

**Evaluation of Kainos Lancaster Farms Challenge to
Change Programme, incorporating a report on changes in
psychometric 'interim measures', 2022**

**'BEFORE' & 'AFTER' INTERVIEWS WITH CHALLENGE TO CHANGE
PARTICIPANTS**

KAINOS STAFF INTERVIEWS

PRISON WING STAFF INTERVIEWS

ANALYSIS OF DROPOUTS

OBSERVATIONS OF KAINOS C2C DELIVERY

CHANGES TO THE 'INTERIM MEASURES' OF 2020 AND 2021 GRADUATES

Tom Ellis, Chris Lewis

Evaluation Solutions UK

October 2022

Executive Summary (Pages 2-8)

Previous research, dating back to 2001, has shown the effectiveness of the Kainos Prisons programme Challenge to Change (C2C). However, to satisfy the requirements of the Correctional Services Advice & Accreditation Panel (CSAAP), such research needs to be updated from time to time. A wide-ranging research exercise into the Challenge to Change programme at Lancaster Farms has therefore been carried out during 2021 and 2022.

This report combines the key findings from our analysis of the following areas:

- 'Before' interviews with ten current participants and seven 'after' interviews with graduates from these ten 'before' interviews.
- Interviews with the three Kainos programme facilitators
- Interviews with three prison service wing staff
- Case analyses of five drop-outs/de-selections
- Observations of the delivery of three C2C sessions from Module 4
- Results showing changes to *interim measures* obtained by 28 recent graduates.

The main aspect missing is any data on reconvictions of C2C graduates. Information on around 1000 graduates of C2C has been sent to the Justice Data Lab but they are not able to respond until at least 2023¹.

Origin of C2C prisoners

- All prisoners and staff agreed that participants overwhelmingly came from the NW.
- Participants were mainly aiming to return to be close to their original home in the NW.
- Some Kainos staff reported that a few participants planned a new start in a different area. This was reflected in participant interviews.
- This profile was unchanged in the 'after' interviews.

Prisoners' previous experience of intervention programmes

- Most participants had been on several other courses. Their responses indicate a large variation in their experiences of previous programmes.
- Those who had been on programmes such as TSP, Victim awareness or Sycamore Tree felt that they were too short, lacked depth and the messages were rushed.
- Most had been on drug rehabilitation programmes. Several were proud of no longer using eg. heroin, but others acknowledged they were still using other drugs eg. spice.
- Most participants acknowledged a trade-off between improving their parole hearing record and the value of the content of the programmes they had taken.
- These views persisted in the 'after' interviews

Participants' reasons for applying to C2C

Most participants first heard about C2C at LFs. The reasons for applying were varied:

- it reduced reoffending
- they were attracted by the length and depth of the course in contrast to TSP which they felt was rushed

¹ The latest (October 2022) message from JDL is that they will not think about what priority to give to analyzing the C2C data already supplied to them until the Spring of 2023. This implies no reconviction results from JDL for C2C can possibly be available to Kainos until at least the summer/autumn of 2023.

- there was a calmer atmosphere on the wing
- there was the chance of doing communal activities, inc. TC.

Some prison wing staff felt that some prisoners chose C2C because they looked for the easier conditions and discipline offered by the C2C wing. This could lead to tensions between Kainos and non-Kainos prisoners on the wing.

Selection Issues

- The 'before' responses overall from participants and from Kainos staff indicated a good level of satisfaction with the selection process. However, the 'after' interviews with participants indicated that most of those who successfully graduated linked their negative experiences with drop outs (deselections). This led to suggestions that the selection process needed to be improved.
- Prison wing staff felt that self-referrals should be more strictly vetted and suggested tightening the process to filter out potential drop outs so that their places could be taken by more motivated participants.
- In particular it was felt the issue of how being on the course affected parole records should be sorted out before starting the course.
- Kainos staff members felt that TSP was, to some extent, in competition with C2C, which might imply the need for better links with the OMU.

The responses overall indicated less satisfaction with the selection process once the participants had experienced life on C2C and, especially, were aware of reasons for drop outs/deselection. There were suggestions for refining selection processes, mostly suggesting the addition of some form of trial period or taster session/s. Obviously, these themes need to be balanced against practicality and limitations for the C2C programme and its wider context within the prison regime. Other developing and connected themes were:

- selection needs to take more account of potential drop outs, especially by looking at applicants' parole situation: asking if they will genuinely wish to continue C2C if refused parole and/or delaying acceptance until after the next parole hearing if it is imminent
- Not allowing those who are deselected back on the Kainos Wing.
- Perhaps to manage realistic expectations Kainos should develop an explanation of the selection process to explain these issues to applicants early on.

Overall, it does appear that there is a need to revisit the selection process, both in terms of the graduates' comments, and in terms of the overall deselection numbers. There is a clear theme that it may be worth considering a practical/trial element to selection: this should be monitored and evaluated by a trend analysis that will be enabled by the revised Kainos MIS.

Putting Kainos into Practice

Overall, most participants and Kainos staff were positive about C2C. Some commented on the calmer wing and the hybrid nature of the course. The overall feedback was very positive, especially the way that lessons learned in class could be put into practice by 'work' on the wing. The Likert score would be higher still, but for one respondent who interpreted the question very narrowly. Two participants flagged the continuity theme of the importance of the Kainos staff being available outside the formal delivery process.

Were participants ‘challenged’

It certainly is the case that those who completed the C2C course were unanimous in agreeing that they had been challenged in ways that were required, even if they sometime found this difficult to address.

Participants’ views on issues with putting Kainos into practice

Dropouts and Non-Kainos prisoners on the C2C wing

‘After’ interviews revealed that opposition to non-Kainos prisoners was as strong as in the ‘before’ period. Non-Kainos prisoners and deselections/drop outs from C2C remaining on the wing were seen as analogous problems. However, two of the ‘after’ respondents noted that there was now a greater proportion of Kainos prisoners on the C2C wing. This included new cohorts and completers remaining on the wing where possible. This could also be extended to those waiting to go onto C2C. This process needs to be enhanced wherever possible if C2C is to establish the TC elements required for its delivery and impact.

Beyond the 1st two cohorts, this requires effective communication between Prison Service and Kainos/LHT on the realistic limitations faced by Kainos, eg: discussion of regime change impact; the future lessening impact of Covid; pressure for beds from outside Kainos, etc.

Kainos has nearly always faced the beds/spaces issue, especially when it is newly introduced to a prison. It can ruin C2C (as 2016 research found for Guy’s Marsh), but the measures taken to alleviate this over time can be stressed explicitly, eg: Mentors and graduates staying on; better information about Kainos C2C in LFs and other prisons.

Practical and logistical issues

The presence of non-Kainos prisoners and deselections/drop outs in the C2C wing were also linked to practical and logistical issues. There was an overall feeling among graduates in the ‘after’ interviews, that these issues had improved. Firstly, the changes that allowed working whilst on C2C had been welcomed and this was seen as righting a disincentive. Second, the restrictions on access to association, gym, snooker, etc. were all seen as lessening as the proportion of Kainos prisoners on the wing increased. This might improve further once all prisoners on the wing are on Kainos C2C.

The above overlapping themes were enmeshed with the obstacles to establishing the required C2C hybrid/TC environment.

TC issues

There is a clear link between the themes of a) providing a TC environment, within which there is availability of Kainos staff outside of formal delivery/class provision and b) understanding of the importance and experience of community principles, within which there was the need to weed out non-Kainos prisoners and Kainos drop outs. It seems that the situation had improved when the ‘after’ interviews were carried out. Kainos staff availability was very positively remarked on, and there was a recognition that the proportion of Kainos prisoners on the wing was increasing. However, there was still some frustration that these positive factors were not yet sufficient to provide a proper TC environment.

- Prison staff mentioned tensions on the wing that arose from the mixture of Kainos and Non-Kainos prisoners. They felt this needed to be sorted out in the medium to long term.
- Prison staff also felt that current arrangements and the mix of different types of prisoner meant the wing was currently not really a TC. One participant agreed with this.
- There are, as a result, some clear, interrelated areas that could be refined, and which also suggest more focus on effective communication of the realistic limitations faced by Kainos participants:
 - most participants and staff would prefer the wing to be entirely composed of those on C2C, although with current low intake numbers this is not possible.
 - the majority of the (then) wing prisoner complement was non-Kainos, which required a significant reduction in expectations for the TC/hybrid element of C2C.
 - it also significantly reduced association time and access to the gym.
 - there was significant dissatisfaction about having to give up jobs obtained on other wings in order to be on the Kainos wing. Prison officers felt this needed to be 'regularised'.
 - Another key issue was the need to keep C2C graduates on the wing. These would support newcomers and build up the Kainos complement of prisoners.
- Although no interviewed prisoners had had pre-Covid experience of C2C, it was clear that restrictions introduced to cope with the pandemic, including sudden changes in the regime, had adversely affected the running of C2C during 2021.
- There was a need for better communication by prison management, to Kainos staff and participants, about the reasons for regime change.
- However, there were some advantages that had arisen as a result of Covid, eg. continued use of the Kainos weekly plan or continued staff training by Zoom, which Kainos staff would prefer to retain after Covid restrictions had eased.

Views on key roles: Key worker sessions; Mentors; Volunteers

Mentoring

- All participants were aware of the mentoring system and/or had had interaction with current mentors.
- Most felt that it worked well. None had any suggestions for change.
- However, discussion with staff did raise possible changes: 'grassing' could be reduced if the mentor system worked well and contact between Kainos participants and wing staff could be improved if mentors could be brought more into discussions with wing staff.

Volunteers

- Due to Covid restrictions, no participants had had experience of the Kainos external volunteering system.
- Most thought volunteers would be a useful addition to C2C after Covid, but felt that they had to be carefully chosen: they would prefer ex-C2C participants to be volunteers rather than those with no experience of Kainos.
- There is some indication from previous research studies that the effectiveness of the role of volunteers could be revisited. In particular, ex-police officers and other professional volunteers who 'know the score' have been shown to be valued by participants and staff. Also valuable are those with clear connections to overlapping resettlement resources such as employment and accommodation;

Drop outs

Most intervention programmes have a number of drop outs/de-selections for a variety of reasons. Our interviews evidence that these cases cause a high level of additional work for both Kainos and prison staff, in addition to disruption and frustration for the remaining participants. It is therefore important to be able to understand better what causes people to drop out. For the first time in research on C2C, full records of the those de-selected were available. The meticulous detail recorded in these documents makes it very easy to summarize the narrative and reduces the impact of not being able to interview those who dropped out.

Records of the five participants who dropped out of the 2021 courses show that, for each of these, some progress had been made during their time on C2C. Of those deselected:

- Two were relocated because of **behavioural problems**:
- One was moved to a different wing **for security reasons**
- One was removed to another wing because of a deterioration in **his mental health**, due to being unable to cope with his situation, including debt due to taking NPS..
- One **deselected himself** after a negative decision by the Parole Board.

In only two cases was it appropriate to give a written warning first, when an important consideration was the effect on the progress of others of the individuals' bad behaviour.

Those who dropped out were little different from completers in their previous experience of courses, pre-knowledge of C2C and in the way they were selected for the course. The records show nothing which, looking back, makes the selection process deficient.

In fact, records show that, during C2C, poor attitudes and bad behaviour were frequently challenged in an attempt to improve the likelihood of success for such people and, in many cases, improvements were seen for significant periods. However, progress was significantly reduced because of poor attendance, poor behaviour during sessions and bad attitudes on the wing.

Participants' geographical origins and release issues

Resettlement on release

- Nearly all current participants thought it was too early in their sentence to receive formal help through the prison and had not yet heard of Through the Gate or LHT options.
- All prison officers interviewed felt that resettlement arrangements were discussed too late in the course to be fully effective.
- Interviewed participants were mainly relying on their existing family connections to find accommodation and employment on release. These relationships could be investigated from the start of the prison term and reinforced if they represent a genuine step.
- However, some prisoners were perhaps overconfident of this as a genuine option and the fact that no mention or discussion of resettlement was made until late in the course gave them no alternative.
- Some recent initiatives will need to be evaluated to see if they are useful in resettlement: eg, the effectiveness of the letter-to-self process.

Observations of C2C sessions

One evaluator sat in to observe the following successive 3 sessions:

- **Module 4 Session 7: Community Activity: What makes Us Happy Discussion Group and Quiz**
- **Module 4 Session 8: Primary Thoughts and feelings of Anger**
- **One to One Key work session Four**

The observations were to assess: whether the sessions' aims/objectives were achieved; the extent to which delivery followed the detailed guidance in the Challenge to Change manuals.

From the evidence the observations, all sessions, conducted by the same facilitator, were conducted well in the following ways:

- The sessions followed the guidance in the C2C manuals
- Participants joined in as envisaged
- There were no disruptions
- A calm atmosphere allowed the aim of the sessions to be achieved.

In the Key Work Session, the participant was able to show how his targets had been met and agree appropriate new targets. Wider issues were discussed, such as his work as a mentor and his ambitions to be a community leader on release.

Changes in the *interim measures* of C2C graduates in 2020 and 2021

Data was analysed for all completers from cohorts 1 to 6, from January 2020 to December 2021, a baseline sample of 28 cases. The numbers in each cohort were much lower than usual during the period of data collection, since COVID restricted the ability of Prisons to run programmes, and for Kainos to deliver them. However, this is a valid source of data. We know that, during this period, C2C was delivered as prescribed in the manuals.

Kainos has collected two different 'before and after' Psychometric sets of data on its cohorts for a considerable time now, dating back to long before C2C was introduced at Lancaster Farms: [CrimePics II](#) Attitudes to Offending Questionnaire; and the [Barratt Impulsiveness Scale](#) (BARRATT). Similarly, End Of Module questionnaires (EOMs), devised by Kainos, have been used to routinely collect feedback. These 3 data sources have been analyzed.

Due to a small amount of missing data, the final samples were: 28 completers with full CrimePics II data pre and post course; 24 completers with full BARRATT data pre and post course; and 23 completers with full End Of Module data that could be analysed.

As recommended in previous evaluations of Kainos programmes, this analysis is formatted so that it provides results for a) the cumulative data for all cohorts and b) for each individual cohort. The analysis of the cumulative data provides the most important results as the number of cohorts and C2C graduates increases.

At the cumulative level, we found a **significant reduction in all five Crime Pics II scores** (n=28). These results are similar to those from our 2012 evaluation of C2C. Five of the six cohorts show a general fall, while cohort 4 showed a small increase. The cumulative analysis for **BARRATT also showed a significant reduction in impulsiveness scores** (n=24). Four of the 6 cohorts showed a fall. Cohort 1 showed no change, but one participant did not have a full BARRATT score. Similarly, the 3 participants of cohort 3 did not have BARRATT scores entered. Full anonymised psychometric scores are given in Appendix 1.

The 3rd element of the analysis, the EOM questionnaires showed varied, although generally positive, results. The completers have few adjudications or negative IEPs. They are also generally very positive about how they regard Kainos staff and how helpful they are. Completers also claim that C2C gave them many more skills to cope with life outside prison.

The power of the analyses at the cumulative level will increase with the addition of each new cohort. At the cohort level, unsurprisingly, no significant reductions were found using the standard paired samples t test. This is mainly due the very small number of completers in each cohort.

However, in Appendix 2 we have noted that the use of the effect size should be considered when reporting the results and have included an example there that might be established as a principle for future routine analysis. The use of effect sizes is now common in Psychology and provides a different way of analysing the impact of interventions. This might be especially useful for 'within cohort' and 'between cohort' analysis, as routine management information. Further, as the size of the post Covid cohorts grow, it will be more meaningful on a routine basis to see how well each cohort performed and to identify where t test and effect size scores indicate specific problems.

Although completer numbers currently available are fewer than 30, this report shows the feasibility of producing 'before & after' measurement on an ongoing basis, both for individual cohorts and for the addition of these to the cumulative analysis. As noted in various CSAAP-related meetings and correspondence, this ongoing evaluation of the LFs Kainos C2C programme will be especially useful in the likely continued delay/absence of any results on reconvictions from the Justice Data Lab. It will also establish the extent to which the interim data correlates with the eventual JDL reconviction data.

The source of all this data was the existing Kainos Management Information System (MIS) spreadsheet maintained at Lancaster Farms, which was made available to the researchers. In a separate project we have delivered software that enables Kainos to use this MIS to produce these interim measures on a regular basis, so that the effectiveness of C2C, as shown by these interim measures can be monitored on a regular basis.

MAIN REPORT

CONTENTS LIST

‘BEFORE’ & ‘AFTER’ INTERVIEWS WITH KAINOS C2C PARTICIPANTS FROM FIRST TWO 2021 COHORTS AT LFs

Background: Before Kainos	10
Selection Issues	15
Participants putting Kainos into Practice	18
Participants’ views on issues with putting Kainos into practice	21
Views on key roles: Key worker sessions; Mentors; Volunteers	26
Participants’ geographical origins and release issues	31

INTERVIEWS WITH KAINOS STAFF	36
-------------------------------------	-----------

INTERVIEWS WITH PRISON STAFF	46
-------------------------------------	-----------

ANALYSIS OF DROPOUTS DATA	49
----------------------------------	-----------

OBSERVATIONS OF KAINOS DELIVERY	55
--	-----------

CHANGES IN THE INTERIM MEASURES OF C2C GRADUATES IN 2020 AND 2021	58
--	-----------

APPENDIX 1: INDIVIDUAL (Anonymised) PSYCHOMETRICS	66
--	-----------

APPENDIX 2: EFFECT SIZES	72
---------------------------------	-----------

Introduction

Previous evaluations, dating back to 2001, have shown the effectiveness of Challenge to Change (C2C). However, to satisfy the requirements of the Correctional Services Advice & Accreditation Panel (CSAAP) this research needs to be updated from time to time. Thus, a wide-ranging mixed methods evaluation exercise was carried out at Lancaster Farms (LFs) during 2021 and 2022.

This report summarises the key findings from our:

1. Semi-structured interviews with the ten Kainos C2C participants
2. Semi-structured interviews with the three Kainos staff (facilitators)
3. Semi-structured interviews with three prison staff from a duty turn on the Kainos wing
4. Analysis of data provided on five C2C drop outs
5. Analysis of observations of selected Kainos delivery and its concordance with manuals.
6. Analysis of the before and after interim measures for all 28 graduates in 2020 and 2021.

1. INTERVIEWS WITH KAINOS C2C PARTICIPANTS FROM FIRST TWO 2021 COHORTS AT LANCASTER FARMS

Introduction

This section provides the main findings from the ten 'before' interviews and from the seven 'after' interviews from the same cohorts to indicate the perceived value of the programme.

Coverage of the 'before' Interviews

<u>GROUP 1 – May 2021 start</u>	<u>GROUP 2 – July 2021 start</u>
6 starters – 2 drop outs: 4 interviews conducted with the remaining participants: TE1; TE2; C1; C2 ²	9 starters – 1 drop out: 2 declined to be interviewed: 6 interviews with the remaining participants: TE3; TE4; TE5; C3; C4; C5.

Combined sampling details of before and after interviews

Overall, the starter samples for Cohorts 1 & 2 amounted to 15 'starter' participants: six starters for Cohort 1; and nine starters for Cohort 2.

Of the 15 starters, **10 were interviewed in the 'before'** period in mid-2021, relatively early in the interviewees' participation in Kainos C2C³. The missing 5 interviews were largely down to early deselections. Only 1 eligible participant declined to be *interviewed 'because there was nothing in it for me'*.

- Cohort 1 (4 interviews) was interviewed in May 2021
- Cohort 2 (6 interviews) was interviewed in July 2021

The **7 'after' interviews** were carried out as follows:

- Cohort 1 (3 interviews) was interviewed in October 2021
- Cohort 2 (4 interviews) was interviewed in February 2022⁴.

² Missed the first Module, which he tried to catch up with.

