THROUGHCARE ASSESSMENT FOR RELEASE ON LICENCE – EVALUATION TEMPLATE

TARL ID (URN/ S-number)**:**	
Evaluation completed by:	
Date:	

TARL Evaluation Template – guidance notes

1. **There are 5 elements of each TARL to consider and rate:**

   o The sources of information used to inform the assessment;
   o The identification of key factors (risk factors, strengths/ protective factors, responsivity issues & other needs);
   o The analysis of offending;
   o The evaluation & conclusion of the assessment;
   o Presentation of the report (incorporating communication and collaboration).

2. **A number of criteria* are provided which should be considered when rating each element. Most of the criteria require either a Yes or No response but, where appopriate, a not applicable (N/A) response is available.**

3. **A comments box for each element is available for raters to provide a rationale for their rating and/ or detail any particular issues, strengths or weaknesses of the TARL assessment.**

4. **A six-point scale is used for rating each of the elements of the TARL:**

   6 – Excellent. All of the areas are strong and demonstrate a high level of quality. Excellent assessments will be of an outstanding level of professional competence.

   5 - Very Good. There are no weak areas and there are areas of real strength. Very good assessments should be of a high standard and should demonstrate professional competence which exceeds an acceptable level.

   4 – Good. Almost all areas are strong although there may be some weaker areas. Good assessments should demonstrate an entirely acceptable level of professional competence.

   3 – Adequate. Most areas are strong but there may be some areas of weakness. Adequate assessments should demonstrate a basic level of professional competence but practice may be variable.

   2 –Weak. No more than half of the areas are strong. Some key areas are weak. A weak assessment demonstrates a lack of professional competence in key areas.

   1 – Unsatisfactory. Only a minority of the areas are strong. There are major weaknesses. An unsatisfactory assessment demonstrates a lack of professional competence.

* The criteria to guide the scoring are mainly drawn from:

   o *Standards & Guidelines For Risk Management (2014) – see Appendix A*
   o *National Outcomes and Standards for Social Work Services in the Criminal Justice System (2010) – see Appendix B*
   o *Framework f*
   o *or Risk Assessment, Management & Evaluation (FRAME) (2011) - see Appendix C*

1. Rate the sources of information used to inform the assessment:	Yes	No	N/A
1.1 Does the assessment specify **sources of information**?			
1.2 Has the assessment been based on a **wide range of available information**, gathered from **a variety of so**urces?			
1.3 Does the assessment distinguish between verified facts and professional opinion?			
1.4 Have any **limitations,** gaps in knowledge or inconsistencies in information been acknowledged?			
1.5 Have **home visits** have been carried out?			
1.6 Is there evidence that pertinent information has been shared between Community Based Social Work and Prison Based Social Work to inform the report?			

Comments

Rating

6 Excellent	5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Adequate	2 Weak	1 Unsatisfactory

2. Rate the identification of risk factors, strengths/ protective factors, responsivity considerations and other needs:	Yes	No	N/A
2.1 Does the assessment identify historical & current factors about the person, their life circumstances and behaviour that support further offending (**risk factors**)?			
2.2 Does the assessment refer to the presence or absence of **strengths** (which promote desistence) or **protective factors** (which may help prevent future episodes of offending)?			
2.3 Does the assessment refer to or identify any special **responsivity considerations** which may influence the style or mode of any proposed interventions (e.g. motivation, communication barriers, learning abilities or personality issues)?			
2.4 Does the assessment refer to or identify any **other needs**/ issues which may present barriers to change unless addressed (e.g. health issues, financial or accommodation problems)?			
2.5 Has the assessment been conducted in an evidence-based, structured manner, incorporating **appropriate tools** and **professional decision making**?			

