Pre-publication copy October, 2009. Chapter in:

'Offence Paralleling Behaviour: A Case Formulation Approach to Offender Assessment and Intervention' Edited by Michael Daffern, John Shine and Lawrence Jones 9780470744482 (Hardback); 9780470744475 (Paperback) Wiley-Blackwell; publication date: October 2010.

Institutional offence behaviour monitoring as an aid to community supervision of high risk offenders; experience from Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements

Cynthia McDougall¹

Dominic Pearson²

Roger Bowles¹

Judith Cornick³

---

¹ Centre for Criminal Justice Economics & Psychology, University of York.

² Durham Probation Service, County Durham.

³ HMP Acklington, Northumberland.

Acknowledgements:

The project was commissioned and Directed by Hazel Willoughby, Director of Public Protection for Durham and Teesside Probation Services. The authors would like to thank Hazel for her enthusiastic contribution, commitment and support for the ADViSOR project. Thanks are also due to Kevin Dawson, Prison Service Area MAPPA and OASys Co-ordinator, whose assistance in setting up and facilitating the project has been invaluable, and the North East Regional Offender Manager, who has funded the ADViSOR project. We would also like to thank Brian Halliday, Annmarie Taylor, and Leila Sedgewick for providing project management and administrative support in making the systems work as they should.

This chapter describes the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) which provide a framework for supervision of high-risk offenders in the community in England and Wales. It will illustrate from research into prison behaviour how knowledge of prison behaviour has the potential to improve the efficiency of supervision in the community, and will describe a project, ADViSOR, designed to systematically provide information on observed behaviour in prison to offender managers in the community. The method of evaluation, including analysis of costs and benefits, is outlined, and ethical issues are discussed.

Background

The process of assessing risk of re-offending has undergone a number of transformations in the last two decades and has developed into a sophisticated, theoretically-driven and research based methodology. It has long been recognised that the original concept of clinical judgement as the most appropriate means of risk assessment is seriously flawed, and that clinical judgement is susceptible to numerous biases (Blackburn, 1993; Hall, 1987; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Subsequent actuarial approaches, derived from analysis of large offender datasets, have demonstrated robust predictive validity, regularly providing evidence that statistically-identified historical data are the best predictors of future re-offending (Grove & Meehl, 1996; Maden et al, 2006; Monaghan et al., 2001; Quinsey, Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 1998). It has however been recognised that, although actuarial assessment processes are reliable predictors of re-offending, they do not allow for any improvement to occur (Nuffield, 1989); history remains history and is unchangeable. Age at first offence or previous violent offences, for example, remain on record. Therefore, any interventions aimed at lowering an offender's risk levels do not diminish the actuarial measure, and the offender maintains or increases his or her original risk level (Andrews, 1989). A

third generation of risk assessment tools has since been developed which incorporates the historically-based actuarial measure, and additionally provides a structured clinical assessment, in order to reduce the judgement biases which previously beset clinical assessment methods (Blackburn, 2000). Based on research evidence of the dynamic factors most associated with re-offending (Bonta, 1996), clinicians are guided towards the kinds of questions that should be asked and incorporated into a clinical assessment. One of the best examples of a structured assessment tool is the HCR-20: which, as its acronym implies, includes historical, clinical, and risk management information (Webster, Eaves, Douglas, & Wintrup, 1995). The predictive validity of this structured assessment instrument has been found to be sound (Belfrage, Fransson, & Strand, 2000; Douglas, Cox, & Webster, 1999; Douglas, Ogloff, Nicholls, & Grant, 1999; Gray et al., 2003; Gray, Taylor, & Snowden, 2008) and allows a combination of historical and clinical assessments, leading to focused risk management of offenders on the basis of this framework of evidence.

An assessment methodology that has been somewhat neglected in the development of risk assessment tools is behavioural risk assessment. Though behavioural assessment is closely associated with functional analysis assessment techniques (Owens & Ashcroft, 1982) and the behavioural diagnosis model (Kanfer & Saslow, 1969), nowhere has observation of behaviour been systematically incorporated into a comprehensive risk assessment protocol, and this is long overdue.

Behaviour as a Predictor of Risk

Over some years, past behaviour has been identified as the best predictor of future behaviour and a number of studies have demonstrated the links (Bonta, Law, & Hanson, 1998; Borum, 1996; Farrington, Lambert & West, 1998; Mossmann, 1994). Although McDougall and colleagues, (Clark, Fisher, & McDougall, 1993; McDougall and Clark, 1991) identified and demonstrated experimentally that the underlying

patterns of offence behaviour were linked to later prison behaviour, to the authors' knowledge, no one has yet demonstrated the continuity of the specific offence behaviour, through the prison sentence, and after release. The nearest examples of continuity from prison sentence to release have come from Hill (1985), who showed that disciplinary behaviour in prison was a strong predictor of re-offending behaviour after release, and Zamble and Porporino (1990), who showed in a longitudinal study that prisoners responded to problems inside prison as they did to problems outside, and that some behavioural measures predicted future offending. The paucity of research on behavioural risk assessment is an omission, particularly since behaviour in the present and the future could be seen as an extension of the behaviour in the past which makes the actuarial measures so powerful in predicting future behaviour.

A positive aspect of using behaviour as a predictor is that behaviour is specific and reduces the amount of subjectivity and potential cognitive bias that exists in clinical interpretations, including judgements that are anchored in theory. Violent behaviour in an offence followed by violent behaviour in prison leaves little scope for doubt about the consistency of the behaviour. This contradicts the view of other authors that behavioural risk prediction is too open to cognitive bias (Towl & Crighton, 1995).

