



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe

**AN EVALUATION OF THE STATUTORY ORDERS TEAM,
SWANSEA YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE,
USING CPAI-2000**

**Final report to the Welsh Government
March 2012**

**Dr Pamela Ugwudike
Professor Peter Raynor
(Swansea University)**

Acknowledgements

We wish to express our thanks to all the staff members of the Statutory Orders Team and to the Manager of the Swansea Youth offending Service who participated and responded without reservation to our requests for interviews. We are very grateful to you all for granting us access and for persevering in the face of repeated demands to grant interviews.

We also wish to extend our sincere thanks to the Welsh Government for funding the evaluation and in particular to Robert Willis who supported us throughout with positive and constructive feedback on earlier drafts of the report.

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of a study that was funded by the Welsh Government under the New Ideas Fund. The study used the Correctional Programme Assessment Inventory-2000 (CPAI-2000,) to evaluate a programme for young people. An additional aim was to assess programme integrity. This is the degree to which a programme follows principles of effective practice.. The particular programme evaluated was the Statutory Orders Team (SOT) based in the Swansea Youth Offending Service (YOS).

This summary provides an easy to read overview. The main part of the report uses some technical terms, which are defined in the glossary.

The Statutory Orders Team of the Swansea Youth Offending Service (YOS) supervises children and young people who have received a court order. The Service is located in Wales and its jurisdiction is the same as the areas covered by the City and County of Swansea Local Authority. There are three full time staff members, and one part time staff member. There is only one male staff member. The programme relies mainly on welfare-orientated strategies (which include providing access to housing, education, training and employment). The risks-of reoffending-and of harm to self and others are also taken into account. It works with a range of external service providers to deliver these services.

Client supervision/treatment takes place in YOS offices, during home visits or visits to hostels or secure units. The YOS supervises an average of 60 young people a year.

This study used the CPAI-2000 to evaluate the team on eight key aspects of practice that are central to programme integrity.¹ The eight aspects of practice have been linked to effective outcomes (in the form of reduced reconviction rates). Below is a summary of the programme's performance on the eight scored sections (Sections B to I) of the CPAI-2000.

¹ The term 'Programme Integrity' is defined in the glossary below.

SECTION B - ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

The programme satisfied all the criteria for organisational culture. The programme has the following in place:

- a clear goal definition and ethics of intervention – this means that the programme is guided by defined goals and a code of ethics;
- strategies for ensuring timely responses to new initiatives or new modes of programme delivery;
- organisational harmony—there are positive interactions/relationships between staff members and also, between staff members and members of management. There are also adequate ways of addressing routine issues and resolving problems ;
- there are adequate staff training facilities;
- there are effective ways of sharing information between staff members working in different sections of the programme;
- the programme has facilities in place for maintaining adequate collaboration with external consultants who can advise on programming and internal evaluation exercises;
- the programme has low levels of staff turnover.

Score: 100% Very Satisfactory (average confidence rating 5)

SECTION C - PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENACE

The programme met some of the criteria set in this section:

- the usefulness of the programme is evident to key stakeholders like the clients, the courts and the relevant government departments;
- stakeholders' views inform service development and delivery;
- there is funding stability;
- staffing levels are adequate;
- staff members possess adequate professional qualifications;
- there are no outstanding policy, or management/staff concerns affecting programme delivery.

Score: 86% Very Satisfactory (average confidence rating 3)

SECTION D - MANAGEMENT/STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

This was another high scoring area for the programme. The characteristics of members of management and members of staff satisfy most of the criteria for effective practices:

- management/staff possess the necessary qualifications;
- the director of the programme has adequate knowledge of the programme and also has the support of staff members;
- the director has direct experience of offender treatment and is actively involved in staff recruitment and training;
- the director uses appropriate techniques to motivate staff;
- all staff members undergo necessary security checks and possess adequate skills, training, educational qualifications, experience, personal qualities such as empathy, and also a belief in the efficacy of rehabilitation;
- staff members are able to suggest modifications to the programme, they are also periodically assessed on clinical skills related to service delivery and they have access to the director and to training.

Score: 88% Very Satisfactory (average confidence rating 4)

SECTION E - CLIENT RISK/NEED PRACTICES

The programme attained a lower score in this section mainly because of the lack of adequate tools for assessing a key principle of effective practice – responsivity². That said, the programme met several key criteria set out below:

- the selection criteria for the programme are appropriate - selection is based on appropriate assessments of risk and need using a risk assessment instrument;
- there is a rationale or legal basis for the exclusion of certain clients;
- treatment mode and intensity and also, the categorisation and allocation of clients to practitioners are based on levels of assessed risk and need;
- the assessments are conducted and periodically re-administered using a risk assessment instrument, such as Asset.

Score: 58% Satisfactory
(average confidence rating 4)

²The degree to which the programme is delivered in a manner that is responsive to the personal characteristics, and abilities of the offender..

SECTION F - PROGRAMME CHARACTERISTICS

The programme attained a lower score in this section which evaluates the quality of the programme's characteristics. Staff members may benefit from training on the skills required for implementing cognitive restructuring processes³. Nevertheless, the programme did meet several other criteria set in this section because the programme:

- predominantly targets criminogenic needs⁴;
- encourages clients to engage in constructive activities;
- ensures that programme intensity matches levels of assessed risk;
- facilitates the collaboration of the client in the treatment process;
- has clear completion criteria in place;
- offers brokerage and advocacy services;
- trains significant others to provide support to clients.

Score: 50% Satisfactory (average confidence rating 4)

SECTION G - CORE CORRECTIONAL PRACTICES

The participating staff members demonstrated that they implement some of the key Core Correctional Practices (CCPS) assessed in this section. Observations of actual supervision sessions revealed that the staff members meet the following criteria for effective practices:

- the staff members offer effective reinforcement in the form of praise and reward in response to prosocial behaviour⁵ exhibited by the clients;
- they encourage the clients to reflect on why the rewarded behaviour is desirable and on the future benefits of that behaviour;
- they also implement effective problem solving strategies and demonstrate effective use of authority;
- they engage the clients in good working relationships and they employ motivational interviewing techniques⁶.

Score: 60% Satisfactory (average confidence rating 3)

v

³ 'Cognitive restructuring' is the process of guiding the client through the process of replacing antisocial thoughts and feelings with prosocial alternatives..

⁴ 'Criminogenic needs' are those factors likely to lead to offending, such as antisocial attitudes and behaviours, criminogenic peers, and substance misuse.

⁵ 'Prosocial behaviour is law abiding behaviour.

⁶ 'Motivational interviewing' involves working with the client to elicit their intrinsic motivation to change.

SECTION H - INTER-AGENCY COMMUNICATION

The programme maintains effective inter-agency communication given that it:

- provides brokerage and advocacy services;
- follows-up on referrals adequately;
- ensures effective inter-agency communication and coordination of treatment across different relevant agencies;
- has readily available, written information about relevant organisations/service providers.

Score: 100% Very Satisfactory (average confidence rating 5)

SECTION I – EVALUATION

This was another low scoring area for the programme but the programme did meet several key criteria for effective evaluation listed below:

- the programme conducts regular internal reviews of client records;
- it conducts client satisfaction surveys;
- it periodically assess clients' risk/needs levels to monitor progress;
- it also engages with researchers/evaluators who can contribute to programme design and management.

Score: 50% Satisfactory (average confidence rating 4)

Summary of key findings and recommendations

In sum, the programme scored highly in Section B – Organisational Culture because it effectively maintains an organisational structure that is orientated towards the implementation of practices that have been shown to reduce recidivism.

The programme also scored highly in Section C – Programme Implementation and Maintenance. It has provisions in place for maintaining the quality of service delivery. For instance, the programme accommodates the views of stakeholders.

Another high scoring area is Section D – Management and Staff Characteristics. The programme maintains an adequate staff/client ratio. Staff members possess adequate professional qualifications and are subject to training and ethical requirements set by their professional body.

Section H – Interagency Communication - is another high scoring area. The programme provides brokerage and advocacy services; it has well established links with external agencies that can provide the services that the clients need.

Moving on to Section I – Programme Evaluation - which evaluates the programme's commitment to self-evaluation, the programme should:

- collate client re-arrest, reconviction and/or re-incarceration data twelve months or more after clients leave the programme;
- have a document that details the effectiveness of the programme;
- ensure that information about the effectiveness of the programme is published in a peer reviewed journal;
- conduct at least one evaluation every five years that compares treatment outcomes with a comparison group.

Acknowledgements.....	i
Executive Summary:.....	ii
Glossary.....	2
Abbreviations.....	9
Introduction and background.....	10
1.1. Aims and Objectives.....	12
1.2. The CPAI -2000.....	13
1.3. Methodology.....	14
1.4. Sources of data.....	15
1.5. Methodological limitations.....	15
The programme's performance on the measures of programme integrity.....	18
Section B - Organisational culture.....	18
Section C - Programme implementation and maintenance.....	21
Section D - Management/staff characteristics.....	22
Section E - Client risk/need practices.....	24
Section F - Programme characteristics.....	27
Section G - Core correctional practices.....	31
Section H - Interagency communication.....	35
Section I - Evaluation – 8 subsections.....	36
Conclusions and key recommendations.....	38

Glossary

The ABC model

- The ABC model is a strategy for helping offenders to learn the basic components of behaviour. The first stage of the strategy involves helping the client to carefully identify the events and conditions that occur/ed before or trigger/ed the behaviour in question (the antecedents). The next step is to identify and explore with the client the result of the behaviour in question (the consequences).

