The Committee will meet at 10.00 am in Committee Room 6.

1. **Items in private:** The Committee will consider whether to consider a draft report on its inquiry into the effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes in prisons in private at this meeting and at future meetings.

2. **Inquiry into the effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes in prisons:** The Committee will take evidence from—

   - Rab Gowans, Service Manager, Inverclyde Council, East Renfrewshire, Inverclyde and Renfrewshire Criminal Justice Grouping; Mairi Brackenridge, Justice Services Manager, South Lanarkshire Council Social Work Resources, and Jim Sexton, Service Manager, Glasgow City Council Criminal Justice Social Work Services;

   - Dr Nancy Loucks, independent criminologist;

   - Hugh Henry, Deputy Minister for Justice, and Alec Spencer, Director of Rehabilitation and Care, and Janice Hewitt, Head of Inclusion, the Scottish Prison Service.

3. **Inquiry into the effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes in prisons:** The Committee will consider a draft report on the inquiry.
Papers for the meeting—

Agenda item 2

Note by the clerk (PRIVATE PAPER). J1/S2/04/39/1

Written submissions—

RP18 from South Lanarkshire Council J1/S2/04/39/2
RP21 from East Renfrewshire, Inverclyde and Renfrewshire J1/S2/04/39/3
Criminal Justice Grouping
RP31 from Glasgow City Council J1/S2/04/39/4
RP25 from Dr Nancy Loucks J1/S2/04/39/5

Correspondence from the Scottish Prison Service in response to points raised by the Committee

Scottish Executive, Supporting Safer, Stronger Communities – Scotland’s Criminal Justice Plan (Extract: Chapter Five – Integrated Services for Managing Offenders); the full text of the document is available online at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/justice/scjp-00.asp J1/S2/04/39/7

Agenda item 3

Note by the clerk (PRIVATE PAPER) J1/S2/04/39/8

Papers for information—

Correspondence from the Minister for Justice about the proposed inquiries bill (UK legislation) J1/S2/04/39/10
Correspondence from the Minister for Finance and Public Service Reform in response to the Committee’s stage 1 report on the Emergency Workers (Scotland) Bill J1/S2/04/39/11

Documents not circulated—

A copy of the following has been supplied to the clerk—

• HM Inspectorate of Prisons, Report on HM Prison Inverness.

This document is available for consultation in room T3.60. Additional copies may also be obtainable on request from the Document Supply Centre.

Forthcoming meetings—

Wednesday, 22 December 2004, CR1.
Post Council Report on the Justice and Home Affairs Council of EU Ministers, 2 December 04

Comments by the Executive

The last JHA Council of the Dutch Presidency. The UK was represented by Caroline Flint MP. Significant in that it was the first Council that the new Commissioner (Frattini) attended.

AGENDA ITEMS

General

Priorities of the new Commission

Commissioner Frattini gave an overview of the Commission’s priorities with asylum and immigration being top of the list. There was a need to balance measures to safeguard security against fundamental rights and freedoms, with attention to access to information. Commissioner Frattini agreed that there should be no EU Criminal Code but said that judicial co-operation needed both the development of mutual recognition as well as the adoption of measures to strengthen mutual trust.

Police and Judicial Co-operation

Terrorism

Gijs de Vries, the EU Counter Terrorism Co-ordinator, gave his regular report to Council. Progress had been made on the June European Council’s priorities but implementation of agreed legislation was still patchy. The terrorist threat remained high. It was vital that there was more effective co-operation between Member States’ police and security services. Engagement with the citizen in a full debate on terrorism was essential and something for the Luxembourg Presidency to take forward.

Council Decision on the Exchange of Information and Co-operation Concerning Terrorist Offences


Council Common Position on the Transfer of Certain Data to Interpol (Lost or Stolen Passports)

A Member State responsibility. All Member States could agree the draft Council Position allowing for the exchange of data with Interpol. A general approach was reached without amendment.

Criminal Judicial Co-operation

Draft Council Framework Decision on the European Evidence Warrant

If this Framework Decision is adopted as currently drafted there will be implications for the exchange of evidence between judicial authorities within the EU, with the principal of mutual
recognition replacing traditional mutual to legal assistance arrangements. The Framework Decision is restricted to pre-existing evidence. A JD official is attending Working Group meetings as part of the UK team. The Council noted the progress of negotiations and the deadline set by the Hague Programme of the end of 2005 for completion.

Proposal for a Council Decision on the Exchange of Information Extracted from the Criminal Record

This Council Decision obliges Member States to pass certain kinds of information (on terrorist groups and persons under suspicion, investigation or having been convicted of offences) to Europol, Eurojust and to other Member States. It builds on an earlier Council Decision (agreed in 2003) which obliged Member States to pass on information on organisations and individuals on specific lists agreed by the EU and the UN. The Council reached a general approach during discussion.

Draft Framework Decision on the Retention of Data

This proposal is co-sponsored by the UK, France, Sweden and Ireland and was tabled in April 2004 in response to a mandate from the European Council following the Madrid bombings. The mandate instructed the Council to adopt rules by 2005 on the retention of communications traffic data for law enforcement purposes e.g. timing, location but not content of calls. The discussion at Council focussed on defining the types of data that should be retained by service providers and creation of a common list of data to be retained by all. This will go back to Working Group for further work and consideration.

Proposal for a Council Framework Decision To Strengthen the Criminal Law Framework for the Enforcement of the Law Against Ship Source Pollution

Prompted by the Prestige Tanker spillage the purpose of this proposal is to raise the standard of international shipping. The Framework Decision seeks to establish common criminal offences and minimum penalties for pollution of the sea. It complements a Directive which requires the introduction of sanctions for infringements of ship source pollution. This has been a difficult dossier to reach agreement on given the importance of the shipping industry to some Member States. At Council the Presidency presented a compromise package which secured a general approach to the Framework Decision. Member States will be required to implement this FD five years after its adoption.

SEJD- EU JHA ACTION TEAM
EU JHA STRATEGY UNIT
7 December 2004
Dear Pauline,

INQUIRIES BILL

As you will be aware, an Inquiries Bill was announced in the Queen’s speech on Tuesday 23 November, and introduced in the House of Lords on the following day. I thought that you would find it helpful to have early indication of the Executive’s plans. As Margaret Curran made clear in the answer to Scott Barrie’s question on Tuesday, we intend, in accordance with the Sewel Convention and the procedural undertakings that have been given, to present the Parliament with a motion and detailed explanatory memorandum in relation to the Bill as soon as possible. I will be providing these very shortly.

The Bill will create a comprehensive new statutory framework for inquiries set up by Ministers to look into events that have caused public concern. The new framework will be able to be used by Scottish Ministers as well as by UK Ministers, Northern Ireland Ministers and the National Assembly of Wales. It can be used by each administration alone, or jointly by Ministers from the different administrations. The Bill will cover:

- the setting up of inquiries,
- the appointment of people to conduct them,
- their procedures and their powers, and
- the submission and publication of reports.

While it is the case that the Scottish Parliament could legislate for most of the matters dealt with by the Bill, in so far as inquiries into devolved matters are concerned, the kind of events where it will be appropriate for an inquiry to be set up are, however, very likely to raise a variety of issues which relate to both devolved and reserved matters. The Dunblane inquiry is an example of this – it made recommendations about school security, now a devolved matter, and also about firearms legislation, which is reserved. In the Executive’s view it makes sense to have a new framework which allows Scottish and UK Ministers to work in partnership to set up an inquiry to respond to such situations. A Scottish Parliament Bill on its own could not do that.
Working in partnership with the UK government in this way offers us an opportunity with clear benefits for Scotland. The legislation will give Scottish Ministers a new statutory framework for inquiries into matters that are within their remit, and it will also facilitate cooperation across the UK on inquiries which need to look at both reserved and devolved matters.

I hope that the Committee will share the Executive’s view on the advantages for Scotland in legislating in this way, and look forward to assisting the Committee and the Parliament in their scrutiny of the proposals.

I am writing in similar terms to Annabel Goldie.

Best wishes,

CATHY JAMIESON
Dear Pauline,

I am writing to respond formally to your Committee’s Stage 1 report on the Emergency Workers Bill.

First of all, I would like to thank the Committee for the invaluable contribution it has made both in examining the general principles of the Bill at Stage 1, and in considering amendments at Stage 2. I was particularly grateful for the opportunity to meet with the Committee informally, to discuss the issues raised in your Stage 1 report before proceeding to Stage 2.

We have made significant progress since Stage 1, and I am confident that by working together, we have succeeded in producing legislation that is workable and effective, and which delivers the right solution for emergency workers in Scotland.

Most significantly, Executive amendments agreed at Stage 2 have:

- extended protection for police, fire and ambulance workers whenever they are on duty;
- extended on duty protection to doctors, nurses, midwives, ambulance workers and those assisting them in any area of a hospital;
- clarified the Bill’s evidential requirements;
• added the crews of rescue vessels which are not operated by the Royal National Lifeboat Institution to the list of workers protected by the Bill; and

• made the order-making power to modify categories of worker covered by the Bill’s protection subject to affirmative resolution procedure.

The Executive also supported amendments laid by Committee members to:

• add mental health workers and social workers enforcing child protection orders to the list of workers protected by the Bill; and

• amend the Bill’s definition of emergency circumstances to make explicit the fact that emergency circumstances include circumstances causing or likely to cause mental illness.

I attach at Annex A, an outline of the sections of the Bill as amended, which highlights the effects of these various changes. I think that this Annex would also be of assistance to MSPs in their consideration of the Bill at Stage 3 and I therefore intend to pass a copy to SPICe for use in their briefing note for the Bill’s Stage 3 debate.

The Executive’s main response to the Committee’s Stage 1 report was enshrined in the amendments laid at Stage 2, which are summarised above. I am aware, however, that the Committee also raised a number of subsidiary issues in its Report. These are addressed in Annex B.

I believe that the progress of the Emergency Workers Bill to date successfully illustrates the vital role Committees perform in scrutinising legislation. I am sure you will agree that in taking on board your views and comments, we have achieved a more robust and comprehensive solution to the unacceptable problems faced by our emergency workers.

Best wishes

Tom McCabe

TOM MCCABE
EMERGENCY WORKERS BILL: RESPONSE TO COMMITTEE'S STAGE 1 REPORT

A1: Assaulting or impeding certain providers of emergency services

1. This is a new section which makes a significant change to the coverage of the Bill by providing protection for police, fire and ambulance workers when they are on duty. Subsection (2) here, and similar provisions in other sections clarifies the Bill's evidential requirements and reflects the discussions we have had with the Law Society on mens rea and other evidential issues, following the Committee's consideration of these issues at Stage 1.

1: Assaulting or impeding certain emergency workers responding to emergency circumstances

2. This is mostly what was section 1 of the Bill and provides protection for emergency workers (other than police, fire and ambulance workers) responding to emergency circumstances. It has, however, been added to in order to extend protection to mental health officers, social workers enforcing child protection orders and other organisations (such as the Loch Lomond Rescue Boat) who fulfil a role similar to the RNLI. Subsection (5) here also ensures that the Bill's definition of emergency circumstances covers situations in which a person's mental health is at risk, by making explicit reference to mental illness.

1A: Assaulting or impeding persons assisting emergency workers

3. This new section provides protection for those assisting emergency workers responding to emergency circumstances - which was previously part of section 1 of the Bill, as introduced.

2: Provisions supplementary to sections A1 to 1A

4. This was Section 2 of the Bill as introduced, but reflects the changed approach to evidential issues and no longer deals with those assisting (now covered by the previous section).

3: Assaulting or impeding health workers in hospital premises

5. This was section 3 of the Bill as introduced, and represents a further significant change to the coverage of the Bill by providing protection to health workers on duty in all parts of a hospital. As before, the protection is provided for doctors, nurses, midwives, ambulance staff and all those assisting them.

4: Penalties

6. This was section 4 of the Bill as introduced, and is unchanged.

5: Saving for certain other offences

7. This was section 5 of the Bill as introduced, and is unchanged.
6: Power to modify

8. This was section 6 of the Bill as introduced. Subsection (4) makes the order-making power subject to affirmative procedure, as already indicated in the Executive's responses to the Committee.

7: Short title and commencement

9. This was section 7 of the Bill as introduced and is unchanged.
EMERGENCY WORKERS BILL: RESPONSE TO COMMITTEE’S STAGE 1 REPORT

Policy intention

I note the Committee’s concerns around the clarity of the Bill’s policy memorandum. Our policy objective stems from the commitment in Building A Better Scotland: A Partnership Agreement, to “protect emergency workers from assault and obstruction.”

