This report is intended to provide details of the final of six visiting scholarships undertaken during the 24-month tenure of the Community Engagement and Partnership Working with Sexual Offenders network funded by the Leverhulme Trust. The visit by Dr. Heather Moulden took place between April 9 and 23, 2016 and was coordinated by Prof. Hazel Kemshall and Dr. Kieran McCartan, of DeMontfort University and University of West England, respectively. During the visit a variety of activities took place related to the grant objectives.

- Visit to Her Majesty’s Prison Whatton in Nottingham, and discussion with Governor, Psychologist, and Research staff regarding clinical service and research
- Meeting at West Mercia and Warwickshire Police regarding Sexual Offender Registration and Community Disclosure in UK
- Visit to Community Reintegration Company probation services in Worcester
- Meeting with IRIIS team at Avon and Somerset Constabulary in Bristol
- Meeting with Multiagency Public Protection Arrangement (MAPPA) team at Avon and Somerset Constabulary in Bristol
- Keynote presentation to, and attendance at, the sixth Leverhulme conference, hosted by University of West England
- Seminar to the Social Sciences Research Group, University of West England

**Key issues and themes emerging from the visit activities**

1. HMP Whatton is a Category C institution for approximately 840 individuals convicted of a sexual offence. Governor Lynn Saunders, Psychologist Kerensa Hocken, and Researcher Belinda Winder from Nottingham Trent University participated in discussion and provided a tour during the visit on April 14, 2016.

The prison operates a therapeutic milieu in addition to specific programming for sexual abuse. Treatment includes a core program, with the opportunity for extended treatment, and an array of specialized programming for intellectually disabled, hearing impaired, neurodevelopmentally disabled, and elderly offenders. There are a large proportion of mentally disordered offenders as well, including personality and severe mental illness.

Clinical activities were clearly embedded within, and linked to, research and evaluation, such as evidence-based assessment protocols, treatment adaptations to enhance responsivity, and innovations in offender management (e.g. Safer Living Foundation, http://saferlivingfoundation.org)
The importance of specialized a) facilities, b) therapist skills for treatment delivery and c) risk management in probation was identified in contrast to the move toward a generalist approach in Canada.

See http://www.justice.gov.uk/contacts/prison-finder/whatton

2. At the West Mercia and Warwickshire Police Headquarters, on April 13, 2016, Inspector Louise Wall discussed the pilot study and implementation of the public notification scheme linked to Sarah’s Law. An overview of the scheme was provided as well as its evaluation carried out by Prof. Kemshall. Public notification is initiated by a concerned member about an identified person, who may or may not already be involved with police/probation. The program goes beyond those convicted of a sexual offence to include individuals who present a risk as evidenced by intelligence from police, child protection, and other agencies related to problematic sexual behaviour.

Police are selected for their involvement and skills in child protection, and decisions about disclosure are made with other agencies under the oversight of high ranking officers. Intelligence is shared across relevant agencies as routine management of at risk or justice involved individuals, such as child protection, police, probation, health, and education. In addition to participation in the assessment and disclosure, officers also provide education about the scheme and sexual abuse, which is a critical part of the scheme. Disclosures are made to the person best able to protect the child, and the content of the disclosure is proportionate.

With respect to implementation and evaluation, all individuals on the sexual offence register were consulted on the scheme and informed of the process. Where possible, when a disclosure is made, the identified individual is encouraged to be involved in the process. Selection and training of officers was important for uptake and follow-through, with ample and responsive support provided throughout the pilot. Evaluations have been positive, suggesting that the public are empowered by the scheme, and that it is used regularly and appropriately, with only one breach reported.


https://www.gov.uk/guidance/find-out-if-a-person-has-a-record-for-child-sexual-offences

3. Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) is an example of a new initiative by the Ministry of Justice to privatize probation services. CRCs are contracted by National Offender Management Service (NPS)/Ministry of Justice (MoJ) to provide probation services to moderate and low risk offenders, while responsibility for high risk and sexual offenders remains with National Probation Service (NPS). These
are newly implemented programs still solidifying their approach, processes, and evaluation. Although there are no standards at this time, in general they aim to reduce recidivism and recalls through a collaborative and intensive case management approach.

Theresa Fox, a senior probation officer facilitated a discussion with various CRC staff, including probation officers and program facilitators on April 13, 2016. This discussion identified their efforts to redefine the culture of community management by addressing barriers to reintegration such as motivation, accommodation, access to community services, and meaningful employment. They also emphasized their interest in the increased role of victim safeguarding in the risk management profile.

An example of their vision is to create a Hub of community resources and partners relevant to community reintegration that can be easily accessed by clients upon release and even after their license (warrant) has expired. In some cases programs, training, or supervision may be subcontracted by the CRC. In this way the CRC aims to prioritize needs and strengths over, or in proportion to, risks. Some of the issues identified by those in attendance were maintaining funding over time and issues of costs and resources, increasing the efficiency and dynamic nature of assessments, in- versus out-of-house programming, and evaluation. Given that different jurisdictional CRCs are supervised by different contracts, regional differences in programming, processes, and outcomes are expected, which may make evaluation difficult.

