PROGRAMMES AND SENTENCE PLANNING FOR CATEGORY A INMATES

Regime Research and Development, DIP 2 (November 1990)

“We would like to see a move towards individual programmes for prisoners, incorporating more diverse activity than at present and geared towards the abilities and needs of the inmate himself. What we broadly envisage is that a long-term prisoner’s individually tailored programme would be put together from the available modules during the period of initial assessment. Throughout the sentence there would be routine reviews, with the prisoner personally involved, where his participation in the modules would be discussed and changes to his programme would be considered.

Encouragement of diverse activities and monitoring prisoners’ performance in them is in no way opposed to the need to keep establishments’ performance in delivering activities under close review too. The two objectives are complementary. Nevertheless, we do think that one factor that has hindered progress in this field is the tendency in this country to speak and think in terms of the regime. As we have noted, the concept of the regime is large and vague, and implies generally that every prisoner in an establishment is subject to the same process regardless of his needs or abilities; and measuring performance across its span raises complex questions. We would like to see the phrase “regime activities” replaced by some description that gives the accurate idea that what is at issue is a bundle of prisoner-orientated activities that are amenable to objective performance setting and efficiency audit. We suggest “prisoner programmes” or simply “programmes”.

We emphatically do not see such programmes as soft options. Properly organised programmes would make greater demands of prisoners than do present regimes. In particular, the whole rationale of programmes emphasises personal responsibility, and we are sure that this is healthy. Furthermore, we believe that programmes which involve prisoners personally must be more conducive to control than the present industry-centred regimes which leave many prisoners under-employed and resentful.

These suggestions for the development of programmes highlight the need for more timely and consistent management information about prison activities. This is but one example of the more general need to use new technology to up-rate management information in the Prison Department and that is already under active study.’

Managing the Long-Term Prison System


(c) Longley Consulting (1998)

(Authors: D Longley, M Williams, H Cookson, L Blud (1990)
INTRODUCTION

In the opening quotation setting out the ideas of the CRC are the key elements for the present exercise:

— inmate activities (rather than regimes),
— reflecting individual needs and potential,
— integrated into a sentence plan, that is
— periodically reviewed, and
— properly monitored.

In what follows, an attempt is made to estimate the practicality of these ideas in the light of analysis of empirical data concerning Cat A prisoners. It is not therefore a formal research report as such, but a more discursive document attempting to use empirical evidence to point to possible ways forward.

There are four main sections to the Report. The first and second examine characteristics of the Category A population with a bearing on the viability of Sentence Planning. This includes an analysis of the categorisation/downgrading process (Section 1) and movements (Section 2) of the group. The objective here is to ascertain what, if any, obstacles there might be to the introduction of sentence planning for Cat As.

The third section of the report examines characteristics of a sample of the Category A population, looking at the inmates themselves in an attempt to ascertain what Inmate Programmes might be needed as elements of Sentence Plans.

The fourth section shows how the system of inmate assessment, programme allocation, and performance might be computerised, and argues that such a system is necessary if the recommendations outlined in the CRC report are to be implemented.
SECTION 1 - DEFINING THE CATEGORY A POPULATION

The Category A population is defined through a three-stage process. First, there is an immediate classification into ‘Potential Category A’ by the receiving establishment based on information about the inmate’s sentence and offence. HQ is then notified and a decision is taken whether or not to confirm the ‘potential’ status. Finally, all of the provisional Cat As are subsequently considered by the Category A Review Committee who decide whether to confirm Cat A status or to downgrade. If Cat A status is confirmed the case is regularly reviewed. It is the decisions of this committee therefore which along with sentence and offence largely determine the composition of the Category A population.

This section describes an analysis of review committee decisions for a group of 92 inmates sentenced in 1983 and 1984. The comments made at the review committee meetings were recorded together with the outcome (remain Cat A or downgrade). The results for the 92 cases considered over the years from 1983 until 1990 (involving a total of 336 reviews) are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>downgraded at first review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>downgraded at subsequent reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>remained Cat A throughout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These outcomes were the basis of four studies. For each kind of decision (first reviews being kept distinct from subsequent reviews) the relationship was explored between

(1) review board comments, and
(2) objective information held in the PROBE data-base

and the outcome of the review.

First Review - Confirming Cat A status

1. Review Board Comments

A content analysis of the minutes of Cat A review meetings showed that the outcome of the first review was related to ten different types of comment about the person reviewed:

- likelihood of reoffending
- history of, or current violence
- control problem
- IRA connections
- escape risk
- horrific offence
- security threat
- outside connections
- disturbed/abnormal personality
- remorse for offence.

Not surprisingly for a first review, these comments refer by and large to characteristics of the prisoner known at or shortly after sentence. The content analysis specifically excluded references to ‘dangerousness’, since this was the target attribute which the committee sought to assess. The object of the analysis here was to determine which other attributes the committee appeared to believe to be relevant in the assessment of ‘dangerousness’.
A simple point system was used, with the prisoners all receiving one point for every comment in the direction of removal to a lower category and losing one point for every comment in favour of retention in Cat A (a constant was added to make all scores positive). The results were as follows:

*Table 1. Frequencies of point scores (based on review board comments) according to the outcome of the first review*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downgraded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result is also shown Figure 1, giving the percentages confirmed and not confirmed Cat A for each point score. Clearly higher point scores are associated with increased probability of downgrading.

*Figure 1.*

These results show that the review decision and the recorded comments are related in a systematic way. Obviously the comments themselves may simply add up to a post-hoc justification for a decision made on quite other grounds. Even so, there does appear to be a consensus of opinion as to the prisoner characteristics which *should* be taken into account in a review.
2. Using the PROBE data-base

Confirmation of Cat A status was also found to be related to various aspects of the offence and sentence that were recorded in the PROBE database.

