

Sentencing of sexual offences

Conference report

Published May 2019

www.scottishsentencingcouncil.org.uk

sentencingcouncil@scotcourts.gov.uk

Sentencing of sexual offences

Conference report

Edinburgh, 22 June 2018

Overview

The [Scottish Sentencing Council](#) was established to promote consistency in sentencing across Scotland and to improve awareness and understanding of sentencing practice. Part of our role is to prepare sentencing guidelines for the Scottish courts. We announced, in our [2018-21 Business Plan](#), our intention to carry out preparatory research into the sentencing of sexual offences. This has been an area of interest since the Council was established and the purpose of this initial examination was to help us decide whether a sentencing guideline or guidelines should be prepared.

We have committed to carrying out wide stakeholder engagement to inform our work and, as a key part of our preparatory research into sexual offences, we held a conference on this topic on 22 June 2018. The delegates at this conference were drawn from a wide variety of criminal justice, governmental, and third sector organisations. The conference enabled us to listen to organisations and individuals with an interest and expertise in the sentencing of sexual offences.

Sexual offending covers a wide range of offences and sentencing options and careful thought will need to be given to the scope of any guideline in this area. We were particularly keen, therefore, to seek input on a range of matters to assist with consideration of potential topics for a guideline or guidelines on sexual offences, including in relation to current difficulties or challenges in sentencing, and any issues which should be considered in the development of a guideline.

As a result of the nature of the conference and the wide-ranging discussions that were held, this report cannot cover all of the points raised. Rather, it is intended to

provide an overview of the main themes arising during the event. To facilitate open discussion, the event followed the [Chatham House Rule](#), which means that no delegates are identified by either name or organisation in relation to views expressed.

It should be noted that the views expressed may not reflect those of the Scottish Sentencing Council.

The conference programme and speakers' biographies are available at **Annex A**.

Purpose and outcomes

The conference was split into two parts. During the morning session, a number of presentations and plenary sessions were held, giving delegates an overview of some of the challenges that arise in the sentencing of sexual offences. In the afternoon session, delegates were asked to reflect on these presentations and to discuss a number of topics in detail during two facilitated workshop sessions focusing on:

- i) Challenges in sentencing sexual offences
- ii) Developing the case for a guideline or guidelines

Summary of workshop 1: challenges in sentencing sexual offences

During the first workshop, delegates were encouraged to discuss challenges encountered or perceived in the sentencing of sexual offences, including with regard to particular types of offender and particular types of offence (for example, historical sexual offences, or those involving children or young people). Delegates also discussed the extent to which the reasons for sentences in sexual offence cases are generally understood.

Registration and notification requirements

Several groups raised the automatic nature of notification requirements as a potential issue¹. In particular, concerns were raised about the fact that notification requirements are more stringent for offenders receiving a fine or admonition than for those who receive a community payback order (CPO)². It was suggested that this may cause difficulties in tailoring sentences to the individual and, in some cases, may result in disproportionate sentences.

There was also discussion around the difficulties in determining what constitutes a ‘significant sexual aspect of an offence’³ and the related requirements for registration.

It was noted that while the Council has no power to alter the statutory notification requirements, further consideration of the interaction between the notification scheme and choice of disposals may be warranted. Given the concerns raised, it was suggested that it may be useful to discuss this matter with the Scottish Government in due course.

¹ The Sexual Offences Act 2003 provides that a person who has been convicted of certain sexual offences is subject to the notification requirements of that Act (sometimes referred to as “the register”). The period of time for which the offender is subject to the requirements is dictated by how s/he was sentenced, and the court has no further discretion over the length of the notification period for any particular offender.

² The offender will be subject to the notification requirements for a period of five years for all qualifying offences which are dealt with by fine or admonition. Where an offence is dealt with by a CPO with an offender supervision requirement, however, the notification period is the same as the supervision period included in the CPO. This can be as little as six months, and will not in any event be more than three years.

³ Where the accused has been convicted of any of the offences listed in Schedule 3 to the 2003 Act there is no room for discretion on the part of the sentencing court as to whether or not the notification requirement comes into play. For other offences the notification requirements apply if the sentencing court determines that there is “a significant sexual aspect to the offender’s behaviour in committing the offence”.

The information available to the court

Several tables discussed the information available to the court at the time of sentencing. Overall, participants felt that the better and more comprehensive the information provided to the sentencer in the form of reports, the easier it is for the court is to select an appropriate sentence and the more likely it is that consistency will be achieved.

There was some discussion around the need for the court to take into account information distinct from the conduct of the offence, e.g. information which is relevant to risk and public protection, which may result in a perceived inconsistency between the sentence and the conduct proven. The issue was raised as to whether strings of previous unproven allegations could be taken into consideration when sentencing alongside previous convictions. It was commented that this is perhaps more of a factor when assessing risk, such as reports to assess suitability for an OLR or to the Parole Board. The relevance of such information could depend on the number of allegations and quality of evidence (even where not proceeded with), or they could be discarded altogether.

