

# **Scottish Advisory Panel on Offender Rehabilitation**

**Annual Report  
2018- 2019  
2019- 2020**

**September 2020**

## **CONTENTS**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| <b>Chair's Foreword</b>                | <b>Pages 3-4</b>   |
| <b>Background to SAPOR</b>             | <b>Pages 5-7</b>   |
| <b>Policy Context</b>                  | <b>Pages 8-9</b>   |
| <b>Overview of 2018/19 and 2019/20</b> | <b>Page 10</b>     |
| <b>Future Priorities</b>               | <b>Pages 11-12</b> |
| <b>Appendices</b>                      | <b>Pages 13-22</b> |

## 1. CHAIR'S FOREWORD

I am delighted to introduce the first annual report summarising the work of the Scottish Advisory Panel on Offender Rehabilitation (SAPOR). This annual report covers activity undertaken in 2018/19 and in 2019/20. SAPOR's panel members include academics and practitioners with expertise in risk assessment and management, rehabilitation and desistance, and the role of the panel is to accredit programmes and endorse interventions and initiatives which support desistance. The panel's role is also to offer support and advice to those engaged in such efforts in Scotland and to promote best practice in rehabilitative effort and wider desistance initiatives across all professionals in Scotland. The panel is a non-core non-regulated public body in Scotland.

During the two years covered by this report, the panel has both delivered ongoing accreditation in relation to offending behaviour programmes in the Scottish Prison Service (SPS) and within Criminal Justice Social Work Scotland (CJSW) and engaged in wider consultation and engagement across professional groups as we have sought to implement the broader role envisaged when Scottish Accreditation Panel for Offender Programmes (SAPOP) was replaced by SAPOR.

As a panel, we have really sought to operationalise this role. We have made good progress and will continue to work towards greater engagement with wider community justice stakeholders and to promote our developing 'endorse' and 'advise' functions as much as our 'accredit' function.

Additionally the panel has calibrated its own processes against international standards to ensure that the standards we set and promote in Scotland are equivalent to international best practice.

In 2018/19 we considered 4 programmes for accreditation: three in SPS - Short Term Interventions (STIP), SPS Women's Programme, SPS Self-Change Programme (SCP) and one Criminal Justice Social Work Programme - the Caledonian System Programme.

In 2019/20, we considered 2 programmes for accreditation the SPS Women's Programme and Short Term Interventions (STIP). In addition to this, we also considered initial submissions from 3 programmes to inform their planning as to whether they wish to submit for accreditation and we have also focused on the development of our endorse and advise functions.

Over the two years covered by this report, we have also attended various events and meetings in Scotland and beyond and meetings to promote the work of SAPOR and best practice and encourage engagement with the panel. We will continue this work going forward and will take forward a real focus in the year to come by further engaging with and supporting Justice priorities.

As Chair, I would like to thank all panel members for the hard work, tolerance and focused effort, especially when it was requested with more material and less time than we would all have liked, over the past year. I would particularly like to thank Dr Trish McCulloch for accepting the position of Vice Chair and in this role promoting

links with Social Work and Community Justice which I hope she will continue this year. Also, the panel is fortunate to have a member of Justice Analytical Services (JAS) on the panel and we would all like to extend a special thanks to Catherine Bisset who patiently explains evaluation commissioning and logic modelling and data to us and our applicants on a regular basis.

Professor Liz Gilchrist  
Chair of SAPOR  
May 2020

## **2. BACKGROUND TO SAPOR**

### **Overview**

The Scottish Advisory Panel on Offender Rehabilitation (SAPOR) was created in 2012, replacing the Scottish Accreditation Panel for Offender Programmes (SAPOP). While SAPOP's work focused solely on the accreditation of offender programmes and interventions ('kite marking' offender rehabilitation programmes which met current professional standards), it was recognised that a wider advisory remit and broader professional membership would be far more beneficial to sponsors and the advancement of effective, evidence-based practice.