— lifers were more likely than others to be downgraded at first review
— robbers were less likely than others to be downgraded at first review
— anyone who had ever used firearms was extremely unlikely to be downgraded at first review
— terrorists were never downgraded
— those with more previous convictions were more likely to be downgraded
— those who had had a long previous sentence were more likely to be confirmed Cat A than others

A point system was again used based on the six characteristics described above. The results are set out in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downgraded:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is shown in the graph in Figure 2. Obviously the range of possible scores is less than that for the score based on Board comments, nevertheless, there is a clear association between the score and the probability of downgrading at first review.
Subsequent Reviews of confirmed Cat As

3. Review Board Comments

For subsequent reviews, further comments are related to the outcome in addition to those described above for first reviews. These relate, again not surprisingly, to aspects of the prisoner which would come to light on a more prolonged acquaintance:

- staff support for downgrading
- poorly/well-behaved
- denying or lacking insight into offence
- making or not making progress
- being unpredictable
- suicide risk
- longer assessment required
- ill-health
- mature/immature
- financial or other resources
- devious or manipulative
- EDR imminent
- refusing to discuss offence
- refusing treatment

Using a similar point system to that described above for the first reviews, the outcomes of the 336 subsequent reviews were as set out in Table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points:</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay Cat A:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downgrade:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is also illustrated graphically in Figure 3. Again higher point scores are associated with increased probability of downgrading.
4. Using the PROBE data-base

Considering information about sentence and offence from the PROBE database, similar factors were associated with outcome as for first reviews, though sometimes in the opposite direction. This may seem puzzling at first sight. However we are dealing here with factors that do not in themselves change with the passage of time, but which may have different significance when applied to a confirmed Cat A from that which they have when applied to a provisional. This aspect of the research has particularly high-lighted the crucial difference between initial and subsequent reviews. For example, as described above, lifers have a much higher chance than determinates of being downgraded at first review. Many of these will have received a mandatory life-sentence, but it will be obvious to all that they are not highly dangerous. Once these cases are removed however, the pattern is reversed. For subsequent reviews lifers have only a 33% chance of being downgraded within 6 years, compared with a 50% chance for determinates. After confirmation we are presumably left with a hard core of dangerous murderers.

The factors associated with review decisions were:

— those with determinate sentences had a higher chance of being downgraded than lifers

— those with offences of robbery, theft, firearms, or arson had a higher chance of downgrading than those with offences against the person. (Remember robbers had a very small chance of downgrading at first review. These prisoners seem to have to ‘prove themselves’ for a time in prison, after which their chances are quite good.)

— the two confirmed cases who had been in special hospital were never downgraded.
— previous convictions for robbery and violence were associated with downgrading - again these may have been responsible in part for the long sentence which is a criterion for Cat A.

— although those who had ever used firearms were extremely unlikely to be downgraded at first review, they were more likely to be downgraded at subsequent reviews than were those who had not. The very strong tendency to confirm these cases (95% were confirmed as opposed to 69% of those who had never used firearms) may have picked up cases which were subsequently recognised as not Cat A material.

— those with more than two previous custodies were more likely to be downgraded. This is probably a similar phenomenon to that described above in relation to the association between downgrading at first review and number of previous convictions.

— a long previous sentence is associated with downgrading.

Awarding points on the basis of these characteristics gave the results set out in Table 4, and shown graphically in Figure 4. Once more the association between decategorisation and point score is clear.

**Table 4. Frequencies of point scores (based on PROBE data) according to the outcome over six years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep Cat A:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down-Grade:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.**

Relationship between Decision to Downgrade and Sentence Information (for Confirmed Category As)
Conclusions and Recommendations

The data presented in this section show that:

— There is a systematic relationship between review decision and the kind of comments made about the person under review.

— There is a systematic relationship between review decision and information about sentence, offence and previous convictions.

These results show that the review committee decisions are more consistent and systematic than is commonly supposed. There remains a degree of uncertainty of outcome characteristic of the exercise of human judgement that is commensurate with the fact that the decisions are not, and cannot be, entirely rule-driven, (since the object of the meeting is to review an initial classification which is based on rules). As it remains a possibility, however, that the consistency may reside in the process of post-hoc rationalisation, it is strongly recommended that the ‘rules’ at present implicit in the decision-making be made explicit via the use of a checklist of the kind provided for first and subsequent reviews illustrated overleaf. This would have several advantages.

— The Cat A committee would start their deliberations with an objective probability of downgrading, and hence be able to articulate additional considerations to be taken into account (for possible future incorporation into the checklist).

— Decisions would be made more quickly, and time concentrated on the most uncertain cases.

— More realistic consideration could be given to the possibilities of feedback to the field (and possibly the prisoner) about the reasons for the decisions that have been made.
Items Associated with Confirmation as Category A at FIRST Review

likely to re-offend
control problem
escape risk
security threat
disturbed/abnormal personality
history of /current violence
IRA connections
horrific offence
outside connections
no remorse for actions
determinate sentence
total previous convictions fewer than 8
longest previous sentence more than 2 years
terrorist
firearms

Name............................
Number.........................
Date............................
Prison............................
Items Associated with Retention as Category A at SUBSEQUENT Reviews

likely to reoffend
control problem
escape risk
security threat
disturbed / abnormal personality
history of / current violence
IRA connections
horrific offence
outside connections
no remorse for actions
staff against down-grading
denies / lacks insight into offence
unpredictable
longer assessment required
immature
devious / manipulative
refuses to discuss offence
poorly behaved
not making progress
suicide risk
ill-health
financial or other resources
EDR imminent
refuses treatment

lifer
offence against person
been in special hospital
no previous robbery convictions
no firearms
no previous violence convictions
longest previous sentence less than 2 years
fewer than 3 previous custodies
Name...................
Number............... 
Date...................
Prison....................
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SECTION 2 - CATEGORY A MOVEMENTS

A: FREQUENCY OF MOVES

It is widely believed that sentence planning is not practical for Category A inmates because of the frequency of their moves in the maximum security system. The analyses reported in this section were performed to estimate the extent of this movement, and hence to determine whether or not the initial allocation and subsequent transfers of Category A inmates were in fact a serious impediment to sentence planning.

Figure 5 gives the distribution of the rate of movements for the whole Cat A group. It shows that approximately half of the inmates (48% of the total) have moved on average less than once a year, although a minority have a much higher rate (6% have four or more moves per year - almost certainly the ‘disciplinary’ moves affecting the difficult control problems).

Turning to the first three years of the sentence (when most of the initial assessment for sentence planning would be undertaken), the moves for all eligible Cat As serving 10 years or more were compared directly with the moves of the equivalent group of Cat Bs (a total of 849 cases). The results are presented separately for determinate and life sentence prisoners in Table 5, and show that the movement rate is broadly similar across both the security categories, and the type of sentence.
Table 5. Moves of Cat As and Bs in the first years of sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category A (N=269)</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Sentence</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(187)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinate</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category B (N=580)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Sentence</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(342)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinate</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(238)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final analysis is of the movement of the Cat As according to type of offence (the results are displayed in Table 6). As with the earlier results, the differences (apart from that between Year 1 and the rest) are marginal, and unlikely to interfere with any normal sentence planning. The evidence also suggests that the various offence groups will pose no particular problems in respect of rate of movement.

Table 6. Moves of Cat As by offence and year of sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases:</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For All Groups</td>
<td>1.2714</td>
<td>.5428</td>
<td>.5428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender</td>
<td>1.1359</td>
<td>.4175</td>
<td>.3592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robber</td>
<td>1.1304</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder/Homicide</td>
<td>1.3864</td>
<td>.5341</td>
<td>.7045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violence</td>
<td>1.5926</td>
<td>.9259</td>
<td>.7037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2143</td>
<td>.2857</td>
<td>.6071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

The results presented above suggest that the rate of movement of Cat As in the Dispersal System is not in fact an obstacle to the development of sentence plans for the majority, nor is it a problem for any particular offence or sentence group.