Anti-criminal coping model

- This involves demonstrating to the client the coping strategies that programme staff used to cope with challenges similar to those confronting the client. This may involve self-disclosure whereby programme staff disclose or demonstrate prosocial coping strategies as part of the overall effort to help the client learn prosocial strategies for dealing with problematic situations.

Antisocial cognitions, behaviour, expressions

- These are 'the specific attitudes, values, beliefs, rationalisations and techniques of neutralisation that imply that criminal conduct is acceptable' Andrews and Bonta (2003: 312). Examples of antisocial behaviours include: 'Cynicism regarding the CJS agencies and staff, 'con talk' to portray 'down to earth' persona, tolerating rule violations, identifying/colluding with the client, endorsing exonerating mechanisms' (Andrews, D. A. and Bonta, J. 2003; Trotter 1999).

Behavioural approaches

- These approaches involve using stimuli/incentives/rewards etc. to alter a client's behaviour. The stimuli may be applied in the form of an antecedent/ or as a consequence of a form of behaviour in order to encourage or discourage the behaviour in question. A stimulus may assume different formats although the evidence suggests that effectively administered positive reinforcements which are the consequences (like praise and approval) that are used to encourage desired behaviours, are more productive stimuli (Trotter 2009). They are 'the most powerful consequences for initiating and maintaining behaviours' (CPAI-2000).

Brokerage and advocacy

- This involves making appropriate referrals to relevant service providers or performing other acts of advocacy on behalf of the probationer.

Cognitive behavioural approaches

- These approaches are based on cognitive behavioural psychology and the idea that our thought patterns can affect our feelings then our behaviour. The cognitive behavioural approach is based on the idea that how we think affects how we feel and what we do. Cognitive behavioural programmes attempt to target and modify distorted thought processes that are linked to the deficient problem solving strategies that can contribute to offending behaviour. Attempts are made to help the offender to develop skills that will help them think differently and exhibit prosocial behaviour when confronted with problematic situations. It incorporates a range of techniques and clients can be taught the techniques to foster cognitive and behavioural self-change.

Cognitive restructuring

- This is the process of guiding the client through the process of replacing antisocial thoughts and feelings with prosocial alternatives. It involves working with the client to identify risky thoughts (e.g. through a thinking report). The staff member encourages the client to describe his/her thoughts and feelings and then generates discussions about problematic thoughts, views or beliefs. The objective is to help the client to identify possible distortions in their thoughts, views or beliefs and to encourage them to practice rational alternatives to these.

Core correctional practices (CCPs)

- Core correctional practice skills involve the following: the effective use of authority, prosocial modelling, problem solving, making adequate referrals and using effective communication skills (see Raynor et al. 2010 for a more detailed explanation of CCPs).

Criminogenic needs

- Criminogenic needs are antisocial personality patterns, antisocial attitudes and behaviours, the influence of criminogenic peers, substance abuse, family/marital relationships, school/work-related deficiencies, lack of involvement in prosocial/recreational activities and criminal history (Andrews and Bonta 2003; Bonta et al. 2008).

Dynamic risk factors

- These are changeable risk factors that are amenable to targeted interventions. Examples include the range of antisocial behaviours, attitudes and expressions described above.

Effective reinforcement

- This involves showing approval for the behaviour/speech exhibited by the client, immediately informing the client why the approval has been offered – why the practitioner likes the behaviour the client has just exhibited. The staff member should provide specific reasons why he/she likes the behaviour or why the client's behaviour/speech deserves approval. Programme staff should also ensure that the reward offered in response to the client's behaviour is given greater emphasis to distinguish it from the support offered typically. Effective reinforcement can be demonstrated through body language: smiling; attentive listening and leaning forward. It can also be in the form of praise, attending court with the client and giving positive evidence, reducing frequency of contact, help with job searches, securing accommodation and other positive forms of support. These rewards should be linked to the behaviour being rewarded.

Effective disapproval

- This is the process through which programme staff challenge clients' anti-social behaviours/attitudes/ speech by immediately informing the client involved why he/she did not like the type of behaviour the client just exhibited; explaining why the behaviour is undesirable; modelling prosocial alternatives to the client; encouraging the client to reflect on why the behaviour/speech is undesirable and highlighting the consequences of that behaviour. Practitioners should show approval once the appropriate pro-social behaviour is exhibited.

Effective use of authority

- Staff members demonstrate effective use of authority by:
 - focusing their activities on the client's behaviour and not on the person exhibiting the behaviour;
 - putting direct and specific demands to the client;
 - not using raised voices;
 - providing effective role/rule clarification and clearly communicating to the clients the consequences of non-compliance with formal rules;
 - rewarding good compliance with praise and other positive incentives;
 - encouraging the clients;

- supporting their words with action;
- being 'firm but fair' by maintaining appropriate boundaries whilst attempting to develop good working relationships based on respect and a client-centred supervision approach.

Motivational interviewing

- Motivational interviewing incorporates a range of techniques that can be used to elicit the intrinsic motivation of clients to change their behaviour. The components of motivational interviewing include:
 - *showing empathy*-involves using comments that demonstrate genuine understanding. Comments such as 'that must have been difficult for you', demonstrate empathy;
 - *reflective listening* - nodding, paraphrasing and attending to the client also demonstrate empathy;
 - *developing discrepancies* - involves highlighting the difference between the probationer's 'current state and desired state';
 - *rolling with resistance* - entails avoiding arguments by using open questions and reflections - the latter may include making statements that encourage clients to consider and overcome the distortions, barriers and obstacles that impede change, for example, repeating a statement made by a client can demonstrate to that client the distortion or inconsistency inherent in the client's views on a particular issue;
 - *developing self efficacy* - involves reassuring clients of their ability to accomplish the tasks necessary for effecting change .

The need principle

- This principle of effective practice states that positive outcomes are more readily achieved where the programme focuses on addressing criminogenic needs (defined above).

Positive reinforcement

- This involves the use of stimuli/incentives to increase desired pro-social behaviour. Stimuli/incentives may comprise, praise, rewards, attention, showing approval and acknowledgement – these can initiate and maintain prosocial behaviour.

Principles of effective practice

- These are the three principles of rehabilitative programmes that have been linked to reduced rates of recidivism. They are the risk principle, the need principle and the responsivity principle (Andrews and Bonta 2003; Raynor 2007).

Problem solving techniques

- For effective problem solving, staff members should focus on the ABC model (Antecedents, Behaviour and Consequences). Staff members should clarify goals for resolving or preventing future negative consequences (problem solving should be goal-oriented). Problem solving should also involve generating alternative solutions, evaluating options and implementing a plan. These processes should be collaborative – the client should be actively involved.

Programme integrity

- The degree to which a programme adheres to the principles of effective practice (defined above).

Prosocial behaviour

- This is a term that encompasses a broad range of behaviours but in this context, the term is used to refer to law-abiding behaviour.

Prosocial modelling

- This refers to: 'the way in which probation officers, or others who work with involuntary clients, model pro-social values and behaviours in their interactions with clients. The term is however often interpreted more broadly to include a group of skills which include supervisors modelling pro-social values, reinforcing client's pro-social expressions and actions and negatively reinforcing or confronting pro-criminal actions and expressions of those clients. The term pro-social practice or pro-social model is also often used by practitioners to describe a still broader approach to the supervision of offenders which includes collaborative problem solving and role clarification' (see Trotter 2009:149).

Pro-social modelling involves the following:

- keeping appointments;
- being punctual, honest and reliable;
- following up on tasks;
- respecting other people's feelings;
- expressing views about the negative effects of criminal behaviour,
- expressing views about the value of social pursuits such as non-criminal friends;
- good family relations and the value of work;
- it involves interpreting people's motives positively e.g. "most police are people trying to do a job and they have similar needs to most of us" rather than "all police are pigs". It involves being open about problems the worker may have had which are similar to the offenders e.g. "I

spent a period of time unemployed at one time and I found it depressing". It also involves being optimistic about the rewards which can be obtained by living within the law' (Trotter 2009:144).

The risk principle

- This principle of effective practice states that: supervision and treatment should match the risk level of the offender. High risk offenders should be targeted for the most intensive interventions and supervision. Violating these principles can lead to increased rates of recidivism for lower risk offenders (CPAI -2000).

Responsivity

- This principle of effective practice incorporates two categories namely, general and specific responsivity. General responsivity involves using effective programmes based on cognitive social learning approaches to reduce recidivism. Specific responsivity involves ensuring that a programme is delivered in a manner that is responsive to the personal characteristics and abilities of the offender.

Responsivity assessment tools

- These are tools that can be used to assess levels of responsivity. They include General Aptitude Battery which can be used to measure cognitive ability, the PCL-R factor 1 which can be used to measure psychopathy and Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety which can be used to measure anxiety.

Risk assessment instrument

- This is used for identifying the risks of future offending and also the needs of (the clients) which should be addressed to reduce the probability of future offending.

Social Learning approaches

- These approaches mainly involve helping clients to learn new prosocial skills. The approaches are based on social learning theory. A social learning approach may involve describing desired skills to the client, modelling the new/desired skills and encouraging the client to practice the new skills so that the client can learn the desired behaviours.

Structured learning procedures for skills building

- This is a structured process that helps offenders learn new prosocial skills. The structured learning process involves three key stages. First staff members define the skill to be learned. Then staff members model the skill for the clients and then staff members give the clients the opportunity to practise the skill in hypothetical situations (i.e. role play). Staff members also provide feedback on how well the clients are doing.

Social welfare provision

- This refers to provision in the fields of housing, education, training and employment.