The role of the Scottish Advisory Panel for Offender Rehabilitation is to:

*“Work to reduce re-offending and support desistance by providing approval and advice, setting standards and promoting excellence in programmes, interventions and processes aimed at rehabilitating people who have offended and by encouraging properly evaluated innovation.”*

SAPOR's focus is on programmes and interventions for individuals who have been convicted of an offence. Therefore, programmes and interventions targeted at those pre-conviction are not within the Panel's current remit.

Though programme accreditation remains a key function of SAPOR, the overarching objective is much broader. SAPOR's main aim is to support professionals to enable desistance by providing approval and advice, setting standards and promoting excellence in programmes, interventions and processes aimed at rehabilitating people who have offended, and encouraging properly evaluated innovation.

### **Membership**

#### **MEMBERSHIP 2018/19 and 2019/20**

Panel members are drawn from both academic and practitioner backgrounds with inter-disciplinary expertise: social work, and forensic psychology. This is to ensure that the panel reflects the wide interest in the rehabilitation of people in contact with the justice system in both Scotland and internationally.

Panel members dedicate up to 10 working days per year to SAPOR related business. Appointments are contracted for six years, with the option of renewal for two further years. There is the option to step down from the panel before this time if panel members mutually agree to this.

#### **SAPOR PANEL MEMBERS (2018/19 and 2019/20)**

SAPOR members over the past two years are as follows:

## **SAPOR Chair**

### **Professor Elizabeth Gilchrist**

Professor of Psychological Therapies at the University of Edinburgh.

## **Panel Members**

### **Dr Trish McCulloch**

Reader in Criminal Justice Social Work, and current Vice Chair of SAPOR.

### **Yvonne Robson**

Involved with a national mentoring service for women in the Criminal Justice System.

### **Beth Weaver**

Senior Lecturer, Director of Knowledge Exchange and Impact and Research Lead in Criminal and Social Justice the Department of Social Work and Social Policy at the University of Strathclyde.

### **Monica Wilson (member until 31 July 2018)**

Had been a SAPOR panel member for six years.

### **Professor Erica Bowen**

HCPC Registered Forensic Psychologist, and BPS Chartered Psychologists and Associate Fellow.

### **Michele Gilluley**

Consultant Forensic Psychologist.

### **Mark McSherry**

Chief Executive of the Risk Management Authority (RMA).

## **SAPOR Accredited Programmes**

SAPOR's Accredited function is a process that requires those delivering an offending behaviour programme to:

- evidence the need for the specific work
- describe the theoretical basis for the focus of the programme
- provide a rationale for the methods of engagement and delivery employed
- set standards for selection of attendees and programme staff
- specify training
- set out governance structures

- specify the logic model for the whole intervention and
- set out the key questions and data requirements for evaluation.

This requires professionals to produce a number of manuals which address 8 design standards (as set out in Appendix A).

Programmes that have thus far been accredited during SAPOR's lifetime, and therefore implemented within Scotland are as follows:

### **The Youth Justice Programme (YJP)**

Aimed at all young people aged 16-23 years of age with a history of offending. The programme was developed by the Scottish Prison Service (SPS) and is being initially delivered to young men in HMYOI Polmont. The YJP is designed to address underlying reasons for offending, with the overall aim to reduce recidivism by promoting pro-social life choices. Current accreditation of the YJP runs to September 2021.

### **Constructs: Steps towards a Positive Life**

A group-based programme designed for adults and young people (18-21 years) of either gender. The programme targets those convicted of general offending – it does not target violent or sexual offending – with a specific focus on enhancing problem-solving skills. The programme was developed by SPS and was accredited in March 2017 for a period of 5 years.

### **The Discovery: Finding New Me**

A moderate intensity intervention programme designed to reduce aggression by those who have problems in the emotional, cognitive or inter-personal domains. The programme works to assess, formulate and provide strategies to manage each participant's aggression-related behaviour within the context of an attuned therapeutic group environment. The programme was developed by SPS and was accredited in December 2017 for a period of 5 years.

### **The Caledonian System**

An integrated approach to address domestic abuse and improve the lives of women, children and men. This community based intervention comprises a two year programme for adult men who have committed domestic abuse offences and services to women partners/ex-partners and children of programme participants. Inter-agency protocols for joint working also form a key part of this intervention. The programme was accredited in December 2017 for a period of 5 years.