Contemporaneously with the development of risk assessment methods, the social demand for reliable risk assessment has also increased. The number of people imprisoned in the UK per head of the general population far outstrips that ratio in the rest of Europe (World Prison Population List, 2007), and hence there is pressure to reduce the UK prison population. Additionally, deficiencies in risk assessment processes have been illustrated in some high profile cases of offenders who have been released from prison, only to go on to commit further serious offences (HM Inspectorate of Probation - HMIP, 2006). In order to manage high risk offenders effectively in the community, our risk assessment processes must be shown to provide defensible and

credible approaches to minimising risk and protecting the public, and these assessment processes must be applicable to the most serious offenders. Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements have been put in place for just this purpose.

Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements

Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) have been in place in England and Wales since 2001 following the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act, 2000. This placed a duty on the Police and the National Probation Service to work together to manage the risks posed by sexual, violent and other dangerous offenders in the community. The Criminal Justice Act, 2003, built on the earlier requirements and included provisions to make the Prison Service part of the 'Responsible Authority'. The Prison Service's role is critical to accessing information regarding the offender's behaviour in custody, information on his/her engagement in accredited programmes and other activities, and preparation for release into the community.

The Prison Service is required to ensure that information is shared with the community-based offender manager and is incorporated into the sentence planning process as part of 'end-to-end' offender management (H.M. Prison Service, 2004). The Responsible Authorities have a duty to ensure that any risks to the public identified pre- and post-release are managed robustly at the necessary level of MAPPA management.

Offenders eligible for MAPPA are registered sex offenders, and violent offenders sentenced to 12 or more months' custody. MAPPA may also include offenders subject to hospital orders with restrictions, adult offenders that have already been formally cautioned for their behaviour, or those convicted of an offence in a MAPPA category while abroad. The responsibility for identifying MAPPA eligible offenders falls to each agency that has a statutory role in their supervision or care (National Offender Manager Service, 2009).

Strategies to address identified risks must be managed effectively across agencies. Level 1 cases that are considered to present the lowest risk of re-offending are likely to be managed involving liaison between at least Police and Probation Service managers. Level 2 cases which are considered to present a greater risk of harm will involve regular multi-agency meetings of representatives of all involved agencies chaired by a senior manager in the Probation Service. Level 3 cases which present the greatest risk of causing serious harm again involve regular multi-agency meetings but will be chaired at Probation Director level. Agencies represented will be the Police, Probation Service and Prison Service, and may include representatives from local authority social care services, health and mental health services, education, housing, employment, youth offending teams and victim support agencies. These MAPPA levels of offender management require the most accurate and relevant risk information possible on the offender under consideration.

The Prison Service additionally has a duty to contribute information to the Violent offender and Sex Offender Register (ViSOR), although creation and maintenance of the ViSOR record is generally the responsibility of the Police and Probation staff. ViSOR is a national secure database developed by the Police and the National Offender Management Service to help share confidential information and intelligence in relation to individual sexual and violent offenders.

MAPPA Supervision

The magnitude of the task of supervising some of our most violent and serious sex offenders should not be underestimated. Although communication between prisons and the community agencies and advice on risk management has greatly improved, there are still gaps in the information that is made available. Routinely, offender managers receive information from prisons on an individual's response to offending behaviour programmes, and they will be told about attitudes and relationships

with family, friends and fellow prisoners. They will also hear about high profile risk behaviours that may occur, e.g., security issues such as attempting to contact a victim of their crime. What is missing however is routine information about offence-related behaviour in prison which provides crucial information about whether the offender is trying to change his/her offending behaviour or whether he/she is continuing with the patterns of behaviour that might lead to future offending. The majority of cases that are considered in MAPPA are serious sexual offences. This raises the question as to how an offender with such a strong sexual offending drive manages this sexual drive whilst in prison. The offender's sexual drive is not left behind with his/her property when he/she is received into prison, so what happens to it? Is this drive being managed in a pro-social way with offence behaviour being moderated whilst in prison or are deviant interests being pursued in prison providing evidence of a likely continuation of offending? This is valuable information from which to draw conclusions about the offender's motivation and capacity for controlling his offending behaviour. The ADViSOR project, described below, was initially a local attempt between HMP Acklington and Durham Probation Area to explore whether systematic provision of information on prison behaviour using the police ViSOR database (hence A-D-ViSOR) could add value to the supervision of risk related behaviour and to the development of interventions that might assist those offenders who have the motivation to change.

Development of Behavioural Risk Assessment

Although the cross-situational consistency of behaviours has been demonstrated by Hill, (1985) and Zamble & Porporino, (1990), relatively little use of this knowledge has been made in the supervision of offenders in the community. Within closed institutions there has been much more interest in behavioural risk assessment development, primarily because there are limited means of assessing offenders who

are spending long periods in custody. Offenders in prisons who have committed serious offences are interviewed in depth on numerous occasions by a variety of interviewers, and there is the danger that they will begin to produce learned responses to the repetitive questions from different interviewers over numerous interview occasions. Changes in psychometric measures of attitudes and emotional control can be used as a means of evaluation, but these are self-report measures and can only be viewed as interim measures which may or may not correlate with future actual behaviours.