Ultimately the program is one of payment by results which includes penalties for recalls/breaches and funding attached to results in the long term. Because it is a new model it was not fully operational, and indeed many questions seemed unanswered for the staff themselves, including philosophical and programmatic decisions. The questions that seemed most pressing are related to the management of competing fiscal and risk pressures, staff training and skills mix, and the sustainability of the model in the long term.

See [http://www.westmerciaprobation.org.uk/](http://www.westmerciaprobation.org.uk/)

4. During a visit to the Avon and Somerset Constabulary in Bristol on April 19, 2016, staff from the IRiS and MAPPA teams met to provide an overview of both programs. The IRiS team is a multidisciplinary group (e.g. police, probation, psychology) within the National Probation Service that manages individuals who are often, but not necessarily, on probation and who pose serious and imminent risk of violence. Interagency communication and intelligence gathering are central to the teams’ management of risk, which is facilitated by their co-location in Bristol. IRiS is distinguished from other similarly specialized management teams, such as MAPPA (see below) and IMPACT (for prolific offending) in that it focuses attention on the most at risk for a time limited period.
A unique feature of IRiS includes the use of psychologists to provide specialized services and consultation for personality disorders, which represents approximately 70% of IRiS clients. Psychologists also coordinate and provide mental health services, consult to the other team members on how best to work with clients, and facilitate risk assessment and management. Ongoing areas of development and improvement for IRiS include services for women, individuals involved in organized crime and terrorism, and the importance of all agencies joining at the same time.

MAPPA (Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements) require the local criminal justice agencies and other bodies dealing with violent and sexual offenders to work together in partnership in dealing with these individuals and their risk management. Individuals recommended to MAPPA must pose a risk of serious physical or psychological harm, but unlike IRiS it need not be imminent. Therefore, individuals can be involved with both MAPPA and IRiS and move between these two teams.

Involvement in MAPPA secures and coordinates protection and management because agencies have a duty to participate in the arrangement. Therefore, all relevant bodies are involved in acute risk assessment and management and are responsible for the actions delineated by the MAPPA team. As part of the visit, a former IRiS/MAPPA client spoke to the group about his experience. Specifically, he identified a number of aspects of the programs that contributed to his success including the relationship with, and accessibility of, the staff, the pace of transitions to facilitate increasing independence, collaboration, identification of and work toward realistic goals, and lack of judgment and normalization.

https://www.avonandsomerset.police.uk/

5. The Leverhulme conference was held at the University of West England on April 20, 2016 and attended by approximately 65 clinicians, researchers, academics and law enforcement and prison officers. There were three keynote presentations provided by Dr. Heather Moulden from McMaster University, *Sex offender treatment and mental health provision in Canada: Working in partnership*; Dr. Geraldine Akerman from HMP Grendon, *Working with high risk sex offenders: treatment and reintegration*; and Sir Richard Tilt from Internet Watch Foundation, *Innovations and partnership working in preventing online child sexual abuse*. In the afternoon, four breakout sessions were offered over two time periods.

Health economics and sexual harm - Jane Powell (UWE, Bristol)

Sex offender policy & practice in community reintegration – Andrew Harris (University of Massachusetts, Lowell; USA)
Taking a public health, preventive approach to sexual harm – Kieran McCartan (UWE, Bristol) & Jon Brown (NSPCC)

Key considerations in therapeutic engagement: Improving treatment one client at a time – David Prescott (Director of Professional Development and Clinical Director for the Becket Family of Services)

Presentations and other conference and speaker information can be found at http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/hls/research/offenderengagement.aspx

6. A seminar was prepared for presentation to the Social Science Research Group at University of West England by Dr. Heather Moulden on April 21, 2016. The talk was titled Treatment and Reintegration for Sexual Offenders: A Canadian Perspective and addressed the reintegration barriers and strategies in forensic and correctional settings in Canada. This presentation can be found at http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/hls/research/offenderengagement.aspx

Summary

A number of overall themes were identified from the various visits with agencies in Worcester and Bristol. Specifically, for a number of the programs there was a commitment to service delivery that was informed by, and subjected to, evaluation. Many programs appeared to be quite thoughtful about how to provide specific and appropriate service to different groups, rather than a one size fits all approach. This approach extended to space and facilities, policy, and staffing. Even within risk categories, service and management was informed by evidence, and there was an effort to provide training or select staff based on their skill set to provide optimal service.

Positive approaches and collaboration was another theme observed across visits in prisons, community management, and probation. In almost every meeting the client’s voice was explicitly solicited and considered. This seemed to very much enhance the collaboration between clients and staff, even when faced with challenges such as privacy and disclosure. All staff involved in the visits expressed a desire to attend to strengths, enhance opportunities for success, and work within the relationship to ensure public safety, including police, program facilitators, and probation.

The formalized approach to multiagency cooperation was a common thread through all visits, including the prison, police and probation. Relevant parties are required to work together to manage risks and protect the community. However, it was quite clear that for these agencies their collaboration went beyond information sharing, and extended to shared location, responsibility, and duties. In some cases this approach included organizations beyond the formal arrangements, such as employment agencies, or housing. The leverage afforded by the legislated arrangements appeared to expedite services, risk management, and victim safeguarding.