on reintegration for a majority of individuals. For individuals who were only in the community for a short while before being recalled, the priority was to meet basic needs for accommodation, food and ensure general wellbeing. This work was extremely resource intensive, leaving limited opportunity for offence focused work in the time available.

Most individuals, particularly those serving sentences of four years and over, had the opportunity to undertake offence focused work either in custody and/or the community. Those serving shorter sentences were often released having done little work to explore or address the factors which contributed to their offending. Upon release, access to the structured Moving Forward: Making Changes (MF:MC) programme was available to individuals convicted of sexual offences. For domestic abuse offences, some individuals were able to access the Caledonian system (where available) or another structured programme such as Up2U or Respect.

For individuals for whom structured programmes were not available, social work staff were a crucial resource. There were examples of workers using their knowledge, skills and expertise to assist individuals explore the causes and impact of their decisions and behaviour with a view to reducing the likelihood of reoffending. There was a gap in the availability of resources to assist with exploring violent and/or more generalised offending behaviour in any consistent way.

Inevitably, for individuals subject to supervision in the community during Covid-19, there was an impact on the availability of all statutory and third sector services. This included access to employability services to support positive use of time, as well as mental health and physical health supports. Staff recognised the absence or reduction in personal contact affected their ability to form relationships to best support reintegration.

Overall, practice relating to statutory social work reviews was variable. There was scope for improvement in terms of the scheduling, focus and recording of reviews. Useful standardised templates were often available but not routinely used. Where reviews took place, in most instances they were of a high standard with partner agencies contributing where appropriate. Some individuals were breached and recalled to custody prior to the initial social work review of progress.



Although staff viewed the LS/CMI system as usefully informing the focus of supervision during the licence period, there were very few examples of any meaningful use of the progress record section of the tool. Collectively, the inconsistent use of reviews and lack of progress records contributed to missed opportunities to capture an individual's progress, personal outcomes or agreed decisions to support effective reintegration.

#### 4. Policies, procedures and legal measures

**This section considers the extent to which the community justice social work service is fulfilling its statutory duties relating to throughcare. It considers the extent to which national and local guidance is informing legally compliant practice. It also considers the extent to which policies and procedures are kept up to date in response to changes in legislation and wider social policy, including cross cutting changes where this is likely to have an impact.**

Community justice social work services continue to be informed by the overarching, National Outcomes and Standards for Social Work Services in the Criminal Justice System (2010).<sup>1</sup> These high-level standards aim to support best practice and delivery of outcomes expected by the public, including victims of crime. Throughcare practice is underpinned by the earlier 'National Objectives for A Social Work Services in the Criminal Justice System: Standards Throughcare (2004)<sup>2</sup>'. Services had a coherent and consistent understanding of their statutory duties under the full range of national guidance and relevant legislation pertaining to the various throughcare release licences and orders.

Roles and responsibilities relating to joint working with community justice partners were fully understood. MAPPA arrangements were functioning well and making an important contribution to public protection. Collective decision-making supported supervising social workers to effectively manage individuals most likely to cause serious harm.

Services were committed to supporting reintegration and promoting desistance. When it was deemed the risk posed by an individual could no longer be safely managed in the community, the use of breach/recall processes was rigorous. The 2018 Parole Board breach guidance and standardised templates were well embedded in practice. Decisions to breach/recommend recall were appropriately escalated, with each application ratified by a line manager. Virtually all applications were submitted within the expected two working day timescale.

Applications to breach/recall were then considered by Parole Board members. There was a very high correlation between the supervising social worker recommendation and the Parole Board decision. Where it was deemed the risk posed could no longer be safely managed in the community, the return to custody was swift with most individuals who had breached the conditions of their licence returned to prison within 24 hours of the recall being agreed.

---

<sup>1</sup> [National Outcomes and Standards](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Throughcare Standards](#)

A high percentage of respondents to the staff survey agreed or strongly agreed that local policies and procedures were in place and assisted them to fulfil their role. Changes at a national and local level as a result of Covid-19 supported timely adaptations to service delivery. The guidance provided was welcomed by staff and ensured critical forums and processes were effectively maintained. This demonstrated flexibility and resilience of community justice social work services in response to unavoidable circumstances. Inevitably, strategic capacity was impacted which caused interruption to any scheduled review of policies, procedures and practice.