Abbreviations

CAMHS	Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services
CCPs	Core Correctional Practices
CCW	Care Council for Wales
CPAI-2000	Correctional Programme Assessment Inventory-2000
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements
SMAT	Swansea Substance Misuse Action Team
YOS	Swansea Youth Offending Service

Introduction

This report presents the findings of a study that used the Correctional Programme Assessment Inventory-2000 (CPAI-2000, Gendreau and Andrews 2001) to evaluate a programme for young people in order to assess programme integrity (the degree to which a programme adheres to effective practice principles). The principles of effective practice are a set of principles that were central to the effective practice initiative that was introduced by the Labour government in the late 1990s (Chapman and Hough 1998; Goldblatt and Lewis 1998). The initiative aimed to promote evidence-based practices and it triggered changes to the design and delivery of rehabilitation programmes. It drew on evidence that rehabilitation programmes that incorporate specific principles can reduce recidivism rates (Andrews and Bonta 2003). In England and Wales, the effective practice initiative subsequently came to be known as the ‘what works’ evidence-based approach. It was heavily influenced by emerging research evidence that highlighted three principles of effective rehabilitation programmes: the risk principle; the need principle and the responsivity principle (Andrews and Bonta 2003; Raynor 2007).

The principles of effective practice

To begin with the risk principle, studies demonstrate that for programmes to produce positive outcomes (particularly reduced recidivism), the intensity of the programme should be proportionate to the client’s level of assessed risk. As such, more intensive interventions should be targeted at those assessed as posing a ‘high’ risk of harm or reoffending. Standardised measuring instruments that can inform assessments of risks and needs have been developed to facilitate the effective implementation of the ‘risk principle’ (Bonta and Wormith 2007).

Furthermore, the effective practice literature suggests that positive outcomes are more readily achieved where interventions are geared towards addressing criminogenic needs which are dynamic risk factors⁹. Criminogenic needs¹⁰ have been listed as antisocial personality patterns, antisocial attitudes and behaviours, the influence of criminogenic peers, substance abuse, family/marital relationships, school/work-related deficiencies, lack of involvement in prosocial/recreational activities and criminal history (Andrews and Bonta 2003; Bonta et al. 2008).

⁹ Those susceptible to change through interventions.

According to Andrews and Bonta (2003: 312) antisocial expressions are ‘the specific attitudes, values, beliefs, rationalisations and techniques of neutralisation that imply the criminal conduct is acceptable’. The effective practice literature suggests that addressing criminogenic needs can reduce recidivism rates (French and Gendreau 2006).

Underpinning the responsivity principle is the idea that treatment approaches based on cognitive social learning approaches produce reduced recidivism (Bonta et al. 2008). Cognitive social learning approaches incorporate two key principles. Firstly, the approaches incorporate the relationship principle which involves developing good quality working relationships with clients. Cognitive social learning approaches also incorporate the structuring principle which involves using prosocial modelling skills to encourage change. The responsivity principle is also underpinned by the idea that reduced recidivism can be achieved where the mode of intervention is tailored to suit the client’s learning style. Supervision practices should be responsive to specific client attributes such as gender, cultural background, social and cognitive attributes in order to ensure that clients are able to fully comprehend and engage with the change process. Therefore, the responsivity principle also directs attention to the importance of engaging clients and encouraging compliance (see also, McNeill and Weaver 2010).

Meta-analytic studies based mainly in North American jurisdictions and also, some small scale British based studies have found that rehabilitation programmes that draw on these three principles of practice and theoretically underpinned by cognitive behaviourism can produce reduced recidivism rates for young people who offend (Greenwood 2008; Lipsey 1992; 1999; 2009) and for adults who offend (McGuire 1995; 2000; 2002; 2007; Raynor and Vanstone 1996; 2001). Departing from the determinism implied in the treatment model of rehabilitation that prevailed until the late 1970s, the cognitive behavioural approach allocates the offender a more active role in the rehabilitative process. It ascribes to the offender, the ability to make the rational choice to replace antisocial attitudes and behaviour with prosocial choices and to acquire effective problem solving skills. By providing people who offend the opportunity to learn prosocial skills and techniques for solving problems and interacting with others, studies suggest that programmes that adhere to the effective practice principles can produce positive outcomes (in the form of reduced recidivism rates). The effective practice approach also emphasises the importance of collaborative rehabilitative processes. It is a process of ‘facilitated change’ rather than ‘coerced change’ (Cavadino and Dignan 2007). It involves ‘helping some offenders to help themselves to stop offending’ (Raynor 2004).

The effective practice literature also emphasises that effective programmes are programmes that possess high programme integrity. Therefore, it is surprising that programme integrity is an often neglected though pivotal aspect of effective practice. Dowden and Andrews (2005) note that: ‘Despite the enormous attention given to the

question of 'what works' in offender programming, issues surrounding programme implementation and integrity are huge and barely explored' (2005:174). Indeed, there is a paucity of empirical research into the actual processes through which practitioners implement the principles of effective practice. Consequently, the potential problems that may undermine the effective implementation of the principles and subsequent outcomes may have been overlooked. Bonta and colleagues note that:

'Unfortunately, there is very little research that examines case management within the context of the offender rehabilitation literature even though the importance of juxtaposing case management with the "what works" literature has been recognized ... Do probation and parole officers use offender risk assessments in assigning intensity of intervention and identifying criminogenic needs that should be addressed? Do probation and parole officers use cognitive-behavioural techniques during their supervision sessions? Answers to these questions are lacking and yet answers are sorely needed to improve supervision practices' (2008:252-253).

Meanwhile, existing studies in the field have drawn attention to the possibility that the effective practice principles are not being efficiently implemented in practice (See for instance, Bonta et al. 2008). This is an important finding that highlights the need to evaluate programmes in order to assess programme integrity. Large scale meta-analytical studies reveal that variations in implementation processes and the failure to comply with effective practice principles can undermine programme integrity which can in turn undermine outcomes (Andrews et al., 1990; Lowenkamp et al. 2006). Reinforcing this, other large scale studies have identified correlations between high scores on the previous version of the CPAI (denoting high program integrity) and positive outcomes (reduced recidivism rates) (Lowenkamp et al. 2006). Similarly, in their meta-analysis of 230 studies covering 273 tests of programme effectiveness, Dowden and Andrews (2005) found links between programme integrity and outcomes. The meta-analyses found that programmes with higher levels of integrity had larger effect sizes in terms of reducing reoffending (see also CPAI-2000; Gendreau & Andrews, 2001). The issues identified as central to programme integrity can be assessed using the CPAI-2000.

1.1 Aims and Objectives

The objective of the study was to evaluate the Statutory Orders Team (part of the Swansea Youth Offending Service) in terms of the quality of service delivery or programme integrity.

The study aimed to:

- contribute to existing knowledge by using the CPAI-2000 to evaluate a Youth Justice programme;
- generate insights that can contribute to effective service delivery and enhance the quality of outcomes in the field of Youth Justice Practice. The study's aims fit in well with the Welsh Government's plans to prevent offending and re-offending amongst young people 'within the wider context of 'ensuring an effective youth and criminal justice system' (Welsh Assembly Government 2007:29);
- use the CPAI-2000 to achieve the following objectives:
 - document strengths and weaknesses of the Statutory Orders Team (the programme);
 - help the programme articulate what it does;
 - provide a credible rationale for service delivery;
 - provide evaluation for staff in what works (CPAI-2000:2-4).
- the study also aimed to evaluate the usefulness of the CPAI-2000 approach in this context given that this study represents the first attempt to apply the CPAI-2000 in England and Wales.

1.2 The CPAI-2000

The CPAI-2000 was developed by researchers who drew on wide ranging reviews of the effective practice literature. It is supported by studies which show that programmes that incorporate specific principles of effective practice tend to produce more positive outcomes (reduced recidivism) (Dowden and Andrews 1999; Lipsey 2009; Sullivan and Latessa 2011). It is an evaluation instrument that can only be applied by assessors who are trained to use the instrument. Qualified assessors undergo an intensive training programme.

The instrument comprises the nine sections listed below. The nine sections in turn comprise 144 subsections:

- Section A - Programme demographics – 13 subsections¹¹
- Section B - Organisational culture – 10 subsections

¹¹ Section A is not scored but it is useful for establishing the context of the programme.

- Section C - Programme implementation and maintenance – 10 subsections
- Section D - Management/staff characteristics – 17 subsections
- Section E - Client risk/need practices – 12 subsections
- Section F - Programme characteristics – 22 subsections
- Section G - Core correctional practices – 45 subsections
- Section H - Interagency communication – 7 subsections
- Section I - Evaluation – 8 subsections

Programmes are scored on Sections B to I of the CPAI-2000. Each of the subsections (of Sections B to I) is scored as 'yes', 'no' or not applicable. To obtain an overall score, the scores for the eight scored sections (sections B to I) are collated and the sum of these scores is divided by the total number of applicable subsections. Based on the overall score, the programme is then classified as 'very satisfactory' (70% and above), satisfactory (implying that there is room for improvement) (50-60%) or 'unsatisfactory' (below 50%).

The assessor also calculates the average confidence rating for each section. The confidence rating represents the degree to which the scorer is certain that the score given to a particular issue is reliable. It relates to how reliable the data is. For instance, where the scorer has seen concrete evidence of information regarding a subsection the scorer can score the subsection 'yes' with a high confidence rating. On the other hand, where a programme claims to implement a specific service but the scorer has failed to see concrete evidence of this, the relevant subsection may be scored as 'yes' but with a low confidence rating. The confidence rating is a five point scale that ranges from five for strong confidence, three for moderate confidence to one for unsure of the reliability..