It was the lack of adequate measures of change in level of risk in life sentence prisoners, and the observation that index offence behaviours emerge within the prison environment (McDougall, & Clark, 1991), that prompted the experimental study of consistency in behaviour from offence behaviour to behaviour in prison (Clark, Fisher, & McDougall, 1993). Although some studies had demonstrated consistency of behaviour across different environments, and disruptive institutional behaviour had been shown to predict future re-offending, the proposition of similarities in the nature of offence behaviour and subsequent prison behaviour had not previously been tested. The Clark et al (1993) study sought to examine whether anecdotally observed offence-related behaviour could be consistently identified by independent observers and whether these behaviours could be linked to index offence behaviour. In the Clark et al study in HMP Wakefield, two experienced prison psychologists independently examined the offence behaviour of life sentence prisoners from detailed police and court records, using a process similar to a functional analysis paradigm (Owens & Ashcroft, 1982), and predicted how the offence behaviour might be manifested in prison. A further two experienced psychologists, who did not have knowledge of the offence behaviour, independently examined officer reports of prison behaviour, prison records, security information, and other written information sources. They were asked

to extract examples of reported behaviour and not to discriminate between positive and negative behaviours. In the final stage of assessment, the predicted behaviours were then compared with actual behaviours by three different experienced psychologists who did not work in HMP Wakefield. Accuracy of prediction was found to be greater for the sample of prisoners under study at a statistically significant level, when compared to a control sample group of life sentence prisoners matched with a random selection of the behaviours. A further study (McDougall, Clark, & Woodward, 1995) described a process of operationalising this risk assessment process so that changes in level of risk could be monitored by officers through behaviour monitoring in prisons that housed life sentence prisoners. This Wakefield Risk Assessment model was used in the Prison Service as the main means of life sentence prisoner assessment for some years, prior to a review of the Life Sentence Planning System as a whole (HM Inspectorate of Prisons and Probation, 1999) and revision of the system.

In 1997 an Offence-Paralleling Behaviour model was developed (Jones (1997), which identified offence-related behaviour as an offence chain, with the potential for the chain to be broken or adapted by intervention. It was proposed that, if the links between thoughts, feelings and behaviours in the offence-chain could be adapted in a pro-social way, then the patient/offender could be assumed to have a reduced risk of re-offending. Jones (2004) has since distinguished offence paralleling behaviours from offence behaviours, (i.e., specific offences committed in a closed establishment), detection evasion behaviours, (i.e., covering up an offence by other apparently more pro-social behaviours), and positive behaviours, which could be described as pro-social, (i.e., instead of punching an individual, the patient might choose to punch a wall). The development of the offence-paralleling behaviour model with its emphasis on links between thoughts, feelings and behaviours, makes the process more

amenable to cognitive-behavioural intervention, and evaluation of the impact of an intervention on future risk.

Community Risk Management

Both the Wakefield risk assessment model (McDougall et al., 1995) and the offence-paralleling behaviour model (Jones, 1997) have attempted to monitor changes in risk behaviour of offenders whilst in custody. However, neither model has explored the utility of the models after release. This is an important development phase and is particularly valuable in provision of risk information to MAPPA. Other models have however taken account of risk management in the community.

The HCR-20 (Webster et al, 1995) and the SONAR (Hanson & Harris, 2000) have both attempted to provide valid risk management guidance based on research evidence. Studies of the HCR-20's predictive validity have shown promising results both for assessments of inpatient violence (e.g., Gray et al., 2003; Grevatt, Thomas-Peter, & Hughes, 2004), and for assessments of community violent recidivism (e.g., Belfrage et al, 2000; Doyle & Dolan, 2006; Gray et al, 2008). Hanson and Harris (2000) have attempted to identify acute risk factors in the community on the basis of known research evidence on sex offenders, and proposed a set of acute risk factors, such as distress or anger, that were associated with the timing of re-offending. Following a prospective test of their risk assessment methodology, Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus (2007) concluded that, although their measures collectively added predictive power above and beyond that provided by the best static risk assessment, the 'acute' factors did not reliably relate to the timing of re-offending.

Neither of the above frameworks specifically includes previous offence behaviour as a risk indicator. The ADVISOR project attempts to explore the value of knowledge of offence-related prison behaviour, such as seeking to make contact with the children of other offenders, in possession of photographs of potential victims, and

inappropriate behaviour with female staff, as possible risk indicators. The project aims to enhance risk management by identifying risk behaviours that relate to the individual offender.

The ADVISOR Project

As mentioned above, detailed information about offenders while in prison is passed on to Multi-Agency Public Protection Units in their regular meetings. This can include specific information on offence-related behaviour, where it has come to the notice of the offender supervisor, and is considered to be of value to the offender managers in the community. Currently a system does not exist for this information to be collected from wing staff on a regular basis and some behavioural information may be missed. The ADVISOR project was set up by County Durham Probation Service and HMP Acklington in order to systematically collect information from prison staff on relevant offence-related behaviours to inform offender supervisors and to assist community offender managers in planning public protection arrangements for offenders on release, with the ultimate intention of populating the ViSOR database with risk-relevant behavioural information from prisons.

The primary aim of ADVISOR is effective risk management through the MAPP Arrangements. A secondary aim is to seek to engender self-control behaviours in offenders, where the offender is motivated to co-operate, building on observed positive behaviours in prison (which Jones, 2004, would categorise as positive pro-social behaviours). The current intervention builds on an earlier project which was aimed at operationalising psychological risk assessment (McDougall et al, 1995) and does so by involving wing prison officers, offender supervisors in prison, education and instructional staff, officers supervising visits and security staff. It is recognised that prison staff are the first line of observation of offender behaviour, and it is important to involve them in the public protection process.

The Design of ADViSOR

The design of the ADViSOR project was a consultative process, as it is acknowledged that such a project can only succeed with the co-operation and commitment of those involved in the process.

The project began with consultation of offender supervisors, some of whom had previously worked as wing prison officers, about the kinds of offence-related behaviours that could be observed on Wings. Offender supervisors confirmed that there was evidence of offence-related behaviours which were known to wing staff, but that there was no system in place for this kind of information to be recorded and communicated. Examples of the behaviours wing staff and offender supervisors had noted were behaviours related to offending, e.g., choosing to sit near children during visits, having photographs of children in their possession, exchanging depositions about their and others' offences, making contact outside of the prison with women with children, seeking to join fan clubs, maintaining correspondence networks with released sex offenders, grooming of prisoners and/or staff, and sexual bartering and coercion. This is just a selection from a wide range of behaviours, some of which involve actual offences such as rape and physical intimidation.