### **Moving Forward: Making Changes (MFMC)**

Aimed at adult men who have committed sexual offences, or offences that contain a sexual element, and are deemed as presenting a medium and above risk of reoffending. The programme can be delivered by the qualified professionals in both community and custodial settings, using a modular approach tailored to individual needs (MF:MC was not put forward for continued accreditation in 2018 due to the revision of the programme).

### **3. POLICY CONTEXT**

SAPOR is very mindful of the wider policy context and in considering how we can support the overarching policy aims of reducing reoffending and reducing the use of short-term imprisonment.

Scotland has the highest imprisonment rate in Western Europe at 152 per 100,000. The rising prison population is driven by a range of factors. In particular, the tendency for particular convictions to lead to custodial sentences (e.g. sexual and violent offences) and the increase in average sentence lengths for certain offences (including the increase in length of punishment part for life sentences). The role of SAPOR is to promote effective interventions in custody and the community to reduce the number of people going in to custody and being effectively treated in the community or when they are in custody, to promote the swift movement of prisoners through the system before they are released back into the community.

A significant shift is needed away from the use of custodial sentences, in particular short-term prison sentences, towards to greater use of community sentences and interventions which are more effective at addressing the underlying causes of offending behaviour.

The Scottish Government and wider community justice partners are taking steps to support this shift. This includes the recent extension of the Presumption Against Short Sentences from custodial sentences of 3 months or less to 12 months or less. Furthermore, the Management of Offenders (Scotland) Act 2019 introduced provisions to extend the use of electronic monitoring to provide further options to manage individuals in the community.

The new model for community justice, introduced under the Community Justice (Scotland) Act 2016, emphasises the importance of prevention (primary, secondary and tertiary) and recognises that effective rehabilitation is a critical part of any disposal. Importantly, the model recognises that preventing and reducing reoffending cannot be supported by justice services alone and highlights the critical role of wider partners including NHS, local Government and third sector organisations.

The model is underpinned by a national strategy which has 4 key priorities:

- Improved community understanding and participation;
- Strategic planning and partnership working;
- Effective use of evidence based interventions; and
- Equal access to services (i.e services which support desistance, health, housing welfare etc.).

This legislation also established Community Justice Scotland (CJS) as the national improvement body for Community Justice. SAPOR is keen to continue to develop our relationship with CJS to explore opportunities to increase the use of and public confidence in community interventions to support rehabilitation and reduce reoffending.



If we are to successfully increase the use of community sentences and interventions, it is critical that there is greater understanding of, and confidence in, these disposals and that high quality interventions are available consistently across Scotland.

SAPOR has responded to these developments by proactively engaging with Community Justice and explaining the process to wider audiences and encouraging those who deliver programmes in the community to engage with the accreditation function. Additionally, SAPOR is operationalising an Endorse Function which is intended to offer some quality review of interventions that are broader than individual change programmes, which in turn should promote confidence and support consistency.

SAPOR sees the value in the need for effective community disposals, core supervision practice, evidence based justice social work services, the review of mental health provision, the proportionate deployment of resources, and relevant partnership working.

SAPOR continues to accredit programmes run in custody, as noted elsewhere in this report this has included the accreditation/reaccreditation of 3 programmes over 2018/19 and 2019/20.

#### **4. OVERVIEW OF 2018/19 and 2019/20**

In 2018/19 SAPOR held quarterly meetings throughout this year where the following programme manuals were discussed and considered:

- Caledonian System Programme Manuals
- SPS Short Term Interventions
- SPS Womens Programme Manuals
- SPS Self Change Programme

In 2019/20, the following programmes manuals were discussed and considered:

- SPS Women's Programme;
- SPS Short Term Interventions Programme (STIP).

In addition, the panel considered and provided feedback on initial submissions from three programmes to inform developers' consideration on whether to submit for accreditation.

A particular focus for the panel in 2019/20 has been on the development of the endorse function, which is discussed in more detail later in this report.