There remains within the Cat As a small sub-group with a high rate of moves. About half of the Special Unit cases are Cat As and previous work suggests that Cat As account for nearly half of the Dispersal System’s difficult prisoners (of which there are about 100 to 150). This implies that there may be 40 to 50 Cat As who are a problem for the system, and whose comparatively high rate of movement may colour the thinking about the movement of the group as a whole.
B: REASONS FOR MOVES

A second common concern regarding the movement of Cat As is that the reasons for moves were generally reactive rather than proactive, and hence potentially inimical to the successful implementation of sentence plans. To investigate this, a content analysis of HQ allocation files was performed to assess the reasons for moves between prisons. The files for 42 of a randomly selected sample of Cat As were obtained, and both permanent and temporary moves were noted. Each move was considered as a separate case in the subsequent analyses, and for the 42 individual inmates there were a total of 119 moves.

38 different reasons were noted in the files in the allocation of inmates to particular prisons. These reasons could be grouped into four categories:

- PROACTIVE reasons (variables 1 - 12) - characteristics of the Cat A indicating which prison-type or regime would be suitable, and anticipation of his needs and/or behaviour.
- REACTIVE reasons (13-22) - relating to current events and/or behaviour (including public reaction or press coverage of particular crimes).
- SYSTEM reasons (23-27) - relating to prison changes and availability of spaces.
- TEMPORARY reasons (28-32) - reasons for temporary moves, including CI10/74. In addition, there were
- CONTRAINDICATIONS (33-38) - factors making particular locations undesirable.

The full list of reasons are set out in Appendix 2, together with the characteristics of the sample and other information referred to but not presented in the text.

**Number of reasons given (permanent moves only)**

The number of reasons cited in the file as contributing to any one decision ranged from 1 to 6. The details are set out in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of reasons given:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of move-decisions:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although fewer inmates were involved in the later moves, the same number of reasons seemed to be offered for early as for subsequent decisions - the process apparently did not become simpler as the sequence of moves unfolded (see Appendix 2 for details). For temporary moves, one reason only was generally given. Because of the number of reasons given for each decision involving a permanent move it was not possible simply to categorise the outcome as either proactive or reactive. However, certain inferences may be drawn from the further analysis.
Type of reason given (permanent moves only)

Using the categories set out in the introductory paragraphs, for permanent moves the number and type of reason are detailed in Table 8. The most immediately relevant observation is that the largest proportion of reasons for permanent moves were proactive.

Table 8. Type of reason given (permanent moves only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason given:</th>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Reactive</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Contraindications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency:</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning to the sequence of moves for individuals in the sample, analysis revealed a tendency for the proportion of proactive reasons to diminish relative to reactive reasons with successive moves. The details are set out in Table 9. The results here mirror those in the previous section. A minority of Cat As have many more moves than the average. For that same group, the reasons for the later moves are more and more reactive to the control problem rather than proactive to perceived needs.

Table 9. Types of reason given for successive moves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent with at least one reason that is:</th>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Reactive</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Contraindicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First move: (no of decisions = 41)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move no 2: (no of decisions = 21)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move no 3: (no of decisions = 10)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves 4,5: (no of decisions = 15)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific reasons

Overall, of the 10 most frequent reasons given for a move, one half are proactive, even though the single most frequent reason is reactive (behaviour/control problems). The details are set out in Table 10. The most frequently occurring variable relating to a temporary move was CI10/74 (frequency=10). The reasons used are often, of course, inter-related. A temporary move on CI10/74 frequently occurred in conjunction with behaviour/control problems. It would appear that in just over half the cases where a behaviour/control problem occurs, a permanent move results.

Table 10. The most frequent reasons for moving Cat As

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour/control problems</td>
<td>22 (R)</td>
<td>Governor/staff request</td>
<td>18 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate visits</td>
<td>21 (P)</td>
<td>Potential security problem</td>
<td>17 (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep apart associates</td>
<td>19 (P)</td>
<td>Has vacancies</td>
<td>15 (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of regime</td>
<td>19 (P)</td>
<td>Remove R43</td>
<td>14 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of offence</td>
<td>19 (P)</td>
<td>Swap initiated</td>
<td>11 (S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(P=proactive, R=reactive, S=system)
The frequency of reasons used in decisions was analysed by type of offence, (only the most frequently used variables are shown).

Table 11. Reason according to offence (numbers in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Reason (most frequent)</th>
<th>Reason (2nd most frequent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex offence (34)</td>
<td>nature of offence</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Robbery (47)</td>
<td>behaviour/control problems</td>
<td>13 keep apart associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder (16)</td>
<td>Inmate request</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist activities (12)</td>
<td>keep apart associates</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs offences (10)</td>
<td>Potential security problem</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some variables never occurred in any of the decisions made for a particular group, whilst being frequently used for another group. For example, ‘potential security problem’ is one of the most frequent factors considered in allocating/moving armed robbers, but never occurs in relation to sex offenders. Similarly, CI10/74 was never used for those inmates in the sex offender, murder or drugs category (although the latter two groups involve very small numbers), whereas it was frequently used in relation to armed robbers. On the other hand, despite these specific differences, the percentage of proactive, reactive and system reasons were more consistent across offence groups, as shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Type of reason according to type of offence (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Reactive</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offence</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Robbery</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist acts</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/customs offences</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the numbers in the last three offence categories are small, a strict comparison is difficult (although it should be noted that the number of cases here relates to moves rather than inmates). However it would appear that the pattern of decision making is generically more similar than the use of specific reasons would have led one to expect.

Conclusion

Overall, the decision-making pattern does not appear to be predominantly reactive. Whilst it is equally clearly not totally proactive, nevertheless the proportion of proactive reasoning would probably sustain continuity in sentence planning for the majority of Cat As.
Although the specific reasons given for moving inmates differed across the various offence groups, the percentage of proactive, reactive and system variables used were similar for the two main groups (sex offenders and armed robbers).

As the number of moves increased, the pattern of decision-making appears to change, with a predominance of proactive variables being used in first allocation decisions, whilst reactive variables become more predominant in subsequent decisions (see Table 9). This is plausibly due to the fact that inmates experiencing a greater number of moves during their sentence are more likely to be those inmates who present control problems and hence evoke reactive moves.