The existing national standards and guidance for throughcare, while still underpinning practice, were viewed by staff as dated as they had not been kept pace with developments in research and practice. Although learning was disseminated from internal quality assurance, Serious Case Reviews and Serious Incident Reviews, this was generally through updates to policies and procedures and staff briefings rather than interactive workshops or training. This limited the opportunities for staff to be actively involved in exploring lessons learned and developing practice.

An important and consistent challenge for services related to Parole Oral Hearings which were viewed as impacting negatively upon service delivery and staff morale. While services prioritised attendance, ensuring staff availability was a significant challenge, especially where travel and all-day attendance was required. Some social workers experienced hearings as adversarial and perceived a disregard for their role and expertise. Workers recognised the need to be held accountable for their practice and decisions but viewed excessive criticism of their assessments and professional judgement, particularly in front of individuals they were supervising, as undermining of their professional role.

Community justice social work services were concerned that hearings were becoming routine and process driven. Concerns were exacerbated by a reported lack of access to specific throughcare training and up to date guidance. Increased opportunities for multi-agency training were viewed as important in order to build a respectful appreciation of respective roles and responsibilities. Maintaining a shared understanding of the language of risk in accordance with Framework for Risk Assessment, Management and Evaluation (FRAME) was crucial to best practice.

## 5. Impact and experience of breach and recall

**This section focuses on the impact of throughcare supervision from the perspective of individuals<sup>3</sup> who have been breached and recalled to custody. It also considers the extent to which the expectations of throughcare have been communicated and understood.**

Throughout the stages of the review, access to suitable accommodation was recognised as important to successful reintegration. Encouragingly, the majority of individuals who contributed their views reported they had received the support they needed to meet their housing needs.

---

<sup>3</sup> It is important to note that the individuals we heard from came from across Scotland and as such we should consider this evidence relevant for the larger scope of the review but not related to the local authorities involved in this review.

Most individuals who identified they needed support for drug and alcohol use received the support they needed in the community.

The importance placed by services and staff on the relationship between the individual and the community based social worker was evident throughout the review. There were clear challenges faced by staff to develop these relationships, particularly pre-release. Individuals reported that having little contact with a community based social worker prior to release, not having a relationship with them, or a deterioration in trust, were factors which undermined a successful reintegration or contributed to a recall to prison.

The most consistently reported unmet need related to mental health and emotional wellbeing. Individuals described persistently raising concerns and seeking support but despite referrals being made they did not receive any support until they were recalled to prison. Worth noting was the experience of bereavement and the impact of loss not being routinely recognised as an unmet need.

When discussing what got in the way of successful reintegration, some individuals made a direct link between isolation and lack of employment, and a deterioration in their mental health while in the community. Other comments related to the importance of using time productively and not being 'forced on to benefits.'

Most individuals reported confusion or a misunderstanding about their licence conditions and what these meant in reality when they were living in the community. Where restrictions meant individuals were geographically isolated or could not accept employment opportunities, it contributed to a sense of hopelessness and affected their confidence in the possibility of a successful reintegration.

When disciplinary action was taken, half of the individuals did not agree with the decision to recall them to prison. Examples were noted of decisions also being contrary to the recommendation of the supervising officer. A majority of individuals viewed communication from supervising officers about the decision to breach as poor, including after their recall to custody.

The SHORE (Sustainable Housing on Release for Everyone)<sup>4</sup> standards aim to ensure that the housing needs of individuals are consistently considered at an early stage. Access to appropriate accommodation on release featured throughout the review as a critical factor for successful reintegration.

Although individuals reported receiving the help they needed, it was evident that the accommodation offered was often not entirely suitable for the individual's needs. They were often expected to present for homeless accommodation on the day of release. This resulted in being accommodated in areas where they felt less safe or at a significant distance from their community or family supports.

Individuals who had been in the community during Covid-19 reflected on the loss of personal contact, including with social workers, as contributing to a sense of isolation.

---

<sup>4</sup> [SHORE Standards](#)

## 6. Conclusions

In terms of the scope of the review, community justice social work services were delivering throughcare responsibilities in accordance with national guidance. Effective partnership working was making an important contribution to public protection. When it was deemed the risk posed by an individual could no longer be safely managed in the community, the use of breach/recall processes was robust. In most instances there was little community justice social work services could have done differently to reduce the likelihood of breach.