³ See Reports on Contract 2 Milestones 1 & 2.

⁴ Due to Covid 'Omicron' restrictions, these 'after' interviews were carried out a month later than anticipated.

The following table summarises the before and after interview samples:

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Total	Attrition from all starters
'Before'	4	6	10	-5
'After'	3	4	7	-8
Total interviews	7	10	17	

Background: Before Kainos

How did participants first hear about Challenge to Change?

In the 'before' interviews, none of the four Group 1 participants had heard of Kainos/C2C before arriving at LFs: Two out of the six Group 2 participants had heard of Kainos/C2C before arriving at LFs (at Garth and Haverigg). Unsurprisingly, this picture changed little within the smaller sample of 'after' interviews.

How did they first hear about C2C?

A variety of ways was mentioned. Two from four in Group 1 heard about it from friends on a previous LFs wing; one saw it advertised on another wing and asked his OMU; one saw it advertised on the induction TV advert and asked OMU as he did not know if he was eligible.

One of the six from Group 2 was asked by a mentor when arriving at LFs; one was referred by a prison officer; one got a letter/form at LFs induction; one got a letter/form through the cell door and self-referred; one saw C2C in operation at a previous prison and got a transfer to LFs to get on it; one saw C2C in operation in LFs and was approached by Kainos staff.

How was C2C described when you first heard about it?

Participants focused on/remembered quite different features that attracted them.

Group 1 participants mentioned the communal living and C2C ethos; the extended length of the course; the combined classroom and a practical aspect being useful to stop reoffending; helping your thinking and emotions.

Three from Group 2 were attracted by the length and intensity of the course and its link to reduced reoffending. Two also stressed the hybrid nature value, calmer atmosphere and a better regime (C3). One said it was 'related to my sentence plan with DV on my record'; One claimed it wasn't described at all, hence indicating a lack of engagement with the written materials available. TE1 noted the Kainos wing was a calm wing. There was a lack of bullying and violence. You get time and personal input: *'There's not much dispute on the wing compared to my first two prisons. It's clean, look at it, there's not rubbish and dirt everywhere. You've got great views out of the window too'*

What was their first reaction to hearing about C2C?

GROUP 1:

- TE1 *'I wanted the community bit. I've learned stuff and it's opened up my eyes and you get 3 hours rather than 1 hour, which was the maximum at 2 previous prisons'*
- TE2 *'I wanted to challenge myself and the title was right. And because I'd done a load of courses already and they were short. Rushed.'*
- C1 *'My First reaction was that this was something I ought to try'*. He had previously been on lots of other programmes and *'it would help him to have many irons in the fire'*.

- C2 *'It seemed to be rather like going back to school'*

GROUP 2:

- Two were attracted by the length of Kainos compared to previous TSP experiences.
TE3 *'It sounded like TSP, which didn't work, but with a better approach. C2C was more attractive. It's longer and it allows me to address what I need, like family issues. I'm also older at this point.'*
TE4 [Due for parole hearing/release June 2022] *'I'm doing it for my kids and I'll do anything to stay out of jail. I've already done everything, but this course is longer and will show social services that I've done all the stuff that they will ask me to do before I can see my kids, so it will speed it up.'*
- TE5 *'I knew I needed it really, I want to change and DV is a big issue for me. It sounded like a good course for someone like me at the stage I have reached.'*
- One was surprised it was possible to change: C1 *I hadn't realised my thinking/behaviour could be challenged and changed until I saw C2C at Haverigg show this could happen.*
- Finally one prisoner rather pompously claimed that: C2 *'I knew C2C wouldn't help me but I can help others on the course because of my experience of prisons and wide reading.'*⁵

Summary

Knowledge of C2C in prisons other than LFs is limited. Participants are attracted by the claim that C2C reduces reoffending and by the length and depth of the course.

Their experience of other programmes

BEFORE INTERVIEWS

Did the prisons they had been in offer any other similar programmes to C2C: ie either Cognitive Behavioural or Therapeutic Community programmes?

Three from 4 in Group 1 had been on a range of previous programmes:

[TE1] Spectrum Drugs programme

[TE2] Victim Awareness, Sycamore Tree, alcohol awareness course, drugs course, TSP

[C1] TC at Dovegate [twice but did not finish], ETS, R&R, TSP

Some had been asked to apply for specific courses:

[TE1] *'The OMU asked me to self-refer [to Spectrum]. I didn't really fancy it, it's more about tick boxes to get your Cat D status, but I had bigger problems than just the drugs.'*

Others said the courses they did were generally good, but were clear that they were too short and/or superficial:

[TE2] TSP and the Drugs course weren't any good, just rushed

One of these participants also noted that elements of other courses were good, but not enough on their own, they were looking to locate specific elements within a longer and more in-depth framework offered by Kainos:

[TE1] *'The alcohol awareness course was good, it was one to one but it would be better alongside Kainos where you've got longer to test yourself.'*

⁵ Although he failed to cite which books, and had not engaged with Kainos literature before joining (C5).

Another participant [C1] was very positive about the TC programme he had been on, but admitted that he had been removed twice from it for using drugs, indicating TC alone was not sufficient.

The final Group 1 participant [C2] thought that he did not qualify for CBT or TC programmes and was a bit surprised when he found he was able to do C2C.

GROUP 2:

Four out of those in Group 2 had been on a range of previous programmes:

TE3: had had experience of several other prisons: *'I had to do TSP. It's not a strong course. It's only six weeks, but by the time you get to the end you've forgotten the beginning. You act out the crime, but it's not intensive enough. You do the programme and that's it, no follow up. They're not interested in your life. The TSP staff aren't around outside the programme times.'* *'The TC bit, being a community makes a difference. I got to know about LFs and asked to come. It has its own little ways that are good as a prison. There's more choice of programmes (TSP and Evolve) as well as Kainos. There was no choice in other prisons, so I've already done TSP twice. It's no good 'cos I'm back again aren't I!'*

TE4: TSP, drug courses, Victim Awareness. *'I've done everything, TSP, Drugs courses, Victim awareness. I've done TSP once a week for 13 weeks in a sh***y shed. You forget the last session before the new one. It's not intense enough, they're not involved and it's not relationship-related. I've only done drugs in the last 3 years, it was mainly alcohol when I was out. They don't work for me, they're not interested in me.'*

TE5: *'I've only been on short sentences before in two local prisons....I just went straight onto doing some work on the wings, no programmes.'*

C3 couldn't recall all programmes on offer but he was *'never recommended for anything significant'*. Resolve, Great Well-being, Criminon⁶ programme (moral choices). The Criminon programme teaches moral choices *and 'equips prisoners with the life skills they need to stay on the straight and narrow, and remain free from future offending'*. He implied he was a volunteer tutor for them. He finished Resolve and Great wellbeing and continues helping on Criminon course.

C4: Sycamore Tree, TC (unfinished). C4 says he was too low risk to do TSP but did start on the TC at a previous prison and Sycamore Tree somewhere else. Finished Sycamore Tree but not the TC. He likened the TC to Pandora's box, which once opened produces lots of consequences. He found the TC did not do anything to make him face these consequences. He hopes C2C will do this.

C5 Refused to go on any programmes until C2C. He was convinced they cannot help him. He feels that he has taken responsibility for his life a long time ago and doesn't need help. He puts this down to almost a mantra that *'no-one forces you to commit crime: so don't do it!'*

⁶ This seems to be a Scientology course <https://www.criminon.org.uk/l-ron-hubbard/>

AFTER INTERVIEWS

Prisoners' previous experience of intervention programmes

At the end of C2C, participants were asked again about their experience of previous programmes and were also asked to provide a Likert scale rating.

More Likert scales were introduced - using a scale where 1= Strongly disagree, and 7 = Strongly agree - in the 'after' interviews to firm up the qualitative responses for some key topics identified in the 'before' interviews. These scores for such a small sample are indicative only, but do form a measure of triangulation and summary of the qualitative text.

Most of them also introduced an explicit comparison between their C2C experience and their previous interventions⁷.

GROUP 1

- *Iv2 'Kainos is one of the best ones. More depth. You just get better knowledge and other skills for the future. Other programmes are for 6 weeks and aren't intensive. You get put back on the wing and left to your own devices. The staff aren't around when you need them.'*
- *Iv3 'Kainos would be a seven [on the Likert scale], but others were a 4.'*

GROUP 2

- *'Iv4' Kainos is a lot more intense and longer. It drills it into your head. I did TSP twice and finished both. Didn't learn nothing, so short. Not useful.'*
- *'Iv5 'I was on a TC programme, but I didn't complete it and was deselected. I lapsed as some things were quite challenging. It's difficult getting mental health support, but I put my mind set more into it with Kainos. The staff were really supportive.'*
- *'Iv7 Kainos is more intense. It opens you up more about your crimes and the victim impact. You learn more about how you are reacting and really understand how you react. Shifting from aggressive to assertive is a big step.'*
- *'Iv7 I did RESOLVE for anger management before. It starts you off with some skills, but really, they just helicopter in. Kainos is deeper and you have to get to use them on the wing. It helps you to be positive.'*

Likert Scores: Experience of previous intervention programmes

Iv2	Iv3	Iv4	Iv5	Iv7	Mean
4	4	1	4.5	5	3.7

Summary

There is a strong theme that the Kainos programme is more impactful to the respondents than previous interventions they have had. This is related to the unavailability of staff on the other programmes outside of formal delivery periods, although one participant noted that he had been on a full TC programme, but hadn't progressed. This might indicate that the Kainos C2C programme has a good design balance for the overall risk level that it is pitched at.

⁷ 1 C2C graduate in each cohort had not has a previous custodial sentence and therefore could not rate previous interventions.

Did the prisons they had been in offer drug rehabilitation programmes? (BEFORE PRISONERS ONLY)

Have you been on any of drug programmes before C2C:

Three from Group 1 and five from Group 2 said they were on offer. Two from Group 1 and four from Group 2 had been on and completed drug programmes

TE3 said *'I was in for drug dealing and taking so I did a course in a previous prison for a previous offence'*

TE5 said he had only been in for short sentences before, so not offered.

C3 was proud of having been clean for 4-5 years after completion - does not recall which drug courses they were.

C4 did various drugs course but has now been free of heroin for 6 years.

C5 said he was offered a course but he was not interested.

Summary

The responses overall indicate a large variation in experiences of previous programmes. For some, all programmes contribute to their record of work done towards parole hearings, Cat D decisions and early release. Those who wanted longer, more intense programmes were more negative about previous programmes and positive about the contrasting Kainos 'holistic' approach at treating the person.

Selection Issues

Participants' view of how they were selected for C2C?

Participants quoted various different routes to selection.

GROUP 1

[TE1] *'After induction and the TV advert in it, I asked the OMU and they sent a self-referral form.'*

[TE2] *'After my mates told me about it, I asked my personal officer and they printed me off stuff and gave me a leaflet⁸, then Kainos contacted me'.*

[C1] - Having seen the advert for C2C he found out more about it, found he qualified for it, and applied. There was a 1-2-1 telephone conversation with the treatment manager and he was offered a place.

[C2] - He completed an application and was interviewed by a Kainos staff member on a 1-2-1 basis. He had to say why he felt the programme would help him and was accepted.

GROUP 2

[TE3] BEFORE *'I was told to do a behaviour programme, so I chose this one as it sounded better than the previous ones, not rushed. OMU got me a self-referral form.'* AFTER Iv4 *'I*

⁸ Prompting strongly suggested this was the self-referral form

didn't accept TSP on the sentence plan this time and got to do Kainos instead. I came from another prison to do it. I wanted to come to Lancaster Farms.'

[TE4] BEFORE 'I just filled out the form given to me in induction.'⁹ AFTER Iv6 – 'An application form was slipped under the door and I just read it and filled it in.'

[TE5] 'I had to see them and I had to say I was suitable. I explained about my relationship problems and they accepted me'.

[C3] had a telephone call with a Kainos staff member who made him talk about himself and his needs which he found a bit embarrassing but necessary.

[C4] BEFORE Kainos C2C was included on his sentence plan after a discussion with KC staff. Then he was transferred when C2C moved. AFTER Iv5 – 'I was in Haverigg and had some contact [with Kainos]. Then I got out but was recalled and the OMU suggested Kainos. It was to support parole/executive release.'

[C5] He was on the wing and thought he would give it a try. He could see that lots of people gained from C2C but is convinced that he can't gain anything from it. Claims he self-referred and does not think he was interviewed.

Summary

Overall, there was consistency between the before and after responses on the selections routes. There was some more detail elicited in the 'after' interviews which showed that the wide variety of dissemination methods re C2C was working and that at least 2 participants had clearly moved prisons to participate in C2C.

Suggestions for changes/improvements in selection?

BEFORE

Overall, few participants could be drawn into evaluating the selection process in the 'before' interviews. In the 'after' interviews, they had had more time to reflect on this in relation to the other participants, including those who dropped out, but it was difficult for most to suggest improvements. Some did respond well to further probing and exploration of particular drop out cases and how they thought this could have been avoided.

There was some concordance between views expressed in the 'before' and 'after' interviews. 2 participants argued it was difficult to get selection right, but knew it was needed.

TE 2 BEFORE 'It's mainly alright and quite long, and requires effort over time, so you do get challenged in a good way. It's hard to identify the ones that will fail and get booted off, but I wish they could. Iv2 – 'No it's just that how much is involved isn't clear at the start. They [Kainos staff] do tell you but experiencing it is a different thing'.

C3 BEFORE He found the 'interview challenging, but I suppose it has to be like that' AFTER Iv7 – 'Nothing really. It's hard to do as soon as you get on the course. A lot of talking about your bad upbringing. Not everyone can do it.'

Those who had not had enough time or experience to reflect in the 'before' period were much more forthcoming in the 'after' interviews. One of these did not really have any suggestions for improvement, but was annoyed about places being taken by unsuitable applicants. He welcomed the idea of refining the process

⁹ Prompting: wasn't able to definitely establish this was the self-referral form.

C1/Iv3 – ‘No. You have to go through the motions. Drop outs deserve a chance. It’s a thorough process.....It should be a privilege. The ones who are deselected shouldn’t be coming to smash things up and cause me to have to wait to be selected.’

C4 had clearly done some thinking between the interviews. BEFORE C4 was ‘happy with the selection process’ but in his AFTER interviews noted (Iv5) – ‘Yes. It is down to the individual, and it depends if you understand [the word] ‘intensive’, but some of ‘em were dossers anyway, box tickers. They need a sort of crash course before they start, do a couple of lessons first and judge it on that.’ Obviously, C4 had had more experience in the after period and took time to consider the question, making an important point.

All recognised the contrast between how C2C might be appealing in the abstract, but that this did not match reality.

Most of the others did have suggestions that were tied up with annoyance at the drop outs from C2C and how they taken up places, or caused delay for genuine applicants

[TE1] BEFORE ‘The drop outs annoyed me. Someone else could have had those places. After eight weeks, they just stopped engaging, it was too much for them and it became too hard. It’s hard to detect the drop outs in advance, but they had come with problems they knew about. You could see they were not engaging early on though, giving one word answers but I gained two best mates in the icebreaker. You could have a four week probation period before starting.’ AFTER Iv1 – ‘No. It is intense, so you have to realise. I think everyone joins with the best intentions, but then some find it too much hard work’....‘The initial assessment was heavy, so I think you will be deterred if you are not sure. But you could do better attitude tests.

This theme was developed further by other respondents in the ‘after’ interviews. The issue of preventing drop outs through selection was very prominent with some of the participants, causing anger and resentment.

[TE3] One dropped out because he didn’t get a parole hearing and thought there was then no point. ‘I was refused it too, but I’m still doing it because I’m committed to change. He [the drop out] took someone else’s place. The parole issue should be identified before they come on the course. Ask them if they will still do the course if they get refused! He also noted ‘Realistically, you shouldn’t put Class A drug dealers and users together on the same course. Weed is different, but still.....’ AFTER Iv4 – ‘Yes. You need to find out if they are really willing to change or just doing the paper stuff. The scoring they do goes on who you was, not who you are now. It’s not working. You need a short session with them. That will check if they are willing.’

[TE4] BEFORE ‘One came back onto the Kainos wing after being kicked off the course. That shouldn’t be allowed. It has a negative impact on the Wing. It’s too soft. He was just chasing Cat D. He packed it in when he didn’t get his parole.’ AFTER Iv6 – ‘Yes. [referring to two who were deselected] Two of them were security moves, you can’t do much about that. One was a bit of a bother the whole time and was moved to another wing after segregation, he shouldn’t have been there. One was only doing it to get Cat D and left. Maybe, do the 1st session or week as a tester, for thinking about the reality of the next 6 months.’

Likert scores: The selection process for C2C works well

Iv1	Iv2	Iv3	Iv4	Iv5	Iv6	Iv7	Mean
5.5	6	7	3	4	4	2	4.5

Summary

The responses overall indicated less satisfaction with the selection process once the participants had experienced life on C2C and, especially, were aware of reasons for drop outs/deselection. There were suggestions for refining selection processes, mostly suggesting the addition of some form of trial period or taster session/s. Obviously, these themes need to be balanced against practicality and limitations for the C2C programme and its wider context within the prison regime. The other main developing, and connected, themes identified are also worth considering:

- selection needs to take more account of potential drop outs, especially by looking at applicants' parole situation: asking if they will genuinely wish to continue C2C if refused parole and/or delaying acceptance until after the next parole hearing if it is imminent
- Not allowing those who are deselected back on the Kainos Wing.
- Perhaps developing an explanation of the selection process that explains these issues to applicants early on, including the limitations and restriction on Kainos C2C, to manage realistic explanations.

Overall, it does appear that there is a need to revisit the process, both in terms of the graduates' comments, and in terms of the overall deselection numbers. There is a clear theme that it may be worth considering a practical/trial element to selection and the this should be monitored and evaluated by trend analysis that will be enabled by the revised Kainos MIS.

Participants putting Kainos into Practice

Positive features of C2C lessons learned in class and put into practice on the wing (BEFORE)

Despite the relatively early exposure to C2C in the 'before' interviews, participants were asked to identify issues relating to applying lessons learned in class on the wing.

Group 1:

TE1 – YES: *'Enjoying all of it.'.....'Knowing how to deal with criticism. I just responded aggressively to any before. I didn't know the difference to being assertive. On the outside I lived by my own rules. Now it's not just about me. 'I was a drug addict previously, so the cycle of change is really useful. I've realised what stage I'm at. The pressures outside were about money. It didn't add up and I've learned to manage my money here so my options are wide open. I can't go back to drug dealing. My perspective's changed. I will be under pressure from my friends who are addicts and Kainos has given me tools to resist addicts. The 7 steps on the drug module is helping, with assertiveness too, which is what I really need. Because it is a longer course, and not just focused on drugs, I'm learning it's a process, you can't just tackle it all on a short course. I think if I'd learned this ten years ago I'd be a different person.'*

TE2 – YES: *'It works well. I can now be assertive but not aggressive with prison officers. I can see when it is not worth arguing. Learning how to come out of my shell and finding out: how to conduct yourself: about assertiveness and problem solving. It's education you need and that I might have missed. It should be in schools.'*

[C1] explained how he liked to be busy and did a lot of things on the wing; cleaning; cooking; etc. He said the C2C staff did a good job.

[C2] YES: 'Thinking about your past life and all the decisions you'd made.'

He felt C2C fell into four simultaneous parts. [A different sort of hybrid model]

- a. Classroom where you were given the key learning points.
- b. Group discussions
- c. Going through the tasks learned
- d. Writing your responses.

'The communal sessions are very important, letting you think about your deficiencies and work on them.'

