DUNDEE CITY COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Social Work Committee – 16 May 2005

REPORT ON: Performance Inspection of Criminal Justice Social Work Services

REPORT BY: Director of Social Work

REPORT NO: 299 - 2005

1.0   PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1   The purpose of this report is to update members on the proposed actions arising from the inspection of Criminal Justice Social Work Services within the Tayside Partnership. The inspection report was considered by the Social Work Committee on 18 April 2005, Report No 245-2005, and it was agreed that an action plan would be submitted for further consideration.

The Partnership has three months to submit an action plan to the Social Work Services Inspectorate Agency detailing how the recommendations will be progressed, this will be reviewed by the Inspectorate after one year. A copy of the Action Plan is attached.

2.0   RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Social Work Committee:

2.1   note and approve the action plan and agree that it be submitted to the Social Work Services Inspectorate agency of the Scottish Executive.

2.2   that the Committee instruct the Director of Social Work to submit a report to the January 2006 Social Work Committee outlining progress made on the action plan.

3.0   FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1   There are no financial implications for the Council.

4.0   SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

4.1   The policy objective of reducing crime and ensuring people are safe and feel safe are reflected in the action plan.

5.0   EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS

5.1   None.

6.0   BACKGROUND

6.1   The recommendations contained in the report cover the full range of social work issues, some apply across the Partnership while others relate specifically to practice within individual authorities.   All of the recommendations have been accepted.

6.2   The Action Plan details proposed actions and responsibilities, work is already underway in relation to many of the recommendations and progress will be monitored by the Tayside Criminal Justice Services Partnership Steering Group.

7.0   CONSULTATION

7.1   The Chief Executive, Depute Chief Executive (Finance) and Depute Chief Executive (Support Services), the Partnership Management Team and the Tayside Criminal Justice Services Partnership Steering Group have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

8.0   BACKGROUND PAPERS

8.1   The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:

Performance Inspection of Criminal Justice Social Work Services: Report on Tayside Partnership: Social Work Services Inspectorate 2005.

Alan G Baird
Director of Social Work

Date: 6 May 2005

Initial Action Plan in response to Tayside CJS Partnership SWSI Inspection Report 2004

Notes on Action Plan Abbreviations

There are almost 100 recommendations within the report. In the action plan we have grouped the recommendations into themes A-G and numbered for ease of reference and for cross-referencing with other relevant plans. The left-most column records these reference numbers.

Some of the recommendations relate to the whole Partnership – they are noted as ALL in the LA (Local Authority column); some relate only to Angus (A), Dundee (D) or Perth (P or P&K)

Other abbreviations used
1 SERs – Social Enquiry Reports
2 CS – Community Service
3 HBR – Home Background Reports
4 SWSI – Social Work Services Inspectorate
5 SE – Scottish Executive
6 PDO – Potentially Dangerous Offenders
7 SARA – Spousal Abuse Risk Assessment
8 COVAID – Control Of Violent And Impulsive Drinkers programme
9 EDR – Employee Development and Review

Theme A: SERs –

Ref		LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need		What will happen	Who will lead	By when
A1	Practitioners should do more to probe the offender's account of his offending and the circumstances surrounding it.	All	Arrange forensic interviewing training with police SER format to be established across partnership with clear guidance notes for all.	Training and Devt Officer SER Working Group	By September 2005
A2	Practitioners, particularly in Dundee, should be more focused in the advice they give to the courts about the feasibility of community sentences.	All/D	Review and disseminate guidance on preferred options in SERs – already agreed through SER Working Group	SER working group	By June 2005
A3	Steps should be taken to reduce the number of cases at Perth Sheriff Court which are deferred for failure to attend	P	Reword letters to clarify repercussions of non-attendance Pilot use of phone contact Develop specialist Ser writing team Liaise with Sheriffs	P/K Service Manager	By June 2005
A4	SER authors in Dundee and Perth and Kinross must ensure that they discuss an offender's suitability for community service with community service staff as required by National Standards.	D/P	Establish criteria required Integrate assessment for CS in Probation Vision in Dundee and with quality Improvement Plan in Perth Integrate into SER Guidance	CS Specialist Group Service Managers D&P SER Working Group	By September 2005
A5	Authorities should also ensure that report writers are familiar with the purpose, requirements, and demands of community service	All	Familiarisation of all report writers with CS e.g. through Induction Ensure that contemporaneous info on CS is available e.g. Dundee intranet	CS Specialist Group to make recommendations	By September 2005
A6	The Partnership should introduce consistent, uniform quality assurance procedures and practices bearing in mind the need to check risk assessments as well as reports.	All	Ensure SER audit includes eval of risk assessment	Partnership Development Manager	By September 2005