1.3. Methodology

A researcher trained in the application of the CPAI-2000 conducted the fieldwork for this study. The field work involved several site visits, structured interviews and semi-structured interviews with the following respondents:

- The Statutory Orders Team
- The manager responsible for the team
- The manager of Swansea YOS

- Young people supervised by the team

There were also reviews of several programme materials including the Asset risk assessment tool and regular performance data produced by the YOS' in-house researcher. The interviews for this study were semi-structured. They covered in depth, the wide range of issues incorporated in the instrument. As such, this study differs from several recent CPAI-based studies where some of the sections were not scored and site visits were brief and did not involve generating data from multiple sources (see for instance, Lowenkamp et al. 2006).

1.4. Sources of data

The study generated its data from three main sources:

- Interviews (with staff members, the programme manager, the YOS manager and young people supervised by the programme);
- Documents (risk assessment tools, electronic case records, policy and procedure manuals, programme manuals);
- Direct observation of staff and clients during supervision in the YOS offices, a detention centre and the clients' homes.

1.5. Methodological limitations

The CPAI-2000 has been applied in several North American jurisdictions but the current project appears to be the first attempt to apply the instrument in a correctional setting in England and Wales. It is quite possible that factors operating within specific jurisdictional contexts can affect the nature of frontline practice and possibly, the outcomes of CPAI-2000 evaluations. Raynor (2004) has described the policy and practice developments that may have impacted on the effective implementation and the outcomes of the 'what works' agenda in England and Wales.

Staff training and experience represent yet another jurisdictional factor that can influence supervision practices, and perhaps the outcome of CPAI-2000 evaluations in different jurisdictions. For instance, probation officers trained in Social Work practices may prioritise relationship skills over cognitive restructuring techniques which require the use of specific skills (albeit within the context of a good working relationship) (see also, Raynor et al. 2010). In the current study, all the participating staff members, the line manager and also, the programme director reported that they are professionally trained Social Workers. It is therefore perhaps unsurprising that although the participating members scored highly in the use of relationship skills, further training in cognitive behavioural techniques including cognitive restructuring methods may be required.

Several commentators have also questioned the relevance of the ‘what works’ approach (which was developed in North American jurisdictions and which also informs the application of the CPAI-2000) to settings in England and Wales and to diverse groups including women and ethnic minority groups (Martine et al. 2009; Shaw and Hannah-Moffat 2004). In response to this observation, it is worth noting that one of the three principles of effective practices is the responsivity principle. As noted above, according to the responsivity principle, programmes or supervision practices should be responsive to specific client attributes such as gender, cultural background, and social and cognitive attributes, in order to ensure that clients are able to fully comprehend, and engage with the change process.

Therefore, the responsivity principle not only recognises the importance of incorporating a consideration of diversity issues, it also potentially provides the opportunity to adapt supervision approaches and styles to the needs of diverse groups in order to encourage effective engagement. Risk/needs assessments can also aid the identification of individual needs.

It remains clear however, that the implementation of supervision programmes/processes and the nature of staff skills are key factors that can affect outcomes (Bernfeld et al., 2001; Dowden and Andrews 2004). By using an empirically validated instrument to evaluate both factors in a Youth Justice setting, the current study should provide useful insights that can inform future practices.

It is also worth noting that the CPAI is an instrument that focuses on drawing comparisons between existing programmes and an ‘ideal type’ of programme. As such, only few programmes attain scores within the higher range of scores (Matthews et al. 2001). For instance, Latessa (2003) observes that CPAI evaluations by researchers at the University of Cincinnati reveal that of over 270 programmes evaluated nationwide only approximately eight percent of the programmes evaluated were classified as “very satisfactory”, 20 percent “satisfactory”, 36 percent “satisfactory but needs improvement”, and 36 percent were classified as “unsatisfactory”.

According to Latessa (2003), another limitation of the CPAI is the possibility of researcher subjectivity. This limitation is not unique to CPAI- based studies. It is a limitation that can affect the reliability of research findings. To address this, the instrument is used by researchers who are familiar with the effective practice literature and who have also undergone the necessary training on how to use the instrument (Matthews et al. 2001). The researchers trained on the instrument are also provided access to scoring guides and relevant background literature.

The CPAI-2000 has yet another limitation. The data generated is specific to the programme as it was at the time of the evaluation (Matthews et al. 2001). Therefore, the findings recorded may not reflect programme changes and other developments

that may be introduced after the data were generated. Notwithstanding these limitations, the CPAI has several strengths. As noted earlier, the instrument is evidence-based and can be used to assess programme integrity (the degree of concurrence with principles of effective practice) across a range of different programmes. The evaluation process can yield useful insights that can be used to enhance service delivery.

The programme's performance on the measures of programme integrity

This section describes how the programme performed on the eight scored sections of the CPAI-2000 (Sections B to I).

SECTION B ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

To score highly in this section, the programme should be delivered within an organisation that has the following in place:

- 1 A clear goal definition and ethics of intervention
- 2 Strategies for ensuring timely responses to new initiatives
- 3 Organisational harmony
- 4 Adequate staff training facilities
- 5 Effective information sharing facilities
- 6 Adequate collaboration with external consultants who can advise on programming, internal evaluation exercises
- 7 Low staff turnover

FINDINGS

The study found evidence of precise goal definition. Information about the programme's (as part of the YOS) primary goals is readily accessible to all visitors to the service. They are displayed in strategic areas including the reception area. In terms of its ethics of intervention, the programme promotes a preventative approach to dealing with young people under supervision.

Staff members are registered Social Workers. As such, general Social Work ethics apply. Further, service delivery is governed by the documented code of practice

which has been prescribed by the Care Council for Wales (CCW).¹² The programme is also committed to the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

A welfare-oriented and rights-based approach operates alongside the statutory requirement of risk-focused work and public protection. The programme also satisfies criterion two above which pertains to the timeliness of responses to new initiatives. The study found that the programme initiates and responds to new modes of service delivery within reasonable time frames.

The programme has in place procedures for addressing problematic issues in order to maintain organisational harmony in line with criterion three above. For instance, to address to resolve staff disputes and grievances or to address disciplinary matters, the line manager ensures that problematic situations are referred through appropriate channels so that they can be resolved.

There are periodic 'supervision' or appraisal sessions between each member of the programme and the programme manager. Other avenues for promoting organisational harmony include regular 'away days', programme training days three times a year, programme meetings and peer supervision sessions. The sessions provide the opportunity to address routine and problematic issues that arise in practice with a view to improving service delivery or in order to rectify problems. There is a panel process for addressing any complaints a young person may have.

Another criterion listed in this section is 'adequate staff training'. As the programme staff are, typically, qualified Social Workers, they are subject to the continuing professional education arrangements prescribed by the CCW. The programme also has access to training arrangements available to the YOS' statutory partners including the Probation Service and the Police Service. The Wales Youth Justice Practitioners Forum, (Cynnydd) also provides training days for practitioners employed by the YOS. There are additional provisions in place for in-house staff training.

In terms of criterion five which states that there should be adequate 'information sharing', the YOS holds periodic intra/inter team meetings to ensure that information can be effectively communicated within the programme and also across the entire service. Annual plans are also circulated across the entire service. There is an intranet service that enhances programme and service communication channels. Furthermore, there are provisions for effective communication through emails, multi agency and other inter/cross departmental meetings.

¹² The CCW is the agency responsible for regulating social care and social work practice in Wales.

The programme also satisfies the criterion relating to ‘adequate collaboration with external consultants who can advice on programming’. The YOS has an in-house researcher who collates statistical information about the performance and activities of Youth Offending Services. The statistics generated include information about rates of access to social welfare provision in the fields of housing, education, training and employment. The statistics also contain information about reoffending rates, rates of access to specialist assessment and treatment services within stipulated time frames and also, performance information based on rates of reoffending. The YOS also has a long standing research relationship with Swansea University and regularly provides access to research students from the university to conduct research projects based on the work of the YOS.

The programme satisfies the criterion regarding ‘internal evaluation exercises’. The study found that the YOS implements regular reviews to assess the quality of practice within the programme. Staff members have their work monitored for quality assurance purposes by the programme manager through several processes including the ‘supervision’ process. The programme also has access to a range of external consultants who can provide useful advice on aspects of service delivery. For instance, there is a consultant who can provide advice on mental health issues. The programme has access to a range of services provided by the Local Authority Social Services department. As part of the YOS, the programme is subject to regular official inspections.

In terms of the criterion that there should be ‘low staff turnover’, the programme has a very low staff turnover rate. All of the qualified staff members have been employed by the organization for at least two years.

- **Score: 100% (10/10)**
- **Average confidence rating: 5/5**
- **Evaluation: VERY SATISFACTORY**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- To enhance the existing organisational culture there should be periodic internal programme-specific evaluation exercises that assess the content of supervision in order to identify areas of effective practice and areas for improvement. Although quantitative data on the YOS’ performance are regularly collated, programme-specific qualitative assessments of the content of supervision may be required to identify practices that are effective in engaging clients. The findings of these evaluations can then inform the development of supervision approaches. The effective practice literature suggests that the quality of case management (particularly the work practitioners do to motivate compliance) is relevant to longer term outcomes

(Andrews and Kiessling 1980; Dowden and Andrews, 2004; Raynor et al. 2010; Ross and Fabiano 1985).

- Staff training in cognitive behavioural approaches may be required to enhance the quality of supervision.

