Correctional Services Accreditation Panel
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This PSO is issued to update the previous version of PSO 4360, which it replaces. It contains only limited changes.

It provides instructions and guidance on the role of the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (CSAP) and its impact on the Prison Service. It deals with the management of submissions to the Panel in respect of accreditable programmes and integrated systems. The CSAP accredits programmes and integrated systems which are likely to reduce re-offending.

DESIRED OUTCOME

All staff who are required to have any dealings with the CSAP or the accreditation process understand its role and procedures and understand and comply with Prison Service procedures relating to the CSAP.

MANDATORY ACTIONS

Mandatory action is specified in this PSO by the use of italic typeface. The actions relate to:

- audit tools and the Standards of Performance for Accredited Interventions in Prison Establishments in England and Wales
- approval process for submission of applications to the CSAP for advice or accreditation
- approval process for application for inclusion in the development portfolio for interventions
- requirement to consider whether application to the CSAP, or an alternative route for validation (under PSO 4350), is to be pursued.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

There are no new resource implications arising directly from this PSO.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: 25th June 2004

(signed)

Director: Peter Wrench  Area/Operational Manager:
Further advice or information on this PSO or on the systems contained within it can be sought from:

Secretary to CSAP – 020 7217 5193

Head of Drugs Strategy Unit – 020 7217 5045
TC policy, What Works in Prison Unit - 020 7217 5887
Head of Policy, Offending Behaviour Programmes Unit – 020 7217 5921
1. This Prison Service Order provides instructions and guidance on the role of the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (CSAP) and its impact on the Prison Service. It deals with the management of submissions to the Panel in respect of accreditable programmes and integrated systems.

2. The CSAP accredits programmes and integrated systems which are likely to reduce re-offending.

**PURPOSE**

3. The outcomes sought are:
   - To ensure understanding of the role of the CSAP and its procedures
   - To ensure understanding and compliance with Prison Service procedures relating to the CSAP.

4. This PSO confirms existing requirements relating to accredited offending behaviour programmes and supersedes AG 45/1996, which is cancelled. It introduces procedures for applying for inclusion in the Prison Service development portfolio.

**PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

5. This PSO enforces the Regimes Standard. The Standard is:

    ‘Every establishment will provide a constructive regime, which addresses offending behaviour, improves educational and work skills and promotes law abiding behaviour in custody and after release.’

**OUTPUT**

6. This PSO will assist the Prison Service to meet targets relating to the reduction of re-offending.

**IMPACT AND RESOURCE ASSESSMENT**

7. There are no new resource implications arising directly from this PSO.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

8. This PSO came into effect on 1 April 2003 and was amended and re-issued on 25th June 2004

**MANDATORY ACTION**

9. Mandatory action is specified in this PSO by the use of italic typeface.

10. *Governors and Directors of contracted-out establishments must ensure that all staff and partner agencies with responsibilities for regimes and the movement of prisoners are aware of the contents of this PSO and have access to it. This PSO must be available to prisoners and members of Boards of Visitors on request. A copy of this PSO will be available on the Prison Service website and Intranet.*
AUDIT AND MONITORING

11. Establishments and Headquarters must comply with the mandatory instructions in this PSO and will be audited against the Regimes Standard. Establishments’ implementation of accredited interventions is subject to audit procedures required by the CSAP and conducted by the Resettlement Directorate.

12. Area/Operational Managers must ensure compliance with Service Level Agreements to deliver completions of accredited interventions. What Works in Prison Unit will maintain a database of delivery and development, in accordance with PSO 4350\(^1\).

13. Periodic reports on the workings of this PSO will be made to the appropriate Head of Group (currently Sentence Management Group) and the Prison Service Management Board.

CONTACT

14. Further advice on the PSO is available from the CSAP Secretariat:

Mark May, Secretary to CSAP 0207 217 5193

15. Further advice on topics mentioned within the PSO is available from:

Martin Lee, Drug Strategy Unit 0207 217 5045

Gina Pearce, What Works in Prison Unit (on therapeutic communities) 0207 217 5887

Martin Stephens, Offending Behaviour Programmes Unit 0207 217 5921

---

\(^1\) See PSO 4350 - Effective Regime Interventions, Annexes E and F.
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THE ROLE OF THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACCREDITATION PANEL (CSAP)

1.1 The CSAP is an Advisory Non-Departmental Public Body, established in 1999 as the Joint Prison/Probation Accreditation Panel, to advise the Home Secretary on the accreditation of programmes aimed at reducing offending. The CSAP consists of a Chair, independent experts, and representatives of the Prison Service, the National Probation Service, and the Home Office. Appointments are made in accordance with the code of Practice on Public Appointments. The CSAP reports annually.

1.2 The CSAP is sponsored by the Prison Service and the National Probation Service. The Secretariat is provided jointly by the What Works in Prison Unit and the National Probation Directorate.

1.3 The CSAP’s full Terms of Reference are set out in Annex A. Its principal functions are:

- recommending and reviewing programme and integrated system design and delivery criteria
- accrediting individual programme and integrated system designs;
- authorising procedures for audit of programme delivery;
- authorising an annual assessment of quality of delivery;
- conducting an annual review of developments in the evidence base and advising on curriculum development.
- advising on training;
- receiving reports on impact and effectiveness and advising on the implications.

Accreditation Requirements

1.4 The CSAP’s current accreditation criteria, documentation requirements and scoring systems for both programmes and integrated systems are set out in Annex B. The CSAP’s accreditation criteria are based on evidence of what works to reduce re-offending, which is drawn from independent reviews of studies of a large number of varied interventions and programmes for offenders. Broadly, effective interventions are those which:

- use methods that are relevant to offenders’ learning styles;
- are well-designed to address specific factors associated with offending; and
- are delivered as designed.

1.5 To ensure quality of delivery is maintained, the programme is delivered to appropriate offenders and the programme continues to demonstrate effectiveness, the CSAP requires programme applicants to provide a management manual, a staff training manual and an assessment and evaluation manual as well as a theory manual and a programme manual. The CSAP has recently expanded its area of activity to cover accreditation of integrated systems. The accreditation criteria and documentation requirements differ slightly from those for programmes. The CSAP follows broadly the same process in considering integrated systems for accreditation.

1.6 Accreditation is necessarily a rigorous and demanding process. The CSAP encourages potential applicants to submit proposals for advice at an early stage; such a proposal will

---

Copies of annual reports are available from the CSAP Secretariat.

Further information and advice to potential applicants are available from the CSAP Secretariat.
normally be expected to consist of a theory manual and an explanation of how it is proposed to develop the programme and all the supporting manuals. The CSAP also considers preliminary applications, which indicate plans and request guidance. The CSAP Secretariat reviews the documentation submitted by applicants to ensure it is complete and complies with the CSAP’s requirements as to format; if necessary, the CSAP Secretariat will return documentation and advise how it needs to be amended.

1.7 Audit of accredited interventions is required to provide assurance that what has been accredited is what is delivered. The tools used for conducting audits must be based on the “Standards of Performance for Accredited Interventions in Prison Establishments in England and Wales” (attached at Annex F). Notice will be given of any changes in audit requirements that require changes in delivery or any other significant additional work. The CSAP may consider whether accreditation granted to a programme will continue, in the light of evidence of its effectiveness.

1.8 Annex C lists the programmes that have been accredited by the CSAP to date for delivery in custody.

Change Control

1.9 The Programme Manual for an accredited offending behaviour programme or other accredited intervention specifies the scope for variation in delivery, particularly to ensure responsivity to differences in the experience and learning styles of participants. It is an essential What Works principle that delivery will not deviate from the Programme Manual. Quality of delivery is a focus for audit, assessed through video monitoring or other means.

1.10 Programme developers collect and analyse evidence from audit and evaluation of programme delivery and relevant related research. This may lead to changes in programme design, which are presented to the CSAP for approval. No other changes to accredited offending behaviour programmes or other accredited interventions are permitted. Notice will be given of changes approved by the CSAP and any resource implications will be taken into account.

---

4 Audit covers institutional support; treatment management; continuity management; and quality of delivery.

5 The list includes programmes that were accredited by previous independent accrediting panels.
2. **THE PRISON SERVICE AND THE CSAP**

2.1 *The appropriate Head of Group (currently Sentence Management Group) approves all applications by the Prison Service, whether for advice or accreditation, and must be satisfied that applications are of sufficient quality to merit consideration by the CSAP.*

2.2 The development portfolio approved by the PSMB, on the advice of the appropriate Head of Group (currently Sentence Management Group), is designed to fill significant gaps in the range of accredited offending behaviour programmes and other accredited interventions. **Annex D** lists the Prison Service’s current development portfolio.

