Warwickshire Probation Trust

Inspection report

Unique reference number:	57986
Name of lead inspector:	Maria Navarro HMI
Last day of inspection:	27 January 2012
Type of provider:	Probation Trust
Address:	Warwickshire Probation Trust Justice Centre, Newbold Terrace, Leamington Spa Warwickshire CV32 4EL.
Telephone number:	01926682288

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) works in partnership with Her Majesty's Inspectorates of Prison and Probation and inspects the management and provision of learning and skills for offenders across the whole range of custodial establishments and probation areas. Inspections may include those serving whole or part of their sentence in the community.

Inspectors judge the quality of the provision against the *Common Inspection Framework* for further education and skills 2009 (*Common Inspection Framework* 2009) and contribute to the inspection frameworks of Her Majesty's Inspectorates of Prisons and Probation.

Information about the probation trust

The Warwickshire Probation Trust (WPT, the trust) has three local delivery units in Leamington Spa, Nuneaton and Rugby. Offenders living in the south of the county can also report to a centre in Redditch. The trust serves the wider Warwickshire county, with a total population of over 536,000 inhabitants. It has two approved premises. There are no prisons in Warwickshire. The trust's current caseload is approximately 1,750 offenders. The percentage of male offenders is 88%. Approximately 84% of the caseload describe themselves as White British and 16% are from other backgrounds. Approximately 50% of offenders are unemployed. The unemployment rates in Warwickshire vary from 1.5% in Stratford-upon-Avon to 3.8% in Nuneaton and Bedworth against the unemployment rate of 8.4% for the United Kingdom. The percentage of Warwickshire's non-white population is 4.4% well below the national average of 9.1%.

The education, training and employment team (ETE) report to the Assistant Chief Officer for Interventions. The team is managed by the Partnerships and Projects Manager. The team comprises a dedicated manager for the veterans' project, three ETE advisers and an administration officer. In addition there is a Next Step adviser and two members of staff from Coventry,Solihull and Warwickshire Partnership (CSWP), the Careers Guidance Company, currently working in the ETE team. These staff are not directly managed by the trust. Staff support offenders to access community based education, training and employment opportunities as well as deliver training through a range of sub-contracts.

The Probation Area became a trust in April 2010.

Information about the offender learning and employability providers:

Lead providers and their subcontractors	Number of learners on discrete provision 2010-2011	Types of provision
The Manchester College – NOMS ESF On Track project Warwickshire Probation Trust ETE Team JHP Training Train Brains Training Ltd Business Enterprise Support Ltd Emergency Life Support Training Bernadette Marshall Training	550	Assessment Case management Discretionary Funding Skills for life First Aid Construction Skills Certification Scheme (CSCS)

CSWP Ltd (Coventry, Solihull, Warwickshire Partnership) Warwickshire Probation Trust ETE Team	300	Next Step – information and advice
West Mercia Probation Trust – AIM Partnership Warwickshire Probation Trust ETE Team	30	Innovative mentoring project – women and veterans
Skills Funding Agency (SFA) Discrete SFL funding in the community Warwickshire College Coventry City College (Dec10 – March 11)	60	Discrete SFL

The following text is Ofsted's contribution to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation's offender management inspection.

Summary report

Overall effectiveness of provision	**Grade: satisfactory**

Capacity to improve	**Grade: satisfactory**

	Grade descriptor
Quality of provision Assessment and sentence planning Implementation of interventions	satisfactory
Achieving and sustaining outcomes	satisfactory
Leadership and management	satisfactory

| Equality and diversity including arrangements to support vulnerability | satisfactory |

Overall effectiveness, including capacity to improve

The trust delivered a comprehensive information, advice and guidance service to its offenders and they benefitted from the support the probation staff delivered to them. The links between offender managers and ETE staff were not fully developed. Offenders received an adequate, basic initial assessment of their needs overall.

The quality of teaching and learning was satisfactory overall. In some cases, the offender's individual learning plan contained insufficiently specific targets. Offenders had access to some innovative community based projects and many benefitted from tailored ETE interventions. The quality of the work placements and unpaid work opportunities provided a good match for their goals and aspirations. However, the provision to meet the additional learning needs of offenders and to give accreditation for their newly acquired vocational skills was insufficient.

The trust placed great emphasis on delivering good employability outcomes for its offenders. Leaders, managers and staff worked hard to plan and carefully monitor the ETE interventions. Communications with employers and other partners were good but the relationship with some colleges remained under-developed. The trust responded well towards meeting the diverse needs of many offenders but it did not offer specialist provision to support those offenders with additional learning difficulties.