SECTION C

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MAINTENANCE

To score highly in this section, the programme should meet the following criteria:

- 1 The usefulness of the programme should be evident to key stakeholders.
- 2 Stakeholders' views should inform service development and delivery.
- 3 There should be funding stability.
- 4 Staffing levels should be adequate.
- 5 Staff members should possess adequate professional credentials.
- 6 There should be no outstanding policy, management/staff concerns affecting programme delivery.
- 7 Reviews of the effective practice literature should be conducted and the findings of the reviews should inform service delivery.

FINDINGS:

The programme satisfies the first five criteria listed above.

There is evidence that stakeholders such as the Youth Justice Board, the Ministry of Justice, and the Courts view the work of the programme as useful and efficient. For instance, a recent inspection report highlighted the service's effectiveness in complying with set National Standards in several areas of practice.

The programme also views the young people it engages with as major stakeholders. There are strategies in place to encourage client collaboration. Extending entitlement and promoting the rights of the young person are guiding principles of practice.

In terms of criteria 3 to 5 above, the programme has access to funding for the foreseeable future, staffing levels have remained stable in the past few years and the professional credentials of staff members are appropriate. Staff qualifications are adequately maintained at appropriate levels. The credentials are defined and regulated by the CCW.

- **Score: 86% (6/7)**

- **Average confidence rating: 3**
- **Evaluation: VERY SATISFACTORY**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- To satisfy the criterion six in the above list which refers to potential policy or staff concerns that may affect programme delivery, attention should be paid to developing provision that may better address the specific needs of female clients.
- Furthermore, in terms of criterion 4 which states that reviews of the relevant literature should inform service delivery, the programme should conduct periodic reviews of the effective practice literature on treatment modality and use the findings to inform the delivery of the programme.
- Periodic reviews of the literature related to effective treatment modality or effective practice should be conducted and published in criminological and psychological journals as part of on-going programme maintenance processes.

SECTION D

MANAGEMENT/STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

To score highly in this section, the programme should meet the following criteria:

- 1 Management/staff should possess the requisite qualifications.
- 2 The director of the programme should have knowledge of the programme and the support of staff members.
- 3 The director should also have direct experience of offender treatment and should be involved in staff recruitment and training.
- 4 The director should use appropriate techniques to motivate staff.
- 5 Staff members should undergo requisite security checks and should possess adequate educational qualifications, experience, personal qualities, belief in the efficacy of rehabilitation, skills and training.

6 Staff members should also be able to suggest modifications to the programme and should be periodically assessed on clinical skills related to service delivery and have access to the director and to training.

FINDINGS:

The programme meets most of the criteria listed above.

In terms of criterion one, the programme director and the staff members possess the necessary professional credentials. The CCW sets out the minimum professional qualification required for employment as a Social Worker. Currently, the minimum qualification is an undergraduate degree – the BSC in Social Work degree. Therefore all the members of the programme and the line manager and also, the programme director meet criterion one – they possess the requisite qualifications.

The programme also satisfies criterion two to four above. The programme director has relevant undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications in Social Science disciplines. Criterion three requires the director to have direct experience of offender treatment. The programme satisfies this criterion. The Programme Director has had substantial and direct case management experience. Therefore he has knowledge of the programme and is able to support programme staff. The Director is more involved in strategic and financial development and is not involved in providing clinical training to staff or in regularly supervising programme members or providing direct services to the clients. Nevertheless, the programme has a supervisor/line manager who is involved in implementing these tasks.

In terms of criterion five, all incoming and current programme staff members are screened through references and through the Criminal Records Bureau. Equally, all current programme staff members have Social Work qualifications either at postgraduate diploma level or at undergraduate degree level. The line manager also has a Masters degree.

Programme staff possess the experience, personal qualities, belief, skills and training required to satisfy criterion five. They have been employed in the field of offender supervision/treatment for at least two years. Staff members also have an inherent belief in the legitimacy and practicability of rehabilitation in penal settings.

The programme is very well staffed given the staff/client ratio. Most of the staff members are long term members of staff although some practitioners in the wider YOS have been appointed on fixed-term contract bases.

The programme meets criterion six. Staff members have the flexibility to modify programme structure. Programme staff are assessed during regular supervision meetings with the line manager. They also have free access to the programme leader (line manager) and there are provisions in place for ensuring adequate and regular contact between the programme director, the programme leader and the programme staff

- **Score: 88% (15/17)**
- **Average confidence rating: 4**
- **Evaluation: SATISFACTORY**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Although the programme meets the criteria for Section D above (management and staff characteristics), an area that should be considered is the requirement to select and train staff members on the basis of their expertise in the delivery of evidence-based core correctional practices (CCPs) (as defined in the glossary).
- Existing staff members should also be trained on CCPs. These are evidence-based supervision skills that have been linked to effective engagement and reduced recidivism. These skills derive theoretical basis mainly from cognitive behavioural theory.

SECTION E CLIENT RISK/NEED PRACTICES¹³

To score highly in this section, the programme should meet the following criteria:

1. The selection criteria for the programme should be appropriate - selection should be based on appropriate assessments of risk, needs and responsivity.
2. There should be a rationale or legal basis for the exclusion of certain clients.

¹³ Particular attention is paid to Section E- Client Risk/Need Practices - because the evidence base suggests that alongside Section F – Programme Characteristics, risk/need practices indicate the strongest validity for program success.

3. Treatment mode and intensity and also, the categorisation and allocation of clients to practitioners should be based on levels of assessed risk, needs and responsivity.
4. The assessments should be conducted and periodically re-administered using a valid instrument.
5. There should be programme-specific recidivism norms. This means that the programme should collate information about the nature and extent of the recidivism of its clients.

FINDINGS

The programme meets all of the above criteria apart from the dimension of criterion 3 which states that treatment mode and intensity and also, the allocation of clients to practitioners should be based on levels of assessed responsivity.

Responsivity assessment tools are required to ensure that the programme adheres to a key principle of effective practice – responsivity.

The programme should also collate information about recidivism norms.

In terms of the remaining criteria, the study found that the selection criterion for admittance into the programme is appropriate - a court order. The programme also complies with the 'risk' principle (one of the three principles of effective practice noted above). The programme utilises the Asset tool to conduct risk/needs assessment. The key risk/need factors assessed are public protection /risk of harm issues. Other risk and need factors assessed include personal and family issues/living arrangements, substance misuse, education, training and employment needs, peer associations, lifestyle, thinking and behaviour, attitudes, motivation.

Following risk/need assessment, the client is categorised as one of the following according to levels of assessed risk of reoffending and risk of harm:

- Low risk
- Medium risk
- High risk
- Very high risk

The risk of harm category informs programme intensity and treatment modality. ASSET permits both objective and subjective assessment. There are tick box sections but practitioners can frame practices around the outcomes of clinical assessments. Risk/needs assessments are also conducted as the order progresses and re-classification may occur according to changed risk/needs levels may follow as appropriate.

Score: 58% (7/12)

Average confidence rating: 4

Evaluation: SATISFACTORY

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Responsivity assessment tools are required to ensure that the programme adheres to a key principle of effective practice – responsivity. A participating staff member noted that a recent inspection identified the lack of responsivity assessment which should inform the allocation of clients to treatment modes and also to practitioners as an area for improvement. The effective practice literature emphasises that adequate allocation of clients to treatment modes according to levels of assessed responsivity can enhance programme integrity which has in turn been found to affect outcomes.
- Staff members should be trained on the implementation of responsivity assessment tools such as General Aptitude Battery which can be used to measure cognitive ability, the PCL-R factor 1 which can be used to measure psychopathy and Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety which can be used to measure anxiety.
- Measures of responsivity levels should inform the allocation of staff to functions, the allocation of clients to supervisors and also to treatment modality.
- Although the YOS periodically collates recidivism data, there should also be information on the recidivism norms associated with the specific programme that was evaluated.

SECTION F PROGRAMME CHARACTERISTICS¹⁴

To score highly in this section, the programme should:

- 1 Predominantly target criminogenic needs
- 2 Encourage clients to engage in constructive activities
- 3 Ensure that programme intensity matches levels of assessed risk
- 4 Facilitate the collaboration of the client in the treatment process
- 5 Have clear completion criteria
- 6 Offer brokerage and advocacy services
- 7 Train significant others to provide support to the client
- 8 Closely monitor the whereabouts of clients and peer associations
- 9 Adopt approaches that are primarily rooted in behavioural, cognitive behavioural, social learning theories and other social psychological theories that emphasise changing behaviour/needs by targeting criminogenic needs through a structured intervention.
- 10 Have a programme manual
- 11 Maintain an appropriate balance between rewards and punishments. The practitioner should offer 4 positive comments/actions to each negative comment/action
- 12 Have a clear theoretical rationale for punishment and assess the emotional impact of punishment on the client

¹⁴ Particular attention is also paid to Section F – Programme Characteristics - because the evidence base suggests that alongside Section E- Client Risk/Need Practices, programme characteristics indicate the strongest validity for program success.

- 13 Incorporate adequate problem solving processes whereby clients are trained to anticipate problem situations, rehearse alternative pro-social responses and practice new pro-social behaviours in increasingly difficult situations and improvements rewarded
- 14 Have in place a booster session whereby clients are able to re/learn/reinforce pro-social behaviour.

FINDINGS:

The programme bears several features of effective programmes. It meets criteria one to seven above. Therefore, it targets mainly criminogenic needs by:

- Challenging clients' antisocial attitudes;
- Promoting prosocial behaviour using prosocial modelling skills;¹⁵
- Promoting victim empathy;
- Trying to reduce the influence of criminogenic peers;
- Improving family relationships;
- Making adequate referrals for substance misuse counselling, anger management, mental health provision and other similar interventions.