As I hope will now be clear from our discussions, and the amendments laid at Stage 2, the primary focus of the legislation is the protection of those who provide emergency services. As the increased protection of emergency workers will undoubtedly be to the benefit of those in receipt of emergency aid, however, an important consequence of the new offence will be the enhanced protection of those emergency workers seek to assist.

Analysis of consultation responses

I am sorry to learn that the Committee was disappointed by the Executive’s omission to publish a detailed analysis of consultation responses. A full list of consultees and a summary of responses was sent to the Committee, and copies of all non-confidential responses were placed in SPICe. At the time, those steps were sufficient to meet the Executive’s guidance on consultation procedures.

Since then, however, and as part of our commitment to open and transparent government, the Executive has adopted revised guidance on consultation good practice. This guidance commits the Executive to producing a report on consultations which provides feedback to consultees, sets out in detail the Executive’s responses to the points raised in consultation and outlines changes made by the Executive as a result of the consultation.

I am confident that these new procedures will ensure that future consultation exercises will address the concerns raised by the Committee.

Information on attacks against emergency workers

The Committee’s report raised concerns about the lack of statistical information relevant to the Bill. I share the Committee’s surprise at the current lack of definitive statistics on numbers or trends of attacks against emergency workers (other than attacks on the police, charged under section 41 of the Police Act 1967).

It is nonetheless clear to me that action is needed. Anecdotal evidence is plentiful that emergency workers are increasingly under threat when responding to emergency circumstances. The previous Minister for Finance and Public Services, Andy Kerr’s early discussions with trades unions, professional bodies and others confirmed that there was a real problem of attacks against emergency workers. I think it is telling that the same view was shared by the large majority of those who appeared before the Committee at Stage 1.

The introduction of this new offence will mean that information about this category of offending can be routinely collected, as is currently the case for offences against the police. As part of the
programme of actions to protect all public service workers, we are also working to improve the recording of incidents of verbal and physical aggression more generally.

**Complexities of legislation**

The Committee identified the Law Society of Scotland's concerns that the complexities of the new legislation would make offences more difficult to prosecute than under common law. That is not the case. The Bill's offence provisions will sit alongside the common law and it will remain a matter for the Crown to choose the most appropriate route for prosecution, taking into account whether the elements of the new offence have been met. In addition, and as detailed above, Executive amendments agreed at Stage 2 clearly set out on the face of the Bill the evidential requirements which the Crown will have to meet in order to prove an offence under the Bill.

On a similar point, I can confirm that there is no conflict with other legislation. Indeed, section 5 of the Bill (as amended at Stage 2) makes specific provision to that effect.

**Power of arrest without warrant**

The Committee noted ACPOS's calls for the Bill to provide police with the power of arrest without warrant. The Police (Scotland) Act 1967 does not provide a specific power of arrest, and the Executive would not wish to go further than the Police Act in this regard. We believe that the police should continue to rely on their common law powers of arrest, as they do for offences committed under the Police Act.

**Downgrading of offences**

I note too, the Committee's firm wish that the new offence should in no way "downgrade" cases which are currently tried under solemn procedure. I can assure you that there is no question of the downgrading of offences in the manner you suggest. The Bill provides for more serious sentences than can currently be passed in the sheriff summary courts. This means that some cases which had previously to be dealt with under solemn procedure can now be dealt with summarily, without weakening the sentencing powers of the courts. The most serious cases, however, will continue to be prosecuted under solemn procedure, where higher penalties – to a maximum of life imprisonment – are deemed appropriate.

**Non-legislative measures**

Finally, I welcome the Committee's support for the package of measures we are developing to protect all public service workers from violence and aggression. Andy Kerr wrote to you on 30 September to share with you the progress we have already made in this area, in particular in relation to our public awareness campaign. I am happy to share with you the results of our evaluation of the first stage of that campaign when they are made available in the New Year. Clearly, that evaluation will help to inform the subsequent stages of our campaign.
Mr Douglas Thornton  
Assistant Clerk  
Justice 1 Committee  
3.11 C  
The Scottish Parliament  
Edinburgh  
EH99 1SP  

18 November 2004  

Dear Douglas  

Justice 1 Committee – Inquiry into the effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes in prisons  

Thank you for your letter of 1 October 2004. I am sorry for the delay in replying.  

1. In January 2003 SPS established an External Advisors Forum to improve the effectiveness of practice within SPS and enhance the working relationships with other agencies involved in the rehabilitation of offenders.  

Around 20 advisers representing the Scottish Executive, Communities Scotland, Scottish Enterprise, CoSLA, learning and training providers, Jobcentre Plus, academia, employers and the health and voluntary sectors were invited to join the Forum, which meets three times a year.  

At the inaugural meeting, the advisers were given an overview of what the SPS is trying to achieve through Inclusion and details of three specific strategies they were asked to contribute to. These areas were Learning, Skills & Employability; Addictions and Social Care.  

It is hoped that the forum will also help to raise the awareness of prison practice in partner agencies over the long-term, further strengthening links between the SPS and those working with released prisoners in the community.  

In addition to representatives from SPS its membership includes:  

- COSLA  
- Families Outside  
- Scottish Qualifications Authority  
- Social Work Director, Renfrewshire Council  
- Criminal Justice Social Work Development Centre for Scotland  
- Four Square  
- Learning Link Scotland  
- Community Services Division, Justice Department  
- Scottish Adult Learning Partnership  
- Lauder College  
- Laing O’Rourke  
- Social Work Inspectorate  
- Jobcentre Plus  

An Agency of the Scottish Executive Justice Department
• NCH Scotland
• Association of Drug Action Teams
• Health Education Scotland
• Greater Glasgow Health Board (Addictions)
• Director of Teaching, Strathclyde University
• Communities Scotland
• Scottish Enterprise
• National Victim Information Agency

2. All Scottish Prison Service accredited programmes are currently being evaluated by Analytical Services of the Scottish Prison Service. These evaluations, which will be published in the SPS Occasional Paper Series, will examine both attitude change in participants before and after the programme and outcome effectiveness, which will be measured in terms of reconviction and return to custody. Copies of those studies, which have been published to date, are attached to this letter.

3. The SPS is currently managing record numbers. This does mean that some prisoners are moved to help reduce overcrowding. However, the vast majority of our population are located in the Prison nearest to their home. Two of our three mainstream long term Prisons are located in the central belt. The remaining prison, Perth, is easily accessible by road and rail.

We have National facilities for female offenders and young offenders. The former are located in Cornton Vale and Greenock. It is planned by next summer all will be located in Cornton Vale, which is a central location. Remand and very short-term prisoners will continue to be located in their local establishments.

Legally, young offenders can only be held in a young offender’s institution. We now have only one such establishment at Polmont, near Falkirk, which is relatively close to home for the vast majority.

The one group which is located far from home is sex offenders. Currently the majority of such long term prisoners are located in Peterhead and Dumfries. Peterhead is not “fit for purpose” and we await a Ministerial decision in due course as to its future.

4. You enquired about staff training. I attach a report prepared by our Prison Service College, which I hope you will find helpful.

5. With reference to programme delivery, all establishments have specific targets. At present the majority are expected to reach these targets. These are a small number of establishments, which are behind schedule, but the reasons are not to do with staffing constraints or overcrowding. In one case it is due to a partial change of prison population and use.

If I can be of further help please let me know.

Yours sincerely

ALEC SPENCER
Director, Rehabilitation & Care

Encs.
Justice 1 Committee

Inquiry into the effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes in prisons

STAFF TRAINING

This report describes the Training that is available through the Scottish Prison Service College. It has been designed and developed in partnership with Psychological Services and supports the running of offending behaviour programmes and prisoner activities. It covers:

  Training / Development / Support / Guidance / Assessment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Prison Service – The Vision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the difference – The Model</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Prison Service College – Officer Development Team</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Change Programmes</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; R Survey Training Figures 2003</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised R &amp; R Programme Manual</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Developments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route to Certification (flowchart)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1-A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route to Certification (flowchart guidance notes)</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: Justice 1 Committee – Inquiry into the effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes in prisons

Staff Training

SPS VISION:

- At the end of 2000 the SPS Board launched our new Vision for a new Service. The Vision is for "Correctional Excellence". It is summarised as "we will be recognised as the leader in prisons’ correctional work, which helps reduce recidivism and thereby offers value for money for the taxpayer".

- The Vision has five pillars to it however, it is the first part, being "viewed as the leaders in Correctional Services, delivering effective prisoner opportunities which help reduce recidivism" which has become known as "The Correctional Agenda". Achieving success in this area requires ‘making a difference’ in the lives of prisoners.

THE MODEL:

In SPS we have a very simple model to describe the process of delivering effective opportunities.

In the Scottish Prison Service the 4 key elements of our Mission Statement are: Custody, Order, Care and Opportunity.

The Custody and Order elements of the Mission were always prevalent at the College mainly through the presence of trainers who are responsible for the training of new recruits. Through the introduction of Cognitive Skills trainers to the Scottish Prison Service, a Team representing the Care & Opportunity elements of our Mission Statement was established.
Scottish Prison Service College: Officer Development Team

The Team consists of seven Operational trainers carrying out various roles within the College, all geared towards training, assessing & supporting staff in addressing prisoners offending behaviour. Within the team, four trainers have sole responsibility for the Reasoning & Rehabilitation Programme (Cognitive Skills). As trainer / monitors they cover all establishments delivering the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Programme and each trainer assesses and supports approximately = 10 coaches. In addition staff training in presentation and group work skills is carried out and support is also given in the training of new recruits.

Background: Reasoning & Rehabilitation Programme (Cognitive Skills)

In 1995 the SPS purchased the reasoning & rehabilitation programme from T3 associates. When this was done T3 strongly supported the fact that it should be prison officers who delivered the programme and the SPS agreed to this. Therefore in 1995, twenty prison officers were trained by T3 to deliver the programme. These staff were assessed by T3 themselves and they delivered two programmes in the first year and attended follow up training similar to the process used for new coaches.

In late 1996 the SPS expanded it’s approach into addressing prisoners offending behaviour. Therefore in conjunction with T3, six of the staff originally trained in the programme were selected and appointed by the SPS as licensed trainers in the programme. These staff were posted to the Scottish Prison Service College in the first instance as R & R trainers.

In early 1997 the programme was rolled out to the whole estate and a further 56 prison officers were trained by the new trainers to deliver the programme. This marked the first major step by the SPS into delivering offending behaviour programmes to a wide range of prisoners across the whole of the estate.

In 1998 the SPS appointed an Accreditation panel consisting of a variety of experts with experience in programme design and delivery at a professional, academic and practical level, from within and outwith the Service, with the majority of the members being external to ensure credibility. Subsequently the R & R programme became the first offending behaviour programme to gain accredited status in 1998.

Due to the re-organisation of the SPS estate in the year 2000 which resulted in a reduction in the number of establishments, the number of R & R trainers was reduces to four.

R & R Trainer Responsibilities are:

- Maintaining the integrity of the programme firstly through assessment of coaches delivery of the programme and also through offering support and guidance to Managers and staff in establishments.
- Delivery of training for all officers who apply to become new coaches delivering the Reasoning & Rehabilitation programme i.e. initial training over 10 days and 5 day follow up training after completion of their first programme delivery.
- On-going support & assessment, including annual certification of coaches.

Note: A pre-requisite to acceptance of training to deliver programmes or activities is the requirement to attend and pass as "competent" the Preferred Programmes Core Skills (5 day Course). The Team also delivers this.

Please see Appendices: 1 & 1A - "The Training route to Certification"
PERSONAL CHANGE PROGRAMMES:

Over the last decade the SPS has placed increased emphasis on addressing offending behaviour which has mirrored the change, taking place in a number of countries worldwide. There is a range of programmes, under 2 headings: Preferred Programmes and Approved Activities. Preferred Programmes are structured interventions that run for a minimum of 50 hours and the programmes that we have in place are:

The R & R Programme (Cognitive Skills) in the SPS is delivered solely by prison officers and managed by the trainers at the College. Other offending behaviour programmes that are delivered within the SPS were either developed by or introduced through our Psychological Services.