Group 2:

[TE3] –YES: Only one month and one module done so far. *'I've learned a lot about the consequences of arguing and how to avoid or deal with them.'....'I see Kainos staff every day and can talk to them. They are always focused on talking about positive futures and not the negative past. What is good to do, instead of what not to do.*

TE4: *'The chance to get emotional management. More chance to learn how to stay out of prison by managing your life. This is a settled Wing. You can tell. There's no bullying, no violence compared to other Wings. I'd rather stay on this Wing when I've finished the course, you've still got the others supporting you. This wing is clean and tidy – much better than any other wing or prison.'* He did also note: *'Kainos staff could engage with us more [outside cells] and they and prison staff need to be more aligned.'*

TE5: *'It does motivate you more to address problems. I enjoy the quizzes/fun time, esp. the 5 second rule. I like to be competitive.'... 'The Kainos approach is putting in the common sense, it's making a difference. I didn't figure it out when I was young. It's already made me think and look at things differently. I understand I need to concentrate on my [5] kids and family. It's a bit early, but Kainos gives you space to discuss your life and what you want to do with it outside the prison, how you want to change and why. You can't just talk about drugs as if it's your only problem. The Kainos content is more useful to me, but we haven't had much chance to put it into practice yet. The first module I'm doing is relevant, how to change and manage my emotions. I look forward to the free time and the Kainos staff are around if you need them. I was a bit stupid at managing emotions, was on methadone and needed to get off it. I thought Kainos was a chance to do it. The medical team came on the wing to try to give me methadone to avoid cold turkey, but I refused it and I'm off it. Now I've got the activities for look forward to, and someone to talk to about my life, I don't need it.*

C3 thought the course had come at a right period in his life (mid 35s). He particularly likes the course's positive nature and the target setting. He is now able to understand himself a bit more. He has had problems in changing his behaviour but thinks he may be overcoming these: *'The first module has gone very fast. I enjoy all of it and accept what is on offer.'*

C4: *'The course gives you tools to enable you to think more clearly and to adopt a calmer approach and not to act on impulse.'.... 'I enjoy all of Module 1. I am more patient with others. I enjoy working on instant gratification. I enjoy getting involved in the tasks set.*

C5: After being generally very negative about C2C course, he said he 'might become a mentor' as he was 'so much able to help others.'

TE5 – *'YES: I think it does. Everyone is doing the same thing.'*

'After' respondents/completers' views on applying Lessons Learned on C2C (inside prison and/or projected for after release)

The 'after' respondents were prompted for more detail on how well they thought they had already been able to apply lessons learned and how these might be sustained after release.

Iv1 feedback from the others [C2C participants] has shown some dramatic changes since they've finished. *'I notice it in others. Even if you get a 10% change, it's enough, it's done its job on what was needed. Like, I learned different ways and I'm no longer afraid of saying No. My girlfriend has noticed the difference in me and I've got a vision now of what to do'.... 'It's all good to me. The staff are around when you need them'*

Iv2 – *'Easy. If you live and breathe it, it works.'*

Iv3 – *'It works because Kainos staff are on the wing'... 'Having Kainos staff around makes the difference' [To other programmes he's been on]. There's a lot of interaction to stop disruption before it becomes a problem.' 'It stops people offending by making them think through the consequences'.*

Iv4 – *'A hell of a lot for once you're outside. It won't be easy. It [C2C] helps with the knock backs, but it's more about me as a person.'..... 'The facilitators and the prisoners you are on the course with create good relations'*

Iv5 – *'I agree with that – you can put lessons into practice on the wing. Rather than just slipping off [after class] you have to use it – being more assertive than aggressive and not losing face that way...The Kainos staff have been brilliant. It's hard to fault them.'*

Iv6 *'I'm a mentor now, so it's good. Kainos gives you a different perspective, I feel like I'm a better person to the point where I can help others. There are experienced Kainos staff and good mentoring systems'.*

Iv7 *'Facilities aren't bad and Kainos staff are good.'* But he also noted *'It can be a problem with the [Prison] officers. You get mixed signals, depends on the individual. There should be set screws for the Kainos wing so they know about the programme.'*

Likert scores: Lessons from C2C are learned and applied

Iv1	Iv2	Iv3	Iv4	Iv5	Iv6	Iv7	Mean
7	7	7	7	6	5	2	5.9

Summary

The overall feedback is very positive that lessons learned in class will 'work' on the wing. The Likert score would be higher still, but Iv7's answer was focused on the role of prison officers, rather than Kainos staff and this is a legitimate concern. Two participants flagged the importance of the Kainos staff being available outside the formal delivery process.

Kainos graduates were also asked specifically to assess whether they felt they would be able to apply the C2C lessons learned, after release. The 'after' respondents were still positive, overall, that C2C lessons would help them outside of prison, but two of the seven were less confident.

Likert scores: Lessons learned from C2C will be applied after release

Iv1	Iv2	Iv3	Iv4	Iv5	Iv6	Iv7	Mean
6	6	5	2	6	6	2	4.7

Did participants feel they had been 'challenged' by C2C and what did they feel was the most important aspect of C2C

Again, there was a good response to this theme already, despite the short duration of C2C experienced in the 'before' period.

TE1 – YES: *'I'm being challenged. I can say NO now, but not being aggressive, I can be assertive instead.'*

TE3: *'Stop people talking about drugs! Staff and prisoners'*. Also, Fun Day. Playing games. *'I understand it is about patience if you roll a marble and I know you need breaks, but you're not learning anything to take away. I just want to be challenged.'*

C1: *'The way that you are encouraged to think about your past lives and how you have sometimes gone wrong in the past. The way you are challenged to change. The way you are given a clear idea about why certain pro social behaviours are the right ones.'*

C5: *'C2C is just not challenging enough.'*

The responses were more positive from those who completed the group. C5 was not a completer while TE3/Iv4's hopes were realised.

Iv1 *'Yes, but I wanted to be [challenged]. I got caught with firearms and drugs because I couldn't say No.'* *I didn't even see drugs as a problem, but firearms Yes. I needed challenging on seeing drugs as normal and to recognise it. It won't be easy to stick to the challenge. I'm realistic but determined. The biggest Kainos contribution was Module 1 - the cycle of change and problem solving. They will help accept it won't be overnight.'*

Iv2 *'Yes. It's challenging at all times. I was kept on my toes and it kept me engaged.'* *Most days, definitely. It will be easy [to maintain what I've learned]. It is built into me now.'*

Iv3 *'Yes. I've been made to think about consequences of my behaviour. I'll be able to stick to it as it's given me ways of coping with the challenges.'*

Iv4 *'Yes. I felt it would be beneficial to me as a person. A lot of things were identified that I didn't know about. How you're seen by others; being assertive without being aggressive.'*

Iv5 *'Yes.'*

Iv6 *'Yes. I understand forgiveness from both sides now and my victim awareness has changed me. Changed my behaviour and how others see me.'*

Iv7 *'Yes. A lot. I've learned patience, understanding situations better.'*

Summary

It certainly is the case that those who managed to stay the course of C2C were unanimous in agreeing that they had been challenged in ways that were required, even if they sometime found this difficult to address.

Participants' views on issues with putting Kainos into practice

There were four clear but overlapping themes that occurred at various points across the 'before' and 'after' interviews:

1. the impact of drop outs (deselections);
2. the mixing of Kainos and non-Kainos prisoners;
3. practical and logistical issues related to workings, association, gym and snooker activities; and
4. problems with ensuring a hybrid/TC approach.

The first two of these themes are separated out from the others initially, but the final two themes increasingly flag the connected nature of the four key themes.

Drop outs

The issue of drop outs affecting the programme was themed throughout the 'before' interviews and was mentioned in connection with a number of sections.

TE1 and TE2 mentioned that drop outs remaining on the wing caused disruption and set a bad example, TE1: *'Just the drop outs. They annoyed me.'* TE2: *'it's demotivating'*

TE3 *'The drop outs need weeding out early.'*

TE4 *'Not letting the wrong people on it who are only focused on parole and then letting them stay on the wing.'*

The view from the 'after' interviews was a little less focused on this issue, perhaps because most deselections had been made earlier in the cohort delivery and was less prominent as a problem.

Iv2 *'The ones who have been kicked off should also be kicked off the wing.'*

Iv4 *'It's also less of a problem now the drop outs have gone. No good keeping them on the wing, they need to go.'*

Iv6 *'The drop outs staying on the wing is a problem too, but a smaller one.'*

Iv7 *'You can't settle on the wing doing Kainos stuff if people are smashing up their cells.'*

The issue of drop outs was most prominent in the discussion of the selection process and might be combined with that theme too.

Mixing Kainos and non-Kainos prisoners

Problems caused by the presence of non-Kainos prisoners on the Kainos wing was a major theme of the 'before' interviews.

C1 *'70% of the wing is non-C2C. This means a lot of the association, such as it is, is with non-C2C people.'* He said the presence of non-C2C people can be disrespectful to C2C.

TE3: *'There is a lack of funding to get a bigger intake so you're stuck with ones from other wings who aren't on C2C. If you let more people onto the actual programme from the other wings it would soon fill up. That said, the mix of Kainos and non-Kainos hasn't been a big problem, it's a nice chilled wing compared to all others.'*

TE 4: *'They need to get rid of non-Kainos people on this wing.'*

C3: *'The presence of other people on the wing is also a discouragement from this communal activity being part of C2C.'* He asked why a smaller wing such as Grisedale could not be used only for Kainos people.

C4: *'Kainos is pretty strict, so the wing should be C2C only: those on the course; those who've finished it; and those waiting.'*

TE5 *'There are some who aren't on the programme and have been in too long and can't be bothered. They shouldn't be here, it should be Kainos only.'*

The view from the 'after' interviews is equally negative, but two of the participants were more confident that the problem was declining as the proportion of Kainos-related prisoners was increasing.

Kainos/Non Kainos Mix of Prisoners on the Wing

Iv1 *'Now we're seeing a big [positive] shift in the last two months. There are more past graduates staying on the wing and a new [starter] group, plus a lot of those coming onto the wing from other jails waiting to start, so it's getting rid of a lot of non-Kainos prisoners.'* *'The [positive] atmosphere has stayed the same overall, but the behaviour has changed. Most*

have been assessed and know the score. It's a well-behaved wing, a walk in the park. It's a lot better than other jails.'

Iv2 'Non-Kainos prisoners disrupt everything and shouldn't be here.'

Iv3 'Non-Kainos cause disruption and should be kept to a minimum.'

Iv4 'It's not right to have non Kainos with us.'

Iv5 It needs to be a dedicated wing – no non Kainos. I was on this wing as non-Kainos first, waiting for a space, which is more OK.'

Iv6 'It isn't a good idea to have non Kainos on the wing, but the mix is getting better.'

Iv7 'non Kainos prisoners shouldn't be here. It causes too much friction. You can't settle on the Wing doing Kainos stuff if people are smashing up their cells. Drop outs too.'

Summary of issues related to dropouts and mixing Kainos and non-Kainos prisoners

Overall, the 'after' interviews revealed that opposition to non-Kainos prisoners was as strong as in the 'before' period. However, two of the 'after' respondents recognised that the proportions were changing as more Kainos cohorts were starting, and some completers were remaining on the wing. This process needs to be enhanced wherever possible if C2C is to establish the TC elements required for its delivery and impact.

This requires effective communication between Prison Service and Kainos/LHT on the realistic limitations faced by Kainos, eg: discussion of regime change impact; the future lessening impact of Covid; pressure for beds on wings from outside Kainos, etc. Beyond the 1st two cohorts, this should be possible to ensure. Kainos has nearly always faced the beds/spaces issue, especially when it is newly introduced to a prison. It can ruin the programme (eg, as the researchers found at Guy's Marsh in 2016), but the measures taken to alleviate this over time can be stressed explicitly, eg: Mentors and graduates staying on; better dissemination of Kainos C2C more broadly in LFs and other prisons. There was a strong feeling among the graduates that the Kainos Wing should only accept Kainos participants, but this potentially could be extended to those waiting to go on to C2C, as well as to graduates.

In all cases, non-Kainos prisoners and deselections/drop outs from C2C remaining on the wing were seen as analogous problems.

Iv7 'The wing needs to be a proper resettlement wing and all Kainos. People who want to change. Graduates should stay, drop outs should go, no Cat D's.'

Both of these issues were also linked with disruption of the 'promised' C2C hybrid/TC environment, but before considering this element, it is important to establish how the key themes of practical and logistical issues are enmeshed.

Practical and logistical issues

In the 'before' interviews, all of the 'before' participants were aware of the recent regime changes and were critical of its impact on association, meaning that Kainos C2C participation had reduced this, plus access to gym, snooker, etc. activities. There was a clear element of resentment about this underlying many of the interview responses, but there was a lot of focus on the physical environment.

Only 1 participant was aware of a security disruption:

TE1: 'We had 30 minute break once when someone went on the bars, but we caught up. The biggest problem is I had to give up 2 wing jobs to come here. It puts a lot of people off.'

TE2: *'The wing situation. I gave up my job to come on it and it took a while to get one again.'*

TE3: *'The regime is not sympathetic to C2C: there should be a classroom on the first floor: there is not enough association and there should be a way of doing prison jobs while on current difficulties; ie: regime change, lack of proper association, lack of gym attendance, not having a complete wing full of C2C enthusiasts. He felt originally there would be more freedoms on the wing and was a bit annoyed about this. He was also annoyed that being on the course meant he could not have a job. He feels that if those on C2C had more things to C2C.'* *'I missed first module due to not having room on the wing.'* He also spoke about the do there would be fewer dropouts and that staff have to pay too much attention to security.

C3: *'It is a challenge to have to give up having a job to be on C2C and losing associations, etc. But it is worth it to get the help that is coming from C2C.'* He felt COVID had affected early delivery and also felt the lack of association, shortage of gym periods and family visits.

C5: was critical of certain practical aspects: *'There are not enough chairs and tables and there could be more pens and paper to write on.'*

TE5: *'The main problem is that the prison regime keeps changing. It's crap. The Association periods clash with Kainos so you lose out on the gym and [playing] pool compared to the non-Kainos people. It would be better to get rid of them and just have Kainos people on the Wing so we could get back our missed Association time.'*

The 'after' participants still comment on the equipment and scheduling elements.

Iv4 *'Covid did affect it a bit at the end – kept changing schedules for the wing rooms.'*

Iv6 *'It did get a bit mixed up at the end, with changing rooms and wings due to regime and schedule issues. Some of the [physical] facilities are poor.'*

However, they were more focused on changes to being able to work or association; etc.

Iv1 *'As there's not so much non-Kainos mixing now, we've got free time to associate and we can work as cleaners. Part-time afternoon jobs would be better, more popular, so you could mix with the Kainos schedule.'* *'I'm out all day as a mentor. You can still get paid for Kainos.'*

Iv2 – *'I gave up cleaning to come on and then got it back. I would have given it up to be on Kainos if I had to choose. Now a lot of non-Kainos have gone, it's not a problem with gym and free association'*

Iv3 *'I have managed to keep working but it should be easier. Same goes for association and snooker, it's easier without non Kainos.'*

Iv4 *'You can now be a wing cleaner as well as doing Kainos, which is beneficial'. Less of a problem with my group to have association and gym, but there's still only 24 out of 68 of us on Kainos. There's not enough funding, so you need more activities to keep you busy'.*

Iv6 *'I didn't work before. It did put some off, but it's changed now, so you can work as wing cleaners. There is much better use of spare time now, esp. Association.'*

Iv7 *'I managed to keep my cleaner job coming on the wing. It would have stopped me coming on Kainos if I had to give it up. Association and gym have also improved'*

Summary

There was an overall feeling among graduates in the 'after' interviews that these issues had improved. Firstly, the changes that allowed working whilst on C2C had been welcomed and this was seen righting a disincentive. Second, the restrictions on access to association, gym, snooker, etc. were all seen as lessening and the proportion of non-Kainos prisoners on the wing reduced. This might improve further once all prisoners on the wing are on Kainos C2C.

Issues with TC/Hybrid element of C2C

All respondents were asked whether Kainos C2C was delivering TC/Community elements? Most of the responses were linked to the three main issues above.

There were understandably fewer comments on this element in the 'before' period.

TE1: 'The Kainos staff are here 9-5 in the day and you can go to them if you're not getting on with someone, or even go with them. Then you've got the mentors, me included! I've never heard any talk of snitching.'

TE4 agreed C2C was better than other programmes: 'They [other programmes] are too limited.' 'But C2C isn't a proper TC. I've been on that at a previous prison and that was better as everyone is on the same track.' 'You are punished for being on Kainos. You have to miss association time because you are doing the course. If you got rid of the non-Kainos we would have all that...there isn't consistency around whether swearing is allowed. Some staff are more experienced and some fresh out of University. I need older supervisors.'

C1 'It would be good for the wing to be only Kainos people. That way it could be more like a TC which is what it needs. That way there would be no negative people on the wing.' He also said there was 'not much time.....in groups because of COVID but things were hopefully now changing' and he hoped they would work towards a hybrid approach. He was able to reflect on what had been taught by himself but could not put it into practice much. This meant he did not really recognise the hybrid nature of the course.

C4 Because of COVID, and the LFs' 2021 regime constraints, he saw that C2C at LF was different from C2C at Haverigg. He felt his mind is in a better place but has not fully registered the differences in the hybrid nature of the course.

C5. said they have not yet been taught anything. All they do is role play and nothing challenging. Clearly saw no hybrid nature to the course as now run in LF.

Of the four who did comment, one thought he didn't have enough experience to make a judgement, while another didn't feel there was any element of TC (and went on the be deselected) The remaining two were clear that the presence of non—Kainos prisoners on the C2C wing was reducing the TC element and TE4 also linked this to a negative effect on access to gym, snooker and association.

In the 'after' interviews, more participants commented on the TC element. The comments recognised that Non-Kainos and/or dropouts being on the C2C wing were still hampering the TC element, but that the situation was improving. They also commented on the positive element of the Kainos staff being available outside the formal delivery periods, which is an indication that there was a significant element of TC delivery within the C2C programme.

Iv 1 'It is more like a proper Kainos wing. This is my only experience. But it's better if you are all on Kainos, which it's more like that now'...' 'The regime has settled down now and we've got visitors again. I've not noticed drugs coming in with visitors so much as before.'

Iv2 'The balance is getting better now that there are more on Kainos [inc. graduates] so it works better.'

Iv3 'The more you get all Kainos, the better it will be but the staff being around makes the difference.'

Iv4 'Proper community living is not happening'. We could use the TSP cabin so it's just Kainos. The staff are here every day though, even Fridays when they are not supposed to be - makes a big difference. It builds up relationships.

Iv5 'It's not a TC, they have more staff 24/7 and are around at weekends. But Kainos does better than other courses. The staff being around works well. Non Kainos on wing doesn't.'

Iv6 'I was told it was a (TC) community, but it isn't because of non Kainos on wing. 'it is important for Kainos staff to be around as much as they are. I still need help sometimes [as a mentor] to refer, all it needs is a knock on their door. It helps the new lads and graduates staying on the wing keeps the balance better.'

Iv7 'Not really. We could use Grisedale (wing) as it's smaller so you'd just have Kainos on the wing.' 'You do have the staff available most of the time you need them, that's a big advantage, avoids helicoptering.'

Summary

There is a clear link between the themes of a) providing a TC environment, within which availability of staff outside of formal delivery/class provision and b) understanding of the importance and experience of community principles, within which there was the need to weed out non-Kainos prisoners and Kainos drop outs.

It seems that the situation had improved when the 'after' interviews were carried out. Kainos staff availability was very positively remarked on, and there was a recognition that the proportion of Kainos prisoners on the wing was increasing. However, there was still some frustration that these positive factors were not yet sufficient for a proper TC environment.

Views on key roles: Key worker sessions; Mentors; Volunteers

Key worker sessions, monitoring/feedback, etc.

For the 'before' interviews, it was difficult to ask them to assess the impact of C2C at a point where they had only just begun the intervention. However, in initial discussions with staff, it was suggested that asking about the additional 'Key Worker' 1-2-1 sessions would perhaps be a good initial proxy measure.