In terms of meetings and representation, with a view to facilitating this wider engagement with justice agencies, over 2018/19 and 2019/20, members of the panel attended the following events:

- SASO conference in November 2018 and November 2019. This is an annual event attended by key professionals across justice, including Sheriffs and lawyers. This provided an opportunity to raise awareness of SAPOR's role with critical stakeholders.
- Attendance at quarterly Academic Advisory Panel for Community Justice in Scotland. This Advisory Panel is run by Community Justice Scotland and provides a forum for both the statutory community justice partners and other relevant stakeholders to explore and develop community justice themes. This provides an opportunity to highlight the role that SAPOR can play in the ongoing development of Community Justice policy and practice and also informs SAPOR's future work planning.
- Engagement with Social Work Scotland Justice Standing Committee representatives to discuss greater involvement between SAPOR and Justice Social Work. This is the beginning of ongoing engagement which will inform the development of the Endorse function.

## 5. FUTURE PRIORITIES

As mentioned in the foreword, SAPOR has been seeking to develop their broader role in supporting rehabilitative effort and operationalizing the advise and endorse functions set out in their terms of reference.

As noted in the previous section the panel has started this process by attending various events and engaging with key stakeholders. Moving forward they will be seeking to fulfil their broader remit beyond accreditation of offending behaviour programmes to look at how SAPOR can support the development and delivery of evidence-based community justice interventions and approaches. The panel plans to engage more directly with those who might benefit from their 'endorse' and 'advise' functions.

In relation to the 'advise' function, the panel will be giving this more detailed consideration over the coming months, informed by engagement with community justice partners to explore and confirm how this function can best support the development of community justice services while acknowledging they may have limited resources.

In relation to the 'endorse' function the panel envisages this as being primarily relevant to those engaged in interventions and employing specific approaches to wider evidence-based rehabilitative and desistance supportive efforts that go beyond offending behaviour programmes.

The endorse function is intended to promote confidence in, and consistency of high standards of, wider community justice interventions and approaches which support desistance. In order to do this, the panel will be focused on clarifying the type of material that would be submitted to allow this kind of work to be submitted and assessed against the agreed endorse standards.

These standards differ from those for accreditation and are as follows:

- theoretically and ethically sound,
- appropriately focused,
- based on sound models of engagement,
- operationalized effectively and
- reflecting international best practice.

The above standards will be considered in more detail by the panel in discussion with stakeholders.

The panel will develop clear guidance and templates to allow health, justice and social care professionals to self-evaluate their work, and then submit clear evidence of the strength, value and benefit of their work to the Panel. The panel are focused on making this process as streamlined and accessible as possible.

In taking this process forward, the panel intends to continue to work in a supportive and collaborative way with wider community justice partners, we will do this by:

- inviting interested parties for early discussions at a panel meeting to discuss their work their ideas, and which process might be most helpful for them
- reviewing and providing oral and/or written feedback on early draft submissions
- providing general guidance on evaluation with some potential for specific input for specific queries as resource allows
- providing comments and feedback on specific questions as Panel expertise and time allows
- undertaking full paper and oral review of documents in relation to programmes, interventions and approaches to work to ensure that rehabilitative effort and support for desistance is evidence based, robustly implemented and reflects international best practice.

In doing this, we will offer ongoing support to professional colleagues to achieve the standards set out for 'accreditation' or 'endorsement'.

Over the coming year, the panel will identify key strategic priorities within Scottish Government and wider community justice partners around health, well-being, public safety, justice and employment; and we will develop a 1 year and 3 year strategic plan of work so that those working with us can clearly see how the panel can support their work and provide added value in relation to promoting a stronger, safer and just Scotland for all of our futures.