The Anger Management Programme was developed by our psychological services using mainly the work of Gareth Hughes. It is aimed at prisoners who have problems in controlling their temper and was piloted in two establishments in late 1997 and then rolled out to a number of prisons within the estate in 1998. The training of the programme is conducted jointly by the Scottish Prison Service college and by Psychological Services and the monitoring / assessment of facilitators is conducted by Psychological Services.

The Drug Relapse Prevention programme was developed by Dr. Ruth Stocks, formerly of our Psychological Services, and is aimed at the long-term prisoner population i.e. 4 years and over. It focuses on helping prisoners cope effectively with the demands of daily life whilst drug free. It was piloted in 2 establishments in late 1997 and then rolled out to a number of prisons within the estate in 1998. The training of the programme is conducted jointly by the Scottish Prison Service college and by Psychological Services and the monitoring / assessment of facilitators is conducted by Psychological Services.

The Lifelines Programme was developed by our Psychological Services. It was developed as a reduced version of the DRPP aimed at the short-term population of prisoners i.e. less than 4 years. It was piloted in two establishments in 2000 and then rolled out to a number of prisons within the estate in 2002. The training of the programme is conducted jointly by the Scottish Prison Service college and by psychological services and the monitoring / assessment of facilitators is conducted by Psychological Services.

The Problem Solving Skills Training was introduced through our Psychological Services in 1999 and is the programme developed by Dr. James Maguire. It is aimed at offenders with a history of repeat offences and it examines the issues around their offending behaviour and was piloted in one establishment and is currently being delivered within 2 of our largest establishments. The training of the programme is conducted jointly by the Scottish Prison Service College and by Psychological Services and the monitoring / assessment of facilitators is conducted by one of the College trainers and Psychological Services.

Sex Offender Treatment programme (STOP 2000) was introduced through our psychological services from HMPS in 2001. It supersedes the original STOP programme and provides the opportunity for both adult and young offenders to address their sexual offending behaviour. The training and monitoring / assessment of this programme is dealt with through our Psychological Services.
Also being developed for introduction to the SPS are the following programmes:

**Adapted Stop** – developed by HMPS from STOP 2000 for offenders with learning disabilities and poorer attention spans.

**Extended Stop** - developed by HMPS from STOP 2000 for offenders who require more work after completing STOP 2000 e.g. high-risk sex offenders.

**Rolling Stop** – developed by Marshall and Fernandez as a short-term intensive programme for sex offenders.

There is also a range of Approved Activities (structured and standardised interventions). Key criteria must be met before approval is granted e.g. minimum 20 hours, must address a criminogenic need, must target issues thought to be related to offending behaviour patterns (anxiety, addictions). Some of our current approved activities are: Drug Education and Awareness, Insomnia and Anxiety, Alcohol Awareness, Parenting and Health Choices.

**R & R TRAINING FIGURES: Survey Results - 2003**

It was evident in 2003 that a number of coaches were dropping out from delivering the programme. On carrying out a survey the following information emerged:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trained</th>
<th>Drop out</th>
<th>% Drop out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for dropout:

The reasons for coaches dropping out from the programme were various and some of them were as follows:

- Progressing to deliver other offending behaviour programmes.
- Promotion to become R & R trainers at the SPSC.
- Promotion within other areas of the estate.
- Resignation from the organisation.
- Operational issues
- A few were deselected due to poor delivery standard.

The college trainers new role which included a mandate to deliver training, combined with a lack of information in establishments with regards to the demands and resources required for programme delivery, resulted in a high drop out rate in the early days of the programme. This highlighted the need for operating procedures (Appendix 2). As a result of their introduction and supported by awareness training, focused at staff and managers. It is believed that this issue has now been addressed.
REVISED MANUAL:

In 2002 the SPS decided to take on board the Revised R & R programme manual from T3 Associates. From this manual and T3’s own training manual a comprehensive new training manual was developed to allow the training of new coaches in the revised manual and the first staff to undertake this training attended a course in April 2002. Also as part of the launch of the new manual it was agreed to issue every coach with a full box set of materials so that they each had everything required to deliver the programme with no need to share. This box set includes: delivery manual, theory and application manual, session supplements, CORT cards, scruples and brainteasers.

Following this it was decided to roll out the revised manual to all existing coaches in establishments. Therefore a 5 day national conference for all existing coaches which was the first of its kind in Scotland was organised. The purpose of the conference was to officially launch the revised manual throughout the whole of the prison estate and to train staff on the changes in the manual of which there were quite a few.

Day one of the conference was aimed at staff and their line managers, outlining the purpose of the new manual and updating managers on the changes to the delivery of the programme. The second day was a full day training event ran by Liz Fabiano & Frank Porporino, the authors of the programme, in which they gave staff an insight into the motivation of prisoners on programmes and the day was finished with a question and answer session.

The next 3 days was a series of workshops conducted by College Trainers and Joanne Reynolds an associate of T3 where staff were updated on the changes in the revised manual and refreshed on some problem areas they were experiencing in delivering the programme.

As a result of the revised manual, some changes in the guidance for delivering the programme was also identified. The main changes focused on how many sessions per week a coach could deliver and also an increase in the amount of participants allowed on the one group. a revised set of operating standards informing everyone of the changes involved was issued.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS:

Following the success of the national conference for R & R coaches. It was decided that some form of coach workshops should be run every 2 years. The main reason for this is that even although staff have regular support from the college trainers it was clear from a training perspective that gathering the coaches together away from their establishments was of direct benefit in addressing areas such as motivation and morale.

The workshops will also provide the opportunity to address common problem areas of delivery and allow coaches to share ideas in line with good practice therefore assisting in maintaining the standard of delivery required for the programme. Since delivering the national conference there has been a lot of positive feedback from coaches and their managers and there is evidence of a rise in the standard of delivery from coaches.

As mentioned previously, the SPSC Trainers joined forces with H.M.P.S. to enable both Services to license new trainers with T3 Associates. This could possibly involve the sharing of training events with England
SUMMARY:

This document focuses generally on Reasoning & Rehabilitation, which was the first programme to run within the Scottish Prison Service. It also identifies five other programmes, which together constitute the six Preferred Programmes delivered. All of these require the same selection and training processes to be in place. The only difference being, that each has its own specific “training of the programme” requirement. Prisoner Activities are designed and developed throughout the year and if accredited are added to the services expanding library.

Having successfully trained staff to deliver, is not the end of the process. To maintain the standards of delivery and maintain the integrity of the programme/s requires appropriately trained, qualified, and motivated individuals who continue to monitor and assess throughout the delivery of all programmes.

If further information is required, please contact:

Walter Frame  
Acting Training Operations Manager  
Scottish Prison Service College  
01324 710 476  
E-mail: walter.frame@sps.gov.uk
APPENDIX 1

"The Training Route to Certification"

Please see guidance notes Appendix FA

Application (Programme Delivery)

(2 Day) Basic Presentation Skills Course (Optional)

(5 Day) Preferred Programme Core Skills (Mandatory)

Competent to deliver Prisoner Activities

Not yet Competent

Candidate to re-apply for course

Competent

Programme Training

Delivery of Programme (1)

Follow-up Training

Delivery of Programme (2)

Assessed as "competent"
CERTIFICATION

Candidate will be given the opportunity to deliver a 3rd programme. If unsuccessful on this occasion: Failure recorded and removed from list.

Assessed as "not yet competent"
Guidance notes

Application (Programme Delivery)

In 2002 the S.P.S.C. also introduced a corporate evaluation system for all training within the SPS. This system also requires that all applications for training courses must be signed off by a line manager and the local staff training manager and it must state clearly that the training is part of the individuals PPMS and a requirement of their role. The evaluation system also includes an action plan for staff on completion of the training.

(2 Day) Basic Presentation Skills Course (Optional)

A 2 day Basic Presentation Skills course which is aimed at staff who have never delivered a formal presentation before. Over the two days, staff are trained to deliver a presentation. The participants are then given the opportunity to deliver a short presentation and receive informal feedback. Also covered is a basic awareness of working with groups, where the different group dynamics and how to deal with various situations that may arise when presenting, is role-played and discussed.

(5 Day) Preferred Programme Core Skills (Mandatory)

This is a recently revamped version of the original group-work skill course. Delivered over 5 days it is aimed at equipping staff with the necessary skills required to deliver offending behaviour programmes and Prisoner Activities by introducing them to the common concepts present in all of the offending behaviour programmes. Therefore when staff progress to offending behaviour specific programmes they have an understanding of the processes used and are able to concentrate more of the content of the material.

Each day begins with the introduction of a concept, (e.g. sub groups and discussions, role plays and performance feedback) followed by a demonstration by the trainers. The participants then deliver a presentation each day in pairs followed by group feedback. They are constantly assessed and are required to deliver a presentation each day. This course is mandatory for all staff prior to them progressing to any offending behaviour programme work.

Programme Training

At this point candidates will be trained specifically in the programme that they have selected. The initial training will be carried out over a ten-day period.

Programme Delivery (1)

Now the candidates deliver live in their establishment to the particular offender group. During this time they are required to submit video’s of each session they run. These are monitored and feedback is given in support. This can also include live monitoring as and if the monitor thinks appropriate.

Follow-up Training

The follow up training is designed to support the coaches after delivery of their first programme and it provides the opportunity for them to develop their understanding of the integrated nature of the programme in order to further enhance it’s delivery. Each coach must in the first instance deliver 2 full programmes to a satisfactory standard within one year from when they are first trained and in Scotland our coaches deliver the R & R programme on a single facilitation basis at all times.

Walter Frame
Scottish Prison Service
College
Programme Delivery (2)

They are required to complete the delivery of a second full programme within one year of their initial training and if the monitor is satisfied with their performance, certification will be granted.

Certification

Every Coach must be assessed over one full programme on an annual basis in order to retain their certification.

This process runs in conjunction with an establishment’s plan of activities for all programmes, which is:
1st April to 31st March each year.

Programme Managers are asked to provide a schedule of delivery for the year in advance. This allows the College Team to plan ahead and ensures that the coach can be contacted prior to the start of the programme when he/she will be informed they will be assessed. Thereafter the coach is required to pass their videotapes for each session to the monitor on a weekly basis. Following viewing, and once the certification process has been completed the tapes are returned.

Another key role is to offer support and guidance to coaches when they are experiencing difficulties with the delivery of the programme. Therefore when a coach is delivering the programme they know they have the option to contact their monitor (or any other team member) for advice on any problems even if they are not being assessed at that time. There can be conflicting demands within an establishment when programmes are being delivered in conjunction with the daily routine. Part of the role is also to support and educate staff and managers on how best to overcome any issues that arise whilst at the same time maintaining the integrity of the delivery of the programme.

When assessing coaches for their annual certification 5 sessions (minimum) from the programme are selected. With the introduction of the revised manual a dual approach to assessment has been adopted. This approach consists of watching 3 sessions on video tape which is followed by e-mailing the written feedback to the coach and talking through the feedback with coach over the telephone once they have a copy of the assessment.

The other 2 sessions require live viewing of the session delivery. This then enables feedback to the coach immediately after they have delivered the session. The live viewing aspect of the assessments is something that has only recently been introduced through consultation with coaches and monitors from other programmes. At the conclusion, there were arguments for and against video and live viewing, however the option for the dual approach was agreed as this was the fairest option for coaches.
NATIONAL PREFERRED PROGRAMMES:
COGNITIVE SKILLS - OPERATING PROCEDURES

NON-CERTIFICATED COACHES:

1. Following the initial ten-day training course, coaches have 60 days from the last day of that training within which to begin their first programme. Some degree of flexibility exists regarding this guideline, however an extension will be granted only under exceptional circumstances. Each such case will be decided on its own merit, with the final decision remaining with the Theme Leader for Prisoner Programmes in consultation with the Cognitive Skills trainers.

2. Should coaches fail to begin their first programme within 60 days they will be required to undergo five-day 'refresher' training. They will then have a further 60 days from the last day of this training to get a programme under way. Failure to meet this requirement will necessitate the coach undergoing the full ten-day training again.

3. If a coach has not begun a programme or undergone 'refresher' training within six months of the last day of the initial ten-day training, they will be deemed ineligible to commence the programme unless they repeat the initial training.

4. On completion of their first programme, coaches should attend five-day 'follow-up' training. It is recognised however, that attendance at this training, prior to coaches beginning a second programme, may not always be possible. Under such circumstances it is acceptable that 'follow-up' training take place during or after the second programme if the Cognitive Skills trainers deem that coach to be delivering at a suitably high standard. This option will not be available to those coaches who are not attaining the required standard and whose performance requires immediate exposure to the 'follow-up' training. Where a coach has been unable to complete the first programme (perhaps as a result of Guideline 28) they must have started another programme prior to attending this training.