2.3 *Any application for inclusion in the development portfolio must demonstrate:*  
- that it would fill a gap in the range of accredited offending behaviour programmes and other accredited interventions, including an estimate of the scale of demand and unit costs of delivery;  
- that the skills and resources to develop and pilot the proposed programme and to prepare the documentation required by the CSAP are available or how they will be acquired.

2.4 *An application for inclusion in the development portfolio must be sent to the relevant policy unit in Prison Service Headquarters, from whom advice is also available. This requirement applies both to applicants who are employed by the Prison Service and to applicants who are contracted to the Prison Service. The business case pro forma at Annex E must be used for such an application*. Others who seek to develop programmes or other interventions for accreditation by the CSAP for delivery in custody are recommended to seek advice.

2.5 *Where the relevant policy unit is satisfied as to the merits of an application for inclusion in the development portfolio, it must be submitted to the appropriate Head of Group (currently Sentence Management Group) for consideration. The relevant policy unit is responsible for feedback to applicants on the outcome of applications. Where policy units themselves initiate or sponsor an application, they must meet the requirements set out in para.2.3 above and submit their application, on the pro-forma at Annex E to WWPSB.*

2.6 **The Prison Service does not undertake to deliver all programmes that are accredited.** Decisions on delivery of accredited offending behaviour programmes, both type and scale, are made in the light of resources, priorities and prisoner profiles. But the Prison Service would not authorise programme development unless it expected that the programme proposed would, if accredited, provide a valuable addition to provision.

2.7 *Those responsible for non-accredited programmes or other interventions currently being delivered, other than those already in the development portfolio, must have decided, by 30 September 2003, whether CSAP, another external route to accreditation, or the internal validation process set up under PSO 4350 is appropriate. They may:*  
- seek advice from the appropriate policy unit  
- apply for consideration for inclusion in the development portfolio

---

6 See contacts at the start of this PSO. If the application or request for advice is not clearly within the domain of the Offending Behaviour Programmes Unit (OBPU) or the Drug Strategy Unit (DSU), then it can be made to the What Works in Prison Unit (WWPU).

7 The pro-forma is available through the Prison Service Intranet. Electronic submission of a draft business case is preferred.
2.8.1 Intensive drug treatment programmes - including hierarchical drug therapeutic communities – have been required to obtain accreditation and were included in the development portfolio. All the initial tranche of intensive drug treatment programmes have now been accredited or removed from the development portfolio. DSU advised whether and when an application to the CSAP was appropriate. Where appropriate, DSU advises an alternative type of quality assurance.\(^9\) Any new intensive drug treatment programmes will have to comply with the requirements set out above at paras. 2.3-2.4 or in PSO 4350.

2.8.2 The democratic therapeutic communities’ core model has been accredited by CSAP. The purposes, scale and cost of democratic therapeutic communities are such that no other type of quality assurance is appropriate. The creation of any new democratic therapeutic communities will have to be approved, on the basis of a business case demonstrating both the need and the availability of the requisite resources to comply with the core model, by the Deputy Director General or Director of Operations on the recommendations of Area Managers and the relevant policy unit, after consultation with the Democratic Therapeutic Communities Strategy Group\(^10\). All democratic therapeutic communities will have to comply with the core model as accredited by CSAP.

2.10 Completions of accredited offending behaviour programmes and other accredited interventions contribute towards KPI 7 and are subject to annual award of implementation quality rating (IQR) to the establishment on the basis of audit findings approved by the CSAP.\(^11\)

2.11 Establishments are set completion targets and provided with funds on the basis of business cases approved by Area/Operational Managers and accepted by the Deputy Director General or Director of Operations. These targets are approved annually and are subject to Service Level Agreement, as part of the establishment’s annual business plan. Information for the database of regime interventions\(^12\) will be supplied by the relevant policy unit.

2.12 Continuation of delivery of accredited offending behaviour programmes and other accredited interventions and the scale of delivery approved will be considered on an annual basis; approved by the Deputy Director General or Director of Operations on the recommendations of Area/Operational Managers and the relevant policy unit; and included in the establishment’s business plan. Information on such changes will be supplied by the appropriate policy unit for the database of regime interventions.

---

\(^8\) See PSO 4350 for details and implementation timetable.
\(^9\) Further advice on the quality assurance of drug programmes can be obtained from Drug Strategy Unit.
\(^10\) Proposals for consideration by the Democratic Therapeutic Communities Strategy Group can be sent to Gina Pearce, What Works in Prison Unit.
\(^11\) In addition, completions of intensive drug treatment programmes which DSU has certified as compliant with the National Treatment Agency’s Models of Care are counted.
\(^12\) See PSO 4350, Annexes E and F.
CSAP TERMS OF REFERENCE

- Recommending (for approval by the Home Secretary) programme design\(^\text{13}\) and delivery criteria, and reviewing those criteria annually
- Accrediting individual programme designs
- Recommending (for approval by the Home Secretary) integrated system\(^\text{14}\) design and delivery criteria, and reviewing those criteria annually
- Accrediting integrated system designs
- Authorising procedures for audit of programme delivery
- Authorising an annual assessment of quality of actual delivery for Key Performance Indicator purposes for the Correctional Services
- Conducting an annual review of developments in the evidence base and advising the Correctional Services on curriculum development accordingly
- Advising upon, and assisting in the identification of areas of accredited programme training content common to several programmes, minimising unnecessary duplication
- Receiving reports on the impact and effectiveness of accredited programmes, to assess the issues arising, and to advise the Correctional Services on the implications
- Ensuring diversity issues are taken into account in the development, accreditation and implementation of all offender programmes and integrated systems
- Advising on related matters, especially in relation to assessment of risk and need
- Assisting with the implementation of What Works across the Correctional Services through appropriate dialogue and communication
- Developing recommendations that will be informed (but not bound) by close liaison with the respective services on issues of operational impact, deliverability and cost
- Producing an annual plan for the Panel (in consultation with the sponsor organisations) to include its future work, planned budget and links to the Correctional Services
- Accounting for its work to the Home Secretary and Correctional Services.

\(^{13}\) A programme is defined by the CSAP as “a systematic, reproducible set of activities in which offenders can participate”. The term “programme” is used generically by the CSAP and may include interventions which would not necessarily wish to describe themselves as programmes.

\(^{14}\) An integrated system is defined by the CSAP as:
- comprising a set of planned and integrated rehabilitative services;
- allocating specific services on the basis of the assessed range of risks and needs for a population of offenders;
- containing a range of defined elements, for example integrated case management;
- having as its main purpose the reduction of the overall reconviction rate for the target population.
Correctional Services Accreditation Panel Accreditation Criteria, Scoring and Documentation Requirements

Programme Accreditation Criteria

Diversity statement

The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel’s commitment is to ensure that all accredited programmes demonstrate in relation to the full range of the accreditation criteria that appropriate consideration has been given to diversity issues.

Programmes can only be effective if they address the implications that gender, culture, age, sexuality, ability, nationality, ethnicity, religion, learning style and past and present life experiences have for programme access, participation and treatment outcome.

Summary of Accreditation Criteria, Document Requirements for Accreditation, Accreditation Assessment Scoring System

(i) Accreditation - The Ten Criteria

To be accredited, a programme must demonstrate to the Panel that it meets the following ten criteria:

1. A Clear Model of Change

   There must be an explicit model to explain how the programme is intended to bring about relevant change in offenders.

   For any effective programme, it should be possible to specify clearly how it brings about change. Without such a specification programme objectives can become blurred, and it may be difficult to identify its evidence base. The programme’s Theory Manual, therefore, must explain for whom the programme is intended, what changes it intends to bring about in participants, and how it will achieve this, providing empirical evidence in support. In addition, the methods and exercises in the Programme Manual must correspond to the approach described in the Theory Manual.