## APPENDIX A

### Accreditation Standards

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Design Standard A1</b></p> <p><b>THE NEED FOR THE PROGRAMME IS CLEARLY STATED AND BASED ON ROBUST EVIDENCE OR REASONED ARGUMENT INFORMED BY RELEVANT THEORY.</b></p>  |
| <p><b>CRITERIA used to assess and evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence of the need for such a programme in Scotland, including explanation of the ways in which it will contribute to reducing reoffending, promoting desistance and</li><li>• Details of the specific population for whom the programme is intended</li><li>• The intended outcomes of the programme should be described</li></ul>   |
| <p><b>Design Standard A2</b></p> <p><b>THE PROGRAMME IS BASED ON A MODEL OF CHANGE CLEARLY STATED AND BASED ON ROBUST RESEARCH EVIDENCE AND INFORMED BY RELEVANT THEORY.</b></p>  |
| <p><b>CRITERIA used to assess and evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:</b></p> <p>A model of change that details how the proposed intervention will lead to the expected outcomes and which locates the programme's role in the wider process of supporting desistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include reference to theoretical and empirical evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of the chosen approach in relation to participant type/targeted nature of offending</li><li>• Theoretical model of change on which the intervention is based</li><li>• Evidence base supporting this model of change</li><li>• Criminogenic needs and dynamic risk factors targeted by this intervention</li><li>• Measurable goals and expected outcomes</li><li>• Clear model (e.g. table or diagrammatic) which illustrates the programme theory, and the theoretical links between its components and individual change outcomes.</li><li>• Clear description of how the programme addresses risk factors linked to reoffending and/or increases protective factors linked to desistance.</li></ul> |

- Details of the criminogenic needs, risk and protective factors linked to and targeted by programme content, with attention to how the proposed content utilises and builds on participants' strengths and resources.

### **Design Standard A3**

**THE PROGRAMME'S METHODS ARE CLEARLY STATED AND BASED ON ROBUST EVIDENCE INFORMED BY RELEVANT THEORY.**

**CRITERIA used to assess and evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:**

- Summary of the activities participants engage in, for how long and in what order
- Methods to achieve intended programme outcomes
- Methods to motivate and maintain engagement of participants and encourage their participation in the process of change
- Methods to connect with and support individual participants in the wider processes of rehabilitation, sentence planning and case management, in order to support desistance, and how they link together.

### **Design Standard A4**

**THE PROGRAMME USES APPROPRIATE METHODS TO SELECT PARTICIPANTS.**

**CRITERIA used to assess and evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:**

- Clear selection/exclusion criteria: explain exactly who the service or programme is designed for, and how the right people will be identified and selected. This explanation should include an account of the risk, needs and responsivity characteristics of the target population. .
- An appropriate referral processes
- Details of how participants learn what the programme aims to do for them and how it fits into their overarching support plan and process of change.
- Assessment methods and procedures for selection and identification of needs, risks and strengths, which include details of opportunities of participant input into this process
- Means of securing feedback to and from participants, and, where relevant, others (for example, partners, family members, case managers, etc.) and

how that feedback will be collated, analysed and used to inform a) individual support plans b) quality assurance/programme monitoring to inform the development of the programme

#### **Design Standard A5**

**THE PROGRAMME DESIGN IS RESPONSIVE TO INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANT'S CHARACTERISTICS AND NEEDS, ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION AND MAXIMISING BENEFIT FOR PARTICIPANTS.**

**CRITERIA used to assess and evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:**

- Clear attention to all stages of the programme (e.g. preparation, motivation and engagement, core delivery, maintenance and follow up)
- Detail of programme length, composition (e.g. if rolling, or open/closed) and mode of delivery (e.g. group size and/or per individual)
- Number, length and frequency of sessions
- Sequencing of components
- Means of supporting participants who have missed sessions or are experiencing difficulties
- Processes for excluding/removing participants before programme completion
- Processes for re-introducing participants
- A clear account of how the programme contributes and links in to wider processes of rehabilitation, sentence planning and case management, to support desistance
- A clear account of how the methods used in the programme take account of participants' learning needs; their diverse backgrounds; and protected characteristics.

#### **Design Standard A6**

**THE PROGRAMME DESIGN INCLUDES APPROPRIATE CRITERIA AND METHODS FOR SELECTION (AND, WHERE NECESSARY, DE-SELECTION) AND MANAGEMENT OF STAFF.**

**CRITERIA used to assess and evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:**

- Person specifications and role descriptions for managers and staff, including details of the knowledge, skills and values required to deliver the programme, including with respect to diversity issues; and also with respect to the complexity of the programme, degree of practitioner skill, and discretionary judgement involved in its effective and ethical delivery
- Guidance on numbers and composition of programme staff

- Selection and de-selection processes for programme staff that are recorded and transparent
- Training (as defined within the Training Manual), supervision and support methods for all programme staff, including consideration of potential risks, and the provision of additional external support, where appropriate. (Programme staff can include: programme managers, delivery managers, case managers, psychometric testers, group workers – to permit full integration of programme management with case management to meet wider offender needs. All staff to be trained before delivering their part of the programme). A record of staff training is to be maintained.