5. Coaches must have started their second programme within twelve months of the last day of the initial ten-day training course or the ‘refresher’ training. Failure to meet this requirement will necessitate the coach undergoing the full ten-day training again. Furthermore, in terms of certification, the first programme run by that coach will not be considered.

6. Until such time as certification is achieved, coaches must not run more than one programme at a time.

7. Non-certificated coaches should run a minimum of three or a maximum of four sessions per week.
PREPARATION TIME:

8. It is recommended that following initial training coaches are given 1-2 week’s preparation time to develop their lesson plans and familiarise themselves with the cognitive skills manual. This time need not necessarily be ‘off line’, however, if preparing while on shift the amount of time given should still equate to 1-2 weeks.

9. During their first programme, coaches should receive two hours preparation time prior to the delivery of each session. In order to set up the classroom, read through their session notes and arrange the transfer of the participants and one hour after each session, in order to write up their session notes. The preparation time required prior to delivery during coaches second programmes may be reduced, however, the time given should reflect coaches level of ability, knowledge and experience and take into account the need for coaches to amend their lesson plans based on their attendance at ‘follow-up’ training.

10. Sufficient facility time must be given immediately before and after each programme to allow coaches to administer pre- and post-programme interviews (which last approximately one hour each), and to collate and prepare general course materials.

COACH EVALUATION:

11. Successful completion of a programme is dependent upon coaches attaining the standards specified by the Cognitive Skills trainers. Programme evaluation occurs as follows: each newly trained coach video tapes all thirty-six sessions of their programme. From these tapes one trainer will randomly select a minimum of five to assess. Assessment involves reviewing each of these five sessions and scoring them on a number of items related to appropriate groupwork and presentation skills, and an adherence to the content of the programme. This process is followed for both programmes.

12. Occasionally, a coach will ‘lose’ either all their participants or an amount, which would leave the group with fewer people than the minimum required operating figure (see guideline 21). The question as to whether that coach has completed enough of the programme for it to be deemed part of the certification criteria lies with the Cognitive Skills trainers. However, for this guideline to become active, a coach must have completed at least half of the programme (i.e. 18 sessions).

13. In the event that a coach is deemed not to have successfully met the required standards necessary for certification, they will be given the opportunity to run a

---

1 But on no account should be less than one hour.
third programme\(^2\). This will run, and be evaluated, as for the first two, with the exception that each tape will be independently assessed by two trainers. If performance in this programme is deemed to be acceptable, certification will be awarded.

If performance within this third programme is not deemed to be acceptable, the coach and his / her establishment, will be informed that the coach is no longer eligible to run the programme. The Cognitive Skills trainers, in consultation with the Theme Leader will make the final decision on this for Prisoner Programmes.

14. Should a coach fail to reach the required standards, this will end their involvement with the Cognitive Skills programme. They will not be given the opportunity to repeat the initial ten-day training.

**CERTIFICATION:**

15. Certification is dependent upon coaches successfully completing two programmes and the 'follow-up' training.

**CERTIFICATED COACHES:**

16. Certificated coaches should be given at least one hour’s preparation time prior to each session and one hour following each session.

17. Once certificated, coaches must deliver one full programme per year\(^3\) to retain that certification.

18. To ensure that programme integrity and the quality of delivery is maintained, certificated coaches will be evaluated annually on one complete programme. This evaluation will be identical to that used for non-certificated coaches. Coaches will be informed in advance that their programme will be assessed.

\(^2\)An exception to this rule exists whereby it can clearly be seen that a coach, throughout his / her first and second programmes, does not possess the skills required to successfully run the Cognitive Skills programme, despite the best efforts of the Cognitive Skills trainers to aid that coach's development. At such times the opportunity to run a third programme will not be given.

\(^3\)Where the certification year refers to 12 calendar months from that coaches actual date of certification. This will be either April to April or October to October.
19. If a certificated coach’s performance is deemed to be deviating from the required standard, as assessed by the Cognitive Skills trainers, he/she will be given guidance and advice from the trainers regarding those areas of concern. Trainers will seek evidence that such advice has been heeded when assessing later videos from that programme. It is possible however, that further evidence from that coach’s next programme may be requested to ensure that any suggested changes have been successfully implemented. Persistent deviation from the required standards could result in **loss of certification**, a decision which would only be made following consultation between the trainers and the Theme Leader for Prisoner Programmes, and after every effort has been made to resolve the situation.

20. Once certificated, coaches can run two programmes concurrently, if time allows. However, to do so the following rules must be adhered to i.e. programmes must be staggered so that a coach does not deliver the same session twice within the same day. A difference between programmes of at least six sessions is recommended; a coach must not deliver any more than six sessions in any one week. When running two programmes this constitutes (i) delivering one programme four sessions per week and the other two sessions per week or (ii) delivering each programme three sessions per week. The threat of ‘burn-out’ to coaches who are delivering too often is a real one and steps to avoid this should be paramount. For this reason it is advisable that coaches run programmes ‘off line’ if they are expected to deliver more than four sessions per week.

21. From time to time a certificated coach may decide they would like time away from the programme, for example, to ‘recharge their batteries’ or, to run another preferred programme. With some careful planning and scheduling it is possible for a coach to have a break of approximately 20 months and still be able to provide the minimum requirements to retain certification. Consider the following example:

_Coach X was originally certificated in October 1998. She immediately requests to be assessed for the period October 1998 - October 1999 on a programme she will be running over 7 weeks from November 1998 - January 1999. Coach X is not required to run another programme until the period from October 1999 - October 2000. During this time they can delay running a programme until August 2000, which would allow a 7 week programme to be completed prior to October 2000 - thus a break of 20 months._

**PRISONER DESELECTION:**

22. Occasionally, it may be necessary to deselect a particular prisoner from a group (e.g. because he/she is particularly disruptive or adversely affects the running of the group). Before such a decision is made, the coach should, where possible, provide the individual with the opportunity to address their behaviour. If this fails to overcome the problem, the coach should inform the cognitive skill trainers of the circumstances surrounding the particular individual and a joint decision made as to that individual’s suitability to continue within the group.
23. Absenteeism from the group should be closely monitored, as (i) programme attendance is a condition of prisoner certification, and (ii) the more sessions missed the less likely the programme is of being effective. For these reasons participants may miss no more than four sessions of a programme. If a prisoner appears likely to miss four or more sessions, the trainers should be contacted to discuss the circumstances and available options.

**PROGRAMME COVER:**

24. Occasionally, a coach may be unavailable to run his/her programme (e.g. because of annual leave, sick). Under such circumstances, every effort should be made to arrange that another coach within the establishment run the sessions.

25. Should the support cover of another coach be unavailable coaches may suspend a programme for no longer than two weeks in order to facilitate their annual leave (or absence through illness). A programme should not be suspended any more than once.

26. If a coach is unable to deliver sessions whilst under assessment (e.g. because of annual leave, sick) and another coach provides cover, further evidence may be required from a subsequent programme before a decision on the competence of that coach is made.

**GENERAL:**

27. Coaches should make every effort to ensure that their group begins with the maximum number of participant's allowable (i.e. eight). This number should not be exceeded. It is recognised, however, that it may not always be possible to attract eight participants to the group. Under such circumstances, and given the likelihood that there may be 'drop-outs' it is recommended that coaches do not start a new programme with less than six participants.

28. The minimum number of participants with which a group can reasonably be expected to run is four. If less than four participants remain, that group should be terminated. If possible, those participants still present should be added to a future group, at the relevant session, in order that they may complete the programme.

---

4 An exception to this rule exists whereby a participant, having begun the programme at another establishment, is transferred in. Rather than ignore this participant and the work they have done as part of another cognitive skills group, it is preferable to add him/her to the group at the relevant session (i.e. the session following the last one they participated in prior to their transfer). At such times it is possible that there may be nine participants within a group.
29. In the event that one of the participants leaves the group very early into the programme, (i.e. within three sessions) a coach has the opportunity - should a suitable candidate be available - to introduce that person into the group if they take the time to instruct that person in the sessions he/she has missed. Following the delivery of session three coaches should not add participants to the group unless for the reason stated in Guideline 27, footnote 4.

30. Under no circumstances should coaches deliver two sessions per day to the same group.

31. Under no circumstances should coaches deliver more than five sessions per week to the same group.

32. At present, cognitive skills is predominantly run within establishments by coaches working individually. This does not mean that coaches cannot run the programme in pairs. In terms of *initial* certification, coaches in this situation should split the first programme such that one coach runs all odd-numbered sessions and the other all the even-numbered sessions. The sessions delivered should then be reversed for the second programme. In terms of *annual* certification, coaches in this situation should split the programme such that one coach runs all odd-numbered sessions and the other all the even-numbered sessions.
SPS RESEARCH BULLETIN

EVALUATION OF THE SPS ANGER MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

Executive Summary

- The initial evaluation of the effectiveness of the Anger Management programme shows change in a positive direction. The evaluation is based on 4 psychometric measures and 2 proxy measures. It is important to note at the outset the limitations inherent in the use of any proxy measure for evaluative purposes as numerous external factors can impact upon such criteria. The drop out rate of 23.2% also needs to be noted, since it is likely that those who remain on the programme will have higher levels of motivation.

- 513 offenders completed the Anger Management programme between 1998 and 2003 (118 groups run in 9 establishments):-
  - 99.8% were male, 0.2% female;
  - Mean age was 27, range 16 – 66;
  - 4.8% were serving sentences of over 10 years;
  - 43.8% serving less than 4 years;
  - 51.3% serving between 4 and 10 years.

- There were significant levels of change recorded in 3 of the 4 psychometric measures when the one, 6 and 12 month follow up data were compared to the pre-programme baseline data.

- The proxy measure of Governors’ Reports analysis demonstrated an initial significant positive change during the programme and in the first month following, but disappointingly figures rose again to almost baseline levels at the 12 month point.

- The proxy measure of Security Category analysis again shows promising positive change at all follow up stages with the overall supervision level being reduced across the cohort (although changes to the algorithm for calculating Supervision Levels may also have had an impact and need to be borne in mind):-
  - when the Security Category data are considered in relation to age groups, (under 21 and 21 and over), the under 21 group demonstrate the more positive level of change;
  - when the Security Category data are considered in relation to the sentence length groupings, the 4 to 10 year group demonstrated the most positive level of change.
Introduction

This bulletin reports the key findings in relation to behavioural change observed in a cohort of offenders who completed the SPS Anger Management intervention programme between the years of 1998 and 2003. From an audit of pre- and post-psychometrics, 632 participants were identified on the database. Of this number, 23.2% were excluded from the current study as they were participants who had failed to complete the programme or who had been assessed for the programme but did not participate. The study therefore focuses on the remaining 513 (76.8%) offenders who in all probability will retain higher levels of motivation. (see Graph 1).

Graph 1. Programme Status

Format of the Anger Management Programme

The Anger Management programme is based on a cognitive-behavioural approach and is grounded in current anger management theory. The model approaches the regulation of anger through three steps - cognitive preparation, skill acquisition and application training.

In the first stage the prisoner is taught to identify the cognitive, behavioural and physiological aspects of anger including both positive and negative functions, in addition to the antecedents.

In the second stage, the prisoner is introduced to alternative strategies of coping when confronted by an anger-provoking situation. Here the emphasis is placed upon thought content. Through a vignette, the prisoner is required to determine whether a situation is provocative or not and whether an angry response would be appropriate or not. Distorted cognitions can be replaced or reconstructed at this point through the adoption of positive self-statement.
The third stage is application training and incorporates the use of imagery and role-play and encourages the prisoner to problem solve in anger arousing situations.

**Prisoner Selection**

During the risk and needs sentence management process, prospective group participants trigger a high criminogenic need for admission onto an Anger Management programme. Once triggered, the offender attends a motivational interview designed to test comprehensively those who may benefit from appropriate placement. When the programme board is assured of the offender's need, that offender will undergo a further battery of psychometric tests to ensure suitability for group inclusion. These psychometric tests are described in the analysis section below and are an important part of the programme’s evaluative process.

**Programme Delivery, Establishments and Group Numbers**

This programme has been delivered to 118 groups in 9 establishments. However, not all of these groups have completed the programme due to drop out through deselection from the programme (see Graph 2).