The trust demonstrated that it had a satisfactory capacity to improve. It had met and exceeded all its employability targets since the last inspection, however, the achievement of educational awards had decreased in the last two years. The trust planned well for the future implementation of ETE projects and it had responded quickly to the growing demands for suitable provision for female and ex-servicemen offenders. Although the quality of their information advice and guidance (IAG) interventions was evaluated well, the trust had not developed yet a rigorous teaching observation system to monitor the quality of the vocational and educational programmes that it offered. The self-assessment report although largely accurate was insufficiently critical when describing certain aspects of the provision.

What does the Warwickshire Probation Trust need to do to improve further?

■ Strengthen the links between offender managers and ETE workers so that managers are well informed about the ETE opportunities and regularly updated on the progress learners make.

■ Expand the ETE offer by developing relationships with more colleges and training providers to ensure there is sufficient accredited vocational and specialist provision available to meet the needs of different group of offenders.

■ Improve the analysis of data to identify the performance of different programmes. Set up challenging targets for improving achievement in the worse performing courses and to ensure equity of achievement across the Trust's diverse groups of learners.

■ Develop the quality improvement processes by establishing a rigorous system of evaluation of learning by observation and by making the self-assessment process more inclusive and critical of the ETE provision.

Offender perspective - learning and employability as confirmed by inspectors

Learners valued the information, advice and guidance they received from the Nextstep and ETE advisors, however not all learners were aware that 20% of the community payback hours in their sentences could be utilised by attending learning activities such as literacy and numeracy courses. Offenders enjoyed their learning and they developed useful skills through placements and unpaid work, however many would like to access more practical workshops to enhance their employment opportunities. They developed good relationships with the trust's staff and greatly appreciated the care and support they received from them. The majority of offenders had improved their self-esteem and confidence by taking part in the projects and work placements organised by the trust. Several learners living in approved premises identified the need for support to help them adapt to the developments and modernisation in life outside of institutions, for example using technology and obtaining a bank account.

Main inspection report

The quality of provision

Grade: satisfactory

Assessment and sentence planning

ETE advisors delivered comprehensive IAG to support offenders well. Offenders took part in a thorough IAG interview that was effective in identifying barriers to education, employment and training and that enables offenders to visualise their future skills and career goals. IAG advisors were skilful in ensuring offenders felt at ease and openly discuss their barriers to participation. Offender learners received good support from the ETE team that helped them to become more motivated at the beginning of their order and to remain engaged in their intervention or programmes.

Some offenders received frequent contact by staff, particularly during difficult or stressful personal times, to check on their well being and offer any help available.

Most offenders received an adequate assessment of their literacy and numeracy needs and these were correctly recorded in their individual learning plans. The trust also identified the preferred learning styles of individual offenders and they were able to undertake a questionnaire that identified whether they had any hidden or unknown learning difficulties.

The links between offender managers and ETE workers were insufficient. Not all offender managers had a good understanding of the ETE offer. They did not have an accurate picture of the quality of achievements or outcomes into employment achieved by the ETE team. Some ETE workers did not always update the offender managers of the progress offenders were making through their interventions. In some cases, offender managers had not carried out the first move initial basic assessment of offender needs.

Implementation of interventions

The quality of teaching and learning was overall satisfactory. Inspectors observed a good literacy session that had a detailed lesson plan and scheme of work. The teacher had a good rapport with learners and they were keen to learn; readily sharing their responses to the tasks and confidently reading aloud. They were well behaved, focused and engaged. They made good progress in the lesson, demonstrating their newly acquired knowledge despite many of the tasks being mundane and worksheet based.

Many learners had clear and useful individual learning plans containing specific and measurable targets that were appropriate to their needs. However some of the offenders' learning plans for literacy and numeracy contained insufficiently specific short-term targets and in some cases, the sequencing of the learning priorities was not correct.

The trust delivered a very tailored ETE offer that met the requirements of many individual offenders. The trust had a small caseload and was using discretionary funding well to meet the individual vocational training needs of many offenders as opposed to providing interventions for groups of offenders. In the past year, some offenders had accessed specialist training in the construction and electrical industries that had allowed them to obtain highly recognised and credible qualifications that resulted in paid employment. Offenders had further benefitted from funds to set up their own businesses and purchase the necessary protective equipment and tools to work in their chosen trade. In many cases, the trust had delivered self-employment training programmes to support those offenders who had been unemployed for a long time, back into employment.