The programme also meets criterion two. It encourages constructive use of leisure time. To encourage clients to devote a significant proportion of their time to prosocial activities, efforts are made to provide gym memberships, encourage participation in youth clubs, resume education or training where appropriate and secure employment.

Young people are given the opportunity to participate in projects funded by the Duke of Edinburgh awards scheme, to undertake army preparation courses and to work towards Open College Network Qualifications.

As noted above, young people can participate in a range of programmes at a Youth Justice Centre where they can acquire the skills and knowledge required for gaining employment and for pursuing further education and training.

In terms of criterion three, there are procedures in place to ensure that the intensity of the programme matches the clients' levels of assessed risk. Risk ratings produced by ASSET inform treatment intensity.

¹⁵ Prosocial modelling and prosocial modelling skills are defined in the Glossary.

The programme satisfies criterion four by ensuring that the clients are able to contribute to the development of intervention approaches. Supervision is very much collaborative within limits; the supervisor retains authority.

The programme satisfies criterion five above. There are statutory criteria for determining when the programme comes to an end. There are provisions for early revocation of the order for good compliance with intervention goals. Early revocation is based on ASSET scores. There are provisions in place for initiating court breach action for non-compliance. Furthermore, the programme meets criterion six which pertains to offering brokerage and advocacy services.

The programme provides advocacy and brokerage services to assist young people with securing access to welfare provision including access to education, employment and training as appropriate, accommodation and health care provision. There is a screening process for identifying mental health needs and for making relevant referrals to the specialist nurse seconded to the programme or to the community mental health service. There are also provisions for implementing interventions based on restorative justice principles such as victim mediation.

The programme is formally linked to a several organisations that offer a wide range of services. Clients are referred to specialist services following assessments.

The services include career advice services, the Swansea substance misuse action team (SMAT) that provides substance misuse counselling, accommodation/homelessness advisory groups, the Swansea YOS improvement plan, counselling for emotional problems, health services and the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) which provides mental health services. In terms of the seventh criterion, although the programme does not formally train significant others such as family and friends to provide help to the client during problem situations, the programme provides family support. It communicates and works closely with families. Parents are invited to periodic reviews. The work done with parents is described as 'unrecognised' but vital work.

The programme also fulfils criterion eighth by tracking the progress of its clients. It achieves this by communicating with the agencies that provide these services through emails and multi agency meetings. Nevertheless, more formal processes for monitoring the clients' whereabouts and peer associations are required.

The ninth criterion in the above list represents a key criterion of effective practice. The programme is best described as a 'relationship oriented programme that includes structuring elements' (Gendreau and Andrews 2001). This is because the programme uses strategies that are based mainly on psychological theories that

emphasise therapeutic relationship skills and promote client-centred counselling. The programme also uses strategies that bear some of the hallmarks of behavioural theories although the terms ‘behavioural/cognitive behavioural’, and ‘social learning’ are not used.

For instance, the programme uses the following strategies:

- incentives and positive reinforcements are used to promote prosocial behaviour, for example, rewards such as approval, gym memberships and early revocation are offered to encourage target behaviours;
- the programme encourages prosocial behaviour through prosocial modelling.
- Young people are taught respect for others during group work and praise is given where the young person exhibits prosocial behaviour;
- antisocial attitudes and behaviour are challenged by inviting the young person to reflect on the antisocial attitude, behaviour and its possible consequences/impact;
- the programme utilises motivational interviewing techniques¹⁶ to help clients learn pro-social problem solving strategies.

Score: 50% (11/22)

Average confidence rating: 4

Evaluation: SATISFACTORY

RECOMMENDATIONS:

In order to fully attain criteria 9 to 14 above and to score highly in this section which sets out the characteristics of effective programmes as identified by the relevant empirical literature, the programme should also incorporate the following strategies:

- it should draw on behavioural, cognitive behavioural, social learning theories and psychological theories that emphasize structured learning procedures for skills building (as defined in the glossary);
- to develop the skills required to guide clients through structured learning procedures for skills building, programme members would benefit from a training programme that is based on a cognitive behavioural curriculum;
- the programme should construct a manual to guide programme delivery. This would enhance the structured delivery of programmes;
- programme staff should maintain the appropriate balance between rewards and punishments;

The formula proposed by the effective practice literature when responding to antisocial behaviour is as follows: the rewards offered for prosocial behaviour

¹⁶ The term ‘Motivational Interviewing’ is defined in the Glossary.

should outnumber the punishers imposed for antisocial behaviour by at least 4:1 (four rewards to one punisher)¹⁷

¹⁷ Examples of punishers and rewards are provided in the Glossary

- the programme should also develop an evidence-based rationale for the punishment it imposes for antisocial behaviour. Staff members currently employ punishment strategies that are not explicitly underpinned by a specific rationale for punishment. Programme staff may benefit from training in the cognitive behavioural strategy for responding to antisocial behaviour, beliefs and attitudes.
- There should be adequate problem solving processes whereby clients are trained to anticipate problem situations, rehearse alternative pro-social responses and practice new pro-social behaviours in increasingly difficult situations. Improvements made by clients should be rewarded.

There should be provision for role plays whereby young people can practice newly acquired behaviours.

- Formal arrangements may also be required to provide 'booster' interventions following the expiration of the statutory order.

SECTION G
CORE CORRECTIONAL PRACTICES*¹⁸

To score highly in this section, programme staff should attain the following criteria:

- 1 Offer effective reinforcement in response to prosocial behaviour
- 2 Encourage the clients to reflect on why the rewarded behaviour is desirable and on the future benefits of that behaviour
- 3 Demonstrate effective disapproval in response to antisocial behaviour
- 4 Implement effective problem solving strategies
- 5 Demonstrate effective use of authority
- 6 Engage the client in a good working relationship
- 7 Employ motivational interviewing techniques¹⁹
- 8 Employ an 'anti-criminal coping model'²⁰
- 9 Use structured learning procedures for skills building
- 10 Use effective cognitive restructuring skills

¹⁸ The scoring of this section was based on actual observations of the therapeutic relationship between participating staff members and clients.

¹⁹ A brief overview of Motivational Interviewing techniques is offered in the Glossary.

²⁰ The term 'anticriminal coping model' is defined in the Glossary.

FINDINGS:

The programme scored highly on criteria one to six above. To begin with criteria one to three, the participating staff members demonstrated that they immediately use positive reinforcements to encourage prosocial behaviour. They do this by offering praise and encouragement in response to the clients' pro-social behaviour even during communications outside the supervision setting. As has been noted above, rewards such as showing approval, offering gym memberships and early revocation of the order may be used to encourage target behaviours. They also encourage the clients to reflect on why the rewarded behaviour is desirable and on the future benefits of that behaviour.

It is also quite evident that staff members show effective disapproval in line with criterion three by immediately challenging anti-social behaviour/attitude/speech. They provide reasons why the specific behaviour/attitude/speech exhibited by a client is undesirable and has attracted their disapproval. Staff members also model prosocial alternatives and provide guidance on how the clients can employ pro-social alternatives.

The programme also fulfils criterion four by implementing effective problem solving strategies. The problem solving techniques used by the staff members (in collaboration with the clients) are goal-oriented. The staff members work collaboratively with the clients to set goals as part of the problem-solving process. There is an attempt to explore the possible short and long-term consequences of several possible options. Staff members also help the clients to design plans of actions and they provide guidance on how the clients may implement the plan.

Furthermore, programme staff direct the attention of clients to the range of resources they can draw on in order to successfully implement agreed plans of action. Practical help is offered to the clients to facilitate effective problem solving. As noted earlier, the programme provides a range of services in the areas of: one to one supervision, anger management, substance misuse counselling, mental health, education, training and services, accommodation advice and family intervention. The programme works with a range of external service providers to deliver these and other services. Plans of actions are periodically evaluated by staff to monitor progress.

Problem solving is a key element of the work the participating staff members do with their clients. As mentioned earlier, the programme provides advocacy and brokerage services to assist young people with securing access to welfare provision including access to education, employment and training as appropriate, accommodation and health care provision. There is a screening process for identifying mental health needs and for making relevant referrals to the specialist nurse seconded to the

programme or to the community mental health service. There are also provisions for implementing interventions based on restorative justice principles such as victim mediation. The programme is formally linked to several organisations that offer a wide range of services.

In terms of criterion five above which relates to the effective use of authority, the staff members demonstrate effective use of authority by:

- focusing their activities on the client's behaviour and not on the person exhibiting the behaviour;
- putting direct and specific demands to the client;
- not using raised voices;
- providing effective role/rule clarification and clearly communicating to the clients the consequences of non-compliance with formal rules;
- rewarding good compliance with praise and other positive incentives;
- encouraging the clients;
- supporting their words with action;
- being 'firm but fair' by maintaining appropriate boundaries whilst attempting to develop good working relationships based on respect and a client-centred supervision approach. As mentioned above, supervision is very much collaborative within limits; the supervisor retains authority.

The programme also satisfies criterion six because it is evident that staff members strive to engage in open, warm and respectful communication with the clients. Staff members tend to be:

- non-blaming;
- empathetic and genuine;
- committed to developing flexible, humorous and engaging exchanges during interactions with the client;
- enthusiastic and optimistic.

There is evidence that the programme satisfies criterion seven which refers to the use of motivational interviewing techniques. The programme utilises motivational interviewing techniques to help motivate clients and encourage change.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

To satisfy criteria eight to ten in this section, attention should be paid to the following:

- programme staff should demonstrate anti-criminal coping strategies to the client;²¹
- staff should also use structured learning procedures for skills building²². The participating staff members currently employ an eclectic mix of clinical skills to teach clients problem-solving techniques;

Training based on a cognitive behavioural curriculum should equip staff members with additional skills required for teaching clients effective problem solving skills including the skills required for implementing the Antecedents, Behaviour and Consequences (ABC) model²³ that underpins the cognitive behavioural approach.