**Design Standard A7**

**THE SUBMISSION IDENTIFIES APPROPRIATE SUPPORT, RESOURCES AND CONDITIONS NEEDED FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION, INCLUDING SPECIFICATION OF HOW AND WHERE THE PROGRAMME FITS IN WITH WIDER SENTENCE PLANNING/CASE MANAGEMENT PROCESSES.**

**ILLUSTRATIVE CRITERIA used to evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:**

- Organisational support (strategic and practical) for the programme; clarity as to where it fits with wider service delivery plans and approaches
- Specific resources required e.g. personnel, accommodation, materials
- Methods for maintaining programme integrity e.g. change control processes devised
- Monitoring, recording and auditing the delivery of programme sessions
- Links to case management/sentence planning processes to support desistance
- Links to any relevant risk assessment and risk management processes.

**Design Standard A8**

**THERE IS AN APPROPRIATE MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, AND THE SPONSOR DEMONSTRATES A COMMITMENT TO CARRY THIS OUT.**

**ILLUSTRATIVE CRITERIA used to evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:**

- Provision of evaluation specification including details of:
- Clear logic model of the underlying programme theory identifying the criminogenic needs and/or desistance factors linked to and targeted by programme content and which operationalises short, medium and long term (where feasible to measure) outcomes



- On-going internal monitoring of programme delivery, including procedures for collection of service user feedback
- On-going internal monitoring of progress during the programme, including methods and procedures for data collection
- Internal monitoring of progress at the end of the programme, including methods and procedures for data collection
- Process evaluation
- Outcome evaluation
- Data analysis
- Qualitative data from participants and, where appropriate others (e.g. partners, family members, case managers, etc.).
- Formative and summative feedback to designers, sponsors and delivery agencies.
- Details of methods for reporting progress, both during and after the programme, including to those people responsible for sentence or case review and/or release/recall decision making
- Details of how the routinely collected evaluation data are examined and fed back into ongoing programme development and improvement.

#### **Design Standard A9**

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF THE PROGRAMME ARE CLEARLY AND EXPLICITLY STATED, AND AGREEMENT ON THE ROLE OF ANY EXTERNAL BODIES HAS BEEN SECURED.**

**ILLUSTRATIVE CRITERIA used to evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:**

- Quality assurance of programme delivery within delivery organisations including details of internal audits.
- Quality assurance of training within delivery organisations
- Written commitment from responsible officers in delivery organisations to deliver programmes as designed
- For community based programmes, establishing a National Implementation Group or equivalent, comprising representatives of all local authorities and/or prisons involved in the delivery of a specific programme to oversee governance once initial implementation processes have been completed

#### **Design Standard A10: FOR REACCREDITATION ONLY**

**THE FEEDBACK, MONITORING AND EVALUATION OUTCOMES AND DETAILS OF CHANGES MADE TO THE PROGRAMME ARE CLEARLY DELINEATED**

**CRITERIA used to assess and evidence HOW each Design Standard has been met:**

- Clear outline of any changes made to the programme and the reasons for this.
- Details of findings and conclusion from the monitoring and quality assurance process and how they have influenced programme design, supports and resources
- Details of empirical findings and conclusions with regard to both process and outcomes of the programme and how they have influenced programme design.
- Details of any feedback from participants, partners/family members facilitators, and case managers and how it is has influenced programme design

## **APPENDIX B**

### **BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION**

#### **Professor Elizabeth Gilchrist**

Before becoming Professor of Psychological Therapies at the University of Edinburgh she was Professor of Psychology at the University of Worcester and prior to that Professor of Forensic Psychology at Glasgow Caledonian University. She is also the Chair of the Division of Forensic Psychology-Scotland a committee of the British Psychological Society. She is recognised by the BPS as a specialist forensic risk assessor and is an accredited trainer in risk assessment in spousal abuse.