   To meet this criterion the application should provide a summary of the model of change of approximately 1000 words. This should describe how the programme is intended to work, drawing on relevant theory and research. This summary will, in effect, provide an overview of the material covered in many of the other criteria. The summary should specify:

   - who the programme is for
   - the dynamic risk factors it seeks to change
   - how diversity principles have been taken into account in the research and development of the programme
   - the treatment methods used
   - what is achieved during each major phase of the programme
   - how the combination of targets and methods is appropriate for the targeted offenders

   Where the evidence is incomplete, the model of change should be in the form of a plausible hypothesis, and the Theory Manual should provide research evidence to support the general
approach and methods employed. However, the programme will not be fully accredited until the hypothesis has been empirically supported through evaluation.

In order to satisfy this criterion, the summary must demonstrate:

i. internal coherence of the model of change
ii. empirical support for the model of change
iii. consistency between the model of change and the programme as described in the Programme Manual

2. Selection of Offenders

There must be a clear specification of the types of offender for whom the programme is intended, and the methods used to select them.

For a treatment programme to be effective, it must be targeted at the right individuals. It is important, therefore, for selection processes to be clearly specified, and for there to be a means to exclude or de-select from the programme as appropriate.

To meet this criterion the application must include:

i. a statement of the type or types of offending behaviour that the programme is intended to address
ii. a list of inclusion criteria
iii. an account of the action taken to ensure that potential participants are not inappropriately excluded on the basis of their background (e.g. their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, disability, sexuality, or age)
iv. a list of exclusion criteria (together with a justification for each)
v. a description of the selection procedure employed
vi. a list of, and references for, any assessment instruments employed in selection, together with a justification for their use and an account where relevant of their psychometric properties (e.g. reliability and validity)
vii. a description of any deselection criteria and the procedures by which unsuitable participants are removed from the programme

3. Targeting a Range of Dynamic Risk Factors

A range of dynamic risk factors known to be associated with re-offending must be addressed in an integrated manner within the programme.

A number of offender characteristics have been shown to be linked to the risk of re-offending. Some of these are associated with offending in general, while others are more particular to specific offence types. Those characteristics that are historical in nature and hence impermeable to change, for instance the number or type of previous convictions, are referred to as static risk factors. Other characteristics associated with re-offending, however, are potentially subject to change, and are described as dynamic risk factors. Because modification to dynamic risk factors should be associated with a lessening of the risk of reoffending, they represent suitable targets for treatment. Examples of dynamic risk factors are listed in the table below.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i. list the dynamic risk factors targeted by the programme and how they complement each other (in cases where only a narrow range of dynamic risk factors are targeted, it must be shown that this will be adequate to reduce the risk of re-offending in those taking part in the programme)
ii demonstrate how these risk factors are either directly or indirectly related to the type of offending addressed by the programme (the dynamic risk factors listed in the table below are accepted for accreditation purposes without the need to produce supporting evidence)

iii provide evidence to show that these risk factors are likely to be present in those taking part in the programme

iv describe how these risk factors, and changes in them, are assessed and measured

v indicate in what ways the programme addresses each of the risk factors

vi where important risk factors are not targeted by the programme, indicate where else in the management of the offender these will be addressed

The dynamic risk factors listed below are acceptable for accreditation purposes and do not require evidence in support of them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic Dynamic Risk Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• poor cognitive skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• anti-social attitudes and feelings, including sexist and racist attitudes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• strong ties to and identification with anti-social/criminal models and impulsive anti-social lifestyle;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• weak social ties and identification with pro-social/non-criminal models;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cognitive support for offending: distorted thinking used to justify offending;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• deficits in self-management, decision making and problem solving skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• difficulty in recognising personally relevant risk factors and in generating or enacting appropriate strategies to cope with them;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• poor pro-social interpersonal skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• dependency on alcohol and drugs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• contingencies favouring criminal over pro-social behaviour;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• some adverse social or family circumstances;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• weak or fragile commitment to avoiding re-offending.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Dynamic Risk Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offending Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• deviant sexual interest, offence related interests, especially arousal patterns, and excessive sexual preoccupation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• empathy deficits: limited awareness of the victim’s point of view, or an inappropriate reaction to victim distress;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social support for sexual offending. This includes direct social support for sexual offending, as in a network;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social support for sexual offence related ideas, for example, social messages supporting cognitive distortions, or family collusion, which may be a consequence of manipulation of family members by the offender; and the absence of social support for relapse prevention strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Effective Methods

There must be evidence to show that the treatment methods used are likely to have an impact on the targeted dynamic risk factors.
The aim of treatment is to modify dynamic risk factors as well as other offender characteristics that make re-offending more likely. These may be targeted in a variety of ways, using a range of treatment methods. In practice, however, it is not always the case that treatment methods have their intended effects. Whatever methods are employed in the programme, therefore, must be supported by evidence of their efficacy – in other words, there must be proof that they work.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i provide a clear description of the treatment methods used
ii offer a theoretical justification for these treatment methods in respect of the dynamic risk factors identified in criterion 3
iii describe how methods will be adapted to take account of diverse backgrounds
iv describe evidence that demonstrates the efficacy of the chosen treatment methods in relation to the type of offender targeted by the programme
v show how the programme acts as a cohesive whole and, where different treatment methods are used, describe how these are integrated with each other

5. Skills Orientated

The programme must facilitate the learning of skills that will assist participants in avoiding criminal activities and facilitate their involvement in legitimate pursuits.

There is an increasing amount of evidence to show that the acquisition of skills by an offender is an important component in reducing his or her likelihood of re-offending. These skills may be related to literacy, numeracy, and employment, or to those associated with aspects of self-management, interpersonal functioning, problem solving, and other cognitive abilities. It is important to note, however, that learning a skill is not simply about being provided with new information, but also about being able to implement it, which requires practice.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i define the skills that participants will have the opportunity to learn
ii demonstrate that these skills are relevant to those participating in the programme, and that participants are likely to lack competence in them
iii provide a reasonable justification backed by evidence, if available, of how the acquisition of each of these skills is potentially associated with either a reduction in criminal activity or an increased ability to pursue legitimate activities
iv specify the ways in which each skill is acquired (if not already described in Criterion 4)
v describe any additional arrangements for fundamental skills acquisition, such as links with education or vocational training

6. Sequencing, Intensity and Duration

The amount of treatment provided must be linked to the needs of programme participants, with the introduction of different treatment components timed so that they complement each other.

For treatment to be most effective, the frequency and number of treatment sessions should be matched to the degree of treatment need typical for most participants in the programme. This will usually be dependent on participants’ learning styles, their level of risk, and the extent to which the dynamic risk factors to be addressed in treatment are likely to be resistant to change: a short programme may be appropriate for low risk offenders, while those with greater need will require
programmes of longer duration to ensure that there is adequate time in which to modify well established attitudes and behaviours. In addition, consideration needs to be given to the timing and pacing of different components of the programme to ensure that treatment gains are reinforced and maintained.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i  specify the overall length of the programme and demonstrate that the programme length will be sufficient to achieve sustained change

ii show how intensity, duration and, where relevant, sequencing can be adapted to meet differing levels of risk, treatment needs and learning styles of participants

iii describe the sequencing and length of different phases of the programme, and where there are gaps between phases indicate how long these last

iv indicate whether homework is a requirement of the programme; if so, describe the nature of homework to be done by offenders between sessions

v describe the action to be taken in relation to missed sessions or activities, insufficient progress, or the emergence of new areas of concern

vi specify any pre-programme preparation and further work to be done once the programme has been completed

7. Engagement and Motivation

The programme must be structured to maximise the engagement of participants and to sustain their motivation throughout.

A programme is unlikely to be effective unless offenders both actively engage with it, and remain motivated throughout its course. The extent to which this occurs is dependent in part on the way in which the programme is delivered, the commitment staff show to it, and the degree to which participants are responsive to programme methods and content. A good indicator of engagement and motivation is the proportion of offenders who complete the programme, and reasons for non-completion must, therefore, be understood.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i specify how motivation is assessed pre-programme, and describe any steps taken to enhance it

ii describe the methods used to maintain motivation during the programme

iii indicate the steps taken to ensure that needs associated with an offender’s age, gender, ethnic background, learning style and personal life experiences (past and present) * are addressed.

iv describe how pro-treatment attitudes are encouraged amongst managers, other staff, and associated professionals with whom the offender is in contact

In addition:

v evidence must be provided of attendance and completion rates, with an account given of the reasons for non-completion, which should include information obtained from participants themselves, e.g. from exit interviews.