Community justice social work services had a coherent and consistent understanding of their statutory role and function. There was a clear commitment to reintegration and supporting desistance to deliver intended outcomes for individuals and communities. Social workers were alert to their responsibilities in terms of supervising licence conditions and the importance of compliance to reduce risk. They were equally attentive to providing support and guidance to meet the wider needs of individuals, often using their experience, knowledge and skills to good effect. There were examples of this support continuing on a voluntary basis following expiry of the throughcare licence.

That said, there were key challenges both for individuals and services. Some current processes and systems, which were beyond the control of community justice social work alone, were getting in the way of a successful reintegration. Individuals often required significant support to meet basic needs with some crucial services inaccessible until the day of release. This took considerable time and effort, predominantly from supervising social workers and emphasised the importance of effective, multi-agency pre-release planning.

Holistic support in the community was essential to supporting reintegration. Timely access to mental health support was consistently noted as a barrier. Access to employability services or opportunities to use time constructively was also noted as a gap.

Services recognised the importance of robust quality assurance. Building on existing approaches to hear the voice of people with lived experience of throughcare supervision offers important opportunities to maximise learning to inform service delivery and support continuous improvement.

The review identified cross-cutting areas for improvement, which would benefit from a multi-agency response to support best practice, promote successful reintegration to the community and reduce the likelihood of recall.

### Areas for improvement

- The Recover, Renew, Transform agenda offers a unique opportunity to achieve lasting change and deliver improved outcomes for individuals and communities, including victims of crime. Partners across national and local government and the wider criminal justice system should maximise any and all opportunities to remove the systemic obstacles to reintegration.

- To ensure a competent, confident and well-trained workforce, a clear learning and development pathway is required for staff with throughcare responsibilities. This should be informed by a coherent strategy to deliver the following:
  - access to risk practice training where required
  - effective community-based management of Orders for Lifelong Restriction
  - up to date national throughcare guidance which reflects research and best practice developments
  - evidence based interventions for violence and general offending
  - guidance on contributing to parole hearings and tribunals
  - alignment with LS/CMI related training.
- To support best practice in risk assessment, partners and groups with responsibility for the various aspects of LS/CMI should ensure the electronic system is fit for purpose and supports the effective and consistent application of the LS/CMI method. While the centralisation of the system offers some opportunities to improve efficient and effective information sharing, there is a critical need to ensure that processes and structures are in place to support the ongoing development of the LS/CMI system and method and that training needs are appropriately addressed.

## 7. Next steps

The Scottish Government National Justice Strategy is currently under review. Recent announcements on the programme for government also outlined new investment to support a substantial expansion of community justice services, to help reduce re-offending. The future arrangements for the delivery of justice social work services in custody and the community are also under consideration within the ongoing consultation on a National Care Service for Scotland<sup>5</sup>.

At the present time strategic priorities include<sup>6</sup> delivering effective community interventions and only using prison where necessary to address offending, or to protect public safety. While there has been a consistent reduction in the number of reconvictions in Scotland, the rate of imprisonment is among the highest in Europe. This includes individuals on remand, serving a sentence or who have been recalled to custody following breach of statutory licence conditions.

This report is produced in the context of these national developments. It is published as a piece of independent scrutiny and assurance of community justice social work contribution to throughcare practice. The findings will inform the overall focus of the RRT workstream. While the scope of the review was on a particular element of community justice social work practice, the findings cannot be considered in isolation. There are elements of the throughcare continuum from point of sentence to expiry date which are worthy of further exploration in order to deliver best practice. The forthcoming review of progression led by HMIPS (HM Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland) offers such an opportunity.

<sup>5</sup> [A National Care Service for Scotland - Scottish Government - Citizen Space \(consult.gov.scot\)](https://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations/national-care-service-for-scotland)

<sup>6</sup> [Justice Vision and Priorities delivery report - key achievements and impact of Covid 19 \(www.gov.scot\)](https://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations/justice-vision-and-priorities-delivery-report)

## Appendix 1

### How we conducted this review

All activities were carried out remotely. All local authorities across Scotland were notified of our intention to carry out a review of breach/recall. The selected areas received specific guidance in May 2021. Areas were selected based on size of available sample, service model and geographical spread. There were no pre-existing concerns regarding perceived risk within services.