Although previous studies which require behavioural observation have used prison behaviour checklists (Cooke, 1998; McDougall et al, 1995), and indeed a behaviour checklist is used in evaluation of prison offending behaviour programmes (Nugent, Geohagan, & Travers, 2005), offender supervisors recommended that we should not use checklists. In their view checklists were rarely completed conscientiously, especially when repeated over long periods, and would be unreliable. Furthermore, to avoid unintended or intended bias, reports needed to record the evidence to back up reports of offence-related behaviour, and this would not be possible with checklists. It was recommended that the project would gain more co-

operation if we used documentation already in existence, e.g., completion of wing history sheets. Staff are required to write a comment in wing history sheets about each prisoner on a weekly basis, but the kinds of information recorded usually relate to behaviours that concern prison security as opposed to risk of causing harm on release. Indeed wing staff training focuses mainly on security issues and it is a novel concept to them that they should be involved in assessment of risk of harm on release. This highlighted the need for awareness training for wing staff on risk of harm issues in order to alert them to the important contribution they can make. To reinforce this message, it was suggested that a guidance note be attached to the wing file indicating the kinds of behaviour that might be observed and which, if observed, should be recorded. A copy of the wing information sheet is shown in Figure 1. This lists a sample of the kinds of information that offender supervisors identified as being regularly observed in prison. The lists include behaviours described by Jones (2004) as offence behaviour (e.g., rape), detection evasion skills, (i.e., grooming of staff), and positive behaviours (i.e., avoiding mixing with other sex offenders).

It is acknowledged that there is an emphasis in the Behaviour Monitoring Form on offence-related behaviour, and less emphasis on positive behaviours in the prison. It should be remembered however that the purpose of the Behaviour Monitoring Form is not to assist decisions about release; the release date of the prisoner has already been determined. At this stage the primary concern is about ensuring that the public is protected from further offences and that potential victims are safeguarded. It is for this reason that emphasis is placed on the risks relating to the prisoner's release. Positive behaviours will be sought and built upon by the offender manager in attempting to make an impact on the offender's offending behaviour, whilst at the same time being responsible for his/her safe management in the community.

Figure 1 about here

Offender supervisors in the prison agreed to take responsibility for extracting information from wing history sheets when a prisoner was due for release. They also undertook to complete a Behaviour Monitoring Form which would record the risk behaviours that had been observed on the wings, and would predict the likely behaviour following release. The Behaviour Monitoring Form was designed to be as simple as possible to encourage its use and to minimise the additional work that could accrue from completing complicated forms. A copy of the front page of the Behaviour Monitoring Form is shown in Figure 2¹, and similar pages are provided for each category of behaviour of interest. The predicted behaviours section is included in order to be precise about the likely community behaviour based on the prison behaviour observed and to avoid the kinds of bias that could occur if the behaviours described were too general, leading to a wide range of possible interpretations.

Figure 2 about here

The Behaviour Monitoring Form is completed by the offender supervisor and sent electronically to the offender manager in the community to assist completion of public protection plans. It is recognised that an important factor in maintaining the behavioural monitoring system is feedback to the staff in the prison as to whether the behaviour recorded and predicted has in fact occurred. A section of the form therefore provides for the offender manager to record any behaviour in the community linked to the predicted behaviour to enable feedback to HM Prison staff. Although it is the intention that this communication will take place via the ViSOR database, full use of ViSOR by the relevant agencies, at time of writing, has not taken place.

---

¹ Copies may be obtained from the Psychology Unit, Co. Durham Probation Service.

Consultation with offender managers in the community confirmed the value of the behavioural information and the importance of its timing. Ideally information should be available at required time-points throughout the offender's sentence so that changes in behaviour, and hence levels of risk, could be monitored, although it was recognised that this would place much pressure on already stretched prison resources. It was considered that, at a minimum, behavioural information should be provided at least 3 to 6 months before an offender's release date in order to contribute to MAPPA meetings.

It was identified that some of the most high risk offenders are first released to Approved Premises (formerly known as hostels), and hence Approved Premises should be involved in the behaviour monitoring process. Approved Premises add value by offering a perception of freedom in comparison to the regimes in prisons, with opportunities for access to social use of alcohol and a wider range of potential activities. Additionally, the responsibility of staff in Approved Premises in relation to MAPPA is clear; Probation Circular 35/05 (National Probation Service, 2005) states that: 'Routine observation and daily assessments of patterns of behaviour, and reliable procedures for those assessments must be recorded'. There is therefore close supervision and observation at Approved Premises that can provide a valuable bridge between prison and community behaviour monitoring.

Learning from implementation of ADViSOR

Following the introduction of ADViSOR, we have found that it is essential to appoint a prison co-ordinator for the ADViSOR behavioural risk assessment process. Although there are many enthusiasts for the project, unless it is designated as someone's job to see that the monitoring forms are completed regularly, then completion is likely to fall behind. It is also sometimes necessary to follow up Wing History Sheet comments with the individual officer to obtain more information or clarification.