Comments

Rating

6 Excellent	5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Adequate	2 Weak	1 Unsatisfactory

3

3. Rate the analysis of offending:	Yes	No	N/A

*3.1 Does the assessement provide a **detailed analysis** of past and current offending in terms of its pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood where:*
 	
    ***Pattern** refers to the onset (since when), duration and frequency (how often)*
 	
    ***Nature** refers to the type, diversity and to whom the offences are directed*
 	
    ***Seriousness** refers to the level of planning, the degree of harm caused and the degree of harm intended*
 	
    ***Likelihood** based on the balance of identified risk and protective factors/ strengths*			

3.2 Is the analysis of offending summarised?			
3.3 Does the summary refer to the likelihood and impact of further offending?			
3.4 Was a ROSH assessment considered appropriate and if so, was there a clear rationale and explanation about why it was applicable?			
3.5 If a ROSH assessment was not considered appropriate then, was there a clear rationale and explanation as to why it did not apply?			

Comments

Rating

6 Excellent	5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Adequate	2 Weak	1 Unsatisfactory

4

4. Rate the evaluation and conclusion:	Yes	No	N/A
4.1 Is there a clear recommendation (e.g. to release or not release from custody)?			
4.2 Is the recommendation what would be expected from the analysis of offending?			
4.3 Does the evaluation/ conclusion avoid the use of terms such as 'high', 'medium' or 'low' (unless clearly explained and quantified what this means)?			
4.4 Is there a plan for release which includes reference to the level and types of intervention required?			
4.5 Is the plan focussed on the most problematic risks/needs, build on any identified strengths and proposals for tackling any engagement, motivation or other responsivity issues?			
4.6 Does the degree of planning and intervention reflect the assessed risk and needs?			
4.7 If the person is assessed as presenting a risk of serious harm to others, is a risk management plan referenced?			
4.8 Does the risk management plan detail monitoring, supervision, victim safety planning and intervention/ treatment activities?			

Comments

Rating

6 Excellent	5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Adequate	2 Weak	1 Unsatisfactory

5. Rate the presentation of the report:	Yes	No	N/A
5.1 Is the report written in a way which is likely to be understood by the decision maker/ the reader?			6
5.2 Is there evidence of collaboration/ active sharing of information between Prison Based and Community Based Social Work?			
5.3 Is the report written in a manner that avoid's repetition?			
5.4 Is it clear in the report which section was written by the Community Based Social Worker and which was written by the Prison Based Social Worker?			
5.5 If there has been a divergence of opinion between the Community Based Social Worker and the Prison Based Social Worker, is this clearly articulated in the report and the steps which have been taken to address the matter?			

Comments

Rating

6 Excellent	5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Adequate	2 Weak	1 Unsatisfactory

APPENDIX A

*Standards & Guidelines For Risk Management (2014); **Standard 1: Risk Assessment***

- Risk assessment will involve **identification of key pieces of information**, **analysis** of their meaning in the time and context of the assessment, and **evaluation** against the appropriate criteria.

- Risk assessment will be based on a **wide range of available information**, gathered from **a variety of so**urces.

- Risk assessment will be conducted in an **evidence-based, structured** manner, incorporating **appropriate tools** and professional decision making, **acknowledging any limitations of the assessment**.

- Risk assessment will be **communicated responsibly**, to ensure that the findings of the assessment can be **meaningfully understood** and **inform decision-making**.

- Risk will be **communicated in terms of the pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood of offending.**

APPENDIX B

National Outcomes and Standards for Social Work Services in the Criminal Justice System (2010):

Chapter 4: Assessments and Reports

- Key information should be, wherever possible, supported by **more than one source**.

- Reports should provide information and analysis based upon **a balance of sources**

- Accuracy and comprehensiveness are enhanced in most cases by **home visits**.