### Position Statement

The Care Inspectorate team considered a succinct position statement prepared by each area. This was in the form of a structured template designed for the review to capture strengths, challenges, and areas for improvement.

### Staff survey

A staff survey was distributed to social workers undertaking a throughcare role, line managers and paraprofessionals supporting the delivery of throughcare services in each area. A total of 193 surveys were circulated: 131 were completed (23 partially) representing a return rate of 68%.

### Review of records

In each area, the Care Inspectorate team was supported by local file readers to read a proportionate sample of records relating to each type of statutory throughcare licence. This corresponded to licences/orders which had had been breached/recalled during the period 1 April 2019 to 31 October 2020. We reviewed records for 98 individuals from a population of 196 individuals.

### Focus groups

Follow-up focus groups were used to explore any areas of uncertainty. In total 31 members of social work staff contributed to five focus groups.

### Interviews and survey of people with lived experience

Support from HMIPS and SPS colleagues enabled the Care Inspectorate team to engage with individuals who had been recalled to custody following breach of their licence conditions. During June and July 2021 using one-to-one, socially distanced semi-structured interviews, we spoke to 14 individuals in two prisons. A survey was also distributed to relevant individuals across the prison estate which attracted a further 17 responses. It is important to note that these individuals came from across Scotland and as such we should consider this evidence relevant for the larger scope of the review. Responses are not specifically related to practice within the local authorities who contributed to the review.

### Feedback to services

This review focused on one aspect of the throughcare process in a small number of geographical areas. Community justice social work practice was not evaluated using the Care Inspectorate six-point scale. Instead, structured feedback was provided to each local authority/partnership to support continuous improvement.

## Final report

This report summarises the overall findings across the relevant quality indicators to highlight strengths, challenges and areas for improvement which may have national relevance. The quality indicators informing the report are outlined below (Appendix 2):

- 2.1 impact on people who have committed offences
- 3.1 impact on staff
- 5.1 providing help and support when it is needed
- 5.2 assessing and responding to risk and need
- 5.3 planning and providing effective intervention
- 6.1 policies, procedures, and legal measures
- 7.1 Staff training and development

## Limitation of methods used

Considering the timing and purpose of this review, it was inevitable that consideration was given to the impact of Covid-19 on throughcare practice. We developed the activities outlined above to ensure we were able to capture relevant learning and adaptations while maintaining a focus on the scope of the review.

As the findings in this review are based on a sample of individuals, we cannot assure the quality of service received by every single individual subject to throughcare service. Equally the views from staff reflect those who responded to the survey or took part in focus groups.

## Appendix 2

### The quality indicator model

The Care Inspectorate team use this model to reach conclusions on the quality and effectiveness of justice social work services. This report summarises the overall findings of the review across the quality indicators highlighted below.

What key outcomes have we achieved?	How well do we jointly meet the needs of our stakeholders?	How good is our delivery of services for those involved in community justice?	How good is our operational management?	How good is our leadership?
<b>1. Key performance outcomes</b>	<b>2. Impact on people who have committed offences, their families, and victims</b>	<b>5. Delivery of key processes</b>	<b>6. Policy, service development and planning</b>	<b>9. Leadership and direction</b>
1.1 Improving the life chances and outcomes of those with lived experience of community justice	2.1 Impact on people who have committed offences 2.2 Impact on victims 2.3 Impact on families	5.1 Providing help and support when it is needed 5.2 Assessing and responding to risk and need 5.3 Planning and providing effective intervention 5.4 Involving people who have committed offences and their families	6.1 Policies, procedures, and legal measures 6.2 Planning and delivering services in a collaborative way 6.3 Participation of those who have committed offences, their families, victims, and other stakeholders 6.4 Performance management and quality assurance	9.1 Vision, values and aims 9.2 Leadership of strategy and direction 9.3 Leadership of people 9.4 Leadership of improvement and change
	<b>3. Impact on staff</b>		<b>7. Management and support of staff</b>	
	3.1 Impact on staff		7.1 Staff training and development, and joint working	
	<b>4. Impact on the communities</b>		<b>8. Partnership working</b>	
	4.1 Impact on the community		8.1 Effective use and management of resources 8.2 Commissioning arrangements 8.3 Securing improvement through self-evaluation	
<b>10. What is our capacity for improvement?</b>				
Overall judgement based on an evaluation of the framework of quality indicators				



## Appendix 3

### Terms we use in this report

**Breach** – where an individual has failed to comply with any conditions imposed as part of their throughcare licence.

**Caledonian System** - an integrated approach to addressing domestic abuse which combines a court-ordered programme for men, aimed at changing their behaviour, with support services for women and children who have been victims of abuse.