Staff training is essential to the introduction of the project, as the concept of contributing information relevant to risk of harm after release has not previously been incorporated in prison officer training, although that may be due to change. Experience suggests that the following training processes should be adopted:

- The ADViSOR project should be introduced to senior level managers at the outset to ensure top-level managerial support for the project.
- Wing staff should be trained to recognise the kinds of behaviour that may be relevant to risk of harm after an offender is released from prison. Training should be given on how to record this information on Wing History Sheets, together with supporting information on behaviour with evidence of instances.
- Offender supervisors need a minimum of half a day's training prior to implementation of the project to be made aware of the behaviours to be recorded, and predictions that may be made about likely behaviours on release.
- Education staff, works instructors and staff supervising visits should also receive awareness training.
- Offender managers in the community need a minimum of half a day's training prior to implementation of the project to explore the value that can be obtained from the behavioural information provided, and to consider how this information can be incorporated into sentence planning. They should be made aware of the importance of feedback to offender supervisors in prison and how this should be reported.

It is intended that manuals will be drawn up by the ADViSOR project team, in order to standardise the awareness training and offender supervisor/manager training, and to allow for cascading of training following the initial training schedule for the project.

Use of wing history sheets and monitoring forms in practice

The project is in its early stages, and there is so far insufficient information to allow for a quantitative evaluation. The information is however interesting at a qualitative level. Some of the information obtained from behaviour monitoring is serious in nature and may have reached the MAPPA Meeting without the existence of the ADVISOR project, e.g., in one case the offender manager had already been told that the offender had tried to get in touch with a member of his victim's family. Other types of information are however less likely to be reported, as they describe lower level risk behaviour, but which may become important if maintained over a long time period. These can relate to who regularly visits the offender, who corresponds, and who is on the offender's telephone list. This can raise questions about supervision, as in the case of an offender whose success on release was perceived to be dependent on strong family relationships but who, the behaviour monitoring revealed, had received no visits, letters or phone contact from his family throughout his sentence. This led the offender manager to take a closer look at the robustness of the family support. In another case, a victim had written to the prison asking how to arrange to visit the prisoner who had offended against her. The significance of this request might not have been recognised in the normal course of events, but was picked up by the offender supervisor in completing the behaviour monitoring form. Another case emerged where there were examples of inappropriate behaviour with different female members of staff in different parts of the prison. These separate pieces of information alone did not attract attention, until they were linked up in the ADVISOR monitoring process as a worrying pattern of behaviour. It is becoming evident that it may be such ongoing low-level risk behaviour that may not appear to be sufficiently serious to raise in MAPPA meetings, that are likely to come to the fore in the new monitoring system.

Evaluation of the project

In order to assess the effectiveness of the ADViSOR project in reducing risk of harm, it is considered essential that the effectiveness and cost-benefits of the project are analysed. The central hypothesis to be tested is that the provision of information on offence-related behaviour in prison, and the forwarding of this information to community offender managers using the new behaviour monitoring form, will improve the quality of offender management and thereby enhance public safety.

The first phase of the research has been the implementation of the project and an ongoing process evaluation of implementation. The second phase of the research will comprise qualitative and quantitative analysis and a cost-benefits analysis.

Choice of outcome measures

The longer term objective of the project is to improve offender management in order to reduce the likelihood of re-offending. For longer term evaluation purposes therefore the appropriate outcome measure will be the proportion of offenders reconvicted at one year and two years respectively after release, supplemented by information about the length of time to reconviction and the type of offences committed.

Since data collection for such an analysis will take upwards of two years, there is a need to develop some interim indicators or intermediate outcome measures to inform policy development.

Proposed interim indicators for this purpose will include the proportion of offenders who are charged or cautioned, or who violate licence conditions or display behaviour giving cause for concern within six months to twelve months of release from prison, with particular attention being given to behaviours identified by prison offence-related monitoring.

Methodology

Qualitative

- (i) Evidence will be sought from the prison, where the behaviour monitoring form is being piloted, on:
  - The quality of the information that is being obtained from behaviour monitoring recorded in wing information sheets and the behaviour monitoring form
  - on the time taken by prison offender supervisors to collect behavioural information from Wing History Sheets, and from individual officers, works instructors and teachers, including organisational aspects of data collection (such as securing prison officer and other staff cooperation, quality control of the data being collected, etc.)
  - time taken by offender supervisors to input the data
  - The staff training requirement.
- (ii) The research will also examine the processes within the regional community Probation Services by which information from the pro-forma is received and used to inform the drafting of sentence plans or licence conditions and other aspects of offender management. The degree to which licence conditions are linked to the content of behavioural information received is an example of the kind of summary measure of how the new information might be influential.
- (iii) Impact of the supervision on interim measures, such as whether offenders are charged, cautioned or violate licence conditions, will be examined in relation to behaviour reported from the prison.

- (iv) A further part of the evaluation will involve investigating the process by which the new information coming from the prison is incorporated into the police ViSOR database system.

Quantitative analysis

The hypothesis to be tested is that the improved provision to community offender managers of information about offender behaviour in prison will support better risk assessment and management of offenders and help identify licence conditions that are more likely to prevent re-offending. The purpose of the quantitative analysis is to compare reconviction outcomes for the 'intervention' group released in early 2008 with those of the two 'comparison' groups, one comprising offenders released during the previous six months period and the second comprising comparable offenders released contemporaneously from a prison not running the prison behaviour monitoring scheme.

The characteristics of offenders in the three groups will be compared to establish how closely matched they are in relation to variables such as age, type of offence for which they have been imprisoned, number of convictions to date, age at first conviction, OASYS profiles etc. The groups will then be compared on the number of charges, cautions and convictions within 3, 6 and 12 months of release. The mean seriousness of any offences committed will also be recorded, as will involvement in other 'incidents' in which they are known to have been involved following release from prison.

Costs and benefits

The qualitative and quantitative components of the evaluation will include a review of the cost-benefit characteristics of using the behavioural monitoring form. A full analysis of the benefits will only be possible once sufficient reconvictions data have

been accumulated to make an assessment of the crime reduction impact of ADViSOR. But there is scope for considering the cost side of the project somewhat sooner.