In the main, there was no meaningful distinction when talking about Kainos Community key work sessions and individual feedback, especially for Group 2 who were relatively recent starters. Most of the discussion was related to the Kainos Community key work sessions.

Group 1

TE1: 'Very useful. My facilitator identified positive and negative factors for me.'

TE2: 'Very useful. It boosts the modules and you get feedback that is done without putting you down. Getting up and getting into a routine. I look forward to it. There's proper value to the content – you can use it. 1-2-1s are also good – you make a lot progress from those.'

C1. The parts dealing with the chance to change. 'I am now more assertive, both in the classroom and in challenging people. I feel I am learning new skills.'....'They [Key Workers] are very good. They happen every month after each module. They give good feedback and keep you motivated.'

C2 found these fortnightly sessions very useful. At first he had felt bad about getting any criticism but was now able to cope with anything negative much more easily. 'The key sessions where you were encouraged to set targets such as keeping a daily diary'¹⁰, noting 10 positive things and 10 negative things about your behaviour. The communal sessions which give your brain a break from information gathering.'

¹⁰ Showed an example to interviewer.

Group 2

Two of the Group 2 cohort were not yet aware that they had had Kainos Community key work sessions. The others were clear that they had had them.

TE 5: *'It's too early, I'm first out of the door as everything has been fine so far.'*

Three found these sessions helpful.

TE3: *'I've only had one so far. I learned a lot from it, it makes the module learning practical so you can use it when you are just on the Wing with the other lads on it.'*

C3: *'I found them quite useful as a calming down mechanism. These sessions reduce the stress. I am a bit volatile and need to calm down to absorb the lessons from the classroom sessions including learning how to forgive myself for poor past behaviour.'*

C4 thinks these *'are working alright.'* He doesn't always agree with what he is told: eg, *'there are pros and cons of diaries.'* He sees these sessions as helpful in various ways, eg, learning: *'how the staff is doing; how he is doing; learning what people should be able to accept from each other; and they involve a straightforward effort.'*

C5 was an outlier: *'Like the rest of the course, I don't rate these very much. I don't like being told what to do by females the same age as me.'* He doesn't feel challenged and hopes things get better: *'all child's work at present.'*

By the end of C2C, the graduates were, perhaps predictably, more universally positive about the Key worker/feedback sessions in the 'after' interviews.

Iv1 *'They are a good thing. I was abrupt in the 1st session and it was noted. It made me think about authority differently. I get positive feedback'*

Iv2 *'I found them good. You talk about the things you need to talk about rather than the easier things you want to, and get the feedback you need. It can turn negative into positive.'*

Iv3 *'Good for you. It can be positive or negative, but you can act on it.'*

Iv4 *'They are very useful. Whatever is bothering you, you can get it off your chest. It identifies what you need to work on.'*

Iv6 *'Yeah, it's good. Good relationship and discussions in them with my Key Worker. You talk in proper detail about what your specific difficulties are and it helped me a lot.'*

Iv7 *'Good. They open you up, so you see yourself'*

Summary

Group 1 certainly provided a ringing endorsement of the C2C programme design and found the Kainos Community key work sessions very helpful in embedding the module content and contributing to the community approach. This is partly a function of the longer period on the programme compared to Group 2. While Group 2 had had less exposure to the Key worker sessions, of the four who were aware that they had had at least one session, three were very positive about their worth. As can be seen in the section below on observing a Key Work session, these can be very effective in setting and monitoring targets and behaviour.

All of the six respondents offering a view in the 'after' period agreed that the key worker sessions were valuable in backing up the lessons learned in class.

Mentoring

In the 'before' period, when participants were new to the programme, there was obviously more focus on their awareness of mentors and their potential benefits.

All ten participants were aware that there was a **mentoring system** and had either seen their mentor chatting to others in their new group, or had had some interaction.

TE3: – *'YES, although we don't have one yet on our course'*

TE4: – *'YES, he's a good lad.'*

TE5: – *'YES, he introduced himself but no need for me at this point.'*

Although relatively unfamiliar with the mentor at the 'before' point, participants were relatively positive about the need for the role, even if that meant for others, rather than personally.

Group 1

All commented that they understood and were happy with the system and the mentors, but hadn't had 'any big issues', more clarifying what was expected of them.

TE1 was a mentor. *'I didn't see it in myself until I was asked by Kainos staff. It was a more intensive process than I thought. My literacy isn't bad, but I wanted to use it to actually educate myself. All that work on presentation-of-self we'd been doing kicked in. It made me think that I can't do things by halves. You have to learn how to conduct yourself instead of just fitting in.'*

TE2: – *'They can fill in what I don't understand as they have more time.'*

C1 felt he would be a good mentor as he had previously been a mentor for the Simon Trust where he teaches other prisoners to read and write better *'People apply and have an interview and, if there is a vacancy they stay on the wing as a mentor: Danny and Luto are mentors. I've applied but didn't succeed.'*

C2 knew about the system but felt he did not need a mentor as he understood what the course was about.

Group 2

These participants were relatively new to the programme and were less aware of how the mentoring system worked, except for C3, who had already engaged and noted that he got on well with one of the mentors and found his help very useful, *'especially the 1-2-1 sessions'* with him. They were all comfortable with the concept except C5 who said *'I don't need mentoring. I don't see this as very important.'*

TE3: *'We have some chats with the mentor who is on the other [May intake] programme. He's helpful but I don't know how it works. I don't have any real experience but it is nice to have one.'*

TE4: *'I've seen him chatting to others on the Wing. Helping them out, and I know he could help me if I need it. Makes it easier to apply lessons as he has had the same sort of life.'*

TE5: *'No more than him introducing himself. Good to have mentors though, it's early on but good to know they are always available.'*

C4: *'It seems to work well.'* He described the mentor Danny as a 'bit of a father figure.'

Knowledge of whether enough participants volunteer to be mentors?

Group 1

TE1: *'There are 3 spaces, with two filled. I will [as mentor] encourage those I think can do it.'*

TE2: *'I don't want to do it, it's not for me. I just want to get the course done first.'*

C1: *'There is only room for a small number of mentors so some people may not apply because they know there is no vacancy.'*

C2 also felt small numbers discouraged applications as there were no vacancies

Group 2

TE3, TE4 and TE5 felt it was too early to know: C3 & C4 said that they thought there were enough volunteers: C5 replied *'Don't know or care'*.

Suggested improvements

None of the 'before' participants felt there was a need for any change to the mentoring system and C1 & C3 remarked that it worked well. C2 noted that *'the system would only work properly when there were much larger numbers on the course.'*

Views and mentoring in the 'after' period

Iv1 *'I am a mentor, but didn't use them really. 'Selection is very professional. You get assignments to do and you have to up your game. It's a positive thing. Once or twice I've not performed, but I'm mainly on the ball and know when I'm not.'*

Iv2 *'Yes there are mentors and you can get on with them informally. Not sure if that counts and when it becomes official, but they are useful.'*

Iv3 *'Yes, I am a mentor now and I used them on the course. There are enough applying, they want to stay on with Kainos and help others.'*

Iv4 *'Yes, there is mentoring. I used the previous one. We sat down and identified positives and negatives after lessons.....by not sitting in a room during Kainos hours, it needs to be after hours, additional.....I'd say there are enough, there's one for each group.....'I've thought of applying, but you sort of have to go through the course again.'*

Iv6 *'I am a mentor now. I used to go to Kainos staff mainly, but used the mentor once. There are two now, one on each landing. There are enough'*

Iv7 *'Yes, he's in the next cell so we engage every day, it's useful. I thought about applying, but there's no point if I get Cat D, even though that will not be for a long time.'*

Summary

There was an overall feeling among 'before' respondents that the mentors were useful. This continued for those who graduated into the 'after' respondents. Not all had made full use of mentors, but some had become mentors themselves. There was predictably more experience in the 'after' group on what would attract participants to the mentor role. It seems that the selection process for mentors is seen as tough by those who are deterred, which perhaps converges with the suggestions made by participants to upgrade the overall selection process for entry onto C2C to avoid recruiting potential drop outs. Imminent release, or moves to Cat D are limiting factors for applying.

Volunteer Participation

One of the ways to maintain input post release that Kainos has tried in the past is in the use of volunteers, both inside and outside the prison.

None of the participants had had contact with prison volunteers due to COVID restrictions in the BEFORE period. Questions were, therefore, limited to a) whether they thought that

volunteers from the local community were desirable and b) what they would want/expect from them.

Overall, 7/10 (Group 1, 3/4; Group 2, 4/6) participants thought the use of volunteers was a sound idea. However, they were consistent, overall, in specifying what type of volunteers they would want:

GROUP 1

TE1: <i>'I'd be looking for understanding from my perspective.'</i> TE2: <i>'It would be good, but it has to be someone who had done the course and made a success outside'.</i>	C1 Sounds a good idea if ever feasible. C2 did not know about this system or seem very interested.
---	---

GROUP 2

TE3: <i>'It could be useful. But it has to be someone who's been through what I've been through. They'd need to be tough and realistic.'</i> TE4: <i>'It would have to be an ex-Kainos offender to make it work.'</i> TE5: <i>'It's a good idea, but it would be best to have an ex-Kainos volunteer so they have the knowledge and knowhow.'</i>	C4 has met this sort of system elsewhere but did not know C2C did it. He has worked with groups such as church meetings and NA meetings and thought he could benefit from volunteering sessions. Neither C3 nor C5 knew about this system and were not interested. .
---	---

As can be seen above, four of the seven who were positive about a visitor role would like the visitors to be ex-offenders, preferably who had been through Kainos C2C and were successful after release.

In the 'after' period, there had been some contact with outside volunteer visits. The view of the single visitor that was mentioned was that they were a good person to talk to and had the participants' best interests at heart. However, 'after' participants all expressed similar views to TE4, who repeated his view in the 'after' interview

Iv6: 'Better to have someone with the same history and out the other side'.....We need examples and would listen to them. Get some tips'.

The Likert scores showed that cohort 1 was more positive than cohort 2 about the usefulness of these visits. Iv5 had not had any experience of the volunteer.

Likert scores: Usefulness of volunteers

<i>Iv1</i>	<i>Iv2</i>	<i>Iv3</i>	<i>Iv4</i>	<i>Iv6</i>	<i>Iv7</i>	<i>Mean</i>
6	7	6	2	5	2	4.7

Summary

The picture is, again, quite mixed. Although cohort 1 were more appreciative of someone visiting them, most of the 'after' respondents felt that an ex-C2C Kainos graduate, or someone with similar experience, who had made a successful break with crime would be more useful. As most of the Kainos graduates will be released into the local area, thought could be given to boosting the volunteer function, both within, and beyond the prison, but the role and desired outcomes of visitor participation perhaps need to be reviewed.

Participants' geographical origins and release issues

Linking where participants were living before prison and arrangements for release

In the 'before' interviews, respondents were asked about where they were 'from' and where they expected to be released. In the 'after' study, the remaining, graduated respondents were asked to update the views on preparation for release.

BEFORE INTERVIEWS The responses here produced a number of clear themes, which are best summarised in the grid below.

Respondent	Before this sentence	Expected release destination
GROUP 1		
TE2	Manchester area ¹¹	Different Manchester Area <i>'...where a relative can employ me and help and I can stay away from my mates'.</i>
TE1	Manchester area	Same Manchester area <i>'.....but I've got a job to get out to through the family, so I've just got to prove I can do it.'</i> Indicated that Kainos learning will help.
C1	Manchester area	Same Manchester area • Guaranteed accommodation with his family • Contacts he could use to get work • Subject to MAPPA arrangements
C2	Manchester area	Same Manchester area • Has family there who could give him a job as a handyman.
GROUP 2		
TE3	Manchester area	Different Manchester Area <i>'but not to the same estate. I'll go to the area where my 'legal friends' live, the ones that visited and helped me inside who will help me with jobs and finding a place. Kainos helps with being able to separate these from my non-legal friends, the ones I went to school with on my estate. They didn't visit or help me.'</i>
TE4	Manchester area	New Area outside Manchester <i>'No, I need to avoid it and move to somewhere like Birmingham so that I can stay away from people trying to beat me up to find my brother who's a drug dealer.'</i> <i>'Need to be near families but they are in different places. I want to connect with my kids but my partners are not so keen so I need to convince Social Workers when I get out.'</i> <i>'I've been gate arrested before so I don't put much weight on parole hearings. I'm guaranteed into a hostel, approved premises, with a tag on release. I might rip up my release or not sign it and do the full stretch, or I'll get recalled to avoid being terrorised by Probation. They can be too intense, ask too much and terrorise you. I'm committed to</i>

¹¹ In the interests of maintaining anonymity, this term covers the Greater Manchester area and towns close to this too. Most respondents were more specific.

		<i>staying on this course rather than taking parole because I'll learn how to survive outside and show social services I've done the work'</i> <i>'Probation just mess up your jobs by having to approve. You miss the chance.'</i>
TE5	Manchester area	New Area outside Manchester <i>'....back to a nearby town where I already have an address and a job [through family] so not a priority for preparation. It's more about changing behaviour once I'm there</i>
C3	Manchester area	Same Manchester area • Has family there who run a removal business he could join • They could offer him accommodation or he could live in a hostel.
C4	Manchester area	Same Manchester area • Intends to go back there, as he has family that he could live with and wants to interact with: eg to help bring up his grandchildren. • He has skills as a car mechanic that he could get a job with.
C5	Manchester area	Same Manchester area • Has no trade, but has family there. Would live with them or in a hostel.

Specific question regarding preparations made for C2C graduates' release

Release dates

To firm up the themes hinted at above, this question was primarily to assess the participants' perspectives and what was salient to them, in both 'before' and 'after' periods, rather than an accurate attempt to match what is recorded on them.

Group 1

TE1: BEFORE Finishes C2C Course Oct 2021: has a parole/Cat D chance for Jan 2022: end of sentence is Sept 2022. *'I'd like to stay on this wing as a mentor and avoid a normal wing. I'm respected here and it's more predictable so you can help people.'* AFTER *'It doesn't make sense at the moment. I'm here to the end of 2021 and then I'll be in Cat D until Sept 2022..... You only get help from OMU 6 months before release..... 'I know who to see for accommodation and work, it will be through Probation. But I know I will be homeless if I can't go back to my girlfriend's or my brother's.'*

TE2: BEFORE *'My parole hearing is in March 2022, I've got a good chance after this [C2C] course. I could go into the main prison to do more courses to help with parole, but would also stay on this wing if I could, but not as a mentor.'* AFTER – No additional comments

C1 BEFORE expects to be released in 2022. C2 in March 2022. AFTER *'No. It is difficult to move back to the same area of Manchester where the problems are, but it's where my family is..... 'Probation have organised me staying at approved premises.'*

Group 2

TE3 BEFORE was not forthcoming on this topic. AFTER Iv4 *'I've got 11 months in Cat D. No input yet, just some information about where to go, who to see..... I'm supposed to be going back home to my partner for accommodation, but they could put me in a hostel. God knows what will happen.... 'I have a job to go to when fully out. A roadie, through friends. I need more support, ready for release.'*

TE4 BEFORE expects his final release in June 2002 irrespective of parole results. *'But I would like to stay on this wing until then.....I've not thought about being a mentor....too early and not ready.'*...*'My major problem will come when Probation start to get involved 10 months before release. I need to be able to show social workers the progress not them.'* AFTER Iv6 *'There's not much support on release'*

TE5 mentioned January 2022 but it was hard to clarify if this was end of sentence or parole hearing.

C3's BEFORE release was not until 2023. AFTER Iv7 *'I'm going back to the same area, but I'll need to cut out a lot of people there and concentrate on my son. It's too early for accommodation and jobs, I'll be on Cat D for a good while.'*

C4: *'I could be out soon after C2C finishes in January 2022'* – not clear if this is parole hearing or final release date. He wanted to know more about what LHT could offer, particularly on and after release. He didn't really miss the association and gym. Thinks C2C is better without these.

C5 could be out in June 2022

Summary

The key factors here are the participants' views based on the points in their sentence and how this relates to formal assistance compared to their own intended arrangements relating to accommodation and employment on release.

8/10 'before' participants thought that it was too early in their sentence to receive help through the prison and had not heard of Through the Gate or LHT options. One [C5] was not interested in any formal assistance, while the remaining participant was interested in what he'd heard about LHT assistance.

In the main, the focus was on family and personal connections for resettlement, for which it was not too early to think about and was obviously an important or dominant narrative that it could be exploited in any rehabilitation setting. Some of these plans were more concrete than others, and some use doubtful tenses in this regard. Some resettlement research suggest these plans may not be realistic and that family members may have a less positive view about their return.

However, there is enough here to think about earlier dissemination and discussion about LHT options, especially if they are developed in the NW. Research on Through the Gate (TTG) so far suggests that it is best not to rely on this option, but it might be that Kainos/LHT are able to discuss hybrid resettlement approaches if the TTG approach is not too rigid.

In the 'after' study, the situation regarding preparations for release were perhaps marginally clearer, but in most cases, it was still regarded as premature. It also affected graduates' willingness and/or ability to remain on the Kainos wing.

Overall, the picture is quite mixed. Some feel it is too early, dependent on their release date, others feel they don't need it, other still don't recognise a Probation connection precisely in that light.

There were some related topics that naturally followed on from the responses in the 'before' period, so these were developed more specifically in the after period.

Staying on the Kainos wing after graduation

In the after period because they were graduates, and had moved on in their sentence, the seven 'after' respondents could give a pretty clear picture of their reasoning on the desirability of remaining in the Kainos wing.

Iv1 'If I wasn't getting released or Cat D, it would be very important to stay on this wing. I'm mates with officers and the other Kainos lads, it will keep you on the right path in a good atmosphere.'

Iv2 'Don't need it. I've got parole or Cat D in March, but would stay on the Kainos wing until then if I stay longer.' Going back to the same place and has money/job/accommodation promises.

Iv3 'I'm going for Cat D or release in July 2022, but best to stay on the wing until then. It also keeps non Kainos out. I'll keep my head down and help others.'

Iv4 'I'm going to Cat D, which I've got by doing this course [C2C]. Otherwise, I'd stay here in the friendly environment'.

Iv6 'I'll stay on Kainos wing until release. No Cat D for me due to adjudication.'

Iv7 'I've got Cat D coming. I'd prefer to stay in Kainos, but on Cat D.'

Summary

There was an obvious, positive attitude and desire to stay on the Kainos wing after graduating. Those who were being released wanted to stay. Obviously, for the others, this had to be balanced against getting Cat D status and moving on. Some participants hinted that they'd like Cat D status but to spend it on the Kainos wing. It is perhaps not possible to achieve this within the current system, but it is worth flagging for discussion, especially since it would help reduce the number of non-Kainos prisoners on the wing.

Staying in Contact with Kainos after Release

In the 'after' period, because the respondents had progressed further in their sentences, we were also able to explore their thinking regarding maintaining post-release contact with Kainos after release.

Iv 1 – 'YES I would like to remain in contact with Kainos afterwards and keep in contact with the lads [from Kainos] too – that would be really helpful and I'd like to help outside too.'

Iv2 – 'YES' [Kainos follow up outside prison would be helpful to keep to the lessons learned]

Iv3 – 'NO, I don't need to, I know what's going on. I'll move forward, I've got a job.'

lv4 – ‘I probably don’t need it. It needs to be the same facilitators’

lv6 – ‘YES That would help, esp. with a drugs past. It would help engage with Inspire too. I’m out soon, in June, and want to be back to the same area as my family is there. But I will be in a hostel in a different town first. That’s been discussed with Probation. As for employment, I haven’t had any help, that’s down to my own arrangements, but it will be cash in hand which isn’t much use. I’m going to concentrate on the kids and staying off drugs.’

lv7 ‘Yes, it would actually help if I could contact Kainos from Cat D. Outside, it would be a good idea, but it would be better if it’s the same staff.’