**Recommendations**

Considering both sections together, it is clear that neither the number nor the quality of Cat A movement rules out the introduction of sentence planning. The problems that do emerge from (or remain after) the analysis are

- although the movement rates may be low or comparable to Cat Bs, the fact that Cat A moves are *unpredictable* (for security reasons) means that programmes could still be disrupted.
- there exists a sizeable minority for which movement is currently used as a means of control and hence would be disruptive of sentence planning.
- the other complexities of Cat A allocation (the need to avoid locating the inmate with known associates and co-accused, the desire not to contribute adversely to the control climate of particular prisons, and the limits on agreed number of cells in the system).

The problem of unpredictable movement may well be solved through the development of short modular programmes, made more widely available in the dispersal system. This is very much in tune with developments in education outside, particularly the move toward the NVQ. But the result would be an added burden on the monitoring of sentence planning. The solution to this might be to utilise a storage system within PROBE, which with suitable development could be used to accumulate the materials relating to assessment, control profiles, and programme history, that in turn could be passed from dispersal to dispersal, with psychologists providing a facilitatory role in maintaining continuity. The very real benefit would be to tie the control problems (for whom sentence planning seems so problematic) into the sentence planning information infrastructure.
SECTION 3 - ANALYSIS OF INMATE ASSESSMENTS

As a way of exploring the needs and abilities of the Category A population, psychologists in six dispersal prisons gave semi-structured interviews to a random sample of Category A inmates, (the format of this interview is shown in Appendix 3). 24 interviews were obtained from inmates who were part of the random sample originally selected for the analysis of the REASONS for moves, so that details on the number and rate of moves, and any data missing from the interviews (such as offence category), could be included in the analysis.

A preliminary content analysis of the interviews was performed to extract information on EDUCATION NEEDS, VOCATIONAL/WORK SKILLS AND NEEDS, and TREATMENT NEEDS, and whether these needs were being met.

Sample characteristics:

Age range : 23-59 yrs  Sentence length : 11-25 yrs  54% (13) are lifers

Table 13. Mean rate of moves according to offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of inmates</th>
<th>Offence:</th>
<th>Movement rate:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>every 33.33 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>sex offence</td>
<td>every 38.6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>armed robbery</td>
<td>every 32.1 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>murder</td>
<td>every 28.0 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>terrorist acts</td>
<td>every 28.5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>drug offence</td>
<td>every 9.0 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NB: permanent moves only considered)

This shows that inmates are moved on average every two to three years. (Although the drugs category shows a much more frequent rate of moves, this category included only one inmate.)

Education

Inmates were divided into four categories.

Basic/Remedial level - Five (21%) of the sample were assessed as having poor basic education. Breaking the sample down into offence categories revealed that sex offenders were most likely to be in need of basic/remedial education. Four of the 5 inmates in this education category had committed a sex-related offence. Two inmates received some educational input this sentence but none were currently in education.

Basic Skill/No qualifications level - The majority of the sample fell into this category (10 or 42%). Most of the inmates falling into this educational category had committed armed robbery offences (six inmates). Three were sex offenders. One had obtained some qualifications during a previous sentence. Half have obtained some education this sentence. Four (40%) are currently on full-time
or part-time education, and three others are engaged in education on their own initiative (i.e., without the intervention of the Education Department).

**Continuing education level** - Six (25%) had some qualifications prior to sentence (GCSEs, O levels). In terms of offence categories at this education level, three had committed sex offences, one was an armed robber, and two had committed murder. Two had gained extra qualifications during a previous sentence, two others had received some educational input this sentence. None are currently receiving education (but two are currently engaged in education on their own initiative).

**High educational level** - Three inmates only fell into this category (two terrorists, one sex offender). All three had attended education classes in prison (one is currently doing so, and one is engaged on his own project).

The data is summarised in the Table 14.

**Table 14. Education level and current educational input according to offence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence :</th>
<th>Education level:</th>
<th>Education received:</th>
<th>own project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B    Q    C    H</td>
<td>this sentence current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4  3  3  1  7  0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0  6  1  0  3  4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1  0  2  0  1  0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0  0  0  2  2  1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0  1  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5  10  6  3  13  5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Input 1 = currently on education Input 2 = currently/recently engaged in own project)

Five (21%) of the sample are receiving formal educational in prison, although a further six (25%) are currently (or have recently been) engaged in educational projects on their own initiative. In Table 15 the inmates are dichotomised into those with a high level of education and those with a low level of education on entering prison. These two subgroups are examined in terms of those receiving and those not receiving any current educational input.

**Table 15. Educational input of different educational groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION LEVEL:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No input</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Input 1 = currently on education Input 2 = currently/recently engaged in own project)
Just over half the inmates in each group are currently receiving no educational input. Of the 15 of low educational level, only 4 are currently receiving education in prison. Only one inmate in the high educational level is currently attending education classes. However, there are a number of inmates currently (or recently) engaged in education on their own initiative: a third of the inmates who already have some qualifications and 20% of those with basic/qualification needs. Three were undertaking Open University degree courses. Another had been pursuing a course on American History through a local university. One was engaged in his own personal project on social history and hoped to publish a book. A further inmate was learning French on his own. It should be noted that inmates pursuing OU courses are often given considerable guidance and support by the Education Department, but the degree to which this is available varies across prisons, and pursuing this kind of course demands a high degree of individual effort. Two inmates reported that education courses/examinations had been interrupted because of a move.

**Work**

The sample were here divided, according to their outside occupation level, into Unskilled, Skilled, and Professional.

**Unskilled** - The majority fell into this category (13 or 54%), having no formal training or work skills prior to sentence. Of these, three had had some vocational/work training on previous sentences. None had received any training this sentence. Work experience inside included mailbags, workshop, braille unit, making toys for hospice, cleaner, laundry, tailors, yardparty/gardens. Two had no work experience in prison. Currently four (31%) are unemployed.

**Skilled** - Five (21%) fell into this category, having some trained skills/trade outside. One of these had received some vocational training on a previous sentence. Another had received some training this sentence. Currently two are unemployed in prison. The others work either in a workshop, as a cleaner, or in the laundry. Their previous work experience in prison was similar to the first group.

**Professional Skills** - The three inmates in the highest educational category also form this category (12.5%). Of these, one had received some vocational training this sentence. Their work experience in prison was similar to the other groups but the data on current work for two of the inmates was missing. The other inmate is currently unemployed.