* personal life experiences (past and present) –
This is intended to ensure that people's individuality is recognised and hence to improve responsivity. It is important to do more than recognise broad aspects of identity. One example would be to recognise the different experiences of young black people - what part of the country they live in, who their friends are, what background factors are important for them, what is the cultural context they live in now. It also includes family-related factors. For example, if
someone has experienced/witnessed violence/sexual abuse in the family they may have developed strategies which, although dysfunctional in the present, were self-protective for them in surviving the abuse at the time. For example, they may have learned that telling the truth is dangerous.

In summary, this notion allows for, and positively encourages, fine-tuning of programme delivery whilst maintaining programme integrity.

8. Continuity of Programmes and Services

There must be clear links between the programme and the overall management of the offender, both during a prison sentence and in the context of community supervision.

Programmes must be integrated with the offender’s sentence and supervision plans to ensure that there is continuity between programmes, both within one service and between prison and the community, to effect a smooth transition and maintain progress. Issues related to public protection also require that provision be made for sharing of information between agencies so that offenders can be monitored appropriately.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i. show how the programme is integrated into the overall plan of work for the offender, demonstrating how offenders’ needs beyond the end of the programme will be addressed (for example, accommodation, community and family networks, links with other treatment providers)

ii. contain guidelines that specify the roles of Case Managers in the Probation Service and Resettlement Managers in HM Prison Service, programme delivery staff, and managers

iii. indicate how Case Managers/Resettlement Managers are informed about the aims and objects of the programme

iv. specify the arrangements for liaison, handover and communication between programme staff and others involved in the management of the offender

v. specify the arrangements for non-completers

vi. indicate how issues relating to confidentiality and disclosure to other agencies are dealt with, especially in cases involving protection of children and vulnerable people

vii. describe the enforcement policy in relation to programme attendance and enforcement of Orders or licence conditions

viii. provide details of pro forma summaries to be used at case reviews and programme completion (which should include recommendations for further treatment or supporting work where appropriate)

9. Maintaining Integrity

There must be provision to monitor how well the programme functions, and a system to modify aspects of it that do not perform as expected.

Unless a programme is monitored closely it may not run as intended, with the risk of undermining its efficacy. Systems therefore need to be in place to ensure that the integrity of the programme is maintained, and deviations from required standards corrected. Three specific aspects of programmes require particular attention: supporting conditions, programme integrity, and treatment integrity.

To meet this criterion the application must:
i indicate how information obtained from monitoring is used to improve the operation of the programme
ii include procedures for obtaining offender feedback, indicating how this is used to influence the further development of the programme
iii indicate how access to the programme and outcomes are monitored in relation to diversity policies and potential discrimination, whether intentional or not
iv describe the arrangements for audit

In addition, consideration must be given to the following areas:

A. Supporting conditions and programme integrity
   i specification of staff selection procedures
   ii describe staff training procedures, and indicate how competency in delivering treatment is assessed
   iii details of staff training (including training in relation to cultural awareness)
   iv description of staff support and supervision arrangements (including an account of how negative effects of the programme on staff are identified and managed)
   v information on procedures to ensure continuity of staff, reliable availability of staff and participants, and the delivery of sessions/activities when planned
   vi description of the resources and facilities available to the programme
   vii account of the management structure of the programme

B. Treatment integrity
   i details of the way in which treatment supervision takes place to ensure compliance with the programme manual and the competent use of any specific techniques
   ii account of methods to ensure proper use of participant inclusion and exclusion criteria
   iii description of how the treatment style of staff is monitored, including their sensitivity to the diversity and past and current life experiences of participants
   iv details of how circumstances or activities that might interfere with treatment are detected and managed

10. Ongoing evaluation

    There must be provision to evaluate the efficacy of the programme.

    Unless the programme is properly evaluated it is not possible to know whether or not it is effective, which in the long term means a reconviction study with relevant comparison data, as soon as reasonably feasible. As a decrease in recidivism is intended to be achieved through change in targeted dynamic risk factors, improvement in these risk factors is an important, and more immediate, measure of efficacy. Evaluation should demonstrate, therefore, that offenders who complete the programme change as intended.

    To meet this criterion the application must describe the arrangements for evaluation, which should as a minimum include an assessment of:

    - the demographic and clinical characteristics of participants and those not accepted onto the programme
    - changes in the dynamic risk factors targeted by the programme
    - reconviction rates
    - relationship between records of attendance and whether offenders change as intended
    - previous criminal history and reconviction
(ii) Documentation Requirements for Accreditation

A full application must consist of the application itself, which must address each of the ten criteria listed above, and five supporting manuals.

The following are the required manuals:

**The Theory Manual**

This manual must describe the theoretical base for the programme and the model for change, and include:

- who the programme is for;
- what is to be achieved during each major phase of the programme;
- why the combination of objectives and methods is appropriate for the targeted offenders;
- how specific dynamic risk factors are addressed in sequence through the programme;
- how each method or group of methods can be expected to lead to the intended changes in cognitions, attitudes, skills and behaviour during the course of the programme;
- the role of complementary work expected to occur outside of the programme.

**The Programme Manual**

This manual must describe each session of the programme in sufficient detail to enable any well-trained professional to run the programme in the intended fashion. There should be:

- specific aims and objectives for each session stated in terms of intended learning outcomes;
- sufficient well-produced and clear materials appropriate for use with the offenders attending;
- clear links between each session, the model of change, and the supporting research evidence;
- clear reference to relevant sections of theory: summarised elements from the Theory Manual should be reproduced as inserts contained within the Programme Manual.

**The Assessment and Evaluation Manual**

This should contain:

- all assessment and evaluation instruments used in the programme;
- guidance on their administration;
- an explanation of the practical uses of the various applications and contents.
The Management Manual

This should describe:

- the selection, training, supervision and performance appraisal of staff;
- how offenders are selected for the programme;
- the ways in which offenders are assessed before, during and after the programme;
- the minimum operating conditions required to enable the programme to run as intended;
- arrangements for monitoring and evaluating the programme, including the assurance of programme and treatment integrity, and audit;
- the roles and responsibilities of managers and staff.

The Staff Training Manual

This should be presented in a similar style to the Programme Manual. It should describe:

- detailed training courses, including curriculum and training materials, for all staff involved in the programme;
- how staff competence to run the programme will be assured;
- how competence will be assessed at the end of training on a pass/fail basis;
- how performance will be reviewed regularly.

(iii) The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel's Scoring System

A full application should demonstrate to the Panel that each criterion is met. The Panel will consider whether the application fully meets, partially meets, or does not meet each criterion. To give an indication of how the Panel applies this system, an application will be adjudged to have “fully met” a given criterion where it is considered adequate, satisfactory or sufficient. The Panel would consider a criterion to be “partially met” where the programme did not fully meet the criterion but, as it stood, was not inconsistent with progress towards being effective and had the potential for improvement. An award of “not met” signifies that the programme is flawed in relation to the criterion in question. Where the Panel awards a rating of “fully met” and wishes to identify and acknowledge excellent practice in meeting a specific criterion, it may record that the application was commended in how it met that criterion.

The programme will be given two points for each fully met criterion, one point for each partially met criterion, and zero for each criterion not met. The maximum possible score is 20 for the ten criteria. To be accredited the programme must score at least 18 points and must at least partially meet all criteria.

Accreditation is not an indefinite status and the Panel will develop, in consultation with programme developers and the prison and probation services, a procedure and timetable for review of accreditation within an adequate timescale to allow for evidence to be assembled to support the case for accreditation status to be maintained. As a guideline, the Panel considers that a review of accreditation status would normally be appropriate around five years after accreditation.
Programmes for full accreditation will be marked either:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accredited</th>
<th>The programme meets the criteria.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognised/Provisionally Accredited</td>
<td>The Panel has identified specific changes which could be achieved in less than 12 months (or a longer period, where specified) and which would bring the programme up to 'Accredited' status. The programme is provisionally accredited subject to those changes being made. To be ‘Recognised/Provisionally Accredited’ the programme should normally have scored about 16 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Accredited/Promising</td>
<td>The programme could be brought up to the accreditation standard, but requires a significant degree of development work first. To get a ‘Not Accredited/Promising’ rating the programme should normally have scored about 10 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Accredited/No further review warranted</td>
<td>The Panel considers that the programme does not merit further work being undertaken. The panel report explains why this view was taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programme Proposals and Preliminary Applications for Panel Advice

Categories defined by the Panel are:

- More information is needed.
- Substantial concerns exist.
- One or more fatal flaws exist.
- Encouraging.
Integrated Systems Accreditation Criteria

Definitions:

Integrated System

An integrated system is defined as:

- comprising a set of planned and integrated rehabilitative services
- allocating specific services on the basis of the assessed range of risks and needs for a population of offenders
- delivering a range of defined elements to offenders for example integrated case management
- having as its main purpose the reduction of the overall reconviction rate for the target population

Services in the context of Integrated System

Rehabilitative services are services available/organised/resourced within the system to address particular risk/protective factors by working with offenders using relevant methods, or offering access to specific services or resources

e.g. within a resettlement scheme for prisoners, basic skills assessment and training service, or employment advice and placement service; within a community punishment scheme, the management and provision of community punishment work placement.