Summary

Four of the six respondents offering a view thought it would be useful to maintain contact with Kainos after release. There was an overall theme among the yeses that it would be important to be in contact with the Kainos participants and/or Kainos C2C staff they had been on the wing with.

Covid-specific issues

How has the COVID pandemic affected C2C ?

Only a few participants, all in the ‘before’ period, mentioned Covid-related difficulties, which tended to be raised more around general wing issues rather than Kainos C2C specific ones, or comparisons with previous prisons.

C1 ‘The visiting system is not what it was and very unsupportive, as is the number of telephone calls allowed. The lack of association and gym cutbacks are partly COVID and partly recent regime changes which no-one understands.’ He never knew C2C apart from COVID but can see how it could be better if there was more association.

C2 felt restricted numbers of visits had lowered morale. He had only been on the programme during COVID so didn’t know what it was like before.

C3 particularly missed the family visits. Did not know C2C before COVID.

C4: ‘Family links are terrible compared with the past. I can’t get in touch for things like birthdays. The visiting system is in danger of breaking down.’

Themes identified for discussion on participant feedback

- How to increase the number of recruits to C2C: eg, by more effective advertising in other prisons
- What should be the priorities for C2C in a post-COVID situation in communal activities and in restoring the hybrid nature of the course?
- Whether the current emphasis on Through the Gate and LHT post-release actions needs to be modified to include participants’ own (perceived) arrangements?
- How to re-introduce a volunteer system more directed towards participants’ needs.
- Better communication between Prison Service management (esp. regime change) and Kainos.

2. INTERVIEWS WITH KAINOS STAFF

Background and Training: Role in delivering C2C

The three Kainos facilitators interviewed comprise all C2C delivery staff¹² in LFs. One of the facilitators has worked for Kainos for over 5 years and had previous experience of C2C delivery in a different prison. The other two had started relatively recently: July 2020 & February 2021, and this represented their first professional job. All three facilitators were graduates, two with criminology-based degrees and relevant placement experience. The most recent recruit had finished sitting in with the more experienced staff and was now delivering structured sessions after practising with other facilitators and the Kainos Treatment/ Programme manager

Training

All have been inducted and have received some C2C training, but had not had relevant training prior to joining Kainos. The most experienced facilitator had completed Kainos C2C induction and core skills training. The two recently employed facilitators were due to complete core skills training by the end of August 2021 and end of 2021 respectively. Some of this has been by zoom due to Covid restrictions. One was looking forward to also taking advantage of additional LHT training.

'LHT also have training for MH, CBT, Working with Sex Offenders, etc. Not all of it is relevant, but I'm looking forward to taking some of those opportunities.'

Overall, all three facilitators were unanimous in saying the training was useful and could be applied in practice. Two were happy with the whole process, even though some had to be via Zoom.

FB & FC valued the sessions' use of colleagues as proxy prisoners:

FA: *'Definitely practising delivering sessions to colleagues. They were very critical and it was later much easier to deliver sessions to the prisoners.'*

FB: *'All of the training was useful and it was adapted well for home/zoom use. We went through any minor issues with [Treatment Manager] and she adjusted as was needed as we went along. She made sure we had breaks so it wasn't overwhelming.'* The core skills is normally in person, but zoom and using other staff for role play did give me orientation for the real thing'.

However, one (FA) did note:

'It was quite a false environment which made it quite stressful and nerve-wracking.' I hadn't seen much of the real programme during the training. It didn't work too well using the other facilitators as the role-playing prisoners. 'You couldn't step back and take a prisoner point of view'. You could do with a day with real prisoner volunteers.

Covid impact on training

¹² The Treatment manager was interviewed in an earlier stage of the project.

FA *'We changed the training, due to Covid, for induction and the module content quite a bit. The content is not too different, but we did Powerpoint slides and adapted to zoom. There is more feedback now as a result.'*

FB *'I don't have anything to compare it with, but it worked well. That said, Covid affected the whole prison. Men were locked up for longer. They complain about the regime. The social aspects of the C2C are now minimal, as they cannot talk freely on the wing: for example, to mentors or previous graduates. There is a mentor [D] but he has not been able to do his job properly because of this lack of contact. One group cannot work with another. A bit frustrating for everybody. Hard for prisoners. The TC work is heavily affected and much more so than the cognitive side, so it has not been possible to get hands on training as much as normal.'*

FC *'I didn't have a comparison, but it has been adapted well.'*

Other issues

FA *'I think the job is refresher training really. You are always reviewing within the modules to get it right. There is a weekly Planning Session which is really useful and you adapt where you have to for Covid and other things that come up.'*

FA *'I don't need to know more about accreditation. I know how what I do fits in and I have a relevant understanding. If it is a more general I would just ask [Treatment manager] Same goes for manuals – you are always applying them in practice'*

FC *'I think it is easy as we have an open relationship with [Treatment manager] or you can go to [longer serving facilitator] who has been there for a while.'*

Summary responses to training

THINKING ABOUT YOUR C2C TRAINING OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE IT
--

Scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7) **FA = 6 FB = 7 FC = 6**

Since the full sample of facilitators only consists of 3 people, the high mean score of 6.3 is only indicative but confirms their generally positive views on training.

Summary

The responses overall indicate facilitators' consistent level of satisfaction with Kainos C2C training and a very functional team approach. Based on responses here, use of volunteer prisoners, perhaps mentors or C2C graduates, could be considered to supplement staff role playing. Although two of the staff did not have pre-Covid experiences, it was clear that FB felt that Covid restrictions had unavoidably impacted on optimum C2C delivery.

How C2C fits with other programmes, how prisoners are selected and how the programme is actually delivered

Kainos staff knowledge and understanding of other programmes in LFs

FA only mentioned TSP. FB expanded that LFs *'offers TSP to a small number of men, which seems quite similar to C2C but with lower dosage, three months only.'*

There is also 'Building better relationships' but this is being removed to be delivered to ex-prisoners in the community'

FC also noted TSP *'and there are other programmes. Those who have been on other programmes know more what to expect and it makes it a bit easier. I wouldn't say it causes any issues. There is some cross over, like the cycle of change.'*

FA and FC mentioned that there was also a specific Drug Rehabilitation wing and/or programme, while FB focused on possible training awareness sessions for HMPS staff and noted that prison wing staff *'don't understand what we are trying to do.'*

Kainos staff Views on other programmes in LFs

None of the Kainos staff had worked on any of these other programmes.

FA did not have views on other programmes, or on what other Kainos workers thought about them. The other two, more recently recruited staff had developed some initial impressions.

FB *'To some extent TSP is in competition for prisoners with C2C. Sometimes C2C gets a referral, but the prisoner is transferred over to TSP, who seem to get first pick, especially as TSP numbers are organised by the Offender Management Unit. This could be a COVID thing, as I know that TSP was shut down for longer than C2C.'*

FC *'Kainos staff generally know about TSP and EVOLVE. Prison staff too. But Kainos is more unknown to them, so we are doing some awareness training and getting more known.'*

Kainos staff understanding of how participants are selected/excluded for C2C

FA was clear that potential C2C participants *'should have an OGRS Score of 47 or more, which were normally all done by [Treatment manager]. I understand the process of referrals and the OGRS score, but it is mainly down to [Treatment manager] to do the selection. We did have one 'Intersex' prisoner that required more discussion and adaptation, but that was sorted.'*

FA also noted that *'LFs is Cat C, so usually 16 months to go, but it can vary. Some have the right score, but we still can't take them if they are on too short a sentence, even though they are eligible.'* FA *'We also can't take prisoners on Methadone, but we can take the rest [of drug users] now. Spice is still a problem, even on the Kainos wing, but less than before Covid. I'm not sure what the reason is, it could be lockdown, or changes in security. The social distancing has probably had an effect.'*

FB *'Prisoners can self-refer or C2C can be in their sentence plan, if they meet the criteria, [Treatment manager] does a triage selection. The assessment process is carried out by me and the two other staff. Only prisoners from Lancaster Farms are referred: none from neighbouring prisons.'*

FB *'Prisoners have an OASys assessment when they come in to Lancaster Farms, which is a way of assessing dynamic risk factors. It is very slow to work on but quite straightforward and prisoners seem quite happy with it. I will introduce myself and conduct a comprehensive assessment with prisoners. This is to get an idea whether*

they are suitable for C2C or not. I have gained experience of interviewing prisoners and now know what other questions to ask them.'

FB *'There are already some [eligible] people for future courses so there does not seem to be a shortage despite some OMU poaching. I see the need for more and better communication with probation staff who run the OMU. There are sometimes clashes between the OMU sentence plan and prisoner's personal wishes.'*

FC *'I know [Treatment manager] selects for OGRS of over 45, which is high risk. They have to have 6 months remaining on their sentence and at the other end, more than 24 months [to serve] means it's too early. No sex offenders or those on methadone, but other drug issues are admitted. Spice use has gone down, perhaps due to Covid, but seems like it might be going back up. Prisoners are aware that Covid has reduced [associated] violence and other problems.'*

FC *'[Treatment manager] does the majority of it and writes to the eligible ones. If they respond, one of us will then get involved and go and speak to them. That's more about filtering out those who say "I want it so I can get Cat D" or "OMU told me to do it" and looking for motivations to change. Potential drop outs are a problem and much harder work and they can disrupt more. I look for if they appear genuine and express the need to change and can give you proper reasons. It is partly age related and that goes with the amount of criminal justice contact.'*

FC *'Contact with kids and family are common factors, but I've noticed those who are on their first long sentence (they call it a first proper sentence) only start to realise the need for change when they have to think about the reality over that longer time.'*

All three Kainos staff agreed that prisoners are not currently moved from other prisons in the area to be placed onto C2C? FA said this *'used to happen before Covid at Haverigg, but not really since.'*

Summary Likert responses to previous courses statement

'THE SELECTION PROCESS OVERALL WORKS WELL TO ENSURE THE PRISONERS ADMITTED TO C2C ARE THE RIGHT ONES'
--

Scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7) **FA = 7 FB = 7 FC = 5**
Since there are only 3 facilitators in total the mean of 6.7 (extremely positive) is indicative only, but does provide a confirming cross check with the positive qualitative feedback.

Understanding of how C2C is currently delivered

Knowledge of manuals

The response varied depending on the facilitators' experience

FA *'There are lots of manuals I'm aware of. 'I can't remember the last time I looked at one. It's only if [Treatment manager] is not there.'*

FB said *'I know all about the manuals and have studied them in detail.'* They named seven manuals that they had studied. *'They are extremely good. All of them.'* They gave a few examples of what was in the manuals.

FC noted that they *'use the programme manual every day.'*

The extent to which the delivery of C2C matches the manuals and related guidance (including Covid impact)

FB noted: *'I think the delivery of the programme is very close to what is in the manuals: we try to keep to them as much as possible, as we recognise their value and the expertise that has gone into writing them.'*

Both FA and FC agreed and also stressed adaptations under Covid.

FA stated that *'[Treatment manager] spent a lot of time making sure it would work during Covid. The introduction of the weekly plan is the best thing.'*

Similarly, FC argued: *'It is pretty close, but Covid has required adaptations. It has affected some activities, like standing in line and ranking each other and of course the groups are only 6, not 12, but this will increase to 9 soon and then back to 12. The weekly planning sessions are really useful. If something comes out of a problem solving in a key worker session, say you've tried something out, you can cover it in the weekly planning and feed it back into future sessions.'*

FA and FB did not note any deviations because of local circumstances such as security schedules, room availability, staff availability, etc. FC was clear that:

'It is related to the wing situation. There are a lot of non Kainos prisoners on the wing as well as Covid restrictions. It means that Kainos participants miss association time to do Kainos sessions and it causes resentment. If all were on Kainos, it wouldn't be a problem. We can get them [non-Kainos prisoners] moved if they are negative about Kainos staff and prisoners. As Kainos group sizes grow and the number of them, it will be easier to exclude non Kainos and also select for future participation.'

Putting C2C classroom learning into practice on the wing

Since C2C is designed so that lessons learned in classes can be put into practice on the wing, all Kainos facilitators were asked whether and how this is achieved.

FA *'We get more of an understanding because we are 9 to 5 every day and although it depends on the mix, the participants do challenge each other. But if they can't agree, they do come to us. It's not [being seen] as "snitches" making formal complaint). You get complaints about general behaviour as well, like smoking spice.'*

FA *'Thefts and debt are common problems in prison. We don't get much, even though they aren't all Kainos participants. We had a trainers theft, but it was easy to find out on the wing and we got them returned with no trouble. It's very difficult to do that on an Open Wing. The biggest theft problem is that my sellotape always goes missing after if I don't watch it, because you can't use blue tack etc. in cells and pictures have to be put up using toothpaste, which eats the paper).'*

FC agreed, noting there was little theft or drugs on the Kainos wing, but also argued that: *'when 3rd cohort has to go out of the wing for classes, there is more potential.'*

FB added that *'Covid restrictions had made it very difficult to maintain the TC element of the C2C application, on top of the mix of Kainos and non-Kainos bunch. However, this should improve now that things [Covid restrictions] are less strict.'*

Four specific issues: mentoring systems, volunteer participation, preparations for support on release, and keeping prisoner records

Mentoring

All 3 Kainos facilitators were aware of the mentoring system¹³ where C2C graduates/near graduates help with successive C2C courses. They were clear there was one current mentor from the 1st cohort and another being recruited.

Recruiting mentors

Perhaps due to the ongoing processes, all three were clear about what was involved in selecting, assessing and appointing mentors and saw the value in mentors. All noted that the selection process was quite exacting, mirroring relevant C2C participant comments.

FA *'Anyone can apply. There is a formal process. They have to fill out the application form, and it is assessed by joint Kainos and Prison key workers, and if supported, they need to do a presentation and panel Q&A session. It is quite like standard job applications. They get help with the form etc. so it's better when they have been on C2C for a while and it also developed their [transferrable] skills.'*

FA *'Most issues are the same under Covid. I will look out for signs of poor behaviour, not being consistent, not exhibiting enough prosocial behaviour. It might be that they are not near the end of the (C2C) programme so they aren't ready. If not, but they are interested, it is a way to engage with them. If they have motivation, they prefer direction and honest feedback, so you can direct them and get them to reflect on the direct positive consequences. This can be discussed with their own mentors. You can also get them to think about the course and another way of engaging.'*

FA *'Not everyone is suitable, but this can also be due to not being on C2C for long enough when applying. In addition to unsuitability, it maybe they are transferred to a Cat D prison, or are released.'*

FC added *'You ask them to apply and this is usually after they've got a few sessions done so you can have an informed view. If they are positive and help prisoners and staff and engage well in sessions, then you are considering them. If they are negative, not helpful in sessions and there are drugs issues, written warnings, etc. you won't consider them. It may be that it is too early, but some won't be eligible.'*

FC *'Mentors make it easier to resolve disputes and it is away from the idea of grassing. It can mediate the involvement of Kainos staff and it can be covered in*

¹³ NB: FB and FC had no pre-Covid experience.

team briefings without necessarily becoming formal. The main thing is to see behaviour change after that.

All three thought the recruitment of mentors was appropriate and sufficient for the overall low numbers and the Covid restrictions. None anticipated recruitment problems as new cohorts came on line and numbers grew.

Suggested improvements to the mentoring process

FA *'I think it's quite good now. [Adapting to] Covid has helped really. We have a 12 week induction process and also a designated supervisor.'*

FB *'There is a need for more communication with wing staff. The mentor role could be more developed within joint working.'*

FC *'Mentors work well and it is a key thing that mentors can stay on the wing after the course and continue in that role. It is also perhaps important to recruit more mentors so that they reduce the number of non Kainos prisoners while helping to run C2C. That applies the C2C graduates too.'*

This raised the issue of how long prisoners remain in LF on the Kainos wing after C2C before release.

FA was the most experienced facilitator and stated: *'It varies. They are typically on 16 months, so it depends when you get them.'*

FB argued *'They don't stay too long. They get their Cat D a couple of month afterwards and are then moved or released.'*

FC stated *'It can be quite fast if they only have just over 6 months to go when they come on the programme. The longest stretch afterwards will be under 24 months.'*

This suggests that while keeping C2C graduates on the Kainos wing would help reduce the number and proportion of non-Kainos prisoners, it would require improved and close liaison with prison management to maintain its value as the stock and flow of Kainos graduates is likely to be relatively volatile.

Resettlement preparations for C2C graduates when released

The period following release is known to be one where the risk of reoffending is likely to be highest, as ex-prisoners face a very different location and context to the prison where they have done rehabilitative work.

Origin of C2C participants and intended release locations

Confirming most C2C participants' responses, all three Kainos facilitators were clear most C2C participants came from Manchester/NW and were likely to return there. FA noted that *'It used to vary a bit, but the majority are from the Greater Manchester area now since Covid'*. FB noted *'Their main interest is in getting away from their home environment and in particular to go south where there is more work and they can start afresh. They do not want to go back to where they came from.'* This last view does not reflect the bulk of the C2C participants' responses.

Resettlement Arrangements

FA said that there were some resettlement arrangements but *'not as standard' through C2C.*

'They do the Through the Gate form, but they can write us a letter if they need us and we will engage. They also now (starting with the January cohort) have a 3 stage self-assessment form process. Introduced during Covid. The 1st self-assessment form, at the start of C2C, requires a letter-to-self which is read after completion of the 2nd self-assessment form at the end of C2C. My group then write a new letter-to-self and they get that letter after 6 months at their address.'

FB was more positive about resettlement provision and stated 'During the final module graduates get a talk from Chris Drury of LHT, who talks about help with accommodation, which some take up: eg moving to living in Langley House Trust accommodation after release¹⁴. There is also the link with Clean Sheet who are partners of LHT and can help with job seeking.'

FC noted *'I haven't had much to do with Through the Gate. I'm more focused on LHT's value added facilities for accommodation, but also Clean Sheet for employment and there is some MH provision.'*

Kainos / non-Kainos mix

FC 'Some hit a wall and start acting up – we've had two de-selections recently because of that: one has come back on the wing as a non Kainos prisoner which has been very unpopular and disruptive with the Kainos groups.'

Summary

The overall impression was that resettlement is not a major concern for any of the actors interviewed and there is an acceptance that these issues can be left until near release when formal systems, eg, Through the Gate (TTG) are programmed in. TTG is not renowned for its effectiveness. LHT has vast experience in accommodation for hard to place groups but coverage of resources is late on in the C2C course. It will be important to evaluate the effectiveness of the letter-to-self process.

C2C participants in study were keen to stress moving back to the same, or similar area in the NW, and were potentially overconfident in relying on their relatives/families for accommodation and employment, with little interest in official, or LHT processes related to this. It is highly likely that C2C and LHT provision could be better connected, and covered, which would undoubtedly reduce reoffending.

¹⁴ It was our understanding that LHT only had Care Home provision in the NW area, to where most C2C graduates said they were likely to return.

Volunteer Participation¹⁵

All three Kainos facilitators were aware of the system that allows volunteers to come into the prison from the local community to support the work of C2C.

FA *'Not seen much of volunteers since Covid. We only had a 'little old lady' who didn't have a similar background to the prisoners. It is good to see people doing it not for financial gain. The prisoners like it for a bit. Even for those who are experienced in what offenders' lives are like, but after a while the prisoners just want to tell it like it is. There is no massive impact.'*

FB was aware of the *'single volunteer who comes in from time to time to help with preparing graduates for their release. This has not happened during COVID and it is not clear to FB if this will be reinstated after COVID. FB didn't know whether the volunteer had known links with institutions: eg churches, NGOs. etc. that could be helpful for resettlement.'*

FC *'There is a volunteer normally yes, but not during Covid. I suppose it is a positive pro social role model which is a good signal. There has been a 'little old lady' who is an ex-social worker. I think she's been able to build positive relationships.'*

Only one FA could rate whether volunteers contributed positively to C2C based on experience and rated them a 3 on the scale: Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (7), indicating that their value was not clear. Both FB and FC had not had sufficient experience of volunteers.