![Graph 2. Establishment Analysis](image_url)

**Demographics**

Of the 513 study participants, the mean age was 27 years with a range of 16 – 66. Nearly all were male (99.8%; n = 505) with only a few females on the programme (0.2%; n=8). The main reason behind the small female contingent was that insufficient hard copies of the psychometrics were available to the study for audit. The suitably of male anger programmes for female participants is also an issue of current debate.

The participants were serving a range of sentences which were categorised - less than four years; four years but less than ten years; ten years and over. The breakdown of the cohort revealed that 43.8% (n = 181) were serving less than 4 years; 51.3% (n = 212) were serving 4 years but less the 10; and 4.8% (n = 20) were serving 10 years and over (see Graph 3).
Graph 3 Sentence Detail

Analysis

The study involved analysis of psychometric change indices and changes or shifts in two other ‘proxy measures'. (Caution must always be exercised when proxy measures are employed as numerous external factors can impact on such criteria). The change indices related to the psychometrics used in the pre- and post-programme evaluation which comprised the Novaco Anger Scale (NAS), Responses to Anger Scale (RTA) and Symptoms of Anger Rating Scale (SOA).

In all the above tests the means scores for one, six and twelve month post-programme follow up periods were statistically compared with the pre-programme baseline scores. Table 1 and related Graph 4 show there were statistically significant changes seen in three of the four measures. There was no significant result in the RTA B (Forms 1 and 2) scores.

These statistically significant changes are all in a positive direction and demonstrate a reduction in levels of anger reported by prisoners who completed the programme. These significant changes are maintained, on the whole, over the 12-month follow up period which suggest that they can be attributed to the SPS Anger Management intervention programme.
Paired Sample t-tests for Anger Management Psychometric Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sig</td>
<td>Not Sig</td>
<td>Not Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sig</td>
<td>Not Sig</td>
<td>Not Sig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. AM Psychometric levels of Significance

**NAS A, B TOT AND SOA Mean Scores**

![Graph showing mean scores for NAS A, B, TOT, and SOA](image)

**Graph 4. NAS and SOA Means Score Graphs**

**Proxy Measures**

**Governors’ Reports**

Two proxy measures were included in the evaluation to provide another dimension to the analysis and these must be treated with a degree of caution. Governors’ Reports for offenders who completed the programme were obtained at the pre- and ‘current’ stages and at the one, six and twelve months post-programme stages. The comparative results were most promising during the programme and in the first month.
following, but the initial impact was not sustained over the full year (see Graph 5). This is disappointing and requires further investigation and explanation.

Graph 5. Governors’ reports

It is clear from the above graph that although overall there is a statistically significant reduction in the number of Governors’ Reports being recorded, the level of reduction is most apparent during the programme and at the one month follow up stage. After this point, figures begin to rise again, suggesting a need for some method for reinforcing the skills learned on the programme. At the 12-month point the number of Governors’ Reports had almost returned to baseline levels.

Security Categories (now Supervision Levels)

When examining these proxy measure data (which again need to be viewed with caution since many external factors can impinge upon a prisoner’s supervision level), non-parametric analyses were conducted since the data are categorical (i.e. high, medium and low risk). The pre-programme category was recorded for each participant who completed the programme and used as a baseline to compare during the programme and at one, six and twelve months post-programme follow-ups. The findings were again promising with positive, but modest, change being demonstrated at all stages (see Graph 6).
Graph 6. Security categories

When security category data are considered in relation to two age categories - under 21 years and 21 years and over – both categories start with almost identical pre-programme security category classifications. While both groups show a distinct improvement in supervision levels, the under 21 group achieves a lower overall mean level of security classification (see Graph 7).

Graph 7. Security Category / Age

When the supervision level is examined in relation to duration of sentence, a clear trend is visible. Sentence length is categorised as before - less than four years, four years but less than ten years, and ten years and over. From Graph 8 below, it is evident that long term prisoners with sentences of ten years and over (not unexpectedly) show the least change in supervision levels. The four years but less than ten years group show the most marked improvement. Again, caution needs to be exercised - while participation in the Anger Management programme may be a contributing factor, other considerations impact on Supervision Level. Long term
prisoners are more likely to have reached a ‘steady state’ position in terms of classification, while those serving shorter sentences may still be working towards satisfying the appropriate criteria for progression.

**AM Security Category (Sentence)**

![Graph 8. Security Category /Sentence Length](image)

**Summary**

The initial evaluation of the effectiveness of the SPS Anger Management programme points to some positive change in self-reported behaviour and attitude to anger among programme completers. While associated changes in proxy measures are also in a positive direction, these are less robust and appear, in terms of data on Governors’ Reports, to be rather short-lived. The sustained impact of the programme over a 12-month follow-up period requires further investigation and consideration needs to be given to ways in which the initial positive behavioural change can be reinforced.

This is the first comprehensive review of Anger Management data available within SPS and the findings do require to be treated with caution. The programme was designed and introduced to SPS for its potential beneficial effect on prisoners’ behaviour on return to the community. Ultimately, the acid test for this, or indeed any other programme, will be in assessing the impact and longevity of behavioural change in such a community setting with appropriate comparison groups in place. SPS Analytical Services are working toward this goal and it is hoped that once linked re-offending data are routinely obtainable on programme cohorts, fuller analyses can take place. Continuing revisions to the way in which Anger Management data are collected and collated will ensure that subsequent analyses are conducted with a fully inclusive sample of the Scottish offender population.

Much of today’s ‘what works’ literature uses recidivism rates and return to prison data to assess programme effectiveness further. Such analysis can provide an indicator of an offender’s ability to utilise and apply the skills acquired during the
programme when confronted with genuine anger provoking situations in the community. In future it should be possible to link SPS data held on programme completers with Scottish Criminal Record Office (SCRO) data on re-offending. This will enable fuller and more reliable evaluations to be undertaken and may offer the opportunity to conduct controlled comparative studies into programme effectiveness.

In conclusion, this study has served three purposes. First, it has re-inforced SPS’s commitment to pursue best practice and to develop appropriate programmes for addressing identified criminogenic needs among the offender population. Second, the requirement to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions in order to understand better the impact and outcome of restorative work with offenders has been met, albeit with the caveats outlined above. Last, it has provided an initial insight into the varying impact of the programme on prisoners’ behaviour over a year.

This and other evaluations in the series will aid progress in both advancing the SPS’s knowledge of prisoners’ offending behaviours in the Scottish context and in improving the quality of service offered to those who offend.

Jacqui Law, SPS Analytical Services, May 2004

Footnotes?

[Novaco Anger Scale (NAS)
This is a self-report scale which assess the prisoner’s experience and expression of anger. The scale currently in use within the SPS is a scale containing 73 items that comprise two sections containing clinically orientated domains and an abbreviated improved version of the Novaco Provocation Inventory (NPI; Novaco, 1975, 1988).

Responses to Anger Scale (RTA)
This is a questionnaire consisting of two distinct sections. The first is a self-report completed by the prisoner - the RTA A. The second part (RTA B 1 and 2) is a behaviour observation tool which should be completed by TWO prison officers who are familiar with the prisoner.

Symptoms of Anger Rating Scale (SOA)
This is a self-report measure which indicates the intensity of the individual’s experience of anger and the situations in which they are most likely to lose control.]
Anger Management Programme

Evaluation Summary

- The initial evaluation of the effectiveness of the Anger Management (AM) programme is encouraging; with both the four short term outcome measures (psychometrics) and two associated proxy measures demonstrating significant positive levels of change when pre and post programme follow up data are compared.
- The sample used were 513 offenders who participated in the AM programme between 1998 and 2003. It consisted of participants from 118 groups run in 92 establishments.
  - Mean age was 27 years, range 16 – 66 years
  - 4.8% were serving sentences of over 10 years
  - 43.8% serving less than 4 years
  - 51.3% serving between 4 and 10 years.
- For the short term outcome measures, there were significant levels of change in three of the four measures when the one, 6 and 12 month follow up data were compared to the pre programme baseline data.
- The proxy measure of Governor’s Report analysis demonstrated a significant overall change in the post programme twelve month follow up period, with the most significant change occurring at the one and six month stages.
- The proxy measure of Security Category analysis again demonstrated promising outcomes with positive change being recorded at all follow up stages with the overall supervision level being reduced across the cohort.

- Current work ongoing
- Introduction and analysis of new short-term measures (psychometrics)
- Produce annual review of both the change indices and the proxy measures associated with the AM programme. Due Nov/Dec 2004
- Identify a comparison ‘control’ group to support findings.
- Identification and attribution of reconviction data for the current cohort.
- Analytic comparisons to enhance the predictability of reconviction levels of offenders participating in the AM programme.

Future Direction

- To maintain and enhance levels of data collection which will contribute to an annual review of the programme
- Produce a longitudinal in depth review of the evaluation of the programme
SPS RESEARCH BULLETIN

Executive Summary

- This initial evaluation of the effectiveness of the Anger Management programme is encouraging; with both short term outcome measures and associated proxy measures demonstrating positive levels of change over the twelve month follow up period.
- The sample used were 513 offenders who completed the Anger Management programme between 1998 and 2003. It consists of participants from 118 groups run in 10 establishments.
- 99.8% were male, 0.2% female
  - Mean age was 27, range 16 – 66
  - 4.8% were serving sentences of over 10 years
  - 43.8% serving less than 4 years
- 51.3% serving between 4 and 10 years.
- In the short term outcome measures, there were significant levels of change in three of the four measures when the one, six and twelve month follow up data were compared to the pre programme baseline data.
- The proxy measure of Governor’s Report analysis demonstrated a positive significant overall change in the twelve month follow up period, with the most significant change occurring at the one and six month stages.
- The proxy measure of Security Category analysis again reports promising positive change being demonstrated at all follow up stages with the overall supervision level being reduced across the cohort.
- When the Security Category data are considered in relation to age groups, (under 21 and 21 and over), the under 21 group demonstrate the more positive level of change.
- When the Security Category data are considered in relation to the sentence length groupings, the 4 to 10 year group demonstrated the most positive level of change.

Future direction

- Produce annual reviews of both the change indices and the proxy measures associated with the Anger Management programme.
- Identify a comparison ‘control’ group to support the current findings.
- Identify reconviction data for the cohort and compare findings to predicted levels of reconviction.
Lifeline Programme

The Lifeline programme was completed in its original draft in February 2001 by psychologists Michele Gilluley and Ruth Stocks. The programme was devised to enable young offenders and female offenders, who have come through the initial stages of withdrawal, to gain further knowledge and skills to remain drug-free. The programme addresses problems both within the prison environment and the community, and as such this programme is devised for those who are nearing liberation. The programme is based on a cognitive–behavioural model incorporating motivational techniques. The programme is an adapted version of the Drug Relapse (Prevention) Programme which has been running successfully in 4 long-term adult male establishments for several years.

Initial pilot programmes were conducted in Cornton Vale (females) and Polmont (young offenders). Both pilot groups comprised 11 participants. The initial pilot at Cornton Vale completed with only 3 participants remaining while the pilot at Polmont unfortunately did not complete. The Lifeline programme subsequently underwent some revision, with amendments to the assessment process and, as neither of the previous programmes could provide sufficient data to inform the impact of the programme, the updated programme was piloted at Polmont in September 2001 with 12 participants in the group. 10 participants completed the programme. A second group comprising 10 participants commenced January 2002, of whom 8 completed the programme. Preliminary analyses of the data from these 18 participants were undertaken.

From the preliminary analyses of self-report measures it was determined that participants had improved significantly in awareness of high risk situations leading to lapse and relapse, coping strategies to prevent lapse and relapse, self-esteem, and general health. However as these analyses were conducted using a small sample of only 18 participants, any conclusions drawn from the data must be treated with caution.

The Lifeline programme underwent further rewriting in May 2002 the content was expanded to include material relevant to short-term adult males. With these further changes in place the programme has become available to other establishments. To date Lifeline is available in Aberdeen, Barlinnie, Cornton Vale, Edinburgh, and Polmont with a total of 20 facilitators trained to deliver the material, 3 of whom have reached certification. It is anticipated that, following training in May 2003, Perth and Greenock will also be delivering the Lifeline programme, with a further 9 staff trained.