Elements in the context of Integrated System

Elements could include specific use of identified methods to work with offenders, or provision of access to specific relevant services

e.g. specific or specialist assessment, integrated case management, pro-social modelling, participation in an accredited programme, mentoring, access to advice or telephone advice lines.

Protective Factors

Factors which, if present, have been associated with a lower incidence of reconviction within a general population

e.g. employment, stable accommodation, strong social bonds with pro-social influences, access to education and training.

Scale

This refers to the amount of direct work with the offender and to the scope of supporting work with significant others or work to support access to the community resources. Scale might need to differ according to the particular offender's needs.

Diversity Statement

The CSAP Panel's commitment is to ensure that all accredited integrated systems demonstrate in relation to the full range of the accreditation criteria that appropriate consideration has been given to diversity issues.

Integrated Systems can only be effective if they address the implications that gender, culture, age, sexuality, ability, nationality, ethnicity, religion, learning style and past and present life experiences have for systems access, participation and treatment outcome.
Summary of Accreditation Criteria, Document Requirements for Accreditation, Accreditation Assessment Scoring System

(i) Accreditation - The nine Criteria

To be accredited, a system must demonstrate to the Panel that it meets the following nine criteria:

1. Integrated Models of Change

   There must be explicit interrelated models to explain how the system is intended to bring about relevant change in offenders.

   For an integrated system to be accredited, it is necessary to describe clearly the planned and integrated rehabilitative services to be provided. Such a specification will identify the evidence base in relation to each main element of the systems. The integrated system’s Core Manual, will therefore, set out the range of defined elements to be operated within the system and what changes it intends to bring about in which groups of the participants, and how it will achieve this, providing empirical evidence in support. It will clarify how offenders will be allocated to specific services on the basis of the assessed range of risks and needs expected to exist in the population.

   To meet this criterion the application must provide a summary of the model of change of approximately 1000 words. This summary will, in effect, provide an overview of the material covered in many of the other criteria. The summary should specify:

   - who the system is for
   - the expected profile of dynamic risk factors and protective factors within the offender population served
   - how diversity principles have been taken into account in the development of the system and its main elements
   - how offenders are allocated into services
   - how the combination of services provided is appropriate for the targeted offenders
   - the methods used
   - what is achieved within each major element of the system

   Where the evidence to support the various methods and services is incomplete, the model of change should be in the form of a plausible hypothesis, and the Manual should provide research evidence to support the general approach employed. However, accreditation is reviewable and the system will not normally be fully accredited until the hypothesis is empirically supported through evaluation.

   In order to satisfy this criterion, the summary must demonstrate:

   i. internal coherence of the model of change
   ii. empirical support for the model of change
   iii. consistency between the model of change and the aims and methods used in each element of the system

2. Assessment and Allocation

   There must be a clear specification of the types of offender for whom the system is designed to provide, and the methods used to allocate them into the various services and elements.

   For an integrated system to be effective, it must deploy assessment methods and allocation procedures appropriate to the offender population and the various services and elements.
To meet this criterion the application must include:

i. a statement of the type or types of offending behaviour, and the dynamic risk and/or protective factors that the system is intended to address

ii. the inclusion criteria

iii. a list of any exclusion criteria (together with a justification for each)

iv. an account of the measures employed to ensure that potential participants are not inappropriately excluded from elements of service on the basis of their background (e.g. their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, disability, sexuality, or age)

v. a description of the assessment and allocation methods, including how the allocation process identifies appropriate combinations of methods

vi. a list of, and references for, any assessment instruments employed in selection, together with a justification for their use and an account where relevant of the evidence for their reliability, validity and feasibility in use.

vii. a description of processes and procedures for review of cases and reallocation

3. Effective Methods and Services

There must be evidence to show that the methods and services used and resources provided are likely to have an impact on the targeted dynamic risk factors and/or enhance relevant protective factors.

The aim of the methods and services deployed in the system is to modify dynamic risk factors and enhance protective factors. Methods and services may be targeted in a variety of ways and will often need to be combined to provide an intervention appropriate to the individual offender. Methods employed in the programme, therefore, must be supported by evidence of their efficacy.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i. provide a description of the methods used and services deployed

ii. offer theoretical justifications for these methods in respect of the dynamic risk factors or protective factors

iii. describe how methods will be adapted to take account of diverse backgrounds

iv. describe evidence that demonstrates the efficacy of the principal methods and services deployed in relation to the types of offender targeted by the system

v. show how the system provides individual interventions for individual offenders which act as a cohesive whole, and where different methods and services are used, describe how these are integrated with each other

A number of offender characteristics have been shown to be linked to the risk of reoffending. Some of these are associated with offending in general, while others are more particular to specific offence types. Those characteristics associated with reoffending which are potentially subject to change are described as dynamic risk factors. Because modification to dynamic risk factors should be associated with a lessening of the risk of reoffending, they represent suitable targets for change.

Other positive factors have been associated with a lessening of the risk of reconviction compared with what might be expected from the risk factors present. These are referred to as protective factors and, where they can be enhanced, would be suitable targets for intervention within an integrated rehabilitative system.

The dynamic risk factors and protective factors below are acceptable targets for accreditation purposes and do not require evidence in support of them.
### Generic Dynamic Risk Factors

- poor cognitive skills;
- anti-social attitudes and feelings, including sexist and racist attitudes;
- strong ties to and identification with anti-social/criminal models and impulsive anti-social lifestyle;
- weak social ties and identification with pro-social/non-criminal models;
- cognitive support for offending: distorted thinking used to justify offending;
- deficits in self-management, decision making and problem solving skills;
- difficulty in recognising personally relevant risk factors and in generating or enacting appropriate strategies to cope with them;
- poor pro-social interpersonal skills;
- dependency on alcohol and drugs;
- contingencies favouring criminal over pro-social behaviour;
- some adverse social or family circumstances (e.g. absence of social support, lack of pro-social influences within family network);
- weak or fragile commitment to avoiding re-offending;

### Additional Dynamic Risk Factors

#### Sex Offending Factors

- deviant sexual interest, offence related interests, especially arousal patterns, and excessive sexual preoccupation;
- empathy deficits: limited awareness of the victim's point of view, or an inappropriate reaction to victim distress;
- social support for sexual offending. This includes direct social support for sexual offending, as in a network;
- social support for sexual offence related ideas, for example, social messages supporting cognitive distortions, or family collusion, which may be a consequence of manipulation of family members by the offender; and the absence of social support for relapse prevention strategies.
4. **Skills and Opportunities**

The system must facilitate the acquisition of skills and provide opportunities that will assist participants in avoiding criminal activities and facilitate their involvement in legitimate pursuits.

There is an increasing amount of evidence to show that the acquisition of skills by an offender is an important component in reducing his or her likelihood of re-offending. These may be related to basic skills and key skills as well as vocational skills, or to those associated with aspects of self-management, interpersonal functioning, problem solving, and other cognitive abilities; this might include skills relevant to self-risk management. It is important to note, however, that learning a skill is not simply about being provided with new information, but also about being able to implement it, which requires practice.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i define the skills that participants will have the opportunity to learn
ii demonstrate that these skills are relevant to those participants, and that some are likely to lack competence in them
iii provide an explanation, backed by evidence, of how the acquisition of each of these skills is potentially associated with either a reduction in criminal activity or an increased ability to pursue legitimate activities
iv specify the ways in which each skill is to be acquired
v specify how capability in the use of each skill is to be demonstrated

5. **Sequencing, Scale and Intensity**

The integrated system must ensure that offenders are allocated to services and elements, which are appropriate in relation to sequencing, scale and intensity.
To meet this criterion the application must:

i. show how case management supervision and/or sentence planning can determine intensity, scale and, where relevant, how sequencing can be adapted to meet differing levels of risk, needs and learning styles of participants

ii. show how case management and supervision and/or sentence planning can achieve integration between the different elements of the intervention

iii. demonstrate that the overall scale will be appropriate to the targets set for particular groups of offenders and how this varies according to the elements of service to which they are allocated; demonstrate that the scale will be sufficient to achieve sustained change in the factors targeted

The term “scale” is used to refer to the amount of direct work with the offender and to the scope of supporting work with significant others, or to work to support access to community resources. Scale may need to differ according to the particular offender’s need.