Summary

Given the limited Kainos facilitators' experience of volunteers, it is important not to base conclusions on these alone. However, when combined with prisoners' views in this study, findings from previous Kainos evaluations and the findings here on resettlement, it is perhaps time to revisit the purpose of the role. Certainly ex-offenders/C2C graduates would appeal to released C2C graduates and there was some indication in previous studies that ex-police officers and other CJ professional volunteers who 'know the score' are valued, along with clear connections to overlapping resettlement resources, eg: accommodation; employment, church connections etc.

Knowledge of monitoring of participants' progress

FA said that *'[Treatment manager] manages the formal measures: IEP, Self harm, etc. But personally, I look for development based on behaviour and decision making. For instance, if they didn't like being challenged, I'd give them a written warning to see how they react. This often results in a positive reaction, something to officially engage with and you can then make progress.'*

¹⁵ NB: Volunteer visits have not been allowed during Covid, limiting FB and FC's experience of them.

FB was aware of the recording processes in place and felt they were all fine. She understood the need to collect all this data. She looked forward to improvements in the MIS resulting from our study.

FC *'[Treatment manager] has the spreadsheets and we can get an overview from that. I'm more focused on the history notes from each session and the EOP reports.'*

What works well in C2C in Lancaster Farms

FA *'Most of it had been covered. Kainos is pretty good.'*

FB *'The positives are that you can sustain challenging the prisoners day-by-day, which might not happen in a community setting, such as a probation order. So, in this respect the prison environment comes to your aid.'*

FC *'It is working better with Prison Service now regarding awareness of Kainos. It used to be us and them, but it takes time to get that right. Their task is mainly unlocking, but a couple did respond to Prison Service adverts to work on the Kainos Wing. There is a good class room and key worker room'.*

Specific challenges to delivering C2C as required in LFs

FA argued that *'Most of the issues relate to the prison service link ups. Consistency is really important outside 9-5 for prisoners and Kainos staff. You need the same faces. During Covid, the turnover of [Prison Officer] wing staff has been high and it is harder to extract information and liaise effectively. This includes the CM and SOs. Prisoners often hear [about changes] before Kainos staff and can get annoyed if we don't know. A recent example was a meeting of Wing Staff that excluded Kainos staff, where the wing regime was changed, from daily timetabling to shifts. This makes it hard to plan ahead effectively in the short term.'*

FA *'We have 2 groups running currently, which use a single, good quality, class room on the Kainos wing. If we get 3 groups running, we will have to use a classroom on another wing, which introduces a lot of issues and uncertainty.'*

FB *'There are staff shortages: HMPS now employs lots of new staff. Lots of their staff are new and inexperienced. There is high [PO] staff turnover. This leads to problems with prisoners being let out late or locked up early.'*

FC *'Communication with Prison Service at Regime [change] level doesn't work for us. We aren't thought about or included despite the problems caused for our planning and for prisoner Association impact. It happens often and the prisoners can know first.'*

FC *'Turnover of prison staff is an issue. You can't maintain consistency between wing staff and us and prisoners like that.'*

Suggestions for future developments of C2C

FB argued that *'At 35 men are getting sick of the prison cycle. That is who it is best for to use C2C in prisons. Women are more difficult than men and I think it would be*

more challenging to deliver C2C to young people. My experience of younger prisoners is that their attitude is not to change. They don't have motivation.'

In contrast, FC argued *'We need to grow more to get a higher profile first. It could work for females.'*

3. INTERVIEWS WITH PRISON WING STAFF

Coverage

The 3 Prison officers interviewed were recruited from a single duty turn on the Kainos wing at LFs in September 2021

Compared to the Kainos staff, the 3 prison officers interviewed presented a very different profile. Two officers were relatively young in service and relatively new to the Kainos wing. In contrast, the other prison officer was very experienced and had had contact with the C2C programme when working in a previous prison. None had specifically requested to work on the Kainos wing and had been routinely allocated.

The emphasis of these interviews is necessarily different to those of Kainos staff.

Comparison with other prison programmes

P3 Argued that the Kainos programme was not comparable with previous programmes they had experience of since they had a narrower focus. *'TSP is not as broad, and drugs programmes are obviously narrower. Kainos is deeper and staff are around so we can do joint keyworker session with them. You have more time.'*

Origin of prisoners

P1 thought that most prisoners were from the North West, but wasn't sure about where they returned to as they had not been in post for very long.

P2 said most prisoners were from the surrounding area, including up to Carlisle, and generally returned there.'

P3 said 'Most prisoners were from Manchester or NW in general and usually return there'.

Kainos and non-Kainos prisoners on the Kainos wing

P1 did not have any other prison, wing or pre-covid experience in order to make a comparisons with the Kainos wing. They felt the mix was about 50/50 with Kainos and non-Kainos and that there were 66 on the wing.

P2 'The balance is wrong. There are 68 beds for a full complement, and most are non-Kainos. It needs to be full Kainos to work properly, more selective, so there is proper community all day.'

P3 'There was a lot of separation between those on Kainos and the others at the start, but it's improved'.

P3 'It's not a proper Kainos regime here. The end goal is to have a Kainos only wing, those that are on it and those that have already finished it. There's 68 beds on the wing and you're lucky if 10 of those are Kainos at the moment.'

P1 'The regime clashes here. You've got two timetables which is a problem they don't have on other wings. Kainos lads can be more entitled and feel normal rules don't apply. I think it would be better for them to have to go off the wing for Kainos classes, to make them more similar to the others. You go off the wing for TSP. It might sort out complaints about not

having enough association time. It's better to let them work and do Kainos, it would sort some regime problems in the pm sessions.'

P2 *'The mixed wing does give Kainos prisoners some level of entitlement. They feel they are above the other prisoners and they play us [POs] off against Kainos staff. I think this wouldn't happen if the wing was all Kainos.'* *'For us it is easier on other wings, it's more hassle here, with Kainos prisoners pecking at us more. A single regime would be better.'*

P3 *'As it is, being on a Kainos wing makes them feel too entitled and creates tension with the non-Kainos prisoners, so it's divisive. The non-Kainos prisoners have to do work and see the Kainos ones getting paid just to be on the programme but the Kainos ones think they should get more. I think it would be better for Kainos prisoners to be able to work as well, even off the wing. They'd be out the cells more, but [Prison Service] 'Activities and Associations' just block it.'*

Selection process

All three prison staff preferred for Kainos participation to be part of a sentence plan and felt self-referrals were not a good way to select genuine Kainos participants.

P1 *'I don't like self-referrals. Some of them come on Kainos just to get Cat D, and if it doesn't work, they aren't interested. I've seen some kicked off because they thought it was a walk in the park and didn't want to put the work in. They need to take responsibility first. I've seen some who genuinely want to change, they've had enough, usually a bit older, and OMU and others can spot those and refer them. It would be better to be on a sentence plan, that makes them have to work at it.'*

P2 *'We get some self-referrals on this wing and they give nothing, just here to be with their mates who have told them to self-refer. Some are committed and some aren't, but it would be better on a sentence plan they have to stick to.'*

P3 argued *'Kainos will work if you get the right people on it. It's better coming from another prison with Kainos as part of the sentence plan. Self-referrals aren't always genuine.'*

Higher management needs to fill the wing were mentioned.

P3: *'We try to filter [out] the non-Kainos people eligible for the Kainos wing but it's above my pay grade to refuse heads on beds'. Management won't be aware or interested without a higher profile and success. They'll just take the funding, but LFs has to engage.'*

The need for a full community function/TC

Despite the Kainos participants' generally positive views on the physical environment of the Kainos wing and its calmer atmosphere, some limitations were mentioned.

P3 *'The only way it works is to get a full Kainos only regime on the wing and then you can get a proper community function. This wing looks OK, but it's too big and you can't spur it off like at Haverigg. It was easy to spur off at Haverigg and keep the community element. I'm an advocate of the Kainos course, but it is affected by too many factors here. My key worker lads who are Kainos are quite positive, but are they getting the full deal. It's not TC is it? How can they apply their learned skills if you can't spur them off? It might be better to put them in Grisdale, which only has 26 beds, although this would limit the planned expansion of Kainos cohorts. I genuinely think it will work if implemented correctly, but there are too many other issues and Covid has just added to that.'*

P1 was more positive: *'it is a calm wing, but LFs is generally like that. I feel Kainos is impacting positively.'*

Differential Discipline

The 3 prison staff all stressed the central importance of the tension between fair prison discipline and rehabilitation through Kainos on a mixed wing, which created a feeling among the majority non-Kainos prisoners that *'Kainos participants get special treatment.'*

P3 noted that for Kainos offenders, there was no real way to discipline them in the same way as non-Kainos prisoners:

'This would not be a problem on a fully Kainos TC wing. As it is, you can't balance between prison discipline and the Kainos approach on a mixed wing. The majority are non-Kainos, so you have to go for the discipline first. But that then conflicts with the Kainos staff.'

*If a [Kainos] prisoner kicks off with an officer outside the classroom, but not when Kainos staff are there, they know they can get away with it. They can threaten 'I'll kick your f***ing head in', ... and that should be an adjudication, and is with non-Kainos prisoners, but with Kainos ones, you have to go back to the Kainos staff unless it gets really serious.... the other prisoners see them getting away with it and that is bad on a wing. There's no denying Kainos adds complexity. If it was a Kainos only wing, you can do a joint intervention about the incident, it becomes part of the Kainos treatment and not an adjudication. That's what it should be like.'*

Kainos and prison staff communication

All three prison staff agreed that relations between prison wing staff and Kainos workers were generally good, *'easy to get on with'* [P2], but were less sanguine about the overall lack of communication mechanisms *'coming from the top'*.

P2 *'We get on well. If asked, I give them [Kainos staff] information on particular prisoners that are my key workers. We do get a lot of info that is useful to them.'*

P2 *'Communication [with senior management] could be better. I don't think Kainos is considered if there is a regime change. It tends to be down to individual officers knowing what is going on, so it can make a difference if they are not on duty. We had a situation where some Kainos prisoners had been told they could have more time out of their cells, but other POs didn't know about it and it all kicked off.'*

P3 *'There is some playing off between Kainos staff and POs. Some less experienced [Kainos] staff learn from us, and we could have joint training sessions. But communication could be better coming down to us. The SO and CM can have meetings but it doesn't always filter down to us. It works both ways, sometime Kainos hear from prisoners first about regime changes, or prisoners come to us saying Kainos have said this is how it will work, but you can't have that.'*

Importance of resettlement arrangements

Prison officers reinforced that resettlement arrangements were not discussed until too late and that prisoners confidence in their own arrangements were unreliable,

P3 *'Resettlement arrangements aren't much on the agenda until 12 weeks before release. It could be earlier. You can't always trust what they say about being fixed up with their family for release. There are genuine cases, but mainly it is underestimating difficulties that could be thought through earlier. I have a key worker on IPP. He knows and accepts he needs to engage with Spectrum [drug support] when he's released. But he also has a good partner and kids who are supportive now that he has changed and used the reflective approach used by Kainos. The family support is high here, but what about where that isn't the case?'*

Covid

P2 argued that 'Covid had made things calmer on the wings but the reintroduction of visitors was starting to make spice more available again and it was more disruptive.'

The future

The officers disagreed about whether C2C was likely to be running in 3 years' time

P1 'Probably, but I've nothing to compare it with': P2 'Yes, I don't see why not.'

P3 'No. there's not enough buy in from management, but I suppose if it's money based [continued funding] then that will be an incentive'.

Summary Issues

Prison officers identified the following needs:

- For better management communication
- For inductions for POs coming on the Kainos wing
- For better communication and research about reasons for drop out, especially for self-referrals, possibly leading to changes to selection processes.
- For a solution to dual regime issues to reduce entitlement and friction between Kainos and non/Kainos (need for better cascading of info by management: need for possible curbs on discretion)
- Regularise the job situation and association for Kainos participants.

4. ANALYSIS OF DROP OUTS'/DE-SELECTION DATA

The accreditation panel has expressed interest in seeing research carried out on those who dropped out of Kainos, to see if they were significantly different from those who continued with C2C. This section of our report examines records available¹⁶ for those five prisoners who dropped out of the courses starting in 2021. It is planned to look at any further dropouts in the same way. Under current arrangements it is not possible to interview dropouts nor have records of previous dropouts been kept for passing to the MOJ to include dropouts in our reconviction analyses.

Programme assessment:

This details the prisoner's history, sentence and background. It also shows how C2C could benefit the prisoner, based upon his history and needs as specified in his interview.

D1 had been involved in crime and drug-dealing since he was around 10 years old. His most recent sentences were for domestic violence, due to lack of trust in his partner but would easily flair up and committed violence against others, gang members and the police who tried to arrest him. He had only been living in the community for six months during the last 5 years. He is from a very dysfunctional family and himself has 5 children from 3 relationships. The PA lists a large number of areas within C2C where D1 could benefit.

D2 had been involved with crime since the age of 8 and had his first custodial sentence at 12. He has been much involved with gangs and committed most types of offence, including

¹⁶ There were nine documents for each drop out, denoted by D1 and D2, to preserve anonymity. The Events Log; Programme assessment; Key work compact, Personal development plan; Key work session reports 1, 2,3: Written warning; End of programme report.

violence. He has also been taking drugs since his teenage years. However, he comes from a family which is all in work and was not badly treated as a child. He has 4 children with the same partner but is no longer with her, as she found him to be unfaithful. He feels that he could benefit from C2C particularly in realizing the consequences of his actions before he commits them. The PA lists many areas of C2C where he could benefit.

D3 had been involved in crime since he was about 11/12 years old, leading to a time when he was stealing high performance cars and served a four-year term. He then got into debt because of his cocaine use and was forced into more criminal activity to clear this debt and is now serving a sentence for drug dealing. He attempted to live a crime free life in Wales with his partner and children but this came unstuck. He comes from a crime ridden and dysfunctional family and would like to move away from them. The PA lists many areas where he could benefit from C2C.

D4 has been involved with burglary and shop-lifting since before the age of 15 when he was in custody for the first time. As a child he was a witness to domestic violence. He has also been convicted of domestic violence to an ex-partner. Many of his burglaries have been committed due to seeking revenge for perceived insults. He had a complex but non-criminal family background and for a time worked as a painter and decorator with his father: but his father died of cancer at the age of 37 and he was unable to cope. He has had several relationships and has two daughters but does not see them now. He has both physical (club foot) and mental (Asperger's, depression) health problems. He has used many drugs in the past. C2C could help him with improving emotional management skills, problem solving skills and his interpersonal relationships.

D5 first got involved with the police when at school, for carrying knives and committing assaults. He was a victim of physical assaults from his mother's partners but retaliated when he was old enough and assaulted them. He is on medication for Schizophrenia and can behave violently if he misses his medication. He has also taken most other drugs, from time to time, both in and out of prison. He has two children and has had various relationships, some of which were violent. For many years he made enough money in various criminal activities with gangs to not have to work legally, His current offence is associated with violence and racial abuse. It is felt that C2C could help with many of his problems, including his impulsivity, consequential thinking skills, poor problem solving and poor decision making.

Key Work Compact:

This is in a standard format, noting that key work sessions will be held once a month or more often if requested.

Key work session 1

This takes place a few weeks after C2C has started.

D1 agreed the Key Work compact. He asked about a cleaning job but was told nothing had changed. He said that he has a positive mind-set towards C2C despite the fact that he is not going to have time to gain Cat-D from it before he is released and is not eligible for parole or HDC. His ADHD was discussed, the pros and cons of asking people for help and the value of having a friend on the course. He apologized for occasions when he showed an abrupt tone of voice to staff and said that he wished he could control his temper better. Targets were set for him to consider his thoughts when in positive and in negative moods.

D2 agreed the key work compact. He thought C2C was going OK. He had started to think about his offences and what he wanted for the future. He was participating well in the group

and encouraging others to do so. He felt positive because he has something to aim at. A goal was set to compare his behaviour at the start of the sentence with now. Another goal was set as to why he needed to change and how this would impact on his life.

D3 was happy with the key work compact but wanted to discuss his habit of 'winding himself up about anything' including trivial matters. It was agreed this would be worked on and he agreed to keep a daily diary so he could get things that worried him down on paper. It was agreed he was doing well in sessions but needed to develop his emotions and learn to trust people more. He also needed to stop his occasional bad language and comments as well as his wandering around the room during sessions as this was disruptive to others.

D4 finds the sessions OK but looking at his past negative behaviour is difficult. He has recently come off methadone and currently has to share a cell: both make life difficult for him and he finds it difficult to wind down out of sessions and can't stop having sad thoughts about his two daughters. This makes it difficult for him to be sure that he will complete the course. However, he did agree to future plans, including using better language in sessions and considering what techniques he could use to wind down after sessions.

D5 had missed a session and not yet copied up material from others. He thinks the sessions are all right but has difficulty in being honest about his life map. He also has difficulty in intervening to make a point and suggestions were made how he could improve this. He said that others find him miserable which annoys him, as he does not feel this but acknowledges that he is quiet. He would like to emulate his sister who has succeeded where he has failed and to get back with his partner, although he is not now allowed to communicate with her. He was set a goal to think about past negative associates with a view to working out how he could have more positive associates in the future. **Unfortunately D5 dropped out before KWS2.**

Key work session 2

This takes place about 4 weeks after KWS1. D5 did not reach this stage.

D1 was initially angry because he felt a member of staff was trying to wind him up.' He was told to be in control of his own behaviour. He then said that he had heard his partner had started a relationship with someone else and various scenarios were discussed for how he should react to this. However, D1 continued to be angry and said he would be violent if he found his partner was seeing someone else. Despite trying to move the session to set targets, D1 continued to be angry with staff, his partner and everything in general. The KWS was not a very successful one.

D2 discussed his goals and agreed they could be more detailed. His participation in the sessions was discussed and it was felt he could concentrate more. He made excuses about the hot weather. His understanding of the sessions was discussed and goals were set for him to consider how he has solved problems in the past and today. His attitude to C2C was discussed and he agreed that he did not work well in a classroom setting. From time to time he feels he does not want to complete C2C. His generally positive behaviour on the wing was discussed.

D3 had completed his daily diary and felt calmer after doing so. He was also more relaxed in sessions, joined in more, while allowing others to speak. He spoke about the 7 steps as being helpful to him has helped to think about taking his time, thinking about things. Goals were set about examining what makes him angry. He also agreed to improve his body language during sessions.

D4 discussed the goals he had been set: it was agreed that his language had improved: also now that he was in a single cell, he felt much calmer, was sleeping better and no longer overreacts to what happens in sessions. However, he was unable to talk to his children on the phone and had taken to using spice to cope with this situation. He knew this was wrong but felt it was inevitable given his upbringing and the situation he was in. **Unfortunately D4 dropped out before KWS3.**

Key work session 3

This usually takes place about a month after KWS 2. D4 and D5 did not reach this stage.

D1's KWS3 was much calmer than KWS2. He discussed all his goals from KWS2 which he had completed. He has also split up with his partner. He said he is becoming aware of how he can be abrupt when speaking to people. He also has several people who support him, inside and outside. He has learned to keep calm. However, his behaviour can be inconsistent. In conversation he admitted that he had been taking another person's medication which led to negative behaviour/adjudications. He had, however, been working well with the Shannon Trust, which he was proud of. Goals were set about taking others' medication and in regard to increasing his self-awareness about his own behaviour. **Unfortunately he dropped out before KWS4.**

D2 had completed all his goals from KWS2; his recent behaviour was discussed, including missing sessions and getting an adjudication for rudeness to staff and how this could be avoided. He said that he had not learned a lot from C2C so far but then spoke about assertiveness. He agreed that he doesn't like being told not to do something and this makes him angry. He agreed his behaviour was a bit up and down. In discussion he admitted this was caused by his smoking spice although he said he no longer wants to use this. Goals were set regarding the skills of emotional management and consequential thinking. **Unfortunately he dropped out before KWS4.**

D3 discussed the two goals from KWS2: looking at what makes him angry and keeping a diary. He agreed he was not keeping a diary properly and said he would try to do better. He discussed his difficulty in knowing how to cope with disagreements. His mood swings were discussed and their influence on how he benefitted from sessions. Two further goals were set: to describe how he can take control of his own future, in regards to managing his emotions and to describe how he would like to react to future problems.