As with the education categories, the different skill categories largely reflect different offence types. 80% of the sex offenders for whom data was available fell into the unskilled category (data on one inmate was missing). 50% of the armed robbers were unskilled and another 50% skilled (again, data relating to one was not available). The two terrorists in the sample both fell into the professional category.
Table 16. Work level outside according to offence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence:</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>(missing)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex offence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist acts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many cited jobs which they would like to do, and the most popular were:

- braille unit
- garden/outside work
- kitchen

Others mentioned vocational training courses they were interested in doing, including:

- computer course
- plastering
- engineering
- painting/decorating course
- tailoring
- hospital orderly

Whilst some of these occupations/training courses were available, most stated they were unable to participate because of their Cat A status. The most popular jobs experienced by the sample included:

- segregation unit orderly
- braille unit
- making toys for hospice
- gym club for handicapped children

Treatment Needs

Sixteen of the inmates (67%) were judged by the interviewer to have some kind of treatment needs. Of these six (37.5%) had received none during their sentence and thirteen (81%) are currently receiving no treatment input. All sixteen were assessed as having treatment needs that were not being met. The range of needs and numbers of inmates requiring (but not receiving) them are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offence-related counselling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/alcohol counselling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd desensitization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour therapy/sex therapy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger control</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectioning to special hospital</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended for Grendon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 19

(NB: total here is greater than 16 because some inmates had more than one treatment need.)
As might be expected, sex offenders are the largest group with treatment needs; 10 of the 11 were judged to be in need of current treatment. Two out of 7 of the armed robber group were assessed as needing treatment. The three inmates in the murder category were all judged to be in need of treatment, as was the inmate in the drugs category. None of the terrorists were seen as in need of treatment.

Only a few of the sex offenders were currently receiving treatment, and none of the other offence groups were in receipt of any treatment. The greatest problem appears to be at Wakefield (having the highest number of sex offenders). All eight of the inmates interviewed here were in need of treatment. None of the interviewees at Albany (2 inmates) or Parkhurst (4 inmates) were judged to be in need of treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed robber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview Of Inmate Activity**

The inmates interviewed were moved, on average, every two to three years, and this would seem to suggest that there should have been ample opportunity for the majority of this group to become engaged in some constructive educational, vocational or treatment programme.

If the three areas of need (education, work, and treatment) are taken together, a pattern can be detected which divides the sample roughly in terms of offence type. At a very general level, it appears that the sex offender group is the most deficient in education and work skills, as well as being the group most in need of treatment, whereas the armed robber group are more likely to have basic educational/work skills, and less likely to have treatment needs. The two inmates in the terrorist category show an identical pattern in that both had excellent education and work skills, and no treatment needs.

The numbers in some of the offence categories are too small to draw any clear conclusions, but a closer examination of the two main offence groups (sex offenders and armed robbers) indicate that these are not homogeneous groupings, but can be further subdivided into different types.

Whilst most of the sex offender group can be seen as needing some kind of treatment programme, their educational and work backgrounds differ considerably. Roughly a third of the sample show an identical profile, in that they fall into the lowest categories in terms of education and work skills, and are all in need of some treatment intervention. This group differs from a second group (also a third of the sample) who have had a ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ education. For this latter grouping, the work profile is more varied - two being unskilled, one skilled, and one professional. The remaining
three inmates form another cluster with a similar profile - all fall into the ‘no qualifications’ education category and the ‘unskilled’ work category.

The armed robber group can be divided into two distinct clusters, differentiated mainly in terms of different work skills. Half fall into the lowest (‘unskilled’) category, and half into the ‘skilled’ category. All are similar in terms of educational background, with all but one inmate falling into the second (‘no qualifications’) education category. Only two armed robbers were judged to be in need of treatment and both of these were also in the lowest work category.
Conclusion and Recommendations

A wide range of needs and abilities is evident in the sample examined here. Taking education first, the majority of the inmates interviewed (79%) were not currently receiving any formal educational input. On the whole, this does not appear to be due to lack of motivation to spend time in prison constructively, since a quarter were engaged in education on their own initiative. The level of motivation to receive education varied quite dramatically, however, and 29% of those interviewed (all falling into the two lowest education categories) expressed no interest in pursuing any further education, many of them citing their age as the reason.

Two said that they had experienced disruption of their education as a result of moves, and clearly the expected unpredictability of security moves is a disincentive to pursuing any of the longer-term educational facilities available. However, another factor may be that educational uptake is highly dependent on the prisoner’s motivation to receive education in the first place.

It appears that those most in need of some educational input (the inmates falling into the ‘basic needs’ category) receive least (none of the inmates in this category were currently receiving any educational input). Those in the second education category (no qualifications) appear to have had the greatest input (40% currently on full or part-time education). In the third category (continuing needs), none were currently receiving education, although two were (or had recently been) engaged in education on their own initiative. In the fourth category (high), all three inmates had received some educational input this sentence. Those with the best educational background (the third and fourth categories) were more dissatisfied with the education received/on offer in prison and more motivated to seek more educational input, and to pursue educational projects on their own initiative. This indicates that those inmates who had previously been successful in educative efforts are more likely to want to continue their education in prison, whereas those who had experienced failure or low levels of educational achievement prior to their sentence are unlikely to seek/accept further input.

A similar motivational factor operates in relation to work activities. The interviews indicated generally that those inmates falling into the lowest skills category were more likely to express satisfaction with the work they were doing in prison and to state that they did not require any vocational training (this was especially so for those inmates in the older age range). The greatest dissatisfaction was expressed by those at the professional skill level. Those inmates in the ‘skilled’ category were also dissatisfied, especially younger men who on the whole demonstrated a fairly high degree of motivation to acquire or extend skills.

It is clear that outside skills/education levels are not reflected in the occupations which prisoners undertake in prison. The work experience of the three skills groups was very similar, and no attempt seems to have been made to match outside skills to inside employment. Several inmates stated in the interview that they would like to pursue skills they already had or acquire new ones whilst in prison.

It appears that only those with the most rudimentary educational and occupational skills are pursuing activities which bear any resemblance to the kinds of occupations they might hope to return to. Those with few work skills outside are invited to continue at the same level in the jobs on offer in prison. Dissatisfaction arises for those prisoners who are unable to pursue work skills at a sufficiently high level.
Table 16. An Illustration of Differential Programming by Group Assignment  (Quay, 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Counselling</th>
<th>Staff Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEAVY</td>
<td>Individualised</td>
<td>Non-repetitive</td>
<td>Individualised (behaviour contracts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed learning</td>
<td>Short term goals</td>
<td>Individual goals</td>
<td>No-Nonsense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MODERATE

- Classroom lecture plus research assignments
- High level of supervised responsibility
- Group and Individual (problem orientation)
- ‘Hands-Off’
- Direct only as needed

LIGHT

- Classroom Lecture plus individual tutoring
- Repetitive
- Group and Individual (personal orientation)
- Highly verbal
- Supportive
SECTION 4 - PROGRAMMES FOR BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

Having established that there is no immediate practical impediment to the introduction of sentence planning for Cat As, there remains the question of the form and content such plans should take. Clearly, the process has to begin with a behavioural analysis of the inmate’s offending as well as of his other behaviour (both in and out of prison). In some cases, there are aspects to the offence that may be addressed directly through allocation to particular behaviour modification programmes (some sexual or violent offences for example), and the assessment procedures then have a reasonably clear focus. Sentence planning cannot consist entirely of allocation to pre-determined regimes, however; it has to consider other aspects of the inmate’s behaviour, in particular their educational, occupational, and social needs and skills. The sentence planning based on these assessments will therefore require programmes drawn from the industrial, educational, vocational and therapeutic facilities available within and between the prisons in the Disperal System.