4

Theme B Throughcare

Ref		LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need		What will happen	Who will lead	By when
B1	All home background reports have a provisional release plan	All	Develop/enhance Operational Guidance on Home Background Reports Develop audit of HBRs to cover quality release plan and description of the oversight and support available on release	Throughcare Implementation Group to make recommendations/ Throughcare Strategic manager	By September 2005
B2	Greater attention is paid to the assessment of possible risk to the community in HBRs	All	Integration of HBR/Throughcare into Risk assessment arrangements Include risk assessment in audit of HBRs	Throughcare Implementation Group	By June 2005
B3	Clearer descriptions are provided of the levels of oversight and support that would be available to the offender on release	All	Develop/enhance Operational Guidance on HBRs/Throughcare	Throughcare Implementation Group/ Throughcare Strategic manager	By September 2005
B4	Review arrangements for throughcare to ensure that the balance of the workloads of staff carrying throughcare responsibilities does not lead to undue pressure	All	Workload analysis	Service Managers/Throughcare Seniors	By March 2006
B5	There should also be better working links between throughcare staff so that they can share information and their experience of this rapidly developing area of work.	All	Throughcare Training Day for all throughcare/resettlement staff and reps form SPS	Partnership Development Manager	By September 2005
B6	Quality assurance must be in place right across the Partnership for HBR	All	Develop, disseminate and analyse audit for HBR	Partnership Development Manager	By September 2005

Theme C Probation

Ref		LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need		What will happen	Who will lead	By when
C1	Make better, more consistent use of risk assessments to inform service plans	All	Risk assessment and action planning training	Training and Development Officer	By September 2005
			Include consideration of risk assessment informing action plans in audit of probation	Partnership Devt Manager	
			Make explicit links between scoring on risk assessment and future management of cases	Probation Specialist Group	
C2	Build on the experience already gained to improve the delivery of offence-focussed work across the Partnership	D/P	Develop Partnership wide approach to delivery of offence focussed work	Probation Specialist Group/Nominated Service Manager Partnership Develop Manager	By December 2006
			Bid for constructs places		
			Develop Resource List for probation /throughcare resources available within Partnership – use TayCrimNet to allow access to data	Probation Specialist Group/TayCrimNet Editorial Group	
C3	Build on the systems, processes and practices which have already been developed to secure compliance re probation with National Standards across all three authorities. First appointments 4 appointments in first 4 weeks	 A/P A/P All	Review practice in each area and make recommendations for change – to include targeting of home visits, recording practice etc. Ensure that these aspects are in audits Implement "Hot Spot" monitoring	Specialist groups to make recommendations P'ship Development Manager	By September 2005

Ref		LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need		What will happen	Who will lead	By when
	Home visits Reviews	D/P			
C4	(Implied from comparative figures) Overall case-recording should be improved	P	Dev guidance on best practice Guidance on case-recording – feedback to staff when cases are reviewed Monitoring through audit	Probation Specialist Group Probation seniors across the Partnership Partnership Development Manager	By September 2005