Key Work Session 4

This normally takes place a month after KWS3. However, only D3 reached this stage.

D3 said that he had completed his diary a little more but had only recently considered the other goals from KWS3. He felt he was dealing with things a little better although he had flared up with a PO the day before. He said the sessions on forgiveness had affected him. Goals were set for him to consider the self-talk he has been using, the importance of it and how this has impacted on him: and for him to reflect on how his views on forgiveness have changed since engaging with the programme. **Unfortunately D3 dropped out before KWS5.**

Personal Development Plan:

This contains the goals that have been set, progress with them and when they were discussed. It is updated throughout C2C.

D1's PDP goals had been completed to a considerable extent: EM skills all save a daily diary: PS skills All: self-awareness skills: empathy complete, consequential thinking unfinished;

D2's PDP goals had been completed to a limited extent: self-awareness partly: behaviour responsibility; postponed: PS skills postponed.

D3's PDP goals had been completed as discussed in KWS4: keep a diary: take control of his own future: views on forgiveness: problem solving.

D4's PDP goals were being only partly addressed, continually postponed and not very much progress was being made at the time he dropped out.

As he dropped out very early on, **none of D5's goals had been progressed.**

Written warnings

Formal notice is given to all those who are in danger of being deselected from C2C.

D1 was given a written warning on 28 June 2021 listing the following attitudes which were contrary to the C2C compact: failure to hand in any of his completed goals from his personal development plan; three recent proven adjudications and one suspended award for being in possession of illicit items, causing damage within the community and becoming verbally abusive; two recent negative IEP warnings for failing to follow the prison rules.

D2 was given a written warning on 28 June 2021 listing the following attitudes contrary to the C2C compact: failure to attend or being asked to leave sessions on a number of occasions; a recent proven adjudication for being abusive to staff; 3 recent negative IEP warnings for failing to follow prison rules.

D3, D4 and D5 were not given a written warning before they dropped out.

Events Log:

This is a detailed record of notes made about each individual for each daily attendance or non-appearance and of other relevant issues such as behaviour on the wing and e-mails from other parts of the prison. These documents are invaluable to the Kainos team in looking back at an individual's behaviour and progress. It is clear, from examining the documents that these are read and commented on by all levels in the C2C team.

D1 Events Log: From D1's log we can see that his experience of prior knowledge of C2C, participation in other programmes and in selection for C2C is on the same lines as those interviewed at Lancaster Farms. But his events log notes in detail enormous variation in his behaviour and his progress. Sometime his attendance and participation are excellent and others respond to this. At other times he is moody, un co-operative or disruptive or just not attend for no valid reason. His behaviour can be very rude or extremely polite so it is not that he cannot be pro-social. Outside in the wing he is often rude to staff or others and can overreact to perceived slights. This culminated in security action one night when he *'was moved to CSU compliantly in handcuffs following previous night smashing up [of his cell] and making threats to staff.'* Following this he was removed from C2C the following

comment: *'Given his recent behaviour and relocation to the segregation unit he has been deselected from the Challenge to Change programme.'*

y

D2 Events Log: From D2's log we can see that his experience of prior knowledge of C2C, participation in other programmes and in selection for C2C is on the same lines as those interviewed at Lancaster Farms. The log shows that very early on he wanted to leave C2C as changes in regime meant those on C2C had to lose some association time. However, he then attended positively for some sessions. Later he was disruptive of the sessions to others' annoyance. The events log goes on to show how at times he could be irate and disruptive and at other times very co-operative, working closely with others in the group. He also missed several (parts of) sessions because of healthcare and adjudication problems. He continued to argue that if staff did not treat him with respect (by which he meant let him do what he wanted) he would react forcefully. This complex behaviour pattern came to a head by security action one night when he *'was moved to CSU compliantly in handcuffs following previous night smashing up [of his cell]*. Following this he was removed from C2C with the following comment: *'Given his recent behaviour and relocation to the segregation unit he has been deselected from C2C'.*

D3 Events Log There was some initial doubt if he could finish the course before his earliest release date. His triage assessment included poor belief systems: negative peer influences: poor problem solving: risk taking: poor decision making, emotional management and interpersonal skills: with negative attitude towards authority. In sessions he was very up and down: He often participated well and was excellent at recalling previous lessons: but he also swore and interrupted others' comments, and could also be late and disruptive. He justified this because he was not well, 'not in the mood', depressed because of a dead friend, of because he was not allowed to speak to his children on the phone. However, all went reasonably well until suddenly **he was deselected from the course after action by wing staff:** they accused him of bullying and put him on a CSIP: later in the week he was moved to another wing 'for security reasons' that Kainos staff could only guess at

D4 Events Log D4 had turned to robbery to fund drug use and his assessment included the need to work on emotional management skills: problem solving: and interpersonal relationships. In prison he was unable to cope with the specific issue of not being able to speak with his children and took to NPS use, as a result of which he got into debt on the wing, which stressed him out and caused behavioural problems. He was making some progress on C2C but was deselected after Module 2 session 6, as he was relocated to another unit after his **mental health** seemingly deteriorated, as a result of debt and behavioural problems.

D5 Events Log D5 was assessed as being able to benefit from C2C for many reasons: the need for victim empathy: the need to take responsibility for his own actions: to reduce his impulsivity and increase his assertiveness. However, he deselected himself after module 1 session 7 after the parole board said he wasn't going to have an earlier release. He explained he had thought C2C would influence the parole board. He was given the chance to think of the benefits of C2C but did not wish to stay.

End of Program Report.

This is a very detailed report on all that has happened to the participant. It incorporates much of what is already in the other eight records already discussed but is set in the context of what C2C aims to do, the needs of the individual at the start, progress towards meeting these needs and ends with an assessment of what , in the judgement of the team, is still

needed for the individual. It typically runs to more than a dozen pages and some 8-10,000 words.

D1's EOP Report says that he needs to continue to develop responsibility for his actions: to develop his emotional management skills, and his victim empathy skills. The report makes it clear that some progress has been made on these but such progress was limited by poor behaviour and taking unprescribed medication.

D2's EOP Report says that he needs to continue to develop his decision making and consequential thinking skills to focus on longer term implications of his actions. He also needs to develop his assertiveness skills so as not to cause further issues for himself and others. The EOP report makes clear that some progress has been made on meeting his needs but that bad behaviour has significantly reduced this.

D3's EOP Report says that a key area of focus for him in the future is his emotional management skills. He should also ensure he continues to use pro-social problem-solving skills, so he considers long-term implications of his actions instead of focusing on short-term gains. He should also therefore continue using his assertiveness skills to ensure he does not revert to unhelpful behaviour types

D4's EOP Report says he would benefit from continuing to work on his emotional management skills. He also needs to focus on interpersonal relationships, as he currently lacks the ability to be able to see things from the point of view of others. Also his behaviour prior to be deselected shows that he needs to work more on his problem solving and consequential thinking skills.

D5's EOP Report says he would benefit from spending spend more time developing his victim awareness and empathy skills by thinking about the impacts of his actions on his victims and the wider community. He should continue to work to take responsibility for his own actions: and finally, he would benefit from continuing to develop his assertiveness skills.

5. OBSERVATIONS OF KAINOS DELIVERY

CHALLENGE TO CHANGE: LANCASTER FARMS: 2021 RESEARCH OBSERVATIONS OF CBT SESSIONS, COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES AND KEY WORK SESSIONS

To complement the quantitative studies of participants' success and the qualitative interviews with prisoners and staff, observations were also made of **three sample sessions** during September 2021.

The **purpose of these observations** was to confirm that the routines set out in various programme manuals were being followed, that the aims and objectives of the sessions were being achieved and to act as useful background experience to the researchers in their understanding of what actually occurred during CBT and other sessions.

The **method used** was for the observer to sit quietly in the Kainos classroom, listening to the session, observing and taking notes. He only interacted with others when asked to do so, either by participants or by the facilitator as an extra resource. Permission was sought from the participants beforehand. This was readily given as nearly all of the participants had

previously been interviewed by one of the researchers. Although the sessions were not selected at random, there is no evidence that these were other than routine examples of normal sessions: the presence of an observer seemed to make no difference to the behaviour of either the facilitator or of the participants.

Session on Primary Thoughts and Feelings of Anger (am: Sept 8)

C2C is a programme divided into 5 modules, with up to 8 sessions in each module. Each session considers a particular aspect of behaviour or feeling. Sessions often refer back to previous work and there is a good deal of reinforcement of lessons previously learned. The researcher sat in on session eight of Module 4: (See the Appendix for an extract from the manual). Four participants were present, together with the facilitator. The session was held in a classroom, with everyone seated around the walls and able to see and hear one another clearly. The session lasted two hours, with a break of 20 minutes in the middle. There were no interruptions or anyone having to leave the session.

Participants were keen to join in. All had brought their work folders so were able to refer back to previous sessions and there was quite a bit of such reference back and reprising of previous discussions. As the facilitator adopted a questioning, rather than an instructive approach, this meant that each participant spoke for around the same amount of time. There was a good deal of self-policing with regard to interruptions, etc. although the facilitator made sure that people had their chance to finish what they were saying. Clearly a good deal of trust had built up amongst all participants and the facilitator. There was a considerable amount of silence while people were thinking about their answers and no-one seemed embarrassed by this. Everyone adopted a non-judgmental approach, there was a good deal of non-prison vocabulary and terminology in the discussion, with courteous language throughout. Everyone's thoughts were given equal value. Nobody felt at all uncomfortable.

Participants explored their understanding of anger through reprising past discussions, through rehearsing examples associated with their own lives and by listening to others. There was a variety of types of anger given and examples of what made people angry, including family members. People discussed how they had changed over the period they had been on C2C. They worked through what is necessary to control anger and discussed the flight or fight response and coping strategies. Moreover, it was clear that the examples given were not artificial ones but connected with the reality of being in prison and trying to keep in touch with outside: eg how to cope with e-mails from partners. Each participant acknowledged that it was important to be able to control one's feelings of anger if they wished to live a pro-social life after prisons. There was no flagging of energy as the session progressed.

Discussion Forum on what makes us happy followed by quiz (am: Sept 9)

The researcher sat in on Module 4 session 7: see the Appendix for an extract from the manual. Four participants were present, together with the facilitator. The session was held in a classroom, with everyone seated around the walls and able to see and hear one another clearly. The session lasted two hours, with a break of 20 minutes in the middle. There were no interruptions or anyone having to leave the session.

Participants were keen to join in, especially the first part which discussed what makes people happy. There was a slow but steady response to the facilitator's probing questions and each person gave examples of what made him happy. The results tended to be somewhat different from the research quoted by the facilitator: money came high on the list for the participants and meaningful work did not get a mention from them. However, good relationships with family and friends held the same high place with the participants as with

the research. However, the main aim of the session was achieved: This was to develop perspective taking and conflict resolution skills rather than just to discuss happiness.

The second half of the session consisted of a series of riddles which had to be solved individually: a quiz, to identify 10 pictures of well-known people: and 20 questions on sport, history, entertainment and food. People's participation varied according to their ability to solve these puzzles: two were quite good at them: one got really hung up about questions he could not really understand and another was a little embarrassed by his lack of knowledge and resorted to saying things like '*I don't do sport*' instead of trying to answer the questions. Despite this those with less ability to get the answers right did develop their skills to listen to others who found them easier and there was little jealousy of colleagues with higher scores.

Key Work session (pm: Sept 8)

Key work sessions are an opportunity for the facilitator and the participant to discuss progress in a one-to-one session. They are held about once a month. The discussion is documented and targets set for the next few weeks. The researcher sat in on the fourth key work session for a participant who had recently become a mentor. In this particular session the lead was taken by the participant who had come fully prepared with his view of how he had progressed with his previous agreed targets. He was clearly keen to show success and to demonstrate that such success would be a good exemplar of how he could behave when the time came for him to leave prison. He explained in detail his plans for working as a leader in his community by getting involved in social work. He spoke very strongly about putting a very serious and violent past behind him and was extremely engaged with the one-to-one progress discussions.

The facilitator moved him on to discuss his development and to reflect how he had been able to change from his attitudes on entry to the prison to his pro-social approach today. He felt this was due to his being much more in control of his emotions and a greater awareness of how he reacted to events.

They discussed the attitudes of other, non-C2C, prisoners on the wing and agreed it was quite calm at present with no violence for some time. He gave examples of how he had defused situations in his role as a mentor, reinforcing his feeling of becoming a community leader. The facilitator asked him to carry a specific message to the wing.

The facilitator reinforced the participant's ambitions and was able to channel his thoughts into further targets including writing a letter to his former self setting out advice on behaviour and considering in more detail the impact of his weapons offences (storing guns for a drugs gang) on the likely victims if those weapons were used.

Summary

The three sessions were conducted well, following the guidance in the manual, participants joined in as hoped for: there were no disruptions and a calm session allowed the aim of the sessions to be achieved. In the Key Work Session the participant was able to show how his targets had been met and agreed appropriate new targets: wider issues were discussed such as his work as a mentor and his ambitions to be a community leader on release.

6. Changes in the *interim measures* of C2C graduates in 2020 and 2021

The analysis was based on results for all completers of C2C during 2020 and 2021, 28 in total. These results are generally very positive, meaning that, if such results continue in the future, then reoffending is more likely to be lower for those completing Challenge to Change. Also software has been made available to Kainos so that they can monitor these results on an ongoing basis.

All five Crime Pics II scales have been analysed and results show a significant fall in the measured attitudes:

- GENERAL ATTITUDE TO OFFENDING (G)
- anticipation of re-offending ('A')
- victim hurt denial ('V')
- evaluation of crime as worthwhile ('E')
- perception of current life problems ('P')

Within this encouraging result, 5 out of the 6 cohorts showed general falls in CrimePics II scores. Judging from previous research on the relationship between interim measures and re-offending, Kainos C2C as currently delivered is showing a significant reduction in criminogenic attitudes.

Barratt's impulsivity scores were available for 24 of the 28 cases (reduced to 5 of the 6 cohorts). These also showed a significant mean reduction in of 7 points on the BARRATT scale, indicating a serious reductions impulsiveness in impulsiveness on completion of C2C. Four of the five cohorts for which there were results showed a fall and the other remained the same. Again, significance testing for BARRATT has the same problems of small cohort size as noted above for Crime Pics II.

The End of Modules (EOM) self-assessment questionnaires confirmed that:

- Kainos staff were well regarded
- Modules were generally well understood
- The content of Modules was rated as fair to good.
- Although completers were uncomfortable with one or two sessions they generally accepted the challenges that Modules presented them with.

In the same way, the End Of Course assessments made by each prisoner were generally very positive, showing a good deal of confidence in the future. At present, only the numerical data can be used to show change and it needs to be decided whether the textual data needs to have a coding frame developed for it in future work.

More Detailed Analysis

A. Crime Pics II Scores

The Crime Pics II psychometric instrument consists of 20 questionnaire items and a 15-item "Problems" inventory. It is completed by each participant, once it is administered by supervising Kainos C2C staff, to each participant at the start of Challenge to Change and

at the end of the programme for those who complete. The instrument measures five relevant aspects of the completer's personality and attitude to crime. The main score (which is referred to as 'G') represents that person's GENERAL ATTITUDE TO OFFENDING at the point in time at which the questionnaire was completed. The other four measures are:

- anticipation of re-offending ('A')
- victim hurt denial ('V')
- evaluation of crime as worthwhile ('E')
- perception of current life problems ('P')

Crime Pics II is a well-accepted, convenient and, most importantly, standardised psychometric measure that has been in use worldwide since 1994.¹⁷(M&A Research, 2013.) It is easy to use by both the prisoner and those running Challenge to Change. The results can be regarded as a leading indicator for the changes in reoffending, with the advantage that Crime Pics II data is available well in advance of the reoffending data and not subject to the additional delays currently being experienced with access to the MOJ Justice Data Lab.

Table 1 Crime Pics II Scores

Cohort		G Score			A Score			V Score		
	Completers	Before C2C	After C2C	Change	Before C2C	After C2C	Change	Before C2C	After C2C	Change
1	5	37.6	32.2	-5.4	10.8	11.2	+0.4	5.8	4.2	-1.6
2	3	44.67	32	-12.67	14.67	9.33	-5.33	6.33	3	-3.33
3	3	42.67	33.33	-9.33	11.67	9	-2.67	9	6.33	-2.67
4	4	28.5	31.25	2.75	9.75	10.5	0.75	4.25	6.5	2.25
5	7	36.43	34.14	-2.29	12.71	11	-1.71	4.71	3.57	-1.14
6	6	42	34	-8	11.83	10.67	-1.17	4	3.5	-0.5
Total/Av.	28	48.25	33.04	-5.21	11.86	10.50	-1.36	5.32	4.32	-1.00
		E Score			P Score					
		Before C2C	After C2C	Change	Before C2C	After C2C	Change			
1	5	10.2	7.8	-2.4	25.4	20.8	-4.6			
2	3	12.67	9.67	-3	27	19.33	-7.67			
3	3	11.67	9.33	-2.33	27.33	21.67	-5.67			
4	4	7	9.5	2.5	24.25	21.75	-2.5			
5	7	8.86	7.71	-1.14	30.71	28.14	-2.57			
6	6	10	8	-2	24.67	21	-3.67			
Total/Av.	28	9.79	8.43	-1.36	26.79	22.75	-4.04			

¹⁷ More detail given in M&A Research, 2013 **CRIME-PICS II MANUAL** downloaded from <http://www.crime-pics.co.uk/cpicsmanual.pdf> on June 20 2018.

Table 1 shows the results of the analysis of the CrimePics II questionnaires for the six cohorts of offenders between January 2020 and December 2021 (n=28). Summary results are given for each cohort: full results for each completer are shown, anonymised, in the Appendix 1 to this report. As is usual, there was a good deal of variation in the results, both within and between cohorts and for different aspects of personality and attitudes. However, in general the results are very positive.

The cumulative 'before and after' results (taking the six cohorts as a whole) of the five Crime Pics II measures scored as follows,¹⁸

General Attitudes to Offending (G Score):

This is the 'main measure' of Crime Pics II and is used as the best indication of overall change. There was a **statistically significant**¹⁹ **mean fall of 5.2 points** in general attitudes to offending, from Mean(M) =38.25 (Standard Deviation (SD) = 10.21) to M=33.04 (SD 7.10), (t(27) = 2.534 , p = .009, 1-sided [p = .017 2-sided]). Five of the six cohorts showed an average fall, ranging from 2.2 points lower to 12 points lower. One cohort showed an average of 2.75 points higher.

Attitudes to Reoffending (A Score):

There was an average fall of just over 1 point in attitudes to reoffending, but this was **statistically significant** from M=11.86 (SD =2.851) to M=10.50 (SD =2.531), (t(27) = 2.028, p = .026, 1-sided [p = .052, 2 sided]). Four of the 6 cohorts showed a fall in their attitudes to re-offending, while 2 cohorts showed a rise.

Victim hurt denial (V Score):

There was a **significant drop** of a mean of 1 point in completers' victim hurt denial, from M=5.32 (SD = 2.554) to M=4.32 (SD =2.001), (t(27) = 2.147, p = .020, 1-sided, [p = .041, 2 sided]), with 5 out of six cohorts showing a fall and one a rise of 2 points.