The design of the Lifeline programme determines that participants are selected via a selection board decision, with issues such as motivation to remain drug free and liberation date taken into consideration. Since the second pilot at Polmont a total of 8 programmes have run in 4 establishments with a further 2 programmes currently ongoing in Barlinnie and Aberdeen. 87 prisoners have been selected to participate in the programmes, of these 6 did not start the programme. Reasons for non-participation at this stage include non-compliance with the programme requirements, for example, refusal to sign the compact (2), refusal to participate in all of the programme (2) and having a change of mind (2). Of the 81 commencing the programme, 69 completed attendance, while 12 either chose to drop-out or were de-selected from further participation. The reasons for de-selection during the programme include self de-selection - feeling unable to continue on the programme (5), absences/non-attendance (3), issue of order (2) early release or transfer (2).
Participants' attendance at their initial community drug appointment will be used as a follow-up measure. However it is also possible to determine those participants who re-enter the prison system and whether their readmission is drug-related. This research, and ongoing analysis of the programme data, is to be carried forward by the What Works Unit (a branch of SPS Research & Evaluation). Another outcome measure is that of drug related deaths. Unfortunately there have been 2 Lifeline participants who have died as a result of overdose following release from prison. One participant had not been able to complete the programme due to having been transferred to open conditions after undertaking 50% of the programme. The other was released shortly after completion of the programme. The prisoner had been scheduled several appointments with his drug worker but did not attend. He also had a previous history of overdose. These 2 cases emphasise the importance of transitional care to underpin transfer from prison to community.

The Lifeline programme is currently being submitted for accreditation and the following are thanked for their contribution to the material;

Michele Gilluley, Chartered Forensic Psychologist and Dr Ruth Stocks, Chartered Clinical Psychologist, for writing the programme.

Marie Cobbald, Chartered Forensic Psychologist, for writing the training manuals in conjunction with Michele Gilluley.

Thanks are also given to;
The officers at Polmont for their participation in the pilot programmes and subsequent contributions which informed the revised manual, namely; Grant Bonar, Mark Lawlor and George Scott-Telford.

Calum McCarthy, Operational Trainer at Scottish Prison Service College for support and advice.

Irene Morgan, Psychologist, for conducting preliminary data and analyses, administrative support and advice.

All facilitators and psychologists who have input to the programme and without whom this report could not have been compiled.
Lifeline Programme

Evaluation Summary

- The initial evaluation of the effectiveness of the Lifeline programme is encouraging; with both short-term outcome measures (psychometrics) and associated proxy measures demonstrating positive levels of change over the twelve month follow up period.
- The sample used were 252 offenders who completed the Lifeline programme between 2001 and 2004. It consists of participants from 36 groups run in 5 establishments.
  - mean age was 27 years, range 16 – 57 years
- In the short-term outcome measures, there were significant positive levels of change in four of the five measures where the post programme data were compared to the pre programme baseline data.
- The proxy measure of Governor's Report analysis demonstrated a positive significant overall change in the twelve month post programme follow up period, with the most significant change occurring at the one and six month stages.
- The proxy measure of MDT analysis demonstrated a positive significant overall change in the six month post programme follow up periods.

Current Work Ongoing

- Produce review of both the change indices and the proxy measures associated with the programme – due October 2004.
- Identification of a comparison 'control' group to support the current findings.
- Identification and attribution of reconviction data for the cohort
- Analytic comparisons enhancing predictability levels of reconviction among Scottish offenders who have completed the Lifeline programme

Future Direction

- To maintain and enhance levels of data collection which will contribute to an annual review of the programme
- Produce a longitudinal in depth review of the evaluation of the programme
Review of SPS Cog Skills Psychometrics
1997 – 1999

Jacqui Law
Research and Analytic Services
Jan 2004
The following is a review of a sample of psychometrics which were introduced in three establishments at the inception of the Cog Skills programmes. They were introduced in order to provide a tool with which to determine short term outcome of the programme, over a restrict timeframe.

The establishments included in this review were Barlinnie, Shotts and Polmont. The cohort consists of 102 adult males resident in one of the three above establishments between 1997 and 1999. All of these prisoners completed the programme during this period.

As is seen from the tables 1 and 2 and graphs 1 - 4 below, the short term outcome measures indicate a significant improvement in the problem solving skills of the cohort (Social Problem Solving). There is also a significant overall improvement in the perception that actions result in consequences and what the perceived likelihood and importance of these consequences are (Consequences). There is also a significant shift in the cohort’s perception of source of responsibility for behaviours in that there is a significant change in the levels of accepting responsibility for one’s own action as opposed to blaming external factors (Locus of Control).

SOCIAL PROBLEM SOLVING INVENTORY

To deal competently with problematic social situations one needs specific problem-solving abilities such as problem recognition, generation of solutions, and a strategy for the selection of the most appropriate solutions and a proper understanding of likely outcomes.

In the Social Problem Solving Inventory subjects are presented with a problem scenario and a range of possible solutions. The participants are asked to rank the solutions they would use in order of preference, first through to third. The five solutions offered include one assertive, two passive and two aggressive. Subjects score one point for their first solution, two for their second solution, three for the third and four for those not chosen. Scores for assertive, passive and aggressive solutions are then tallied across the eight situations. A good score, where a candidate always chooses the assertive response would be eight, a poor score, where the assertive option is never chosen would be 32.
A forth measure taken from this inventory is the number of alternative solutions generated by the subject. After each problem subjects are requested to give other ways they might deal with the situation. For the last two problems no solutions are given: they must generate their own. Two scores are computed, the total number of alternatives given for scenarios A-H and the total for scenarios I and J. Any solutions are counted, no matter how unlikely or unusual they are, provided they are unique (i.e. they are different from the solution already provided).

Therefore the direction of the desired change after the programme is:-

- Assertive % - UP
- Aggressive % - Down
- Passive % - UP

Source:
The Social Problem Solving Questionnaire used for Cognitive Skills Programmes was developed from a five stage model suggested by Freedman et al (1978) when creating the Adolescent Problems Inventory (API):-

1) Situational analysis: identification of the problem situations that might be related to offending
2) Item development: obtaining a sample of responses from a wide range of respondents to these problems
3) Response enumeration: judges rate responses as either assertive, aggressive or passive (working independently)
4) Response evaluation: judges, working independently, were asked to rate the competence of these responses
5) Construction of the inventory and rater's manual: choice of situations and responses to construct the inventory based on the judges' classification

10 scenarios were generated from this method and from these scenarios 4 measures can be generated:

Assertive Problem Solving
Aggressive Problem Solving
Passive Problem Solving
Alternatives with read examples (A-H)
Alternatives without read examples (I&J)
CONSEQUENCES

Geurra and Slaby (1989) investigating social problem solving in children, found that some had difficulty appreciating the consequences of a given action. This was subsequently tested on a delinquent juvenile population (Perry, Perry and Rasmussen (1988)). These researchers found that aggressive and violent delinquents believed the consequence of their interpersonal strategies would be higher self-esteem and ignored the negative consequences. They rated the likelihood of negative consequences as low and rated the social consequences as more important.

Therefore the direction of the desired change after the programme is:-
- Likelihood - UP
- Importance - UP

Source:
The material was generated (Clark, 1996), using the five step model of Freedman et al (1978). A pool of situations was generated (so they were of greater relevance to test population) and refined. A sample of respondents produced the most likely consequences for each scenario. The same judges classified responses as legal, social, immediate or long-term “in the case of the last 3 classes judges also noted whether the consequences benefited or damaged the perpetrator”. Consequences were narrowed down to the most common and most agreed on by the judges. This left 10 scenarios.

This test attempts to investigate the probabilities and value subjects attached to certain consequences following from a situation. Subjects are presented with ten scenarios in which an individual acts in a certain way. Each scenario is followed by three possible outcomes, which are not mutually exclusive. Subjects are asked to rate on a scale of 1 - 10 the likelihood of each outcome and how important that outcome would be should it occur to the individual concerned.
LOCUS OF CONTROL

The questionnaire consists of 18 questions on a 5-point scale. Locus of control scales measure the extent to which a person perceives events as being a consequence of his or her own behaviour and therefore potentially under personal control. More specifically, the Cognitive Skills Locus of Control Scale, measures the extent to which inmates perceive responsibility for their own personal problem behaviour.

A link has been made between Locus of Control and Critical Reasoning, one of the major cognitive deficits. Offenders’ most common thinking error is externalising the blame for their own actions, Yochelson and Samenow (1972), Walters and White (1989).

Therefore the direction of the desired change after the programme is:-

- Internal – UP
- External – DOWN
- Total – UP

Source:
The measure included in this test battery is the Craig, Franklin and Andrews (1984) Locus of Control Behaviour (LCB) scale. This is composed of 17 items with 6 point scales. The items originate from 20 items identified from work done by Mirels (1970) who identified a factor in Rotter’s I-E scale (1966) that concerns an individual’s belief in control over his/her own personal behaviour. The Cognitive Skills Locus of Control Scale differs from the LCB in that it has an extra item (see later) and the 6-point scale is reduced to 5. The LCB was devised using people with treatable problems (agoraphobia & speech problems). From the Craig et al (1984) article it is clear that the LCB was a valid and reliable measure. Further, the scale was a good predictor of relapse.
RESULTS

Overall Means
Social Problem Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Programme</th>
<th>Post Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertive- %</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive - %</td>
<td>89.71</td>
<td>77.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive - %</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>54.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solutions Provided - n</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>8.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Programme</th>
<th>Post Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>152.45</td>
<td>167.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>142.26</td>
<td>145.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locus of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Programme</th>
<th>Post Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>25.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barratt Impulsivity Scale - II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Programme</th>
<th>Post Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>20.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Planning</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>29.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>72.14</td>
<td>69.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table one. – Means scores for Cog Skills Psychometrics, Pre and Post Programme.
T Test Results
(Matched T test between pre and post programme psychometric scores,
reported to the p <= 0.05)

Social Problem Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solutions Provided</td>
<td>No significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locus of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barratt Impulsivity Scale - II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>No significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Planning</td>
<td>No significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>No significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table two. – T Test results for Cog Skills Psychometrics, matched comparisons between Pre and Post Programme psychometric results.
Social Problem Solving - Overall Means

Graph 1. Social Problem Solving Inventory
Consequences - Overall Means

Graph 2. Consequences
Locus Of Control

Graph 3. Locus of Control

- Locus of Control Pre Programme
- Locus of Control Post Programme
Barratt's Impulsivity Scale - II

Graph 4. Barratt Impulsivity Scale - II

Cog Skills
Problem Solving Skills Training Programme

Evaluation Summary

- The initial evaluation of the effectiveness of the Problem Solving Skills Inventory (PSST) programme is encouraging; with both short term outcome measures (psychometrics) and associated proxy measures demonstrating significant positive levels of change at points within a twelve month follow up period.
- The sample used were 230 offenders who participated in the PSST programme between 1999 and 2003. It consists of participants from 12 groups run in 2 establishments.
  - Mean age was 30.06 years, range 21 – 66 years
  - 2.6% were serving sentences of over 10 years
  - 53.5% serving less than 4 years
  - 43.9% serving between 4 and 10 years.
- For the short term outcome measures, there were significant positive levels of change in two of the three measures when the one month follow up data were compared to the pre programme baseline data.
- There was insufficient robust data to comment on follow up periods outwith these reported.
- The proxy measure of Governor’s Report analysis demonstrated a positive significant overall change in the post programme twelve month follow up period, with the most significant change occurring at the one and six month stages.
- The proxy measure of Security Category analysis again demonstrates promising with positive change being recorded at all follow up stages with the overall supervision level being reduced across the cohort.

- Current work ongoing
  - Introduction and analysis of new short-term measures (psychometrics)
  - Produce review of both the change indices and the proxy measures associated with the PSST programme. Due Nov 2004
  - Identify a comparison ‘control’ group to support findings.
  - Identification and attribution of reconviction data for the current cohort.
  - Analytic comparisons to enhance the predictability of reconviction levels of offenders participating in the PSST programme.

Future Direction

- To maintain and enhance levels of data collection which will contribute to an annual review of the programme
- Produce a longitudinal in depth review of the evaluation of the programme
- Consult with programme strategy team with a view to programme development
- To determine reliability and validity data for the short-term measures recently introduced.
Evaluation Of The Problem Solving Skills Training Programme

Jacqui Law
Analytic Services
October 2003
Problem Solving Skills Training (PSST) Programme

This bulletin describes the key findings from the evaluation of the SPS accredited Problem Solving Skills Training (PSST, McGuire, 1999) programme which is being run in two establishments (HMP Glenochil and HMP Barlinnie). The study herein is reflective of the programme effectiveness as described in terms of the change indices level of the psychometrics used to evaluate the programme at the pre and post stages. Additionally, there are two proxy measures included to give further dimension to the study. These measures are the number of governor's reports and the level of security category of the participants at the pre, during and post programme stages of the evaluation.