A leader in the forensic psychology and criminology field, Professor Gilchrist served 8 years on the Parole Board for England and Wales and 7 years on the Parole Board for Scotland. She has published extensively on the assessment, planning and evaluation of rehabilitative interventions and is currently working with a range of colleagues to develop innovative interventions for those involved in offending and substance use.

An expert on risk assessment tools for domestic abuse, sexual offending and violent offending, she was a member of the Research Advisory Group for the Risk Management Authority (RMA). She has operated internationally as an advisor on implementation and review of offending behaviour programmes and interventions for the Council of Europe and for the Department of Corrections in New Zealand. She presents regularly at international conferences and offers expert input in court, including child protection in criminal cases, including appearing in relation to charges of murder at the High Court.

#### **Dr Trish McCulloch**

Reader in Criminal Justice Social Work, and current Vice Chair of SAPOR. She is the Social Work Lead in the School of Education & Social Work at University of Dundee. Dr McCulloch joined the University in 2003, having previously worked as a social worker within youth and adult justice settings. Her teaching and research activity straddles community justice and professional learning and is grounded in ideas of voice, co-production and social change. Current research and knowledge exchange projects include an exploration of 'user' experiences of justice; designing socially just institutions for 18-25 years olds; a study of gender in criminal justice social work, and a five year longitudinal study of the experiences of newly qualified social workers in Scotland.

Dr McCulloch is an active member of various national and international criminal justice and social work forums.

#### **Yvonne Robson**

Yvonne Robson's career in Criminal Justice Social Work (CJSW) spans over 30 years. She held middle and senior management posts in local authorities and the Probation Service for over 20 years. Ms Robson recently retired from her role as

JSW national lead for the Association of Directors of Social Work (now Social Work Scotland), where she provided professional advice to the Scottish Government, SPS, the RMA, Convention Of Scottish Local Authorities, local authority and third sector colleagues on all aspects of risk assessment, risk management and rehabilitation. This includes Specific Incident Reports, Community Payback Orders and the report from the Commission on Women Offenders. Since retiring, Ms Robson has been involved with a national mentoring service for women in the Criminal Justice System, women remanded or servicing a short prison sentence and women on Community Payback Orders who are at risk of breach. Ms Robson has developed skills and knowledge of such women, the considerable barriers they face and remarkable resilience and achievements they make with the right supports and services. Ms Robson stands down from the Panel in the summer of 2020.

### **Beth Weaver**

Dr Beth Weaver is Senior Lecturer, Director of Knowledge Exchange and Impact and Research Lead in Criminal and Social Justice the Department of Social Work and Social Policy at the University of Strathclyde. She specialises in Criminology, Sociology and Criminal Justice Social Work. She is also an Associate Director to the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research and a research consultant to the Centre for Youth and Criminal Justice.

Dr Weaver is actively engaged in a number of research networks, projects and knowledge exchange activities. She has specific interests in critical criminology, desistance, gender and criminal justice, the sociology and experiences of punishment, user involvement and co-production, along with the use of through-the-prison-gate social cooperative structures of employment. All of her research has an applied focus on penal reform.

### **Monica Wilson (member until 31 July 2018)**

Professor Monica Wilson was joint co-ordinator, then director, of CHANGE (men learning to end their violence to women) Limited from 1989- 2000. This was the first criminal justice based men's programme in Europe. Prior to this Professor Wilson worked in social research, and in higher and health education.

From 2002 -2005, Professor Wilson was Chair of RESPECT, the National Association for Domestic Violence Perpetrator Programmes and Associated Support Services. She has also sat on the National Domestic Abuse Training Strategy Steering Group, which was charged with implementing the training strand of the Scottish Executive's *National Strategy to Address Domestic Abuse* (2000).

From 2004 – 2009, Professor Wilson was part of the team which worked to develop the Caledonian System Programme for submission for accreditation by SAPOP. The Caledonian System Programme gained accredited status for the men's programme in February 2009. Professor Wilson was then employed as a Professional Advisor in the Scottish Government's Effective Practice Unit to project manage the roll out of the Caledonian System Programme in twelve local authority areas. The Caledonian team's work was acknowledged with a Butler Trust award in 2009-10.