The costs of ADViSOR are a mix of up-front capital costs and recurrent costs. The up-front costs involve staff training and costs of setting up the organisational links needed to support the new information flows. Liaison between prisons, probation, police and other agencies is costly to establish. We will endeavour to make some estimates of the scale of the work entailed in training and liaison, and the resource costs associated with it.

The recurrent costs will fall on prison staff completing and collating the data on offenders and also on community offender managers who will have an additional stream of information to incorporate in files and decision-making. Once the project has been under way for three months and monitoring forms on a number of prisoners have been compiled it should be feasible to investigate the amount of staff time (and thus costs) involved in running the system. Interviews with prison staff completing and/or collating the data on offenders and also with community offender managers will be used to explore these recurrent costs.

Project design costs

The 'project design' cost element, including the costs of this evaluation, is a 'one-off' cost that would not have to be met again. It covers items such as the basic design work and background research along with the design of the forms to be used, the design and revision of the content of staff training and the production of training material. These costs are all 'sunk': they are irrecoverable irrespective of the impact of the project.

Project initiation costs

Some, but not all, of the initial costs incurred in ADViSOR would be incurred if the project were to be rolled out elsewhere. The project initiation costs that would arise if the project were being rolled out in a different setting would include the following:

- governor or senior management involvement to make decisions about how the project is to be run, including allocation of responsibilities and briefing of middle managers and supervisory staff
- middle manager time to set up the information collation system, appoint a co-ordinator, liaise with wing staff and offender supervisors, liaise with offender managers in the community
- training of offender supervisors
- training, or at least awareness raising, for wing staff
- ensuring that existing methods of liaison with offender managers in probation are in place and are adequate for dealing with a new flow of sensitive information.

Recurrent project costs

Once the system has been implemented over a period of a few weeks or months it may require minimal support from senior staff. At this point the key requirements would be:

- ensuring that an information co-ordinator in the prison spends an appropriate amount of time and effort collecting and monitoring the quality of information being collected in wing files.

The principal costs associated with this will be salary and related costs of a co-ordinator in the prison and of a co-ordinator in the relevant probation offices.

Recurrent benefits

The measure of benefits would rely primarily on a comparison of the reconviction outcomes for ADVISOR-supported offenders and a control group about whom the information was not being collected. This might be based on estimates of the economic and social costs of the offences for which the intervention group are responsible in relation to the corresponding costs for the control group.

An absolute minimum of several months would be required before any such estimates could be made, particularly in relation to sex offenders whose offence types tend to involve lower reconviction rates and longer intervals to reconviction than for other groups of prisoners.

Project returns and viability

The key determinant of the returns will thus be the benefits derived. These benefits are expected primarily in the form of reduced re-offending rates for discharged prisoners. But there may be additional benefits at offender management level. If it can be demonstrated that the increased flow of information from the prison offender supervisor to the community offender manager makes it easier to collect the information required for MAPPA purposes then there might be some savings to police, probation and others.

Ethical Considerations

Although the value of behavioural risk assessment is generally recognised, some concerns have been raised about the ethics of monitoring behaviour in prison, and it has been proposed that it is necessary to inform the offender when a specific behaviour is being monitored. A contrary argument is that offenders in the Public Protection category are already informed by means of a printed leaflet (National Offender Manager Service - NOMS, 2007) that they are considered to present a

serious risk of re-offending and that their actions are being continuously monitored and assessed to prevent their re-offending, The latter approach is supported by the British Psychological Society in its Generic Professional Guidelines (2008), which allow for exceptions in obtaining permission to disclose information, i.e., 'In exceptional circumstances, disclosure without consent, or against the client's expressed wish, may be necessary in situations in which failure to disclose appropriate information would expose the client, or someone else, to a risk of serious harm (including physical or sexual abuse) or death (p.10). There are a number of circumstances where this (disclosure) might not apply: for example where the health, safety or welfare of the client or someone else would otherwise be put at serious risk (p. 9)'. Similar guidance exists in clinical domains. Blackburn (1993) proposes that psychologists in a multi-disciplinary context are professionally obliged to share information with other members. This is particularly so where there is a conflict between the interests of the public and those of the offender. Blackburn (p.412) states that 'the guiding principles should be the maximum benefit and least harm with pride of place going to those interested parties whose lives are most negatively affected by the problem behaviour'.

Conclusion

The ADVISOR project has required the co-operation and involvement of a wide range of people both within the prison and the regional community probation areas. This has been made particularly easy because the concept of observing and monitoring behaviour in prison as a means of predicting risk behaviour in the community is generally accepted among practitioners. It is not a difficult psychological concept and, when proposed, seems so logical that it is surprising that it has not been done before. Having introduced the idea of behaviour monitoring to wing staff, we immediately received requests to be involved in the project from other staff in the prison who come into contact with offenders in other domains, e.g. in education, and in work situations,

whose environments present different opportunities in which to observe behaviour.

There are however dangers in monitoring behaviour in that incorrect inferences might be drawn from behaviours which may not be linked to offending. This is why it is essential to give proper training in completion of the behaviour monitoring form and the use in sentence planning of the information provided; to require that reports of prison behaviour and community behaviour are supported by evidence; and to ensure that the ADViSOR project is properly evaluated. We have yet to demonstrate that offence-related behaviour in prison is related to offence behaviour after release, but if this can be shown, we will have a valuable means of enhancing the protection we give to the public through the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements.