Theme D: Risk Assessment

Ref			LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need			What will happen	Who will lead	By when
D1		The Partnership should adopt a single framework for risk assessment	All	Awaiting guidance from Scottish Executive – expected late summer 2005	Partnership Development Manager	December 2005
D2		The Partnership should ensure that all staff have appropriate risk assessment training which also addresses how to refer to the findings of risk assessments in reports	All	Implement training plan re risk assessment Review guidance for protocols re risk assessment Integrate risk assessment guidance into SER guidance	Training/Development Officer Service Managers SER Working Group	September 2005
D3		Greater attention is paid to the assessment of possible risk to the community in HBRs	All	Operational Guidance on Home Background Reports Integration of HBR/Throughcare into Risk assessment arrangements	Throughcare Implementation Group	September 2005

Theme E Potentially Dangerous Offenders (PDOs)

Ref		LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need		What will happen	Who will lead	By when
E1	There should be a common definition of high risk offenders across the Partnership	All	Awaiting guidance from SWSI/SE Interim definition - e.g. medium/high risk of re-offending and high risk of serious harm	Partnership Development Manager	December 2005
E2	Each authority should routinely involve all the relevant agencies in drawing up, implementing and reviewing risk management plans	All	Agencies are involved where relevant to particular cases; other Departments/agencies will be asked to nominate a key officer to be invited to all review meetings however the meetings will still go ahead in their absence rather than delay the development of the plans	Service Managers	September 2005
E3	All staff across the Partnership should all know what is required of them and be properly supervised and supported in their work re potentially dangerous offenders.	All	Ensure PDO issues are covered in Induction Ensure that the guidance is available and accessible across the Partnership Ensure that PDO issues are dealt with in case reviews	Service Managers Service Managers Service Managers	June 2005
E4	Managers should look at their own authority's performance and take steps to ensure that Standards (for minimum contact including home visits) are met especially for high risk offenders;	All	Audit of PDO cases: use Angus outline for audit SWSI will again be asked to identify those cases where the authorities were shown to be failing in this area	Service Managers	By June 2005
E5	(Implied) the Partnership should develop structured approaches for intervening with violent offenders and improve assessment	All	Develop Partnership approach to violent offenders e.g. Ensure violent offenders are properly	Angus to pilot use of	December 2005

Ref No	Key Issue/Identified Need	LA	What will happen	Who will lead	By when
			identified through Risk Assessment mechanisms e.g. assess potential for specialist violent offenders risk assessment, relevant staff to be trained in use of SARA for domestic violent offenders	specialist risk assessment tool;	
			Review possibility of Anger management, Domestic violence, COVAID programmes to be available across the Partnership	Probation Specialist group	
			Examine need for programme to address racist/hate crimes – consider either "From Murmer to Murder" or current Glasgow development on Hate Crime	Probation Specialist Group/Planning Team	
			We await progress in the Accreditation Panel on the development of a programme for violent offenders		
E6	Perth and Kinross should also look seriously at developing a programme to address violent behaviour;	P	As above	As above	December 2005
E7	In moving over to delivery of C-SOGP the partnership may wish to take the opportunity to train a number of team based social workers as facilitators along with Tay project staff	All	Review current arrangements for service to sex offenders, leading to re-issue of partnership protocol	Tay Project Manager	September 2005
E8	The Partnership should also set out clear guidelines for work with (sex) offenders assessed as unsuitable for work with the Project.	All	Review Partnership protocol to ensure explicit reference to provision of service to sex offenders not on Tay Project	Tay Project Manager	September 2005
E9	Perth and Kinross must ensure that their criminal justice staff are familiar	P	Implement Child Protection aspects of Training Matrix	Training and development manager	September 2005

Ref No	Key Issue/Identified Need	LA	What will happen	Who will lead	By when
	with their responsibilities as set out in "Getting Our Priorities Right".				
E10	Those criminal justice staff in the partnership who have not yet had child protection training should receive this soon with the roll out of the Scottish Executive funded training initiative.	All	Implement Child Protection aspects of Training Matrix	Training and development manager	September 2005