- a cognitive behavioural curriculum which would equip staff members with the skills required for teaching clients to anticipate problematic situations, rehearse alternative pro-social responses and practice new pro-social behaviours in increasingly difficult situations;
- programme staff should implement the processes of cognitive restructuring by using thinking reports and role plays to encourage young people to reflect on and describe their thoughts and feelings. The objective of this exercise to identify and explore risky/antisocial thoughts and feelings and to encourage the clients to practice alternatives to risky thinking.

As noted above, the programme employs approaches that incorporate the features of a behavioural strategy and a social learning strategy. Nevertheless, these approaches are not always necessarily delivered using effective structured learning procedures for skills building as described above. Staff members are trained in Social Work principles of practice and appear to emphasise the use of client-centred relationship skills. They also employ an eclectic mix of clinical skills to teach clients problem solving techniques. Although Social Work relationship skills may contribute to effective practice, the evidence-base suggests that the cognitive behavioural approach is more clearly linked to reduced recidivism (Andrews and Bonta 2003).

- **Score: 60% (27/45)**
- **Average confidence rating: 3**
- **Evaluation: SATISFACTORY**

²¹ Please see the glossary for a definition of 'anticriminal coping strategies.'

²² Please see the glossary for a description of how staff can implement structured learning procedures for skills building.

²³ The ABC model is defined in the glossary.

SECTION H INTER-AGENCY COMMUNICATION

To score highly in this section, the programme should:

- 1 Provide brokerage and advocacy services.
- 2 Follow-up on referrals adequately.
- 3 Ensure effective inter-agency communication and coordination of treatment across the different agencies.
- 4 Have readily available, written information about relevant organisations/service providers.

FINDINGS:

The programme successfully meets all of the criteria listed above. As already mentioned, the programme provides brokerage and advocacy services to assist the young people with getting back into education, employment and training as appropriate, securing accommodation and registering with a General Practitioner for health care provision. The Asset risk/need assessment tool highlights the areas of need and informs the referral and advocacy processes. For example, the programme may assist a young person's application to further education colleges by highlighting positive changes to risk assessment scores. There is an effort to minimise the impact of a criminal conviction in order to aid successful integration in wider society. Advocacy work is also done to help the young person secure employment.

The programme is also formally linked to several organisations that offer a wide range of services including career services for young people not in formal education, drug services, SMAT Swansea, housing providers, Swansea YOS improvement plan, and the Swansea Training Scheme (which offers taster courses to motivate young people).

Furthermore, the programme satisfies criteria two and three by tracking the progress of clients through regular communications with the agencies the clients have been referred to. Communication may be through emails and through multi agency meetings. Through regular communication with these agencies, the programme is able to assess client compliance, client progress and to inform three monthly sentence plan reviews. Core groups have also been established to monitor client

progress and to coordinate the treatment of young people involved with more than one agency. The core groups may comprise members of the YOS, education services, social services and the police if the young person remains criminally active. There are also risk management panels (an example is the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements - MAPPA) that have been established to monitor progress in cases involving young people assessed as high risk. The core groups and multi agency meetings are used to ensure effective coordination between the agencies involved in the treatment of clients and to reduce duplication of work.

In terms of criterion four, there are several electronic and paper leaflets and booklets that detail relevant information about the Service's links with other agencies and the wider community. These are readily available to all visitors to the YOS.

- **CPAI-2000 (SECTION H) Score: 100% (7/7)**
- **Average confidence rating: 5/5**
- **Evaluation: VERY SATISFACTORY**

SECTION I EVALUATION

To score highly in this section, the programme should:

- 1 Conduct regular internal reviews of client records.
- 2 Conduct client satisfaction surveys.
- 3 Periodically assess clients' risk/needs levels to monitor progress.
- 4 Engage with researchers/evaluators who can contribute to programme design and management.
- 5 Collate client re-arrest, reconviction and/or re-incarceration data twelve months or more after clients leave the programme.
- 6 Have a document that details the effectiveness of the programme
- 7 Ensure that information about the effectiveness of the programme is published in a peer reviewed journal.
- 8 Conduct at least one evaluation in the last five years that compares treatment outcome with a risk-control comparison group.

FINDINGS:

The programme meets the first four criteria set out above.

The programme regularly conducts internal quality assurance evaluation exercises. As part of the YOS, the programme is also subject to external official inspections. For internal quality assurance purposes, case records, plans and risk/needs assessment records are regularly monitored/reviewed on three monthly or more bases. The reviews are also conducted to assess the young persons' progress in terms of risk/needs levels as the order progresses.

The programme also satisfies criterion two above by conducting client surveys to measure their satisfaction with service delivery. For instance the young person may complete a 'what do you think?' section on Asset to outline their views. They may also complete an exit questionnaire which is like a satisfaction review which is then reassessed during a formal review process chaired by a senior practitioner. The outcome of the review process is used to reassess future plans.

In terms of criterion three, the programme uses the risk assessment tool - Asset - for objective, periodic and standardised assessments of young people on target behaviours and the information generated (risk scores) is recorded in the young person's file.

Criterion four is in part attained through evaluations conducted as part of research projects conducted by researchers based in Swansea University. The service has a longstanding research relationship with the Department of Criminology in Swansea University. Researchers and research students based in the Department have conducted a wide range of empirical and theoretical projects within the Service. The outcomes of research inform service delivery and the development of effective strategies. The service also employs an in-house researcher.

- **Score: 50% (4/8)**
- **Average confidence rating: 4**
- **Evaluation: SATISFACTORY**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

To satisfy criterion five to eight above, the programme should put the following in place.

- There should be a strategy for collating client re-arrest, reconviction and/or re-incarceration data twelve months or more after clients leave the programme.
- As part of the process of programme evaluation to inform service delivery; client re-arrest, reconviction and/or re-incarceration data should be gathered twelve months or more after leaving the programme and there should be at least one evaluation in the least five years that compares treatment outcome with a risk-control comparison group.
- There should be a document that details the effectiveness of the programme;
- There should be a peer reviewed journal article that contains information about the effectiveness of the programme.
- Periodic evaluations of the programme which compare programme outcomes with a risk control comparison group, should be conducted.

Overall Score

OVERALL SCORE – 68% (87/128) SATISFACTORY
MEAN CONFIDENCE RATING – 4

Conclusions and Key Recommendations

The overall CPAI score suggests that the programme attained a 'satisfactory' level of programme integrity but there are areas for improvement. By attaining a score of 68% the programme scored highly on the CPAI-2000. This is a positive finding given that as mentioned above, large scale studies suggest that programmes that attain high CPAI scores are associated with reduced recidivism rates (Lowenkamp et al. 2006). In order to satisfy all the key criteria for effective practice, the programme should implement the strategies described below.

- The programme should conduct periodic programme-specific evaluation exercises that assess the content of supervision practices. The objective of the evaluation exercises should be to identify areas of effective practice and areas for improvement.
- Staff training in cognitive behavioural approaches is required to enhance the quality of supervision.
- Attention should be paid to developing provision that better addresses the specific needs of female clients.
- The programme should conduct periodic reviews of the effective practice literature on treatment modality and use the findings to inform programme delivery.
- Staff members should be trained on how to deliver the CCPs.
- Responsivity assessment tools are required to ensure that the programme adheres to a key principle of effective practice which emphasises that adequate allocation of clients to treatment according to levels of assessed responsivity can enhance programme integrity which has in turn been found to affect outcomes.
- There should also be information on the recidivism norms associated with the specific programme that was evaluated.
- The programme should draw on behavioural, cognitive behavioural, social learning theories and psychological theories that emphasise structured learning procedures for skills building. This should equip clients with the skills required for replacing antisocial attitude and behaviours with prosocial alternatives.
- Training based on a cognitive behavioural curriculum should equip staff members with additional skills required for teaching clients effective problem solving skills including the skills required for implementing the

Antecedents, Behaviour and Consequences (ABC) model that underpins the cognitive behavioural approach.

- Programme staff should maintain the appropriate balance between rewards and punishments. The formula proposed by the effective practice literature states that the rewards offered for prosocial behaviour should outnumber the punishers imposed for antisocial behaviour by at least 4:1 (four rewards to one punisher).
- The programme should also develop an evidence-based rationale for the punishment it imposes for antisocial behaviour.
- Formal arrangements may be required to provide 'booster' interventions following the expiration of the statutory order.
- The programme should put in place a strategy for collating client re-arrest, reconviction and/or re-incarceration data twelve months or more after clients leave the programme.
- There should be at least one evaluation in the least five years that compares treatment outcome with a risk-control comparison group.
- There should be a peer reviewed journal article that contains information about the effectiveness of the programme.

We hope that this report will make an important contribution to the development of effective service delivery in Youth Offending Services in Wales. This report should also pave the way for further evaluation studies using the CPAI-2000 to assess the work of other Youth Offending Services across Wales.