Evaluation of crime as worthwhile (E Score):

There was a **significant drop** of just over 1 scale point, from M= 9.79 (SD =2.936) to M=8.43 (SD =2.631), (t(27) = , p = .032, 1-sided [p = .064, 2 sided]), with five cohorts showing a fall and one an increase of +2.5 scale points.

Perception of Life Problems (P Score):

There was a **significant drop** of over 4 scale points in completers' perceptions of life problems, from M=26.79 (SD = 7.041) to M= 22.75 (SD =7.127), (t(27) = , p = .003, 1-sided [p = .007, 2 sided]). All cohorts showed a drop in this measure, ranging from 2 points lower to nearly 8 points lower. This was possibly because participants were likely to have a more realistic feeling about their future after completing C2C.

Variations by Cohort:

There was considerable variation by cohort. Much of this is probably due to the low

¹⁸ See Appendix 2 for a discussion on intervention effect sizes, as an additional measure.

¹⁹ For this study, we have used 1-sided tests to reflect the fact that the purpose of Kainos C2C is to reduce criminogenic factors. However, given the general controversy in the field, we have also included the 2-sided results, so readers can make their own decisions.

numbers completing each cohort which make it impossible to say whether such results are significant. However, Cohort Four showed worse results than all the others, with rises in each score except the P score. Three cohorts Two, Three and Six showed falls in each score. Cohort One showed falls in each score, save the A score which was about the same. Cohort Five showed falls in each score except the E score which rose by 2 points. (See Appendix 2 for a possible approach that will be useful for managers through the MIS.)

Validity of the results:

The raw data show no evidence that the tests were conducted poorly, or that the scoring was not carried out properly. However, it is known that occasionally 'rogue completers' decide to not fully co-operate, as a protest against form-filling. For example, by answering nearly all the questions the same way by ticking 'I am not a criminal'. If this happens, the completer should be asked to take more care in completing the questionnaire and this requires the completed questionnaire to be quickly read by a supervisor. If there is no change to the answers, it is important to note the validity issues and that the scores have not been included.

Barratt impulsiveness scores

The Barratt Impulsivity score is derived from a questionnaire designed to assess the personality/ behavioural concept of impulsiveness. It is the most widely used measure of its type and has been in use worldwide for 50 years. It has 30 items describing impulsive or non-impulsive behaviour and preferences.²⁰ Each completer filled in a form before and after the C2C programme. Full results are shown, anonymised, in Appendix 1.

Table 2 Barratt Impulsiveness scores

Cohort No.	Cohort completers	Barratt scores		
		Before C2C	After C2C	Change due to C2C
1	4	62	62	0
2	3	72.33	56	-16.33
3	3	76.33	Not scored	
4	4	69.75	65	-4.75
5	7	72.00	65	-7
6	6	73.50	63.67	-9.83
Total/Av.	24	70.38	63.04	-7.33

Average is when both pre and post scores were recorded, that is leaving out cohort 3.

Table 2 shows the Barratt scores before C2C commenced and after the programme finished, for each of the cohorts except cohort three where the post course data was not recorded and, therefore, change could not be measured. Apart from Cohort 1, where there was no change in the mean 'before and after' scores (and one measure was missing) the other four cohorts all recorded falls in the Barratt scores, indicating that **impulsivity significantly fell** from M=70.375 (SD =12.493) to M=63.042 (SD =9.521), (t(23) = , p = .008

²⁰ Explained in Barratt, E.S. 1994 **Impulsiveness and Aggression**: in Monahan, J. and Steadman, H.J. (eds) Violence and Mental Disorder : Developments in Risk Assessment (pp.61-79) Chicago

1-sided [$p = .016$, 2 sided]). For all cohorts (except cohort 3) **the average fall was 7.33 scale points**, varying from no change for Cohort one to a fall of nearly 17 points for Cohort Two.

All the evidence is that Barratt's Impulsivity Scores were collected and analysed in a proper fashion, using the spreadsheet macro provided by ESL at an earlier stage.

End of Modules (EOM) questionnaires analysis: Quantitative data

Completers fill in questionnaires after each module giving their views about the module including a chance to score some aspects of it. To this are added data recorded about each prisoner's individual behaviour. Table 3 shows that there were very few adjudications or self-harm incidents recorded for completers. There were a number of positive IEPs²¹, especially for the early Modules but very few negative IEPs.

Table 3 Adjudications, etc given to completers after each Module

All cohorts	Total Numbers	Average per person
Adjudications		
Module 1	2	0.09
Module 2	1	0
Module 3	2	0
Module 4	1	0
Module 5	2	0
Positive IEPs		
Module 1	13	0.57
Module 2	12	0.52
Module 5	4	0.17
Module 4	3	0.13
Module 5	4	0.17
Negative IEPs		
Module 1	3	0.13
Module 2	3	0.13
Module 3	4	0.17
Module 4	0	0
Module 5	4	0.17
Incidents of self-harm		
Module 1	2	0.09
Module 2	0	0
Module 3	0	0
Module 4	1	0.04
Module 5	0	0

All those on C2C were asked to say how useful each module was to them and why. Table 4 shows these results. Prisoners were asked to rate their answers from 1= best to 5= worst.

²¹ IEPs are Incentives and Earned Privileges

Table 4 Assessments made by completers after each Module

All cohorts (23 people)	Average assessment (1=excellent to 5=poor)		
	Ease of understanding and following content of sessions	Usefulness of session content	Helpfulness of Kainos staff
Module 1	1.57	1.48	1.26
Module 2	1.91	1.39	1.26
Module 3	2.00	1.48	1.43
Module 4	1.78	1.26	1
Module 5	1.23	1.61	1.35

There was considerable variation in completers' answers, possibly showing the seriousness with which they filled in their EOM questionnaires. All modules were rated positively as far as completers' **ease of understanding their content**. The average for each Module was rated between 1 and 2, with Module 5 the easiest to follow at 1.23 and Module 3 as the most difficult but that was rated only at 2.

There was a similar variation in **the usefulness of each module** to completers. Module 4 was rated the most useful at 1.23, and Module 5 the least, at 1.61 but all were rated quite positively.

The **Helpfulness of Kainos staff** was similarly rated very highly, with slight variations according to the Module being taught. All were rated at between 1 and 1.43. For Module 4, everyone rated Kainos staff as helpful as they could.

End of Modules questionnaires analysis: Qualitative data

Completers were also asked to say, in their own words, what they had learned from each Module and whether they felt uncomfortable in any sessions. In fact, nearly 100 comments were noted down for each completer and it is not possible to summarize all these: many are repetitive, a few contradictory and there is a question to be asked as to whether it is useful to record as much data of this type. However, the most common comments on each Module are noted in the following paragraphs.

Responses to Module 1:

These were mainly positive: comments were often far-reaching:

'I learned where I want to be';

'How to plan decisions and the consequences of planning';

'I learned skills to help me how to problem solve';

'Different ways to problem solve'; and

'Understanding what I want in life and how to go about it'.

The main uncomfortable aspects were mentioned by several completers who were concerned

'talking about my past life as most of it was bad or negative' or said they were

'not for standing up and speaking in front of people'.

Responses to Module 2:

These were less varied: although one summed up the module as *'just learning more communication skills'* most recognised it dealt with *'Authority, communication and responsibility, community living'* and said they had *'learned how to deal with authority'*. Completers mentioned that they had learned specific skills such as *'to take your time and don't rush into everything'* or *'how to plan things properly'*;

Few completers mentioned sessions they were uncomfortable with, although those dealing with communicating continued to worry some, especially when these

'meant speaking in front of others.'

Responses to Module 3:

All completers recognised that this module was about self-awareness and dealing with things that you could control yourself. Completers quoted a wide range of skills learned:

'How to turn a negative into a positive and how to try and change your beliefs. To try and open up more because it makes you feel better.'

'I learned how to forgive myself.'

'I would like others to see me how I think I am and what I need to do to do this.'

'A lot about how to stay positive when things get hard.'

'I have learnt why I believe certain things and where those beliefs come from'

No sessions were mentioned as causing the completers to feel uncomfortable.

Responses to Module 4:

This Module on victim awareness was regarded as very intense but rewarding.

Specific learning outcomes mentioned included

'Learning about my interpersonal relationships'

'Learning to stop and think whatever situation I'm in and however heated a situation may get there's always an alternative to how you handle it. You're responsible for your own actions.'

'The Ripple Effect has opened my eyes on the bigger impact it has on the victim and the community'

Only one person mentioned a session he was uncomfortable with and this was the session *'on the consequences of anger; good or bad'*.

Responses to Module 5:

Everyone mentioned that the module helped them to find out more about the preparations they needed before release. Specific skills or useful information mentioned were:

'The consequences of drug-taking',

'Debt management; Help in getting property and with a job'

'Living on as budget'

'What companies and charities can help me on release.'

Several people mentioned that the sessions on children and families made them upset because they were missing their families.

End of Course assessments

Nearly all completers had completed the 48 sessions, although a few had to do this via one or two catch-up sessions. 20 out of the 23 had an enhanced IEP status on completion, with the others having a standard IEP status. There was a varied reaction to being asked to choose which Modules they had enjoyed best with most giving a general answer that they had enjoyed the community as a whole and the way that they been able to examine their own behaviour. However, victim awareness was mentioned specifically by a few people. When asked which Module they found least helpful, about a quarter mentioned Module 5: mostly they wanted more specific help for their individual situation.

When asked to sum up their view as to how C2C had changed them, responses were very varied: no-one said that C2C had not changed them.

'I didn't think at first that I could learn something new and I was a bit stubborn and I now think there is a lot for me to learn and a lot more I can do to be better.'

'Come out of my shell more',

'I have changed the way I approach each situation',

'I thinking understanding my anger and thinking before I act',

'I have become more confident, voiced my opinions',

'Learnt the benefit of listening more so I'm understanding more of what is going on'

Evaluation Solutions Ltd October 2022

Appendix1: Individual psychometric scores

COHORT 1: CRIMEPICS II AND BARRATT SCORES

	G SCORES			A SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
²²	29	31	2	7	10	3
	37	28	-9	12	10	-2
	44	35	-9	11	11	0
	43	38	-5	16	13	-3
	35	29	-6	8	12	4
Average	37.6	32.2	-5.4	10.8	11.2	0.4

	V SCORES			E SCORE		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	7	5	-2	6	7	1
	7	3	-4	10	7	-3
	6	7	1	13	8	-5
	6	3	-3	11	11	0
	3	3	0	11	6	-5
Average	5.8	4.2	-1.6	10.2	7.8	-2.4

	P SCORES			BARRATT SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	17	21	4	59	61	2
	28	22	-6	52	56	4
	28	22	-6	69	67	-2
	28	20	-8	No Score	65	
	26	19	-7	68	64	-4
Average	25.4	20.8	-4.6	62	62	0

²² All names have been removed to ensure anonymity.

COHORT 2 CRIMEPICS II AND BARRATT SCORES

	G SCORES			A SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	48	31	-17	17	10	-7
	41	37	-4	14	9	-5
	45	28	-17	13	9	-4
Average	44.67	32	-12.97	14.67	9.33	-5.33

	V SCORES			E SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	7	3	-4	11	9	-2
	6	3	-3	13	11	-2
	6	3	-3	14	9	-5
Average	6.33	3	-3.33	12.67	9.67	-3

	P SCORES			BARRATT SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	26	16	-10	77	59	-18
	28	24	-4	69	57	-12
	27	18	-9	71	52	-19
Average	27	19.33	-7.67	72.33	56	-16.33

COHORT 3 CRIMEPICS II AND BARRATT

	G SCORES			A SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	41	36	-5	13	12	-1
	50	26	-24	14	6	-8
	37	38	1	8	9	1
Average	42.67	33.33	-9.33	11.67	9	-2.67

	V SCORES			E SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	5	7	2	10	10	0
	7	3	-4	14	9	-5
	15	9	-6	11	9	-2
Average	9	6.33	-2.67	11.67	9.33	-2.33

	P SCORES			BARRATT SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	25	22	-3	No Scores Recorded		
	33	18	-15			
	24	25	1			
Average	27.33	21.67	-5.67			

COHORT 4 CRIMEPICS II AND BARRATT

	G SCORES			A SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	31	30	-1	11	6	-5
	24	25	1	7	12	5
	39	36	-3	13	10	-3
	20	34	14	8	14	6
Average	28.5	31.25	2.75	9.75	10.5	0.75

	V SCORES			E SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	3	3	0	5	12	7
	7	8	1	9	5	-4
	3	8	5	10	11	1
	4	7	3	4	10	6
Average	4.25	6.5	2.25	7	9.5	2.5

	P SCORES			BARRATT SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	27	18	-9	74	68	-6
	24	21	-3	77	60	-17
	21	24	3	60	68	8
	25	24	-1	68	64	-4
Average	24.25	21.75	-2.5	69.75	65	-4.75

COHORT 5 CRIMEPICS II AND BARRATT

	G SCORES			A SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	34	34	0	14	10	-4
	52	52	0	18	18	0
	38	30	-8	12	10	-2
	34	21	-13	14	10	-4
	21	28	7	10	8	-2
	44	44	0	10	10	0
	32	30	-2	11	11	0
Average	36.43	34.14	-2.29	12.71	11	-1.71

	V SCORES			E SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	7	3	-4	10	8	-2
	4	4	0	10	10	0
	3	3	0	7	4	-3
	7	3	-4	10	4	-6
	3	3	0	4	6	2
	6	6	0	14	14	0
	3	3	0	7	8	1
Average	4.71	3.57	-1.14	8.86	7.71	-1.14

	P SCORES			BARRATT SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	24	28	4	80	74	-6
	40	40	0	93	75	-18
	38	29	-9	93	66	-27
	24	15	-9	50	45	-5
	15	22	7	44	67	23
	42	42	0	72	67	-5
	32	21	-11	72	61	-11
Average	30.72	28.14	-2.57	72	65	-7

COHORT 6 CRIMEPICS II AND BARRATT

	G SCORES			A SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	30	26	-4	11	10	-1
	26	48	22	10	12	2
	40	26	-14	12	6	-6
	68	34	-34	11	11	0
	42	29	-13	12	14	2
	46	41	-5	15	11	4
Average	42	34	-8	11.83	10.57	-1.17

	V SCORES			E SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	3	3	0	8	6	-2
	3	3	0	6	12	6
	3	3	0	11	7	-4
	3	3	0	11	8	-3
	5	3	-2	13	4	-9
	7	6	-1	11	11	0
Average	4	3.5	-0.5	10	8	-2

	P SCORES			BARRATT SCORES		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
	21	15	-6	66	52	-14
	15	34	19	88	80	=8
	20	15	-5	64	70	6
	21	16	-5	70	71	1
	32	15	-17	87	39	-48
	39	31	-8	66	70	4
Average	24.67	21	-3.67	73.5	63.67	-9.83

APPENDIX 2: Effect sizes

Table 1 on page 59 relates to the full sample of 28 for the 5 Crime Pics 2 variables, plus the sample of 24 for the BARRATT impulsivity scale. Bearing in mind that the t tests in the main text all showed significance in the 1-tail tests, and most on the 2-tail tests, we can say that Kainos C2C had a significantly positive effect, as intended, on lowering criminogenic factors.

However, another measure is now commonly used that shows the magnitude of the intervention's effect. Effect sizes either measure the sizes of associations between variables or the sizes of differences between group means. There are 2 key measures used, the small differences are explained under the next table.

Paired Samples Effect Sizes

			Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower	Upper
Pair 1	GBEFORE - GAFTER	Cohen's d	10.888	.479	.083	.867
		Hedges' correction	11.042	.472	.082	.854
Pair 2	A1 - A2	Cohen's d	3.540	.383	-.004	.764
		Hedges' correction	3.591	.378	-.004	.753
Pair 3	V1 - V2	Cohen's d	2.465	.406	.017	.788
		Hedges' correction	2.499	.400	.016	.777
Pair 4	E1 - E2	Cohen's d	3.714	.365	-.021	.745
		Hedges' correction	3.767	.360	-.020	.735
Pair 5	P1 - P2	Cohen's d	7.265	.556	.152	.950
		Hedges' correction	7.368	.548	.150	.936
Pair 6	BARRATT1 - BARRATT2	Cohen's d	13.81451	.531	.098	.954
		Hedges' correction	14.04496	.522	.096	.938

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the sample standard deviation of the mean difference.

Hedges' correction uses the sample standard deviation of the mean difference, plus a correction factor.

There are 2 key points here.

First, the scoring works the opposite way to the p score for t tests, so you are looking for the decimal that is closest to 1, rather than to 0, the demonstrate the maximum effect.

Second, with the above in mind, in the wider field of study, there are variations in the significance of the effect size (Point Estimate in the table below).

'The mean effect size in psychology is $d = 0.4$, with 30% of effects below 0.2 and 17% greater than 0.8. In education research, the average effect size is also $d = 0.4$, with 0.2, 0.4 and 0.6 considered small, medium and large effects. In contrast, medical research is often associated with small effect sizes, often in the 0.05 to 0.2 range. Despite being small, these effects often represent meaningful effects such as saving lives. For example, being fit

*decreases mortality risk in the next 8 years by $d = 0.08$. Finally, effects as large as $d = 5$ are common in fields such as pharmacology.*²³

In Kainos's case, the psychological discipline is perhaps the most relevant, given the nature and setting of the C2C intervention.

The utility of effect size is better for smaller samples, eg cohorts, as effect sizes tend to decline as the sample size grows.

The simple point here is to consider whether it might be useful to build in the effect size calculations for each cohort. As can be seen below in the next table, using the example of cohort 6 in the study ($n=6$), there are no significant t test results (ie, $p > .05$).

Paired Samples Test										
		Paired Differences					Significance			
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	GBEFORE - GAFTER	8.000	18.232	7.443	-11.133	27.133	1.075	5	.166	.332
Pair 2	A1 - A2	1.167	3.251	1.327	-2.245	4.578	.879	5	.210	.420
Pair 3	V1 - V2	.500	.837	.342	-.378	1.378	1.464	5	.102	.203
Pair 4	E1 - E2	2.000	4.940	2.017	-3.184	7.184	.992	5	.183	.367
Pair 5	P1 - P2	3.667	11.994	4.897	-8.921	16.254	.749	5	.244	.488
Pair 6	BARRATT1 - BARRATT2	9.83333	20.18333	8.23981	-11.34777	31.01444	1.193	5	.143	.286

But, for the Crime Pics II P score (perception of current life problems) there is a relatively high P effect size P score for that cohort. This information might vary depending on the mix of participants and a number of factors that staff may be able to relate to lower or higher effect sizes and which might inform future actions and which can be evidenced to CSAAP.

Paired Samples Effect Sizes						
			Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower	Upper
Pair 1	GBEFORE - GAFTER	Cohen's d	18.232	.439	-.423	1.262
		Hedges' correction	19.758	.405	-.390	1.165
Pair 2	A1 - A2	Cohen's d	3.251	.359	-.486	1.172
		Hedges' correction	3.523	.331	-.449	1.081
Pair 3	V1 - V2	Cohen's d	.837	.598	-.304	1.451
		Hedges' correction	.907	.551	-.280	1.339
Pair 4	E1 - E2	Cohen's d	4.940	.405	-.450	1.224
		Hedges' correction	5.353	.374	-.415	1.129
Pair 5	P1 - P2	Cohen's d	11.994	.306	-.529	1.113
		Hedges' correction	12.999	.282	-.489	1.027
Pair 6	BARRATT1 - BARRATT2	Cohen's d	20.18333	.487	-.386	1.319
		Hedges' correction	21.87312	.450	-.356	1.217

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.

Cohen's d uses the sample standard deviation of the mean difference.

Hedges' correction uses the sample standard deviation of the mean difference, plus a correction factor.

²³ <https://scientificallysound.org/2017/07/27/cohens-d-how-interpretation/#:~:text=In%20education%20research%2C%20the%20average,the%200.05%20to%200.2%20range.>