Theme F Community Service

Ref		LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need		What will happen	Who will lead	By when
F1	Workers holding responsibility for community service orders in Perth and Kinross must undertake an assessment of the potential risk an offender might pose in a placement	P	Develop risk assessment mechanism based on current good practice in Partnership	Cs Specialist Group	June 2005
F2	Services in P&K and in Angus must establish more systematic procedures for information exchange between CS Supervisors and case-holding staff using appropriate IT or paper formats.	A/P	Develop information sharing on the basis of current good practise in the Partnership – investigate partnership wide use of Dundee system	CS Specialist Group	September 2005
F3	All three authorities must take steps to ensure that supervisors have adequate opportunity to read relevant information and that this information about offenders is securely stored at mustering points.	All	Develop information sharing on the basis of current good practise in the Partnership – investigate partnership wide use of Dundee system	CS Specialist Group	September 2005
F4	Perth and Kinross must inform supervisors when they are supervising sex offenders	P	The identification of sex offenders per se is not necessary. CS workers should receive relevant information on the risk posed by individuals Develop information sharing on the basis of current good practise in the Partnership	CS Specialist Group	September 2005
F5	Services in Dundee and Angus should make every effort to secure a higher number of individual placements	D/P	Share best practice from Perth Appoint Activities officer in Dundee with target for placements generated	CS Specialist Group Dundee CS Senior	December 2005
F6	Dundee must also widen its range of squad activities	D	Appoint Activities officer in Dundee with target for placements generated	CS Senior Dundee	September 2005

Ref No	Key Issue/Identified Need	LA	What will happen	Who will lead	By when
F7	Dundee should review the system of "doubling-up" squads and establishing a more focused way to manage risk;	D	Review mechanisms for managing size of work teams	Cs Senior Dundee	December 2005
F8	All authorities must seek to ensure that offenders commence work wherever possible within the timescale set out in National Standards;	All	Monitor waiting lists Increase numbers of placements Ensure weekend and evening work	CS Specialist Group	March 2006
F9	Perth and Kinross staff supervising community service orders must deal firmly and consistently with offender non-compliance	P	Determine levels of discretion Mentor numbers of warning/progress of breaches in case reviews	P&K Seniors	September 2006
F10	Perth and Kinross council should undertake a review of the roles and responsibilities of its staff group in relation to community service functions;	P	Review in context of work force development plan	P&K Service Manager	September 2006
F11	All authorities should ensure that all community service staff have regular, formal supervision that include audits of individual skills and training needs;	All	Develop training matrix for community service staff Undertake training needs analysis Review arrangement for supervision within local supervisory policies	Training and development officer Training and Development Officer Service managers/CS Seniors	December 2005
F12	Staff carrying out CS risk assessments should also be fully trained and their assessments recorded.	All	Expand training matrix	Cs Specialist groups Training and development Officer	December 2005
F13	Services in Angus and Perth and Kinross must establish formal emergency weekend cover for supervisors	A/P	Institute lone working procedures asap	Service Manager Angus and P&K	March 2006