It is important to ensure that the individual programmes should mesh together and overlap in their effects; indeed, it is through the scheduling of such programmes that Sentence Planning may be defined. In many ways, it is not so much that Sentence Planning or Inmate Programmes need to be established, since so many of the component parts already exist; it is rather that the present situation should be more systematically developed, with a clearer practical rationale informing the revision of allocation and assessment procedures. And the assessment is not just of the prisoner. The gaps in our existing knowledge are not restricted to uncertainty about the inmate; the actual functions of activities are also unclear and will require extensive analysis.

An example of an analysis of a specific inmate activity will be given later but at a more general level any properly organised educational programme (for example) will develop a number of skills in addition to the subject named on the timetable. These could include social skills, communication skills, the ability to co-operate with others, to organise one’s time, and so on. Different courses will lay different emphases on these ‘hidden’ aspects of the curriculum, and attention must be paid to them if a suitable programme is to be developed for any particular individual. Similarly a range of needs may be met through the proper choice of activity. Different jobs require and develop different abilities; for example, interpersonal skills, concentration, reliability, responsibility, or attention to detail. These will be present in varying degrees in all jobs, and a graded programme of activities can be used to address a range of problems in the natural context of the inmate’s normal working day. Treatment need not necessarily and perhaps should not be seen as some separate activity grafted onto the prison regime.

The range of activities available could be increased by re-organising those that already take place. Sewing mail-bags is frequently cited as an example of meaningless activity, but could become much more significant if it were re-organised so that prisoners took greater responsibility. The enterprise could require secretaries, clerks, stock managers, charge hands, someone to deal with orders, perhaps a computer operator - in fact the whole range of activities, abilities and responsibilities that are normally present in any factory. This would not only increase the options but fulfill the CRC requirement of giving prisoners meaningful work. Of course, this kind of change should be seen as complementary and not an alternative to the introduction of more varied and demanding work and vocational activities into prison.

All of this is necessarily speculative, however, simply because no-one has in the past looked at the possibilities of this kind of development, and hence the information on any systematic scale is
totally absent. It is our belief that it is at the informational level that planning should begin - there has to be a system capable of holding and making generally accessible the enormous amount of information required in the implementation and management of sentence planning. What follows is illustrative of the form such an infrastructure might take.

The PROBE System - the inmate data-base

The PROBE network covers the Dispersal System and therefore in principle all confirmed Category A prisoners. The nature of the PROBE infrastructure (the data-base as well as the networking) makes it possible for staff in establishments and HQ to generate behaviour profiles on any inmate, and the potential exists for using the system to monitor the progress of inmates through inmate programmes.

One of the records within PROBE allows for the recording of each inmate activity to which the inmate has been allocated. These may be periods in workshops, education (including VTCs), or one of the more domestic tasks such as wing cleaning. The potential exists therefore, to provide a profile of the inmate’s prison career incorporating both control information (reports, segregations, disciplinary moves etc.) as well as programmes undertaken. Profiles covering behaviour bearing on control are already used in the identification of SUSC candidates and it is these which can be developed to incorporate measures of the inmate’s progress through activities and programmes.

Set out below is an example of some of the information bearing on inmate activities currently kept within the PROBE database at Parkhurst and Long Lartin. The structure of the record containing this information is under development as one of the current tasks of the Regimes Research and Development unit of DIP2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODIFIED 14/06/1990</th>
<th>STATUS 1 CLOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Work Location & History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRISON NUMBER (CASE ID)</th>
<th>B75783</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUMMULATIVE WORK APP NUMBER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>JUDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REASON FOR CHANGE TO THIS WORK</td>
<td>3 On initial allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISON WHERE EMPLOYED</td>
<td>PKC PARKHURST DI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE STARTED THIS WORK (DD MM YYYY)</td>
<td>23/06/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF WORK</td>
<td>U Unallocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK LOCATION</td>
<td>UB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INMATE PROGRAMME</td>
<td>PRUBXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF APP FOR CHANGE (DD MM YYYY)</td>
<td>11/06/1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK TYPE APPLIED FOR</td>
<td>P PSIF workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME OF APPLICATION</td>
<td>1 Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE FINISHED THIS WORK (DD MM YYYY)</td>
<td>11/06/1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is generally thought that the current data might be supplemented by

— measures of inmate behaviour during the course of the activity,
— how successful the placement was,
— which aspects of the work staff rated as of value to the inmates general behaviour, and
— reasons for leaving.

These data are required to provide an overall picture of the inmate’s progress, and it is hoped that another record will serve as the repository for Sentence Plans, in the form of recommendations for further programmes in the light of continual assessment. The ‘dynamic’ or ‘heuristic’ nature of Sentence Planning is a feature we wish to emphasise. A process of continuous assessment of the inmate throughout sentence means that the system must be responsive to changing demands, and this is one of the benefits of a distributed computer system (of which PROBE is illustrative and perhaps prototypic), whereby all levels of management have access to information about the inmate as he progresses through the system.

To make the above operational it is necessary to be able to record assessments and programmes. The assessments are clearly inmate specific, and we recommend that these be based on recorded and observed behaviour. We are concerned that interviews with inmates should not be the exclusive, nor even the primary source of information, but should serve rather as an opportunity for staff and inmates to discuss profiles generated from more extensive sources such as observations and assessments from wing and daytime activity staff, perhaps using machine-readable behaviour checklists or other ratings. These would comprise the basic data of continuous assessment.

The PROBE/PROGRAM System - the activities data-base

The programmes (or inmate activities) themselves need to be recorded and analysed in a second system, which we refer to here as PROBE/PROGRAM (although recent research by DIP2 suggests that the activities/programmes information might usefully be held in the Regime Monitoring System, suitably adapted). PROGRAM is designed to capture an analysis of Inmate programmes as a complement to the analysis of individual inmate behaviour held within PROBE. Information in the PROBE data-base is intended to identify ‘areas of concern’ in the inmate’s behaviour via continuous assessment, which in turn will inform the selection of appropriate inmate activities or programmes described in the PROBE/PROGRAM system. It is the combination of these two systems of analysis that render Sentence Planning as a means of behaviour modification viable. Experimental development of PROBE/PROGRAM has been undertaken by psychologists throughout the Maximum Security System, and is briefly outlined below.