6. Engagement and Motivation

The integrated system must be structured to maximise the engagement of participants and to sustain their motivation throughout the period of supervision.

A system is unlikely to be effective unless offenders both actively engage with the service(s) provided to them and remain motivated throughout. The extent to which this occurs is dependent in part on the way in which the various elements are delivered, the commitment staff show to the approach used, their level of skill and ability and the degree to which participants are responsive to these methods and services. This will include participants’ motivation to attend, to comply with requirements, and their motivation to change behaviour. One good indicator of engagement and motivation is the proportion of offenders who complete the sessions or activities identified in the case management plan, supervision plan, or sentence plan*, therefore reasons for non-completion of the various elements provided within the system must, be understood.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i. specify how motivation is assessed, before and during the activity and describe any steps taken to enhance it, how people are engaged and how obstacles are overcome

ii. describe the methods used to maintain motivation, how work is valued from the earliest stage and appropriate feedback provided

iii. indicate the steps taken to ensure that needs associated with an offender’s age, gender, ethnic background, learning style and personal life experiences (past and present) are addressed whilst maintaining the integrity of the system

iv. describe how pro-social attitudes are encouraged amongst all agency staff, and associated professionals with whom the offender is in contact

In addition:

v. evidence should be provided, if available, of attendance rates (where obligatory) or, access/uptake rates (where service optional) This should include analysis of offenders not attending or accessing services non-completion and include information obtained from participants themselves, e.g. from exit interviews. Where evidence is not yet available, plans to collect and use this information should be included within Criteria 8 on Monitoring
vi. evidence that, where relevant, offenders engaged meaningfully in generalisation exercises or other pieces of work that demonstrated they have applied the skills taught in real life situations outside of regular sessions.

* Note: Current requirements for case management planning are set out for the Probation Service in the National Standards for the supervision of offenders in the community 2000 (revised 2002), and for the Prison Service, in Prison Service Order 2200. The application should describe how staff are trained in motivational approaches, and how their skills in this area are assessed and monitored.

7. Planning and Integration

The case management plan, supervision or sentence plan must achieve integration between the different elements of intervention at individual case level.

The case management system and the sentence plan should establish continuity of planning between custodial and community elements. Planning is a joint activity between the relevant professionals and the offender and where appropriate his/her family. Most cases will involve a variety of elements of supervision provided either in custody or in the community, and by a variety of agencies, both statutory, voluntary and private in order to achieve and sustain satisfactory attendance rates or access/uptake rates and to effect a smooth transition and maintain progress. Issues related to public protection also require that provision be made for sharing of information between agencies so that offenders can be monitored appropriately.

To meet this criterion the application must:

i show how the various methods and services are integrated into the overall interrelated plans with the offender
ii demonstrate how this integration is achieved in relation to how specific staff engage with individual offenders
iii contain guidelines that specify the staff and management roles required to deliver the services by each agency involved
iv indicate how relevant staff are informed about the aims and objectives of the services
v specify the arrangements for liaison, handover and communication between relevant staff involved in the management of the offender
vi specify what is being planned to reduce drop out.
vi indicate how issues relating to confidentiality and disclosure between agencies are dealt with, especially in cases involving protection of children and vulnerable people
viii describe, where relevant, the enforcement policy in relation to attendance and enforcement of Orders or Licence conditions
ix specify arrangements for monitoring and reviewing progress, including how offenders will be involved in this.

8. Monitoring to Maintain Effectiveness

There must be Quality Assurance mechanisms to monitor how well the system functions, and a process to modify aspects of it that do not perform as expected.

Unless a system is monitored closely it may not run as intended, with the risk of undermining its efficacy. Processes therefore need to be in place to achieve this.

To meet this criterion the application must:
i indicate how information obtained from monitoring is used to improve the operation of the various elements of the system and the system as a whole
ii include procedures for obtaining offender feedback, indicating how this is used to influence the further development of the elements of the system
iii indicate how access to the various elements of service and outcomes are monitored in relation to diversity policies and potential discrimination, whether intentional or not
iv identify key issues for audit and Quality Assurance of delivery

In addition, consideration must be given to the following supporting conditions to ensure System integrity:

i committed leadership and organisational structure
ii staff selection procedures
iii staff training procedures (including training in relation to cultural awareness) and indicate how competency in delivery is assessed and monitored
iv staff supervision arrangements (including an account of how staff are supported and provided with development training to counter any difficulties experienced)
vi procedures to ensure continuing availability of staff, resources and facilities to the Integrated System
vi mechanisms to ensure the accessibility of the Integrated System to appropriate offenders and to achieve their continued participation

9. Ongoing Evaluation

There must be provision to evaluate the efficacy of the system.

Unless the system is properly evaluated it is not possible to know whether or not it is effective, which in the long term means a reconviction study with relevant comparison data, as soon as reasonably feasible. As a decrease in recidivism is intended to be achieved through change in targeted dynamic risk factors and protective factors, improvement in these factors is an important, and more immediate, measure of efficacy. The evaluation should address different sub-groups of offenders and take into account that the system provides different interventions for different offenders.

To meet this criterion the application must describe the arrangements for evaluation, which should as a minimum include an assessment of:

- the demographic and other relevant characteristics of participants and those not accepted onto the integrated system
- changes in the dynamic risk factors and/or protective factors targeted by the integrated system
- relationship between records of attendance and whether offenders change as intended
- previous criminal history and reconviction rates

(ii) Documentation Requirements for Accreditation

The minimum documentation for a full accreditation must consist of the application itself, which must address each of the nine criteria, and a supporting Core Manual. The Core Manual should contain two main sections:

Section A - Theory and Design
Section B - Implementation and Evaluation
Applicants might also wish to use appendices or attach extra documentation for additional information where necessary, but these are not requirements of the Panel.

The Core Manual

Section A - Theory and Design

This section must describe the theoretical base for the Integrated System (IS) and the model for change, and include:

- who the Integrated System is for
- what dynamic risk factors it is intended to address
- how each element of the system contributes to addressing the dynamic risk factors and harnessing the protective factors
- the rationale for allocating offenders to particular elements of the Integrated System
- how diversity issues are addressed within the integrated system
- what each element of the system is to achieve, both separately and in combination with other elements, with particular reference to:
  - case management
  - organisation of delivery of the elements (sequencing/parallel delivery etc)
  - the use of methods which are effective
  - connections between the elements where relevant
  - how the Integrated System links with other interventions which may be delivered to the targeted offenders
- specific aims and objectives for each element, stated in terms of intended learning or other outcomes
- a clear description of the content of each element of the Integrated System, along with well produced and clear materials for use with offenders where appropriate
- a clear explanation of how the individual elements and their linkages relate to the model of change and the supporting research evidence

Section B - Implementation and Evaluation

This section must describe each element of the system and how they link together in sufficient detail to enable it to be delivered in the intended way. There should be:

- The minimum supporting conditions (including information on the Integrated System's performance, resourcing, staffing, and management structures) required to enable the Integrated System to run as intended.
- A clear description of how the different elements will be linked together in a coherent way in practice
- The roles and responsibilities of managers/governors and staff
- How the competencies of staff will be ensured through one or more of:
  - The provision of detailed training courses, including curriculum and training materials and supporting assessment arrangements
  - The assessment and development of required competencies
  - The possession of a recognised qualification
  - Regular review of performance
- How offenders are selected for the Integrated System
- All assessment and evaluation instruments used in the Integrated System, a rationale for their choice, and guidance on their administration
- How offenders are allocated to the elements which match their needs
- Arrangements for monitoring and evaluating the Integrated System, including the assurance of delivery integrity and audit
(iii) The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel’s Scoring System

A full application should demonstrate to the Panel that each criterion is met. The Panel will consider whether the application fully meets, partially meets, or does not meet each criterion. To give an indication of how the Panel applies this system, an application will be adjudged to have “fully met” a given criterion where it is considered adequate, satisfactory or sufficient. The Panel would consider a criterion to be “partially met” where the integrated system did not fully meet the criterion but, as it stood, was not inconsistent with progress towards being effective and had the potential for improvement. An award of “not met” signified that the programme was flawed in relation to the criterion in question. Where the Panel awards a rating of “fully met” and wishes to identify and acknowledge excellent practice in meeting a specific criterion, it may record that the application was commended in how it met that criterion.