Theme G Management and Infrastructure

Ref		LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need		What will happen	Who will lead	By when
G1	Senior managers in Perth and Kinross should ensure they have proper oversight of the performance of criminal justice services.	P	Establishment of Quality Improvement Officer post	P&K Service Manager	June 2005
G2	(Text) Partnership should be more "energetic"	All	Develop action plans for specialist groups based on priorities identified in Inspection Report Progress plans for Seniors symposia	Partnership Development Manager	June 2005
G3	The Partnership has entered into preliminary discussions about the more flexible use of funding and has established working groups to look at critical areas of practice. These initiatives must now be translated into real outcomes;	All	Re-emphasise partnership agreements to review as a partnership how under spend monies are spent Progress development of distributive formula – timing to be reviewed in light of timescales for new Criminal Justice Authorities	Partnership Management meeting	March 2006
G4	The Partnership should introduce consistent, uniform quality assurance procedures and practices bearing in mind the need to check risk assessments as well as reports.	All	Establish Partnership Management Information portfolio Establish strategic calendar for partnership	Partnership Development Manager	June 2005
G5	Managers in Perth and Kinross must ensure they provide regular structured supervision for staff covering both casework and workload issues and staff development	P	Develop review schedules Develop and implement quality improvement plan	P&K Service Manager/Quality Improvement Manager	June 2005
G6	P&K should undertake a full audit of training needs.	P	Training audit to be undertaken across the Partnership	Training and Devt Officer	September 2005
G7	P&K should ensure that employee development reviews are conducted as	P	EDR had not been formally introduced at the time of the Inspection	Training and Development	March 2006

Ref		LA			
No	Key Issue/Identified Need		What will happen	Who will lead	By when
	required by the Council's own procedures.		EDR to be in place across the Partnership	Officer/P&K Service Manager	

Baseline Information

SERs

	Poor	Adequate	Good	Very Good
Analysis of offending behaviour	20%	54%	25%	2%
Analysis of offending related needs	20%	50%	28%	2%
Analysis of risk of reoffending	19%	47%	32%	3%
Feasibility of different sentences	13%	51%	33%	2%
Overall standard	15%	55%	29%	1%

Home Background Reports provided to the Parole Board

	Poor	Adequate	Good	V.Good
Family and community supports	0%	57%	35%	9%
Post release supervision	17%	35%	39%	9%
Risk assessment	35%	30%	22%	13%
Overall Standard	9%	48%	35%	9%
	Yes	No		
Release Plan	61%	39%		

Planning in Probation and Throughcare

	Yes	No
Written supervision plan	84%	16%
Focus on		
Addressing offending behaviour	78%	22%
Offending related needs	86%	14%
Supervision delivery	69%	31%

Supervision

Compliance

	Poor	Adequate	Good	V Good
Overall standard	15%	34%	45%	7%

Compliance with KPIs

	Yes	No –organisational control	No –outwith organisational control
1st scheduled appointment (CS/Prob)	65%	32%	4%
lst scheduled appt (thru'care)	100%	0%	0%
Review at 12 wks	60%	34%	6%
2 home visits in 1st 12 wks	46%	50%	5%
4 appoints in 1st 4 wks	67%	28%	5%

PDOs – Serious Violent Offenders
SERs

		Poor	Adequate	Good	VG
Standard of the report		18%	59%	23%	0%
Analysis of offending		14%	73%	14%	0%
offending related needs		23%	64%	9%	5%
risk of re-offending		27%	50%	23%	0%
risk of harm		36%	45%	14%	5%
advice on sentencing options		23%	50%	27%	0%
Verification of evidence		45%	55%		
outline plan for supervision		36%	64%		

Supervision

Table 18					yes	No
Does supervision focus consistently on addressing offending behaviour					31%	69%

Does supervision address victim awareness			31%	69%

Performance							
Sex offenders				yes	No -our fault	No not our fault	
Did the service arrange 4 appointments in 1st 4 weeks				80%	13%	7%	
2 home visits in first 12 weeks/3 for parole/non-parole licences				53%	40%	7%	
serious violent offenders							
4 appointments in 4 weeks				50%	43%	7%	
2 home viists/3 for parole/non-parole in first 12 weeks				50%	43%	7%	
sex offenders			Poor	adequate	Good	v good	
level of supervision reflects assessed risk			7%	7%	53%	33%	
content of supervision reflects risk			7%	27%	47%	20%	
management of compliance			14%	29%	29%	29%	
serious violent offenders			Poor	adequate	Good	v good	
level of supervision reflects assessed risk			21%	36%	29%	14%	
content of supervision reflects risk			23%	46%	31%	0%	
management of compliance			40%	30%	30%	0%	