The Structure and Function of The PROBE/PROGRAM System

The system comprises three records for each identified programme (which are currently best described as inmate activities). The first record holds basic information such as the title of the activity, the department responsible for it, the duration of the activity and the number of inmates it can support at any one time.
— The second record comprises a thorough description of what the activity involves. For industrial tasks educational courses, this will be a step by step description of what the inmate would do during each session. The purpose of the record is to provide staff throughout the system with as comprehensive a description as possible of what an inmate would actually be DOING whilst allocated to the activity.

— The third and final record is similar in structure to the second, but attempts to provide a Behavioural Analysis of the activity in sufficient detail to allow users of the system to consider how such activities might be used as elements of an inmate programme.

The objective here is to identify particular characteristics of the task which might naturally address some of the areas of concern identified through assessment.

The content of this record should clearly suggest how elements of the inmate activity might modify the target behaviour. It should also suggest how behavioural change might be assessed, although such assessments need not be limited to behaviour during the activity itself. Clearly this approach requires the active participation of all involved in the running of the activity.

Building and Maintaining The PROBE/PROGRAM System

Through liaison with staff involved in the design and running of these Inmate Activities (Education, PSIF, PE, Chaplaincy etc.), comprehensive descriptions of what types of behaviour characterise the activity are compiled. This task analysis is designed to provide a clear description of what inmates would be doing when allocated to the activity, thereby helping management to match inmates to activities which might address the areas of concern identified through analysis of inmate behaviour.

The inmate activity/programme profiles are read into the PROBE/PROGRAM database, and each week the database is polled by the HQ PROBE/HOST system for any changes made to the local system. The HQ PROBE/HOST system then updates a central copy of the PROBE/PROGRAM database and over the weekend distributes to establishments all updates which have been received, thereby ensuring that each establishment contributing to PROBE/PROGRAM has a library of all programmes and activities available throughout the maximum security system.

Example From the PROBE/PROGRAM Database

The following is an example of one entry in the PROBE/PROGRAM system as it is on 12 October 1990. The selected example is a detailed description of the work of the laundry at Parkhurst. This is an activity which, like sewing mailbags, at first sight seems far removed from what might be conceived of as an ‘inmate programme’. However, detailed analysis of the tasks involved reveals many functions requiring different levels of manual skill, concentration, and co-operation for example which would be essential elements of any individually tailored programme. The recommendation being made here is that each element of the inmate activity be analysed not only in terms of the specific activities required to fulfil the goal of that activity, but also in terms of the opportunities for personal programme goals.

Following that example is a list of activities currently in the Dispersal System.
Example From the PROBE/PROGRAM Database

The following is an example of one entry in the PROBE/PROGRAM system as it is on 12 October 1990. The selected example is a detailed description of the work of the laundry at Parkhurst. This is an activity which at first sight seems far removed from what might be conceived of as an ‘inmate programme’. However detailed analysis of the tasks involved reveals many functions requiring different levels of manual skill, concentration, co-operation etc. which would be essential elements of any individually tailored programme. The recommendation being made here is that each element of the inmate activity be analysed not only in terms of the specific activities required to fulfil the goal of that activity, but also in terms of the opportunities for personal programme goals.

EMPLOYMENT Laundry

DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBLE Industrial Manager

NUMBERS EMPLOYED 20

ENTRY BY vacancy

SELECTED BY The Employment Board (after interview with Laundry Instructor)

NATURE OF WORK The laundry is responsible for washing all the dirty linen from all the Island Prisons. The work is broken down into discrete units, these are:

1. UNLOADING THE LORRY - (which delivers the dirty linen) this task is undertaken by half of the inmates working in the laundry.

2. SHEET COUNTS - counting sheets out into groups of specified size suitable for loading the washing machines. Also recording linen state and number on arrival. Undertaken by one inmate.

3. LOAD WASHING MACHINES - selection of the appropriate wash cycle, at end of cycle emptying machine and putting the washing into bins. One inmate’s responsibility.

4. LOAD AND SUPERVISE DRIERS - emptying bins of washed linen into the drier, selecting the timing, ensuring items are thoroughly dried and then emptying them into bins. Undertaken by one inmate.

5. LAY OUT SHEETS - prepare sheets for ironing by folding them in half and laying on table in a pile. Undertaken by two inmates.

6. IRON SHEETS, two inmates working together pass the sheets one at a time into the press.

7. COLLECT AND FOLD SHEETS - two inmates collect the sheet as it comes out of the press, fold it and place on table.
8. **FINISHERS AND BAGGERS**, two inmates collect the folded sheets, fold them further and then pack them ready for dispatch.

9. **SHIRTS** - pressed and folded by four inmates.

10. **KITCHEN WEAR, TOWELS ETC.** - these are sorted, ironed and folded by one inmate.

11. **BLANKETS AND PYJAMAS** - are sorted and folded by one inmate.

12. **THEATRE GEAR** - (Surgeons gowns etc) are sorted, washed, pressed and folded by the same inmate who does the kitchen gear. (underwear and sports wear are sorted and folded by instructors).

13. **LOADING LORRY** - the other half of the inmates load the clean linen on to the lorry for dispatch.

14. ‘**NO. 1 IN THE WORKSHOP**' - An inmate who is prepared to work all the time necessary and do any of the jobs required, including checking up on the performance of others. Not a high status job because of the hours (evenings and Bank Holidays). Very well paid.

**HOURS OF WORK** - In the Summer work starts at approx. 9am until 11.30 and resumes at 2pm until 3.30pm. However if the temperature exceeds 80 F by the end of the morning the workshops do not open in the afternoon and if the temperature reaches 82 F the workshops will close immediately. In Winter work starts at approx. 9am until 10.45am and resumes at 2pm until 4.30pm. Allowing for time off to go to the canteen etc. this is approximately a 20 hour week.

While there appears to be a range of work here in practice inmates have their own responsibilities and stick to that job. Ironing sheets seems to be the job with the highest status, because it is the easiest job. Laundry arrives three times a week and for practical reasons there are times in the week when the inmates will have no work to do. They are then allowed to read, play cards, do their own washing, etc. There do not seem to be any behavioural problems in the laundry - if the laundry received is not done in the week of arrival and it is clearly the inmates’ fault - they do not get paid. If one of them misbehaves in the workshop none of them get paid and if they recommend someone else to come into the workshop and that person causes trouble both he and the person who recommended him gets the sack.

2. **NEGATIVES TO THE JOB.** Even in the winter it is a hot and noisy job. The work is repetitive and heavy. The laundry does not close down for the Bank holidays like other workshops and even Christmas is a much shorter holiday for those working here. Few if any

3. **POSITIVES OF THE JOB.** The pay is one of the best in the prison, inmates can do their own washing (and frequently do their friends washing as well - potential here for furthering their income). Fruit squash is made available every day for those working there.