The study has restricted its programme evaluation to a cohort identified by the Correctional Effectiveness Unit (CEU) and the subsequent data which has undergone a 100% audit after capture from existing SPS databases and spreadsheets. The CEU database consists of 281 participant entries, however only 81.85% (n = 230) have been included in the study. The remaining 18.15% (n = 51) participants were excluded as the related establishment were unable to provide key data. A breakdown of the group data used is provided in the Programme Delivery, Establishments and Group Numbers Section.

PSST

PSST is a cognitive behavioural groupwork programme which is mindful of the 'What Works' principles (McGuire, 1995). As such, the programme is based on a substantial body of research that has indicated that many offenders have deficits in a number of cognitive skills required for adequate social adjustment. These are:-

- Interpersonal problem solving
- Means end reasoning
- Social perspective taking
- Critical reasoning
- Abstract reasoning
- Creative thinking
- Values

Format of the Programme

The PSST programme provides material for a 30 session, 60 hour programme focussed on factors influencing behaviour. At its core is a sequence of exercises designed to teach participants a number of social problem solving skills. These are then applied to aspects of offending and other situations.

The main components of the programme map onto the four principal areas of cognitive behavioural groupwork theory:-

- **Problem Solving** - a range of cognitive training and cognitive restructuring exercises. This section has been designed to teach a number of 'thinking skills' which have been isolated within research into social problem groups.
- **Self Management** - based on work in cognitive behavioural therapy, the importance of cognitive self instruction in the management of behaviour is demonstrated.

- **Social Interaction Training** – a section addressing how to deal with potential offending situations within the interpersonal context. This helps address the offenders' limited skills in this area

- **Perspective Taking** - many offences are a product of specific beliefs or attitudes which are conducive to certain forms of anti-social behaviours. These behaviours may reflect a lack of empathy and as such the moral reasoning training and the specific attitude changing methods in this section are aimed at a broad spectrum of thinking patterns.

**Programme Delivery, Establishments and Group Numbers**
To date, twelve groups have been held at HMP Glenochil since April 1999 and six at HMP Barlinnie since January 2001 and the analysis is evenly divided with each establishment providing 155 participants. The group data used is summarised in Tables 1 and 2 and Graph 1. These illustrations demonstrate the frequencies of the participants who have completed (67.8%, n = 156), failed to complete (7.4%, n = 17), were assessed for the programme (15.2%, n = 35) and whose who are currently undertaking the PSST programme in both HMP Glenochil and HMP Barlinnie (9.6%, n = 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenochil</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlinnie</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Establishment completion detail.

**Graph 1. Cohort completion rates.**

17/11/04
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Group 8</th>
<th>Group 9</th>
<th>Group 10</th>
<th>Group 11</th>
<th>Group 12</th>
<th>Group 13</th>
<th>Group 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No Data Available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Database breakdown by establishment
Prisoner Selection
Primarily, prospective group participants trigger a high criminogenic need for the admission onto a PSST programme during the risk and needs sentence management process1. Once triggered, the offender will attend a programme interview, the result of which is submitted to the programme board for consideration. This motivational interview is designed to comprehensively test those who trigger for the programme ensuring appropriate placement. If the programme board are assured of the offender’s need, that offender will undergo a battery of psychometric tests further ensuring their suitability for group inclusion. These psychometric tests are described under the analysis section and are an important part of the programme evaluative process.

Demographics
Of the 230 study participants the mean age is 30.6 years with a range of 21 - 66. See Table 3. The cohort consisted of males only as this programme is not available within the female offender establishment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample/Group</th>
<th>Age Range (Years)</th>
<th>Mean Age (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>21 - 66</td>
<td>30.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Age range and means

The participants were serving a range of sentences that were subsequently categorised. The categories are:
- Less than four years
- Four or more years but less than ten years
- Ten years and over.

The break down of the cohort was that 53.5% (n = 123) were serving less than 4 years; 43.9% (n = 101) were serving 4 years but less the 10; and 2.6 (n = 6) were serving 10 years and over. See Graph 2.

---

1 A high level of reactive anger (as indicated by a raised NAS score) and a high level of impulsivity (as indicated by a raised BIS II score).
Analysis
This study was conducted in relation to the analysis of change indices and changes or shifts in the measures of two proxy measures.

The change indices relate to the programme psychometrics used at the pre-programme and the one month, six months and twelve month post programme evaluation. The psychometric battery comprises of the:

**Novaco Anger Scale (NAS)**
Self report scale which assess the prisoner’s experience and expression of anger. The scale currently in use within the SPS is a scale containing 73 items that comprise two sections.

Part A contains the clinically orientated domains. Responses are made on a 3-point scale reflecting how representative the item is, ranging from 1 (never true) to 3 (always true).

Part B is an abbreviated improvement of the Novaco Provocation Inventory (NPI; Novaco, 1975, 1988). It contains 25 items that were intended to measure anger intensity across a range of potentially provoking situations. It has five sub-scales that range from 1 (not at all angry) to 4 (very angry). For both parts A and B, higher scores reflect greater levels of anger.

**Means-Ends Problem-Solving (MEPS, Platt and Spivack, 1975)**
The MEPS is an instrument designed to measure an important component of real-life problem-solving. The component measured is the individual’s ability to orient themselves to, and to achieve the ability to,
conceptualise means of moving towards a goal. Originally developed to measure this ability in impulsive adolescents, the MEPS has been administered to a wide variety of groups and has been employed in a number of research studies.

For this scale the prisoner is asked to complete a story to which he has been given a story stem, that is, a beginning (arousal) and an end (satisfaction). The responses are then analysed for the number of relevant means demonstrated by the offender when connecting the story parts. The higher the number of means the more adequate the offender's problem solving ability is deemed to be.

**Barrett Impulsivity Scale - 11 (BIS II, Barrett, 1985)**
The Barrett Impulsiveness Scale – 11 is designed to measure levels of impulsiveness. This tool identifies a prisoner's pattern of impulsive behaviour by measuring the extent to which a person acts without thinking (Motor Impulsiveness), the extent to which they make quick decisions (Attentional Impulsiveness) and the extent to which they may lack concern for the future (Non-planning Impulsiveness).

The scores gained from the BIS II are indicative of level of need for impulsiveness, high scores show high levels of impulsiveness.

The BIS II provides a measure of overall impulsiveness. The thirty questions responses are made on a 4-point scale reflecting how representative the item is, ranging from 1 (rarely/never) to 4 (almost always/always).

**Culture Free Self Esteem Scale Inventory (CFSE – 2, Battle 1992)**
A two-part self-report inventory which is intended to measure an individual's perception of self and have been proven to be of value in offering greater insights into client's subjective feelings.

The inventory consists of 40 questions that require dichotomous yes or no responses. The scores reflect the offender's level of self-esteem.

Despite constant reminders, the post programme follow ups were not conducted in a timely manner in either establishment. The upshot being that the number of psychometrics available for audit in the latter post follow up stages of the programme was very low and resulted in the twelve month follow up data having to be dropped from the analysis due to the resultant unacceptably reduced statistical power of the analysis. See Table 4.
For all of the psychometric tests the means scores for the one, six and twelve month post programme follow up periods were statistically compared with the pre programme baseline scores. As can be seen from Table 5\(^2\), there were few statistically significant changes seen in the four measures. These statistically significant changes are all in a positive direction.

**Paired Sample t-tests for PSST Psychometric Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychometrics</th>
<th>Pre to 1 month post</th>
<th>Pre to 6 month post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAS A</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Not Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS B</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Not Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS D3A</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSE A</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Not Sig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Paired sample t tests for PSST.

T-tests are limited to situations where two conditions (e.g. Pre programme and follow up 2) are being tested. As such, it was considered appropriate to conduct an analysis of variance (ANOVA). This permits the comparison of two or more conditions, (e.g. Pre programme and follow up 1 and follow up 2 etc) to determine whether there is any main effect or interaction between any of the variables included in the study such as establishment, status and sentence length. The main effect determines whether or not differences in scores, number of governor’s reports, and security category level result in differences in treatment effectiveness (e.g. reductions in negative outcomes). The interaction enables the evaluation of other differences that may be the result of unique combinations of two factors (e.g. combination of sentence length and establishment).

**NAS A, B and Total**

When the two factor ANOVA was conducted on the NAS components and combined with the variable of sentence length, a main effect was seen across the three components but there was no interaction in any of the cases.

When the same two factor analysis was conducted using the NAS components but combining these with the variable of establishment, the findings were replicated.

\(^2\) The table has been abridged for ease of viewing
BIS II, Motor, Attentional and Non-planning
In the two factor analysis of variance of the BIS II motor, attentional and non-planning components, there was no main effect or interaction when combined with either the establishment or the sentence length variables.

Proxy Measures
Governor's Reports
As previously mentioned, two proxy measures were included in this report to provide an added dimension to the analysis. The number of governor's reports recorded in PR for the offenders who completed the programme were obtained at the pre, during, one month, six months and twelve month post programme stages. The pre programme figure was taken as the baseline with the during, one, six and twelve month's figures being statistically compared\(^3\) to it. The results are very promising in that there was a significant change at each of these levels with the trend being a reduction in the mean number of governor's reports being recorded up to the six month follow up period.

In an analysis of variance, the data pertaining to governor's reports were analysed in relation to the establishment, sentence and status variables.

Governor's Reports/Establishment
In a two factor ANOVA, there was a significant main effect of establishment whereas there was no interaction, See Graph 3.

Graph 3. Gov Reports and Establishment ANOVA

\(^3\) Repeated measure t-test.
Governor's Reports/Sentence
In a three factor ANOVA there were no significant main effect or significant interactions. See Graph 4.
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Graph 4. Gov Reports and Sentence ANOVA

Governor's Report/Status
In a three factor analysis of variance there was no significant main effect of status. Due to the small numbers involved in the non completer and assessed categories, any significant interaction was non calculable. See Graph 5.
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Graph 5. Gov Reports and Status ANOVA
Security Categories
When looking at this proxy measure data it was necessary to conduct a non-parametric analysis as the data is categorical, that is, high, medium and low risk.

Again the pre programme category was recorded for each participant who completed the programme and used as a baseline when comparing the during, one month, six months and twelve month post programme follow ups. Once again the findings were promising with positive significant change being demonstrated at all stages.

In an analysis of variance, the data pertaining to security categories were analysed in relation to the establishment, status and sentence variables.

Security Category/Establishment
The two way ANOVA showed a significant main effect of establishment but no significant interaction. See Graph 6.

Security Category/Status
The three factor ANOVA showed a main effect of Status. Due to the small numbers involved in the non completer and assessed categories, any significant interaction was non calculable. See Graph 7.
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Security Category/Sentence

In the three factor ANOVA there was a significant main effect of sentence length on security category however due to small numbers of 120 months and over, an interaction effect was non calculable. See Graph 8.

Summary
With regard to the psychometric assessment of this programme - the findings were not of particular interest, however the results could be indicative of poor data collection, particularly the post programme psychometric follow up. This could account for the divergence of levels of change between the
psychometric findings and the proxy measures which were more promising. An example of a reason behind the psychometric ‘failure’ to pick up on programme effectiveness may lie in the psychometrics used. For example, the MEPS completion requires that the prisoner is given the same story stems four times in the space of just over a year. It is understandable that he will simply repeat the same story.

McGuire (1999) suggested that the PSST programme be evaluated through the use of psychometrics and analysed in terms of demographic data. In the SPS Accreditation document there were no specifically suggested psychometrics. Due to personnel changes it has not been possible to determine the process involved in identifying the NAS, BIS II, CFSE –I and the MEPS as the preferred tools.

While the programme has a clear overall structure and specified programme objectives, it can be considered that the psychometrics used to evaluate the programme do not meet the need adequately and this may be reflected in the poor results in relation to the programme psychometric change indices. As is seen in the previously section, the psychometric change indices are not indicative of the changes seen in the proxy measure changes.

The PSST programme used by SPS draws from the four principle areas of the cognitive behavioural work of,

- Problem solving
- Self management
- Social interaction training
- Perspective taking

Given the model in use, it may be appropriate to consider applying psychometrics that are appropriate to each of these specific areas in order to evaluate the outcome of this programme effectively. This would enable a more comprehensive, reliable evaluation of the programme and would have the additional effect of identifying any aspect of problem solving where an offender may still display a deficit. This being the case, the need for follow-up work or booster activities can be identified. It is suggested that alternative psychometrics be investigated along the lines of those outlined below.