References

- Andrews, D.A. (1989). Recidivism is predictable and can be influenced: Using risk assessments to reduce recidivism. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 1(2), 11 – 18.
- Belfrage, H., Fransson, G., & Strand, S. (2000). Prediction of violence using the HCR-20: A prospective study in two maximum security correctional institutions. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 11, 167-175.
- Blackburn, R. (1993). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. Ltd.
- Blackburn, R. (2000). Risk assessment and prediction. In J. McGuire, T. Mason, & A. O’Kane (Eds.). *Behaviour, crime & legal processes: A guide for forensic practitioners*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Bonta, J. (1996). Risk-needs assessment and treatment. In A.T. Harland (Ed). *Choosing correctional options that work* (pp. 18 – 32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bonta, J., Law, M., & Hanson, R.K. (1998). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123, 123 – 142.
- Borum, R. (1996). Improving the clinical practice of violence risk assessment: Technology guidelines, and training. *American Psychologist*, 51, 945 – 956.
- British Psychological Society (2008). Generic professional practice guidelines (2nd edition). Leicester: British Psychological Society.
- Clark, D.A., Fisher, M.J., & McDougall, C. (1993). A new methodology for assessing the level of risk in incarcerated offenders. *British Journal of Criminology*, 33 (3), 436-448.

- Cooke, D.J. (1998). The development of the prison behavior rating scale. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 25 (4), 482 – 506.
- Douglas, K.S., Cox, D.N., & Webster, C.D. (1999). Violence risk assessment: Science and practice. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 4, 149-184.
- Douglas, K.S., Ogloff, J.R.P., Nicholls, T.L., & Grant, I. (1999). Assessing risk for violence among psychiatric patients: The HCR-20 violence risk assessment scheme and the Psychopathy Checklist: Screening Version. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 917-930.
- Doyle, M., & Dolan, M. (2006). Predicting community violence from patients discharged from mental health services. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 189, 520-526.
- Farrington, D.P., Lambert, S., & West, D.J. (1998). Criminal careers of two generations of family members in the Cambridge study on delinquent development. *Studies on Crime & Crime Prevention*, 7 (1), 85-106.
- Gray, N.S., Hill, C., McGleish, A., Timmons, D., MacCulloch, M.J., Snowden, R.J. (2003). Prediction of violence and self-harm in mentally disordered offenders: A prospective study of the efficacy of HCR-20, PCL-R and psychiatric symptomology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 443-451.
- Gray, N.S., Taylor, J., & Snowden, R.J. (2008). Predicting violent reconvictions using the HCR-20. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 192, 384 – 387.
- Grevatt, M., Thomas-Peter, B., Hughes, G. (2004). Violence, mental disorder and risk assessment: Can structured clinical assessments predict the short-term risk of inpatient violence? *Journal of Forensic Psychiatric Psychology*, 15, 278-292.
- Grove, W.M., & Meehl, P.E. (1996). Comparative efficiency of informal (subjective, impressionistic) and formal (mechanical, algorithmic) prediction procedures: The clinical-statistical controversy. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 2, 293-323.

Hall, H.V. (1987). *Violence prediction: Guidelines for the forensic practitioner*.

Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Hanson, R.K., & Harris, A.J.R. (2000). Where should we intervene? Dynamic predictors of sexual offence recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27, 96 – 135.

Hanson, R.K., Harris, A.J.R., Scott, T-L, & Helmus, L. (2007). Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The dynamic supervision project. *Public Safety Canada*. www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/cprmindex-eng.aspx

Hill, G. (1985). Predicting recidivism using institutional measures. In D. P. Farrington, & R. Tarling (Eds.). *Prediction in criminology*. Chichester: Wiley.

HM Inspectorate of Probation - HMIP (2006). An independent review of a serious further offence case: Anthony Rice. London: Crown Copyright.

HM Inspectorates of Prisons and Probation (1999). *Lifers - A joint thematic review* by HM Inspectorates of Prisons and Probation, 1999.

<http://inspectorate.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprison/thematic-reports1/lifers>

H.M. Prison Service (2004). *Multi-agency public protection arrangements*. Prison service order 4745.

<http://www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/resourcecentre/psipsos/listpsos/>

Jones, L.F. (1997). Developing models for managing treatment integrity and efficacy in a prison based therapeutic community: The Max Glatt Centre. In E. Cullen, L. Jones, & R. Woodward (Eds.). *Therapeutic communities for offenders*. Chichester: Wiley.

Jones, L.F.(2004). Offence paralleling behaviour (OPB) as a framework for assessment and interventions with offenders. In A. Needs, & G. Towl (Eds.) *Applying psychology to forensic practice* (pp. 34 – 63). Oxford: British Psychological Society and Blackwell Publishing.

- Kanfer, F.H. & Saslow, G. (1969). Behavioural diagnosis. In C. Franks (Ed). *Behaviour therapy: Appraisal and status*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Maden, A., Rogers, P., Watt, A., Lewis, G., Amos, T., Gournay, K., & Skapinakis, P. (2006). Assessing the utility of the Offenders Group Reconviction Scale-2 in predicting the risk of reconviction within 2 and 4 years of discharge from English and Welsh medium secure units. *Final Report to the National Forensic Mental Health Research Programme*. <http://www.nfmhp.org.uk>.
- McDougall, C., & Clark, D.A. (1991). A risk assessment model. In S. Boddiss (Ed.). *Proceedings of the Prison Psychology Conference*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- McDougall, C., Clark, D.A., & Woodward, R. (1995). Application of operational psychology to assessment of inmates. *Psychology, Crime and Law*. 2, 85 – 99.
- Monahan, J., Steadman, H. J., Silver, E., Appelbaum, P.S., Robbins, P. C., Mulvey, E. P., Roth, L. H., Grisso, T., & Banks, S. (2001). *Rethinking risk assessment: The Macarthur study of mental disorder and violence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mossman, D. (1994). Assessing predictions of violence: being accurate about accuracy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 783 – 792.
- National Offender Management Service - NOMS (2009). *MAPPA Guidance version 3.0*. London: NOMS Public Protection Unit.
- [http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/MAPPA Guidance \(2009\) Version 3 0.](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/MAPPA%20Guidance%20(2009)%20Version%203%200.pdf)
- National Probation Service (2005). *The role and purpose of approved premises*. Probation Circular 37/2005: London: National Probation Service.
- Nugent, F., Geohagan, K., & Travers, R. (2005). *Cognitive skills assessment test battery guide. Test Battery Guide Version 2*. London: Ministry of Justice, Offending Behaviour Programmes Unit.