Offenders accessed innovative and supportive community-based projects. The Choose 2 Change project recently set up to support offenders in the community,

offered them volunteering opportunities, information, advice, guidance, personal, social and vocational skills training. It had created strong links with local schools to raise awareness of the criminal justice system. Presentations led by ex-offenders were well received by staff and young people in schools. The Veteran Contact Point at the town hall in Nuneaton offered information, advice and guidance services to offenders in the community who were ex-forces. Staff had an in-depth knowledge of barriers this group of offenders faced and had forged excellent productive partnerships with specialist support services, such as community health psychological services. Good links with the probation service ensured the timely referrals to the project.

The specialist provision for the most vulnerable groups in the trust was insufficient. A women's project was available only when the trust had sufficient number of offenders to join it. There was no specialist provision for offenders with specific learning difficulties and/or disabilities or other vulnerable groups. Provision to meet the needs of elderly residents living in approved premises was also insufficient. Many of the approved premise's residents in Leamington were older offenders and the trust's offer focused on completing their education and generic training for work was inappropriate. However, unpaid work and volunteer placements were well matched to individual needs.

The number of training providers available to the trust was insufficient. Few training providers were operating locally to enable offenders to explore a range of training options. Local colleges and Adult and Community Learning (ACL) providers offered most provision that was available, but offenders did not always feel comfortable accessing mainstream courses. Some supportive provision was available at Rugby via the local college inclusion group. Residents living in approved premises had access to few accredited vocational training options. Currently CSCS cards and first aid training were the main vocational options. Residents reported the need for practical skills workshops to better prepare them for the world of work and help them develop the vocational skills needed to enter useful employment.

Achieving and sustaining outcomes

Grade: satisfactory

Offenders achieved good employment outcomes at the termination of their sentence order. Over the past few years, the trust had increasingly achieved higher employment outcomes for offenders meeting and exceeding the targets set by the Ministry of Justice. Last year, over 60% of the offenders obtained employment by the time they finished their order. Similarly, forty eight offenders who were not engaged in education, training or employment (NEETS), obtained employment after successfully completing their order and participating in the On Track programme. Offenders enjoyed being back in work and establishing a positive routine in their daily lives.

Offender-learners developed good practical and personal skills on unpaid work and in volunteering placements. Learners in community and partnership projects were gaining in confidence, developing good communication skills and demonstrated a commitment to and the development of the organisations they were based in. Employers reported that learners made a positive contribution to their businesses and saw tangible growth in the learners' knowledge and skills. They worked well in teams and had become an integral part of the workforce team. In unpaid work projects, learners were working well together under the direction of their supervisor. They were developing good practical skills and had a good understanding of safe working practices. Learners felt safe and enjoyed their work placements.

The educational achievement rate was low. The trust had met its targets for referral into education for the past few years and for achievement of educational awards. However, the educational award target was very low and the last year only two in every ten offenders that were referred to education had achieved an award. The rate of achievement of literacy and numeracy qualifications varied greatly across the different projects. The Train Brain provider last year delivered 100% achievement of literacy and numeracy qualifications whilst the success rate for this type of programme in the approved premises provision in Leamington was very low at 10%.

The trust did not provide sufficient accreditation of the skills offenders acquired on unpaid work placements. Learners on community payback projects learnt a wide range of new skills that were not formally accredited and subsequently offenders did not achieve any recognised qualifications to help them gain jobs that were more skilled.

Leadership and management

Grade: satisfactory

The trust placed a strong focus on delivering employability outcomes for offenders. Offender managers and ETE staff were very committed and worked hard towards meeting and exceeding the nationally set targets. The trust held regular and frequent reviews of each of the projects delivered by the ETE team to ensure that the contractual targets and outcomes were being met. External partners were involved in these reviews and regular updates were shared with the board highlighting any risks and barriers to achievement. Although there was no written strategy for the ETE function, the trust planned well for future developments, considering comprehensive risks and balancing these against the positive employment outcomes for offenders. The trust delivers good value for money through its ETE provision.

Probation staff maintained very good communication with employers. They were confident about their productive and useful relationship with the trust. There had

been several successes in securing permanent employment for offenders however one employer had some unreliable offenders referred. Employers received the necessary information about each referred offender with regards to the safety of other employees and the clients they worked with ensuring no placement was inappropriate. Volunteer placement providers enjoyed particularly effective communication with the probation staff resulting in a good match between the offenders' aspirations and the volunteering work roles.

The trust had developed many useful links with support agencies and volunteering charities in the community. However, relationships with some local colleges were under-developed and the trust had not been able to work collaboratively with them to meet the individual needs of some offenders.

The analysis of data to inform managerial decisions on the ETE offer was insufficient. Data on achievement of educational awards were not sufficiently analysed to identify good performance and consequently manage the quality of different programmes. There was little understanding of how different groups of learners achieved. Although the trust used staff and offender feedback effectively to adapt and shape the ETE offer, it did not conduct a regular needs analysis to decide what programmes would be most beneficial to offenders.