4. **ENTRY REQUIREMENTS.** All inmates in the laundry must have grade one health because of the lifting involved. They will accept up to four Cat As at any one time.
5. SELECTION. Men are chosen for the laundry by the Employment Board, it would seem that some assessment of personality is taken into account (will they fit in with the other inmates in the laundry).

6. FOR THE FUTURE. Apparently there are plans to rebuild the laundry in about seven or eight years time. The Instructors did not feel there was any scope to develop this into a modular type course, particularly given the unlikelihood of any of the inmates pursuing this career on the outside.
The following are two fictional cases of assessments and programmes to serve as an illustration of the ideas developed earlier in this paper.

1. BROWN is a 36-year-old persistent pederast at present at Parkhurst. He lived an itinerant life in a caravan and never went to school. He has no educational qualifications. He has learnt to read and write in prison by attending basic English classes. He is able to read books such as Harold Robbens and newspapers such as the Sun and Mirror. He writes to his wife and children and has spelling difficulties. He is not at present attending any class and does not appear motivated to do so.

His outside occupations have generally been unskilled active outdoor work - council dustman, farm labourer, building labourer. He has no occupational qualifications.

BROWN is a quiet unassertive passive man with no friends in prison. Staff view him as submissive, lacking in motivation, and showing no interest in anything.

A major pre-occupation for BROWN is maintaining contact with his wife who is disabled and cannot visit very often.

He states his interests as photography, wildlife, and the countryside.

BROWN lack of basic education is an important factor in attempting to assess his needs and abilities. His low achievement may partly flow from this initial disadvantage. The fact that he has learned to read and write in prison suggests that he may be more capable than he appears and can take advantage of educational programmes. A course designed to improve basic literacy and numeracy would therefore be appropriate for BROWN. This could be oriented around his interests and concerns. For example, his reading could be improved through the use of books on wildlife photography and the countryside. His spelling could be improved by composing letters to his wife, which would improve his vocabulary and written communication skills.

He has had little opportunity so far to develop social skills. These can be learned in a structured situation which minimises anxiety. An occupation such as laying out sheets, collecting and folding sheets or finishing and bagging sheets in the laundry would provide a simple, repetitive task which would require a degree of co-operation and interaction with one other, the first step in developing a repertoire of social skills. This could be extended to pressing and ironing shirts, a task requiring slightly more manual skill, and a higher degree of interaction with four others. Other inmates would have an incentive for developing a friendship with BROWN. as he would then be able to do their washing. Opportunities also exist in the workshop for developing a more complex but still structured social and numeracy skill, playing cards.

A programme for BROWN should take account of his criminal behaviour. Individual and group counselling with a personal orientation would be suitable. The educational and occupational programmes outlined above should also help tackle his criminal behaviour. It is likely that his low achievement in education, occupation and social skills have all contributed to his low self-esteem,
lack of assertiveness, and general lack of interest, and that all of these have combined to prevent him from developing alternative behaviours.

2. SMITH is a 47-year-old robber. He attended a private grammar school up to the age of 16 and has ‘O’ levels in English, history and art. He reports that his parents were disappointed that he was not more academic. He went to Art school for a year until 17 and then dropped out. He has been to maths, sociology and computing classes in prison. He is currently studying at second-hand using another inmate’s sociology course.

His occupations outside were mainly self-employed. He has been involved in various enterprises. In prison he has been employed as an outside works painter, a draughtsman and an engineer.

He says has suffered depression since his mother died (aged 80). He says he thinks his mother would be alive now if she had not neglected herself for him. He is despondent because of his long sentence and the damage he feels he has done to his family. He has broken off his relationship with his wife and children.

He reports no problems with staff or other inmates.

Staff describe him as distant and tense.

He describes his interests as physical rather than intellectual, eg horse-riding, ski-ing, motor racing.

SMITH has also not achieved his potential educationally, perhaps because unrealistically high expectations of him at school and at home lead to an early loss of confidence which he attempted to regain through more active and entrepreneurial pursuits. There is mismatch between his perception of himself as being physical and non-academic, and his actual behaviour of volunteering for intellectual activities, notably his self-taught sociology course. This also suggests a lack of belief in his intellectual capabilities which is not borne out by the facts. He would benefit from an educational course in almost any subject that appealed to him eg sociology, maths, art, design, with the important requirement that it should lead to a recognised qualification of sufficiently high standing to restore some of the lost confidence.

SMITH is pre-occupied with the harm he thinks he has done to those close to him. His guilt about the death of his mother should not be taken at face value, since the death of an 80-year old woman cannot be unexpected nor reasonably laid at the door of her son, however trying he may be. This guilt is more likely to be indicative of a general lack of self-worth and failure to live up to his potential. He may benefit from group and individual counselling in this area. The type of educational programme outlined above should help him realise that potential. This could also be achieved by the choice of occupation, which should ideally give SMITH a high level of responsibility.
Summary and Recommendations

This report has examined what are seen as the three main obstacles to sentence planning for the Category A population - the complexity of the review process, the unpredictability and frequency of Cat A moves, and the nature of the Cat A inmate population.

It is argued here that none of these problems presents a real impediment to sentence planning for this group of inmates.

When the characteristics of the Cat A population are examined in depth it emerges that the review committee decisions are not as inconsistent and unsystematic as is generally supposed. The movement rate of Cat A inmates is similar to the movement rate of comparable Cat Bs, and the decisions made when moving Cat As are generally proactive rather than reactive, although for a small sub-group of disruptive inmates decisions are more likely to be reactive and movements more frequent. Cat A inmates have a wide variety of needs and abilities which differ across and within offence groups. It is clear that many of these needs are not currently being met, but they are amenable to measurement.

Whilst it can be concluded from this that sentence planning is feasible for the Category A population, the development of suitable programmes may still be problematic. Several specific recommendations designed to facilitate the process can be made:

1) To improve the review process the committee should consider monitoring decisions made, this can be achieved by producing a checklist of those dimensions considered most relevant to outcome.

2)Whilst a high movement rate should not be seen as an impediment to sentence planning for Cat As, any planned programme could be disrupted by the unpredictability of moves. This problem could be alleviated to some extent by the introduction of short-term modular programmes.

3)The PROBE system can play a facilitatory role in the development and monitoring of programmes, maintaining the continuity of programmes through ensuring that information is up to date and available throughout the maximum security system.

4)The CRC recommendation that incentives be incorporated into inmate programmes may be addressed through an analysis of inmate behaviour and suitable programmes with a view to sequencing programme elements in such a way as to enable one programme to serve as an incentive to the completion of another.