- Nuffield, J. (1989). The SIR scale: Some reflections on its applications. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 1, 19 – 22.
- Owens, G., & Ashcroft, J.B. (1982). Functional analysis in applied psychology. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 21, 181 – 189.
- Quinsey, L., Harris, G.T., Rice, M.E., & Cormier, C.A. (1998). *Violent offenders: Appraising and managing risk*. Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association.
- Towl, G. J. & Crighton, D. A. (1995). Risk assessment in prisons: a psychological critique. *Forensic Update*. 40, 6 -14.
- Tversky, D & Kahneman, A. (1974). Judgement under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185, 1124 – 1131.
- Webster, C. D., Eaves, D., Douglas, K. S., & Wintrup, A. (1995). *The HCR-20 scheme: The assessment of dangerousness and risk*. Vancouver, Canada: Simon Fraser University and Forensic Psychiatric Services Commission of British Columbia.
- World Prison Population List. (2007). London: International Centre for Prison Studies, King's College London. www.prisonstudies.org.
- Zamble, R., & Porporino, F., (1990). Coping, imprisonment and rehabilitation. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 17(1), 53 – 69.

Figure 1

Wing Information Sheet

TYPES OF INFORMATION TO INCLUDE ON THE HISTORY SHEET

We are interested in identifying behaviour in prison which is related to offence behaviour, so that we can provide information on level of risk, and advise on likely behaviour in the community. Please report on the *History Sheet* evidence of any relevant behaviour, examples of which are shown below. This will be followed up and collated by Offender Supervisors for use in Inter-departmental Public Protection meetings and MAPPA meetings.

Acquaintances - Close friendship with offenders with similar offences - Always mixes with sex offenders - Grooming of other prisoner/s - Sexual relationship with other prisoner/s - Details of cell-mate	Behaviour with other prisoners - Intimidating behaviour to other prisoners (including violence/ rape) - Sexual behaviour for payment - Victimised by other prisoners – injuries - Bullying – lack of, or lots of personal belongings
Behaviour in Work / Education - Involved in offence-related discussion with other prisoners - Inappropriate comments to instructor / teacher - Inappropriate behaviour with teachers - Selects unlikely reading materials - Attempted grooming of instructors - Interested in learning about skills related to own offending - e.g internet access, making soft toys	Reading/Photographic Materials - Pornographic material - Unlikely reading material, such as women's magazines, material with pictures of children, young girls or boys, etc., catalogues - Offender depositions - Pictures and photos of concern on pin board
Hobbies/ Pastimes - Making soft toys - Choice of TV - Interest in violent videos or video-games playstation. - "Fetish"-like behaviours (e.g., collecting underwear) - Phone sex/compulsive masturbation - Excessive use of gym - 'Legitimate' avoidance of Offending Behaviour Programmes	Contacts with outside world (by letter or phone) - In touch with ex-prisoners/sex offenders - Wide range of contacts - Contacts with children - Female pen-friends/ grooming - Postal orders and transfers of money - Lots of small amounts of money to one address - Contact with minority groups, including religious
Visits - Drug trafficking - Inappropriate behaviour with visitor/s - Watching children on visits - Excessive applications to see children, e.g., nephews, nieces. - Requests to see partner's children	Behaviour with staff - Seeks out female members of staff - Seeks out specific member of staff - Grooming behaviour - Tries to 'bend the rules' - Seeks favours - Exposes self (even if seemingly by accident) - Excessive use of requests/complaints
Any other behaviour that concerns you – Please contact offender supervisor	Positive Behaviours Related to Offending - Avoiding offenders with similar offences - Evidence of controlling offence-related interests - Positive alternative behaviours - Constructive plans for release

Figure 2

Behaviour Monitoring Form

OFFENDER SUPERVISOR PRISON BEHAVIOUR FORM

(ONLY FILL IN RELEVANT SECTIONS)

Release date No

Name of Offender	DOB
Name of Offender Supervisor	PNC No
Signature	Name of Offender Manager
	Today's date

1. ACQUAINTANCES	- Close friendship with offenders with similar offences - Always mixes with sex offenders - Grooming of other prisoners - Sexual relationship with other prisoner/s - Details of cell-mate						
Behaviour with acquaintances causing concern – (include evidence) Give 2 examples if possible							
1)							
2)							
Likely behaviour on release indicated by behaviour with acquaintances							
APPROVED PREMISES (Complete if applicable)							
<table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;">COMPLETED BY OFFENDER MANAGER AFTER RELEASE (Describe)</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Behaviour evident in first 3 months</th> <th style="width: 20%;">YES/NO</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="height: 150px;"></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		COMPLETED BY OFFENDER MANAGER AFTER RELEASE (Describe)	Behaviour evident in first 3 months	YES/NO			
COMPLETED BY OFFENDER MANAGER AFTER RELEASE (Describe)	Behaviour evident in first 3 months	YES/NO					

Continue on extra page if necessary