The promotion of equality of opportunity and diversity by the trust was satisfactory. The trust appropriately highlighted its diversity commitment to offenders during their induction. Offenders were aware of the different equality policies and felt their diverse needs were respected. The trust had created a comprehensive range of ETE interventions to meet the specific needs of female offenders on the recognition that the previous offer was insufficient to meet their specific needs. A meaningful amount of the trust's caseload of offenders were ex- servicemen and the trust had quickly established a multi partnership project to support their individual needs. The trust carried out impact assessments on all ETE policies including new projects at the planning stage. A member of the ETE team attended the trust's equalities and diversity group to ensure their views were taken into account when implementing planning new processes. The trust had comprehensive safeguarding policies and codes of practice for managing the safeguarding of its offenders. All staff had undergone a criminal record bureau (CRB) check and they received annual training on safeguarding procedures. Learners receive the appropriate information on health and safety as part of their induction into their ETE intervention and they felt safe.

Some of the quality improvement processes within the department were underdeveloped. The trust underwent adequate quality monitoring of the information, advice and guidance they delivered for the Next step contract. However, it did not evaluate the quality of learning of any other educational or vocational learning that took place. There were no regular auditing processes of offenders' learning files in place. The trust carried out a rigorous self-assessment of the IAG provision they delivered on behalf of their contractors. Their ETE self-assessment process built on the information gathered for their IAG contracts and it involved some of the ETE staff. However, the process did not involve other stakeholders sufficiently. The self-assessment report was extensive but not appropriately critical

when describing all aspects of the provision. The development plan did not use data well to identify targets for improvement in the achievement of educational awards.

Information about the inspection

1. Two of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI), assisted by the partnerships development manager at Warwicshire Probation Trust as co-ordinator, carried out the inspection. Inspectors also took account of provider's most recent development plans and data on learners and their achievement.

2. Inspectors used a range of methods to gather the views of learners including group and individual interviews. They also visited learning and information, advice and guidance sessions. Inspectors collected evidence from the projects the trust offers.

Record of Main Findings (RMF)							
Provider Name:	Warwickshire Probation Trust		**Inspection No**		57986		
Learning types: 14 − 16: Young apprenticeships; Diplomas; **16-18 Learner responsive:** FE full-time and part-time courses, Foundation learning tier, including E2E); **19+ responsive:** FE full- and part-time courses; **Employer responsive:** Train to Gain, apprenticeships **Blank Column**: insert Judicial Services or Nextstep as appropriate							

Grades **using the 4 point scale** 1: Outstanding; 2: Good; 3: Satisfactory; 4: Inadequate	**Overall**						
Approximate number of enrolled learners	600						
Overall effectiveness	3						
Capacity to improve	3						
A. Outcomes for learners	3						
A1. How well do learners achieve and enjoy their learning?	3						
A1.a) How well do learners attain their learning goals?	4						
A1.b) How well do learners progress?	3						
A2. How well do learners improve their economic and social well-being through learning and development?	2						
A3. How safe do learners feel?	3						
A4. *Are learners able to make informed choices about their own health and well being?**							
A5. *How well do learners make a positive contribution to the community?**							
B. Quality of provision	3						
B1. How effectively do teaching, training and assessment support learning and development?	3						
B2. How effectively does the provision meet the needs and interests of users?	3						
B3. How well partnerships with schools, employers, community groups and others lead to benefits for learners?	3						
B4. How effective are the care, guidance and support learners receive in helping them to achieve?	2						
C. Leadership and management	3						
C1. How effectively do leaders and managers raise expectations and promote ambition throughout the organisation?	3						
C2. *How effectively do governors and supervisory bodies provide leadership, direction and challenge?**							
C3. How effectively does the provider promote the safeguarding of learners?	3						
C4. How effectively does the provider actively promote equality and diversity, tackle discrimination and narrow the achievement gap?	3						
C5. How effectively does the provider engage with users to support and promote improvement?	2						
C6. How effectively does self-assessment improve the quality of the provision and outcomes for learners?	4						
C7. How efficiently and effectively does the provider use its available resources to secure value for money?	2						

*where applicable to the type of provision

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, work-based learning and skills training, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It rates council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this report in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 08456 404040, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may copy all or parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes, as long as you give details of the source and date of publication and do not alter the information in any way.

Royal Exchange Buildings
St Ann's Square
Manchester, M2 7LA

T: 08456 404040
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.ofsted.gov.uk

© Crown copyright 2012