## **Professor Erica Bowen**

Professor Erica Bowen is a HCPC Registered Forensic Psychologist, and BPS Chartered Psychologists and Associate Fellow. She has a PhD (Birmingham 2004) and Masters in Criminological Psychology for which she evaluated a probation-based domestic violence perpetrator programme.

She has practice experience of conducting risk assessment within open prisons and family court contexts. In 2008, she won a competitive tender from the RMA to design and deliver multi-agency training on the legislative and practice context of the Order for Lifelong Restriction.

Since 2004, Professor Bowen has engaged in research and consultancy concerning 'What works' in the rehabilitation of domestic violence perpetrators, publishing the first book on the topic located in a British context (The rehabilitation of partner-violent men) in 2011.

In her varying professional roles, Professor Bowen has had considerable experience of working in partnership, in the context of course development, research project development and implementation, and the development and implementation of training and intervention programmes. In addition she has experience of providing written and verbal feedback in academic and practice contexts to a range of recipients, including adults in custody, adults being assessed within family court proceedings, and fellow academics at all levels.

## **Michele Gilluley**

Michele Gilluley is a Consultant Forensic Psychologist who has worked for over 20 years in a range of forensic settings. Since 2002, she has been Departmental Head of Psychology, initially in the prison service and subsequently in a secure hospital.

She has been a senior academic contributing to forensic postgraduate courses since 2013 and is currently Co-Programme Lead for the MSc Forensic Psychology at Glasgow Caledonian University. In 2019 Ms Gilluley was appointed to the Board of the RMA. She has contributed internationally on a range of projects with the Council of Europe related to providing expert advice and training on risk assessment and management processes and the development of therapeutic interventions to assist in reducing offending behaviour and risk of harm to self and others in prisons and secure hospitals.

Ms Gilluley played a key role in the establishment of the Division of Forensic Psychology (Scotland) in 2006 and remains involved having been Chair of the committee (2013 – 2016).

Ms Gilluley graduated with B.A in Social Sciences, with Honors in Behavioral Science (University of Paisley); MPhil. In Psychology (Glasgow University), MSc. in Forensic Psychology (Glasgow Caledonian University), PG. Cert in Forensic Medical Science (Glasgow University) and is a Consultant Psychologist, HCPC Registered Forensic and BPS Chartered Psychologist, and Associate Fellow of the British Psychology Society.

## **Mark McSherry**

Having initially studied at Glasgow University, Mark began his career working with community education and the residential care sector. Mark began his work in Criminal Justice in alternative to custody projects, initially with young people. He worked in youth justice and with care organisations such as Alzheimer Scotland before joining SACRO in 1997.

Mark studied social work which included placements with Glasgow Women's Reproductive Health Services, children and families' social work and a counselling service for survivors of childhood sexual abuse.

Mark developed programmes on Domestic Abuse and support services to woman and children across the Forth Valley as well as programmes for those convicted of sexual offending and for young people on Probation. He held posts at Glasgow Community Safety Services providing restorative programmes with young people and Renfrewshire Council prior to becoming Head of the Scottish Government's Effective Practice Unit in 2007. This role incorporated policy responsibility for risk assessment and risk management, accredited interventions National Standards and workforce development.

Mark first joined the RMA in 2010 as Head of Development and since then has led their development, training and research programmes, as well as delivery functions relating to OLR's, including approval of Risk Management Plans, review of Annual Implementation Reports and the accreditation of assessors. Mark became Chief Executive of the RMA in 2019.



Scottish Government  
Riaghaltas na h-Alba  
gov.scot

© Crown copyright 2020

**OGL**

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at [www.gov.scot](http://www.gov.scot)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

The Scottish Government  
St Andrew's House  
Edinburgh  
EH1 3DG

ISBN: 978-1-80004-056-4 (web only)

Published by The Scottish Government, September 2020

Produced for The Scottish Government by APS Group Scotland, 21 Tennant Street, Edinburgh EH6 5NA  
PPDAS760206 (09/20)

W W W . g o v . s c o t