The integrated system will be given two points for each fully met criterion, one point for each partially met criterion, and zero for each criterion not met. The maximum possible score is 18 for the nine criteria. To be accredited the integrated system must score at least 16 points and must at least partially meet all criteria.

**Integrated Systems for full accreditation will be marked either:**

- **Accredited**
  - The integrated system meets the criteria.

- **Recognised/Provisionally Accredited**
  - The Panel has identified specific changes which could be achieved in less than 12 months (or a longer period, where specified) and which would bring the integrated system up to ‘Accredited’ status. The integrated system is provisionally accredited subject to those changes being made. To be ‘Recognised/Provisionally Accredited’ the integrated system will have scored 14 points.

- **Not Accredited/Promising**
  - The integrated system could be brought up to the accreditation standard, but requires a significant degree of development work first. To get a ‘Not Accredited/Promising’ rating the integrated system should normally score about 9 points.

- **Not Accredited/No further review warranted**
  - The Panel considers that the integrated system does not merit further work being undertaken. The Panel report explains why this view was taken.
ANNEX C

PROGRAMMES AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS ACCREDITED FOR DELIVERY IN CUSTODY

Programmes accredited by Prison Service Accreditation Panels prior to creation of the Joint Prison/Probation Accreditation Panel in 1999:

- Reasoning And Rehabilitation (R&R)
- Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS)
- Sex Offender Treatment Core Programme (Core SOTP)
- Sex Offender Treatment Adapted Programme (Adapted SOTP)
- Sex Offender Booster Programme (Booster SOTP)
- Problem Solving (Renamed: Think First Inside) (TFI)
- Grendon therapeutic community

Programmes accredited by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (formerly Joint Prison/Probation Accreditation Panel):

- 12-step Substance Abuse Treatment Programme (Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners’ Trust) (RAPt)
- Controlling Anger And Learning To Manage It (CALM)
- Cognitive Self Change Programme (CSCP)
- Revised Sex Offender Treatment Core Programme (Core SOTP)
- Sex Offender Treatment Rolling Programme (Rolling SOTP)
- Revised Sex Offender Treatment Extended Programme (Extended SOTP)
- Better Lives (Revised Booster SOTP)
- Lancaster Castle 12-step drugs programme
- Prison – Addressing Substance Misuse Related Offending drugs programme (P-ASRO)
- Healthy Relationships (Domestic violence programme)
- Democratic Therapeutic Communities core model
- North West Area (formerly Garth/Wymott) drugs therapeutic community
- Ley Community Prison Programme (drugs programme)
- FOCUS/High Security Estate (drugs programme)
- Action on Drugs programme
- STOP drugs programme

Programme awarded recognised/provisionally accredited status by CSAP

- Cognitive Skills Booster programme (for prison and probation graduates of cognitive skills programmes)
ANNEX D

PRISON SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO OF OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR PROGRAMMES AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS INTENDED FOR ACCREDITATION BY THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACCREDITATION PANEL

- Adapted ETS for juveniles (JETS)
- Programme for violent psychopathic offenders
- FOR A Change resettlement programme
- Dialectical Behaviour Therapy for women
- Anger/Emotional Management for Women
- Violent Offender Booster
- Sex offender treatment programme for women
- Healthy Sexual Functioning programme
- P-ASRO for women
- Short duration drug treatment programme
ANNEX E

PRO FORMA FOR BUSINESS CASE FOR SEEKING APPROVAL FOR INCLUSION IN THE DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

1. Sponsors of business case

1.1 Is this a joint Prison/Probation business case?
   If not, what are the reasons?

1.2 Policy/HQ groups involved, e.g. OBPU, DSU, WWPU, JG, WT

1.3 Other parties involved, e.g. YJB, DSPD

2. The proposed intervention

2.1 Its aims

2.2 Target group - inclusion criteria, risk need
   - exclusion criteria - responsivity

2.3 Sequencing of intervention - in relation to existing interventions.

3. Need for the intervention

3.1 Contribution to Aim 4, Ministerial Aims and priorities

3.2 Evidence of need for the intervention, including:
   - scale
   - distribution
   in the prison population/in the offender population in the community

4. Value of additional intervention to existing portfolio

4.1 How does the proposal fit with the existing portfolios for the two services?

4.2 What is the position of the two services in respect of the proposal?

4.3 On what basis is developing this intervention assessed to be a priority?

5. Skills and resources required for development and to achieve accreditation

5.1 What are the options for achieving a suitable accredited intervention?

5.2 In relation to each option, what are the benefits, and what are the costs, full resource requirements?

5.3 Cost/benefit evaluation of the proposal, compared to other options.

5.4 Are the resources required available?
5.5 From what source?

6. Implementation

6.1 Proposed approach to implementation

6.2 Proposed timetable, for pilots and roll out

6.3 What resources will be required for implementation? (Include central, area and local resources and the estimated unit costs of delivery.)

6.4 What resources are available for implementation? (Include staff, expertise, funding)

6.5 Practicality of implementation – Is it achievable?

6.6 How will the programme be monitored, evaluated? (Include timeframe for evaluation)

7. Any other information
INTRODUCTION

This document provides high-level common standards for the delivery of interventions that have been accredited by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel or its predecessor panels for delivery in Prison Service establishments in England and Wales, including establishments managed by the contracted sector or under Service Delivery Agreement. These Standards have been approved by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel and adopted as Prison Service policy through inclusion in PSO 4360. Any future changes in Standards will similarly require the approval of the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel and adoption as Prison Service policy.

2. Delivery of these accredited interventions is subject to site audit on an annual basis. Sites that have been authorised to deliver accredited interventions and have contractual or service delivery agreements to do so will be audited. The purposes of audit are:

- To assess performance in the delivery of interventions
- To provide an incentive to perform well
- To provide guidance on improving performance
- To provide recognition of good performance
- To determine overall Prison Service performance
- To contribute to estimating the contribution of accredited interventions to achieving the objective of reducing re-offending

3. Draft audit reports will be provided quickly to sites. Any disagreements may be raised in the first instance with the auditors. If not resolved in this way, a complaint may be lodged with the Prison Service Audit Advisory Group through What Works in Prison Unit. Audit scores and summaries will be provided to the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel for validation.

4. The audit tools and associated scoring provide measures of compliance with these Standards. These audit tools vary between interventions, to reflect their specific design, but are aligned as much as possible. This document provides an overview of the elements they have in common.

5. The Standards are grouped into Sections for:

- Institutional support
- Treatment management
- Continuity and resettlement
- Quality of delivery
6. For each high-level Standard, this Manual provides:
   - A rationale
   - The types of measures in current use

7. The audit tools provide, for each baseline:
   - A cross-reference to these Standards
   - Required actions by the site/provider
   - The evidence required and auditors’ method of checking
   - The scoring schema

8. In addition to scoring each baseline, the auditors will provide an overall commentary on the site’s performance in each Section. This commentary may refer to specific Standards. Even where audit compliance with a Standard achieves the maximum score, auditors may draw attention to scope for improvement or risks of deterioration in performance.

9. A maximum score of 4 is available on each baseline. The criteria for a maximum score are such that it is achievable. The number of baselines in each Section varies, but the scores are then re-weighted to reflect the contribution of each Section to the overall implementation quality rating (IQR). Sites should have a target IQR of 100% and many achieve this.

10. There may be some baselines which set a mandatory minimum score. Establishments which fall below this standard and/or fail to achieve at least 60% in each Section will be deemed to have performed unsatisfactorily. This will be reflected in the weighted scorecard.