- Reports should provide information and analysis relevant to purpose:
  − The individual's background and current circumstances;
  - An analysis of offending which considers the pattern, nature and seriousness of the offending to date;
  - The likelihood of and impact of reoffending, with particular regard to child and vulnerable adult protection;
  - Protective factors (strengths and available resources) decreasing the risk of re-offending;
  - Desistance needs which, if met, will sustain desistance from offending;
  - Taking into consideration differences in social circumstances, age, gender, ethnicity, mental health and learning abilities;
  - Taking into consideration the impact of previous sentences and in some cases the effects of institutionalisation on long term prisoners;
  - Readiness, motivation and capability to complete an intervention plan and to comply with requirements

- Reports should be concise, **written in plain English**.

  In cases of risk of serious harm
- Develop a formulation of risk – an evaluation of the nature, severity, imminence, frequency and likelihood of risk that the **individual** poses; identify the relevant risk factors and how they interact; early warning signs and behaviours to monitor.
- Consider the current and near future contexts, and the situations or 'scenarios' in which seriously harmful offending may occur
- On the basis of the risk formulation and consideration of likely scenarios, identify the **preventive** strategies of:
  - Supervision
  - Monitoring
  - Intervention / treatment
  - Victim safety planning
  that are necessary to address **each** of the relevant risk and protective factors; and the **contingency** measures in response to early warning signs.
- Clearly document roles and responsibilities for the delivery of these measures, and agreed means and frequency of communication.

  In cases of other levels of risk
- outline options proportionate to the seriousness and persistence of offending to reduce the risk of re-offending, to meet the needs for desistance, and to make reparation.

- This should include the level of contact that will be maintained with the individual.

APPENDIX C

FRAME (2011) ***Chapter 3: Language of Risk***

Risk Assessment is a process by which risk is understood. It involves the three steps of identification; analysis and evaluation of the best available information, which is then communicated to inform decision making and action with the ultimate aim of reducing the likelihood and impact of future offending.

1. Gather and review the relevant information to identify the:
- Historical and current factors about the person, his or her life circumstances and behaviour that support further offending (***risk factors***) or desistance (***strengths***). This element of assessment is assisted by the application of appropriate risk tools
- Pattern of offending
- Nature of previous and current offences
- Seriousness of previous and current offences

2. Analyse this information
- To further identify how likely further offending is in the long term and in the current context given the presence and balance ***of risk, strength*** and any identified ***protective factors.***
- To identify the possible outcomes in the event of such further offending
- What is the likelihood of each possible outcome:
  - Non-violent and non-sexual offending
  - Violent offending
  - Sexual offending
- Further analyse all of the above to estimate the impact of each possible outcome
- Make a statement of risk in terms of the nature, seriousness, pattern and likelihood of offending

3. Evaluate this analysis
- Evaluate against the appropriate criteria, and the context and purpose of the assessment
- Make a decision on the most appropriate course of action
- Communicate the risk as required
- Proceed to deliver the appropriate response

When working with vulnerable adults or young people, the same process of assessment will apply, however it should be noted that a range of risks and needs related to vulnerability, age or developmental stage may be indicated.

Statement of Risk is a clear expression of risk in terms of the nature, seriousness, pattern and likelihood of offending.
Nature is the type of offence and the target
Seriousness combines the degree of harm done, the degree of harm intended and the extent of planning in an episode of offending
Pattern consists of the onset, duration, frequency and escalation of offending
Likelihood is understood as the current balance of risk and protective factors/strengths. It is not   expressed as a statistical probability.

This statement of risk can then be evaluated against the relevant criteria for the decision in hand; certain procedures have defined ***risk criteria***, in other situations risk is evaluated against legislative, professional practice considerations.

Every effort should be made to ensure that such statements of risk are expressed in terms which area accessible to the individuals to whom they apply. This is particularly important when working with children and young people, or adults with learning needs.

Risk Criteria are the measures against which risk is evaluated to inform decision making in varying processes and systems. Risk criteria are important as they serve as gate-keepers for particular sentences and procedures, promoting fairness, transparency and integrity. Risk criteria are central to the sound functioning of MAPPA and the Order for

Lifelong Restriction, and in those examples, revolve around the consideration of 'risk of serious harm'.