- **Problem solving**
  - Cognitive Behavioural Semi Structured Interview (CBSSI, Porporino and Fabiano, 1998)

- **Self management**
  - Locus Of Control Of Behaviour (LCB, Craig et al, 1984)
  - Barrett Impulsivity Scale (2nd Ed), (BIS – II, Barrett, 1994)

- **Social interaction training**
  - Situation Response Assessment (SRA, Clark, 1999).

---

5 This finding was borne out in the 100% review of the programme psychometrics
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- **Perspective taking**
  - Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS, Walters, 1995)
  - Perspective Taking Assessment (PTA, Law and Hedger, 1998).

In addition to this consideration and the contribution it may make to furthering the design of the programme, it should be borne in mind that a well designed programme is not sufficient for effective prisoner interventions. Not only should the programme target criminogenic need, the practitioners of the programme also need to consider the offenders learning styles and characteristics and match them to the programme. This is a fundamental of the principle of treatment responsivity. This is the term used to describe client based factors which influence the potential for positive effect. Therefore in conjunction with the above proposed amendments. Effort should be ongoing to create a robust demographic database which records an offender’s complete treatment programme history including completion and non-completion data. This can be used to inform future treatment readiness and permit more effective targeting of motivated offenders who will respond better to the treatment programmes.
Drug Relapse Prevention Programme

Evaluation Summary

- This initial evaluation of the effectiveness of the Drug Relapse Prevention Programme (DRPP) is encouraging; with both short term outcome measures and associated proxy measures demonstrating positive levels of change when pre and post programme follow up data are compared.
- The sample used were 186 offenders who completed the DRPP between 1999 and 2003. It consisted of participants from 37 groups run in 4 establishments.
  - Mean age was 30 years, range 19 – 56 years
- In the short-term outcome measures, there were significant levels of change in five of the six measures when the post programme data were compared to the pre programme baseline data.
- The proxy measure of Governor’s Report analysis demonstrated a positive significant overall change at the during and post programme follow up periods
- The proxy measure of failed MDT’s at the during and post programmes stages also demonstrated significant levels of change at the during and post programme follow up periods

Current Work

- Produce a review of both the short term change indices and proxy measures associated with the DRPP – Oct/Nov 2004
- Identify a comparison 'control' group to support findings.
- Identify reconviction data for the cohort and compare findings to predicted levels of reconviction

Future direction

- Produce annual reviews of both the change indices and the proxy measures associated with the Drug Relapse Prevention Programme.
- Produce a longitudinal in depth review of the evaluation of the programme
Preliminary Report on DRPP
(Up to May 2002).

Jacqui Law
Analytic Services
Feb 2004
Introduction

The Drug Relapse Prevention Programme, DRPP, was introduced into the Scottish Prison Service in 1998. Data held from 1998 to May 2002 showed that thirty one DRPP groups had been initiated in four establishments: Edinburgh, Glenochil, Perth and Shotts. A total of 271 prisoners had commenced and 132 completed the DRPP programme between 1998 and May 2002.

This interim report discusses the pre and post DRPP psychometric scores of 174 prisoners, which represents the data currently collated on the DRPP database (See ‘DRPP Data 28.01.2004’). A fuller report will be compiled when all remaining data from May 2002 onwards, have been collected, scored, entered onto the database and subsequently analysed.

The average age of the cohort is 32.5 years (sd = 6.3).

DRPP Psychometrics

The DRPP data will be discussed with reference to the DRPP battery of seven psychometrics: - Barrett Impulsiveness Scale, Coping Responses Inventory, Culture Free Self-Esteem, Drug Abuse Screening Test, General Health Questionnaire, Inventory of Interpersonal Problems and Severity of Opiate Dependency Scale.

This partial DRPP data was analysed by reference to pre and post score histogram distributions for the population and t-test of mean scores. The two tailed, t-tests were carried out as matched pair t-tests. When referring to tables summarising the inventories and their domain in this report, these will be presented in the final report.

Barrett Impulsiveness Scale II (BIS II)

Barrett (1994) developed the BIS based on the theoretical grounding that indicates that "much aggressive behaviour is underpinned by impulsively". The 30 question psychometric covers three domains: - Non Planning, Motor Impulsiveness and Cognitive Impulsivity. The three domains can be better understood as:-

Non Planning – lack of concern for the future
Motor Impulsiveness – acting without thinking
Cognitive Impulsiveness – making quick decisions.

The pre and post BIS II distributions indicate a significant shift, \( t(91) = 5.25, p<0.05, \) in a positive direction (decrease in mean score). The pre and post BIS II scores are 70.62 (sd = 11.18) and 65.13 (sd = 10.08) respectively. The total post BIS II scores indicate a decrease of 7.8% from the pre score.
Domains of Non Planning, Motor Impulsiveness and Cognitive Impulsivity decrease respectively, between Pre and Post DRPP, by 8.3, 10.2 and 8.0%. (DO T TEST ON THESE!!)

Coping Responses Inventory (CRI)

The CR , (Moos 1990), examines behaviour and cognitive strategies in relation to 'Avoiding' and 'Approaching' coping mechanisms, giving a total of eight possible subgroups. The CRI domains are referred to as:

- Logical Analysis
- Positive Appraisal
- Seeking Support
- Problem Solving
- Cognitive Avoidance
- Acceptance
- Alternative Rewards
- Emotional Discharge

The mean pre and post CRI scores were 60.1 (sd = 35.1) and 55.48 (sd = 24.2). The shift in CRI mean between pre and post scores was not significant.

Interestingly, with reference to the summary table, change in the post CRI in relation to the 'Avoiding' coping mechanism scores were noticeably greater than that evident in the 'Approach' scores. Improvements in the 'Avoiding' scores range from 7.5% to 24.2% whereas the 'Approach' scores show little or no improvement in the post scores. (It will be useful to score and statistically test the 'Avoiding' and 'Approaching' CRI scores separately when comparing the pre and post scores as these dimensions may respond differently to intervention. Data has not yet been analysed with regard to subgroups on the Behavioural and Cognitive coping strategies, but this will be carried out. In addition it may be insightful to t-test pre and post CRI scores across the four subgroups: - Cognitive – Approach, Cognitive – Avoiding, Behaviour – Approach, Behaviour – Avoiding as some subgroups might be more sensitive to intervention than others)

Culture Free Self-Esteem (CFS-E)

The CFS-E assesses the dimensions of self esteem in an individual. Self Esteem, the perception the individual possesses of his / her own worth, develops with maturity and experience, (Battle 1982, 1990). Self-esteem is a composite psychological construct, which Battle argues can be understood by reference to a number of facets or components. Therefore, the CFS-E has three main domains:

- General Self-esteem ( an overall perception of worth )
- Social Self-esteem ( an overall perception of the quality of relationships with peers )
- Personal self-esteem ( an individuals most intimate)
perception of self worth)

Although both pre and post scores for CFS-E fall into the 'Intermediate Self-Esteem' category i.e. the scores lie in the range 20 to 26, there is a statistically significant change, \( t(88) = -3.62, p < 0.05 \), in the post total scores. Comparison of pre and post CFS-E distributions indicate an increase in scores which implies an overall shift in the direction of increased self-esteem in the post programme data.

Each of the three CFS-E component scores, General, Social and Personal show improvement, with increased levels of scoring in the post data.

**Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST)**

The original DAST (Harvey, ?????) was a 10-question assessment tool used in relation to determining the level of severity of drug usage and problems relating from drug use.

Mean pre and post DAST scores, 7.43 and 8 respectively, fall into the category Substantial – Severe level of problems related to Drug Abuse. There was no significant difference between the pre and post DAST scores. However, it is worth noting that the low number of post DRPP scores would invalidate any meaningful conclusion in regard to the DAST\(^1\).

DAST 20 has now replaced the DAST. Investigation is ongoing to determine the date of change and any effect this will have on subsequent analysis.

**General Health Questionnaire 28 (GHQ 28)**

Goldberg and Williams (1988), devised the GHQ 28 which assesses psychological components of ill health and psychiatric disorders.

Comparison of the pre and post scores for GHQ 28 were found to be significant, \( t(81) = 4.88, p<0.05 \), in the sample of prisoners completing the Drug Relapse Prevention Programme. The mean GHQ 28 pre and post scores, are 4.73 (sd = 6.05) and 1.99 (sd = 4.17) respectively.

The General Health Questionnaire has four domains:

- Somatic Symptoms
- Anxiety / Insomnia
- Social Dysfunction
- Severe Depression

Each of the GHQ 28 domains showed a reduction in score which reflects a reduction in the severity of psychological ill health, in the post condition scores. The reduction in GHQ 28 domain scores ranged from 40.7 to 61.2%.

\(^1\) This point should be addressed in the 'catch up exercise' about to commence.
Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP)

The IIP, (Horowitz et al. 1988), consists of 127 items concerning difficulties relating to other people. The inventory has six subscales: -

- Assertive
- Sociable
- Submissive
- Intimate
- Responsible
- Controlling

The data for the pre and post IIP scores indicated a positive shift. There was a significant decrease between the pre and post programme General Health Questionnaire 28 mean, from 71.74 to 52.35, $t(82) = 5.56$, $p<0.05$.

It is worth noting that each of the subscales demonstrate an improvement\(^2\), in the post programme scores. The decrease in the pre to post score subscales range from 21.3 to 27.3%.

Severity of Opiate Dependency Scale (SOD)

The SOD Scale (Author????) looks at the effects of Opiate usage, categorising this as: -

- Physical / Affective,
- Withdrawal Relief,
- Subjective Dependence

As in the case of the DAST, very few post SOD scores were available at the time of writing this reporting\(^3\). The pre and post means for SOD were 28.8 (sd = 14.68 ) and 0.76 (sd = 0.76 ) respectively. Therefore no meaningful conclusion can be made with regard to SOD at this time.

Summary

Of the seven psychometrics looked at in this initial analysis, four indicate a statistically significant improvement in post DRPP scores. Significant differences between the pre and post programme mean scores were evident in the:-

1. Barrett Impulsiveness Scale
2. Culture Free Self-Esteem
3. General Health Questionnaire

\(^2\) Decrease
\(^3\) This point should be addressed in the 'catch up exercise' about to commence.
4. Inventory of Interpersonal Problems

Of the other three psychometrics scores two were not found to be appropriate for meaningful interpretation at this juncture i.e. Drug Abuse Screening Test and Severity of Opiate Dependency Scale primarily because of low numbers in the post programme condition.

The remaining psychometric, Coping Responses Inventory may be more usefully analysed by separately analysing ‘Avoiding’ and ‘Approaching’ strategies as these categories may respond differently to intervention.

Actions

These will include determining appropriate proxy measures, reconviction and return to custody data and perhaps a behavioural report. On the latter point an investigation will be made to determine the usefulness of collecting and collating file data which records the scores of the Prisoner Behaviour Rating Scale (PBRS, Cooke, ???). There may be a resource issue with this but this will be considered as part of the investigation. If considered feasible this data will form a very useful part of the overall Drug Relapse Prevention Programme analysis.

An interesting addition would be inclusion pre and post DRPP Mandatory Drugs Testing (MDT) results for the prisoner population who completed the programme. However, at this time there is no systematic way of collating MDT results. Enquiries are ongoing to determine how best to overcome this issue and taking failed or passed MDT results as a percentage over a period of one year prior to and one year after the programme may be an acceptable method.

Previously held data has been tabulated to identify which prisoners complete, drop out or are removed from DRPP and this process will be completed to bring the information up to date. It is planned to correlate pre psychometric scores with these variables, the aim being to better understand why some prisoners do not complete the DRPP. It may also be useful to complete a similar analysis on individual DRPP groups as this might identify why some DRPP groups were more successful than others. Analysis by Establishment is also possible, if required, once a complete data set has been achieved.

The pre and post data from the DRPP has, in this instance, been used retrospectively. There is perhaps a case for utilising such information at the onset of a programme on prisoners who score particularly high on, say, the GHQ 28 and who may be more at risk from dropping out of the programme. Such use of the psychometric data may benefit Programme Officers and Facilitators in the selection process, or in supporting groups or individual prisoners.

Finally, data with regard to reoffending will be collated and presented as part of the findings. This may be restricted to a comparison between programme completers and programme non completers, but much effort will be made to advocate and capture data relating to a control group of matched participants.