11. Normally, each Section will contribute equally to the final IQR, but the proportion may vary from year to year, on the advice of the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel, in the light of audit outcomes, to encourage greater attention by sites to some aspects of implementation.

12. The contribution of each Section to the total score awarded for purposes of calculating the IQR currently varies as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional support</th>
<th>Treatment management</th>
<th>Continuity &amp; resettlement</th>
<th>Quality of delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Sex Offender Treatment Programmes (SOTP)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&amp;R), Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS), Cognitive skills booster, Controlling Anger and Learning to Manage it (CALM), Cognitive Self-Change Programme (CSCP), all drug treatment programmes, and Therapeutic Communities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. The number of baselines for each Section varies between interventions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Institutional support</th>
<th>Treatment management</th>
<th>Continuity &amp; resettlement</th>
<th>Quality of delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOTP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;R/ETS/Cognitive Skills Booster</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-behavioural drug treatment programmes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-step drug treatment programmes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Communities drug treatment programmes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Therapeutic Communities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION A: INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
(These Standards may be the responsibility of Programme Managers.)

Standard

1.1 The senior management of the establishment is actively committed to the proper resourcing, management and delivery of the intervention, and to ensuring a supportive institutional environment.

Rationale

This is an essential pre-condition to ensure infrastructure to deliver the intervention as designed and to ensure that progress achieved by prisoners is not undermined by contrary messages outside the intervention.

Types of measures in current use

- Letter of commitment from Governor
- Management team of appropriate grades in place, trained and competent
- Adequate hours allowed for the management of the intervention
- Managers attend national and local management meetings
- Awareness training provided and attended by all staff, as appropriate
- Suitable facilities and materials available for the delivery of the intervention

Standard

1.2 Scheduling of sessions and attendance of staff and prisoners meet effectiveness criteria.

Rationale

To maintain momentum in prisoners’ learning and ensure motivation, scheduling and attendance must be regular.

Types of measures in current use

- Interventions delivered at an appropriate number of sessions per week
- Appropriate number and calibre of staff involved in and available for delivery of intervention
- Continuity of staff maintained as required
- Group size within limits appropriate to intervention
- Prisoners made available to attend the intervention

Standard

1.3 Management and deployment of staff should allow proper completion of all aspects of their role and ensure maintenance and development of their skills.

Rationale

Skilled staff, who are responsive to the needs of the individuals in their treatment group, are one of the most critical factors in effectiveness. If they are to apply their skills effectively, they must have enough time before, during and after treatment sessions.
Types of measures in current use

- Tutors/facilitators have adequate time for preparation, debrief, record keeping, report writing, supervision and support
- Tutors/facilitators deliver programmes on a regular basis and for an adequate period of time
- Tutors/facilitators complete records and reports
SECTION B: TREATMENT MANAGEMENT
(These Standards may be the responsibility of Treatment Managers.)

Standard

2.1 Staff selection procedures meet the requirements of the intervention and only staff who meet the defined criteria are selected to deliver it.

Rationale

Effective practice requires staff who have an aptitude for the type of work.

Types of measures in current use

- Staff selection follows guidelines in programme management manual

Standard

2.2 Staff training provision meets the requirements of the intervention. Staff are not deployed in roles for which they have not successfully completed the required training and newly-trained staff are deployed as appropriate to their level of experience and learning needs.

Rationale

Effective practice requires skilled staff. Skills are acquired both through successful completion of initial training in delivery of the intervention and through experience and feedback on performance, with successful completion of additional training when required.

Types of measures in current use

- Tutors/facilitators have successfully completed skills training, assessment course, tutor training course and any other required training and are able to demonstrate competence and knowledge
- Staff supervision gives ongoing attention to development needs
- Newly-trained programme tutors are paired with accredited tutors initially; tutors only tutor alone when fully qualified and if permitted by the programme manual

Standard

2.3 Staff supervision is provided according to the requirements of the intervention. Evidence of delivery of the intervention, for use in supervision, is obtained by treatment managers, according to the requirements of the intervention.

Rationale

Effective practice requires skilled staff. The maintenance and development of skills requires support and sensitive feedback on performance.

Types of measures in current use

- Supervision sessions held at required frequency
- Supervision and counselling requirements comply with managers' manual
Where required, treatment managers ensure that all programme sessions are videoed or recorded in alternative specified method
Where required, treatment managers review video or alternative specified observation of tutors prior to each supervision session

Standard

2.4 Evidence is supplied to facilitate audit and evaluation.

Rationale

Effective practice must be demonstrated, through the evidence provided to and assessed by audit and evaluation.

Types of measures in current use

- Programme delivery documentation sent in or available for inspection as required
- Videotapes or alternative specified evidence of delivery sent in or available as required

Standard

2.5 Prisoners are selected and de-selected for an intervention through assessments of risk, need and suitability

Rationale

Research shows that the effectiveness of interventions is related to careful matching of the intervention to the assessed risks of re-offending, criminogenic needs and learning styles of those who participate.

Types of measures in current use

- Selection and de-selection follows current guidelines for selection and de-selection of prisoners for the intervention

Standard

2.6 Prisoners undergo assessments as required to facilitate evaluation of the intervention.

Rationale

Initial assessments provide evidence of the suitability of the prisoner for the intervention. Before/after assessments provide evidence of short-term change in relevant attitudes and behaviour as a consequence of the intervention.

Types of measures in current use

- Psychometric and other specified tests are administered as required, including when a prisoner has been transferred or released
Standard

2.7 Reports are prepared as required, containing an assessment of prisoners’ progress, based on evidence from records kept during the intervention. Reports and post-course reviews provide recommendations for further work to maintain/enhance the effectiveness of the intervention.

Rationale

Research evidence shows that treatment effects dissipate unless reinforced through appropriate follow-up. A specific intervention may not have met all the individual’s treatment needs. An individual may require a greater dose of the same type of intervention or a different intervention.

Types of measures in current use

- Session and/or block and/or periodic reports are prepared
- Post-course reports are prepared and they contain an account of prisoners’ participation and performance in the programme and proposals for SMART follow-on objectives
SECTION C: CONTINUITY MANAGEMENT
(These Standards may be the responsibility of Resettlement Managers.)

Standard

3.1 Appropriate procedures are in place to ensure that progress made by prisoners who complete interventions is reinforced and taken forward during the remainder of their sentence and following release.

Rationale

Research evidence shows that treatment effects dissipate unless reinforced through appropriate follow-up. A specific intervention may not have met all the individual’s treatment needs. An individual may require a greater dose of the same type of intervention or a different intervention.

Types of measures in current use

- Contact is made with supervising probation officers before the start of the intervention and, if required, during and after the programme
- Course reviews/case conferences are held as required for each participant
- Appropriate personnel are invited to, and encouraged to attend the course review, with failure or refusal to attend followed up as appropriate
- Objectives for further work are agreed
- Post-intervention reports and course review minutes are attached to sentence planning documentation and sent to supervising probation officer and other relevant personnel

Standard

3.2 Offenders are followed up as required to track objectives and ensure that their outcome is fed into ongoing case and sentence management and into improving interventions.

Rationale

Research evidence shows that treatment effects dissipate unless reinforced through appropriate follow-up. Improvements to interventions depend on feedback of long-term impact.

Types of measures in current use

- Resettlement managers contact supervising officers and/or prison colleagues and obtain information about the outcome of objectives, which is placed on file and fed back to programme staff
SECTION D: QUALITY OF DELIVERY/TREATMENT INTEGRITY
(These Standards may be the responsibility of Treatment Managers.)

Standard

4.1 Delivery of the intervention adheres to the programme manual and to the prescribed treatment style.

Rationale

Research evidence shows that treatment effectiveness depends on adherence to the design of the intervention, in content and style of delivery.

Types of measures in current use

- The programme manual is adhered to
- The prescribed treatment style is adhered to

Standard

4.2 The intervention produces a positive treatment effect.

Rationale

This is the primary aim of treatment. This outcome provides good evidence that the intervention was delivered well.

Types of measures in current use

- Assessment measures show changes in the required direction

Standard

4.3 Completion rates for the intervention are high.

Rationale

This outcome provides good evidence that the intervention was delivered well and attention was paid to maintaining prisoners' motivation.

Types of measures in current use

- Overall dropout rate from the intervention is at an acceptable level
- Reasons for drop-out are recorded
- Drop-out occurs for good reasons, which are related to treatment risks and needs