**Case management plan** – risk and needs are actively addressed through a case management plan of intervention in which the individual actively participates. Any strengths identified by the assessment process should be promoted within the plan.

**Community Justice Social Work** – there is no consistency across the 32 Scottish local authorities about the terminology used regarding statutory justice social work services. Previous Care Inspectorate reports refer to justice services. The term community justice social work is to distinguish between prison-based social work.

**Desistance** – the process of abstaining from crime among those who previously had engaged in a sustained pattern of offending.

**FRAME** – The Framework for Risk Assessment, Management and Evaluation promotes consistent and proportionate practice by proposing a tiered approach in which the same standards, principles and practice process apply, but are delivered proportionate to the risk. ‘Active and alert risk management’ is the term applied to the approach indicated when managing individuals who pose a risk of serious harm.

**HMIPS** - Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland is an agency which is responsible for inspecting prisons in Scotland.

**ICM** - Integrated Case Management is a management structure used by the Scottish Prison Service and brings together the prisoner and other key staff and agencies to examine the prisoner’s progress through custody and to plan for release.

**Intensity** – the level of contact noted in the case management plan which is required to effectively manage any identified risk and need. Intensity may be very high, high, medium, or low.

**Level of Service/ Case Management Inventory** - a comprehensive risk/need assessment and management planning method for general offending. In Scotland, the LS/CMI approach has been developed to combine the robustness of an actuarial approach with an evaluation of the pattern, nature, seriousness, and likelihood of offending.

**Licence** – certain individuals are released from prison into the community under conditions. Being on licence means they are still serving their sentence in the community and are subject to social work supervision.

**MAPPA** - is the acronym for multi-agency public protection arrangements put in place to manage the risk posed by registered sex offenders and other individuals who pose a high risk of harm to people and communities.

**Moving Forward: Making Changes** - MF:MC is a behavioural programme designed to provide treatment for men who commit sexual offences or offences with a sexual element.

**Parole Board** - the Parole Board for Scotland is a Tribunal Non-Departmental Public Body whose members are appointed by Scottish Ministers. The Parole Board operates independently from the Scottish Government.

**Reintegration** – upon release from custody, an individual enhances social inclusion through maintaining supportive relationships and access to the opportunities and resources required to maintain desistance. As a result, the individual is no longer a significant risk to others. A reduced risk of reoffending enables the individual to focus on developing a law-abiding lifestyle.

**Respect** – a programme for working on a one-to-one basis with perpetrators of domestic abuse.

**RM2000** - Risk Matrix 2000 is an actuarial risk assessment tool applied to men aged 18 years and over convicted of sexual offences and is used by trained professionals to assess the risk of reconviction.

**SA07** - Stable and Acute 2007 is a dynamic risk assessment tool which provides a structured method for identifying and measuring dynamic risk factors that are predictive of sexual offence recidivism.

**SPS** - The Scottish Prison Service is an agency of the Scottish Government which is legally required to deliver custodial and rehabilitation services for those sent to prison by the courts.

**Statutory social work reviews** – National Outcomes and Standards indicate that case management plans should be reviewed and where necessary, revised, at regular intervals during the period of statutory supervision.

**Trauma informed practice** - a strengths-based approach grounded in an understanding of, and responsiveness to, the impact of trauma, that emphasises physical, psychological, and emotional safety for everyone, and that creates opportunities for survivors to rebuild a sense of control and empowerment.

**Up2U** - a programme for people who use domestically abusive and unhealthy behaviours in their relationships. It is designed to help people make positive changes to their behaviour in their relationships.

**Headquarters**

Care Inspectorate  
Compass House  
11 Riverside Drive  
Dundee  
DD1 4NY

web: [www.careinspectorate.com](http://www.careinspectorate.com)

email: [enquiries@careinspectorate.com](mailto:enquiries@careinspectorate.com)

telephone: 0345 600 9527