References

- Andrews, D. A. (2006) Enhancing Adherence to Risk-Need Responsivity: Making Quality a Matter of Policy. *Criminology and Public Policy*. 5; 595-602.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2003). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Andrews, D. A., Kiessling, J. J., Russell, R. J. and Grant, B. A., (1979) *Volunteers and the One to One Supervision of Offenders*, Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990) 'Does Correctional Treatment Work: A Clinically-Relevant and Psychologically-Informed Meta-Analysis', *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Andrews, D. A. And Dowden, C. (2005) 'Managing Correctional Treatment for Reduced Recidivism: A Meta-Analytic Review of Programme Integrity', *Legal and Criminological Psychology*. 10, 173–187.
- Bernfeld, G., P. Farrington and A. Leschied (eds) (2001) *Offender Rehabilitation in Practice*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Bonta, J., Rugge, T., Scott, T., Bourgon, G. and Yessine, A. (2008) Exploring the Black Box of Community Supervision. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 47(3), 2008. Pp.248–270.
- Bonta, J., and Wormith, S. J. (2007). 'Risk and Need Assessment'. In G. McIvor & P. Raynor (Eds.), *Developments in Social Work with Offenders* (pp. 131-152). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Burnett, R. (2004), 'One-to-One Ways of Promoting Desistance: In Search of an Evidence-Base', in R. Burnett and C. Roberts (eds) *What Works in Probation and Youth Justice: Developing Evidence-Based Practice*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Burnett, R. and F. McNeill (2005) 'The Place of Officer-Offender Relationship in Assisting Offenders to Desist from Crime'. *Probation Journal*. 52, 3, 221-242.
- Burnett, C., Baker, K and Roberts, R. (2007) 'Assessment, Supervision and Intervention: Fundamental Practice in Probation', in L. Gelsthorpe and R. Morgan (eds) *Handbook of Probation*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Cabinet Office (1999) *Modernising Government*. Cmnd. 4310. London: HMSO.
- Cavadino and Dignan (2007) *The Penal System: An Introduction*, Third Edition, London, Sage.
- Chapman, T. & M. Hough (1998) *Evidence Based Practice: A Guide to Effective*

Practice. London: HMIP.

- Dowden, C. And Andrews, D. A. (1999) 'What Works in Young Offender Treatment: A Meta-Analysis'. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 11, 21-24.
- Dowden, C. And Andrews, D. A. (2004) 'The Importance of Staff practice in Delivering Effective Correctional Treatment: A Meta-Analytic Review of Core Correctional Practice'. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 48(2), 203-214.
- French, S. A. and Gendreau, P. (2006) 'Reducing Prison Misconducts: What Works!' *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*. 33; 185-218.
- Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D. A. (2001). Correctional Programme Assessment Inventory—2000 (CPAI-2000). Saint John, Canada: University of New Brunswick.
- Gendreau, P., C. Goggin and P. Smith (1999) 'The Forgotten Issue in Effective Correctional Treatment: Programme Implementation', *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 43(2): 180–7.
- Goldblatt, P. and Lewis, C. (1998) *Reducing Offending: An Assessment of Research Evidence on Ways of Dealing with Offending Behaviour*. Home Office Research Study 187. London: Home Office.
- Healthcare Commission, Healthcare Inspectorate Wales , HM Inspectorate of Constabulary , HM Inspectorate of Prisons , HM Inspectorate of Probation Office for Standards in Education Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (2009) *Joint Inspection of Youth Offending of England, Report on: Swansea Youth Offending Service*.
[http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectors/hmi-probation/docs/swansea_yos_report-rps\(1\).pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectors/hmi-probation/docs/swansea_yos_report-rps(1).pdf) (Accessed May 2011).
- Hollin, C. R. (1995) *The Meaning and Implications of "Programme Integrity."* In J. McGuire (Ed.), *What works: Reducing Reoffending* (pp. 195-208). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hollin, C. R., McGuire, J., Hounscome, J. C., Hatcher, R. M., Bilby, C. A. L., & Palmer, E. J. (2008) 'Cognitive skills Behaviour Programmes for Offenders in the Community: A Reconviction Analysis'. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 35, 269-283.
- Hollin, C. R., & Palmer, E. J. (2006). 'Offending Behaviour Programmes: History and Development'. In C. R. Hollin & E. J. Palmer (Eds.), *Offending Behaviour Programmes: Development, Applications, and Controversies* (pp. 1-32). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hollin, C. R., Palmer, E. J., McGuire, J., Hounscome, J., Hatcher, R., Bilby, C., et al. (2004). *Pathfinder Programmes in the Probation Service: A Retrospective Analysis* (Home Office Online Report 66/04). London: Home Office.
- Kemshall, H. and Canton, R. with Bailey, R., Dominey, J., Simpkin B. and Yates, S. (2002) *The*

Effective Management of Programme Attrition: A Report for the National Probation Service (Welsh Region). Leicester: De Montfort University.
http://www.design.dmu.ac.uk/Images/ATTRITION%20%20REPORT%20-%20PDF_tcm6-10440.pdf

- Latessa, E. (2003) *Correctional Programme Assessment Inventory Conducted on Quehanna Boot Camp, Clearfield County, PA*. Center for Criminal Justice Research Division of Criminal Justice University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, OH 45221-0389.
- Lipsey, M. (1992) 'Juvenile Delinquency Treatment: A Meta-Analytic Enquiry into the Variability of Effects', in: T. Cook, H. Cooper, D. S. Cordray, H. Hartmann, L. V.Hedges, R. L. Light, T. A. Louis and F. Mosteller (Eds.), *Meta-Analysis for Explanation: A Case-book*, New York: Russell Sage.
- Lipsey, M. W. (1999) 'Can Intervention Rehabilitate Serious Delinquents?' *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 564, 142-166.
- Lipsey, M. W. (2009) 'The Primary Factors that Characterise Effective Interventions with Juvenile Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Overview.' *Victims and Offenders*. 4, 124-147.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J. and Holsinger, A. M. (2006) 'The Risk Principle in Action: What Have We Learned from 13,676 Offenders and 97 Correctional programmes?' *Crime Delinquency*. 52; 77-93.
- McGuire, J. (1995) *What Works: Reducing Re-offending*, Chichester: Wiley Press.
- McGuire, J. (2002). Integrating Findings From Research Reviews. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment: Effective Programmes and Policies to Reduce Re-Offending* (pp. 3-38). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- McGuire, J. (2000) *Cognitive-behavioural Approaches: An Introduction to the Theory and Research*, London: Home Office.
- McGuire, J. (2007) 'Programmes for Probationers' in G. McIvor and Raynor, P. (eds) *Developments in Social Work with Offenders*, London, Jessica Kingsley.
- Maguire, M. (2004) The Crime Reduction Programme in England and Wales: Reflections on the Vision and the Reality, *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 4, 3, 213-237.
- McNeill, F. And Weaver, B. (2010) *Changing Lives? Desistance Research and Offender Management*. Glasgow School of Social Work: The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice.
- Martin, J., Kautt, P. And Gelsthorpe, L. (2009), 'What Works for Women?: A comparison of Community-Based General Offending Programme completion,' *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(6): 879-899.
- Matthews, B., Hubbard, D.J. and Latessa, E. (2001) 'Making the Next Step: Using Evaluability Assessment to Improve Correctional Programming'. *The Prison Journal*. 81; 454-472.
- Ministry of Justice (2010a) *Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders*. London: Ministry of Justice.
- Office for National Statistics (2001) *2001 Census*

<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001/census2001.asp> (accessed 5 October 2010).

- Palmer, E. J., McGuire, J., Hounscome, J. C., Hatcher, R. M., Bilby, C. A. L., & Hollin, C. R. (2007). Offending Behaviour Programmes in the Community: The Effects on Reconviction of Three Programmes with Adult Male Offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*. 12, 251-264.
- Palmer, E.J., McGuire, J., Hatcher, R.M., Hounscome, J.C. Bilby, C.A.L. and Hollin, C.R. (2009) 'Allocation to Offending Behaviour Programmes in the English and Welsh Probation Service'. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*. 2009; 36; 909.
- Raynor, P. (1998) Attitudes, Social Problems and Reconvictions in the 'STOP' Probation Experiment'. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*. 37, 1:1-15.
- Raynor, P. (2004) 'The Probation Service "Pathfinders": Finding the Path and Losing the Way?' *Criminal Justice* 4(3): 309–25.
- Raynor, P. (2007), 'Community Penalties', in Maguire M., Morgan R. and Reiner R. (eds) *Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, Third Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Raynor, P. (2008) 'Community Penalties and Home Office research: On the Way Back to 'Nothing Works'? *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. 8: 73-87.
- Raynor, P. and Vanstone, M. (1996) 'STOP (Straight Thinking On Probation): The Mid-Glamorgan Experiment'. *International Journal of Offender Therapy: Comparative Criminology*. 40; 272-84.
- Raynor, P. and M. Vanstone (2001) 'Straight Thinking on Probation: Evidence-based Practice and the Culture of Curiosity' in G. Bernfeld, D. Farrington and A. Leschied (eds) *Offender Rehabilitation in Practice*, pp. 189–203. Chichester: Wiley.
- Raynor, P., Ugwu-dike, P. and Vanstone, M. (2010) 'Skills and Strategies in Probation supervision: the Jersey study', in McNeill, Raynor, P. And Trotter, C. (eds) *Offender Supervision: New Directions in Theory, Research and Practice*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Ross, R. R. and Fabiano E. A. (1985) *Time to Think: A Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation*. Johnson City TN: Institute of Social Sciences and Arts.
- Ross, R. R., Fabiano, E. A., & Ewles, C. D. (1988). 'Reasoning and Rehabilitation'. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 32, 29-35.
- Shaw, M. And Hannah-Moffat, K. (2004) 'How Cognitive Skills forgot about Gender and Diversity', in Mair, G. (ed) *What Matters in Probation*. Devon: Willan.
- Welsh Assembly Government (2007) 'One Wales: A Progressive Agenda for the Government of Wales.' <http://wales.gov.uk/strategy/strategies/onewales/onewalese.pdf?lang=en> (accessed 2010).