There were questions about the use and influence of victim statements, and whether more widespread use of these might be helpful. Victim statements may be seen as assisting victims in having a voice in the sentencing process. However, delegates discussed potential risks around the degree to which victim statements should influence sentencing – noting the potential variation in content and the fact that some victims choose not to give a statement at all. There may also be issues where an accused pleads guilty at the earliest stage in summary procedure, with the consequence that the prosecution will not have the opportunity to engage with the victim to the same extent as it would in lengthier proceedings.

Additionally, there was some discussion in relation to assessing harm in victim statements. It was suggested that it can be difficult to tell what the effect will be on a victim in later life and, similarly, where a statement is given in a historical case there

may be more scope for harm to be evidenced than in a recent case. A further point around assessing harm through victim statements highlighted that a victim may not necessarily be in the best position to offer objective insight into this, for example in cases involving coercive control or where the victim is very young. This raises issues of risk alongside social work intervention, and can be particularly difficult at the higher end of summary level cases where available information is sparser. Sufficient information is necessary to make an informed decision, and there is an argument that where offending is of a lower level this information becomes even more essential and complex (and yet often more difficult to retrieve).

Motivation and culpability

There was discussion as to the extent to which the effort involved in the commission of an offence may increase an offender's culpability. An example given was where grooming has taken place or a network has been established for the sharing of images, as opposed to a more limited possession of indecent images case. Delegates were concerned with how effective deterrence is in cases where the offender is committed to the conduct in this way. Where behaviour is less entrenched – for example in a younger person – delegates felt there may be more opportunities for rehabilitation to be effective and that this should be prioritised in sentencing decisions.

Delegates also discussed the situation where the accused claims to have been sexually abused him or herself as a child. There was discussion as to the difficulties in determining how much that should be taken into account when sentencing.

Impacts on families and familial relationships

Delegates acknowledged that sexual offences have a huge impact on the families of both victim and offender. This could be seen as particularly acute where the offender and victim are related. Sentencing aside, the various interventions involved alongside court proceedings, such as the removal of a young victim (rather than the offender) from the family, could be significantly detrimental to the victim's wellbeing.

For an offender's family, a conviction, and in particular a custodial sentence, can disrupt family relationships, and lead to loss of employment.

Delegates also noted that there are particular challenges when sentencing in cases where there has been an abuse of trust or imbalance of power in close relationships. Behaviour by abused people may be counter-intuitive: the offending may not be disclosed to the police for a considerable period of time, because the victim wishes to maintain a relationship with the perpetrator and wants the behaviour to stop, rather than involving the police/courts.

In relation to the offender, there was discussion around concerns that where a family relationship is involved, it may be more difficult for a perpetrator to admit guilt and get the help they need. This may lead to denying the offending in the hope of maintaining a family position.

Public perception and understanding

Delegates discussed areas where there appeared to be a lack of understanding around the sentencing of sexual offences. Delegates noted the following areas as being potentially of value in increasing public awareness and understanding:

- The impact of making offenders subject to the registration and notification requirements and what this involves;

- How onerous community based sentences can be, tackling the perception that a short jail sentence is a “tougher” – and therefore more desirable - outcome than a long CPO, even though the latter may be more effective in reducing re-offending;
- Extended sentences and how they operate;
- The sentencing process generally and requesting reports for sentence in particular;
- Orders for lifelong restriction; and
- Processes beyond sentencing, particularly MAPPA⁴, automatic early release, and parole.

Delegates were concerned that inaccuracies or gaps in media reporting, for example around the factors considered by the court, could contribute to public misunderstanding around sentencing in sexual offence cases. There can be significant public concern at what may appear to be a short sentence for sexual offences, but this may partly be a result of a lack of an explanation of the rationale for the decision or the full implications of the sentence, e.g. OLRs. It was noted that use of language by the media can sometimes sensationalise cases, which may detract from the facts of the case. Delegates felt that Council engagement with the media could assist in raising public awareness and understanding.

Delegates felt that sentencing statements were useful in helping everyone involved understand the sentence, especially where questions arise afterwards. The work of the Council and increasing the use of sentencing statements may be of assistance.

⁴ Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements. Further information is available on the Scottish Government website at: <https://www2.gov.scot/Topics/Justice/policies/reducing-reoffending/sex-offender-management/protection>.

It was noted that the increased visibility of such offending, through high-profile examples as the Weinstein and Savile cases, appears to have changed the dynamic of what is reported and what the public expects.

Sentencing guidelines generally

It was suggested that any sentencing guideline needs to set clear expectations as to tariffs, as well as aggravating and mitigating factors, and should be capable of being easily referred to in court.

There is always the possibility of a guideline leading to up-tariffing (sentences becoming more severe). Careful work on the potential impacts of any guideline will be required.

Research into other jurisdictions, the Scottish system and, specifically, consistency should be undertaken to support the development of any guidelines in these areas.

Other issues raised

Some delegates discussed concerns about the level of availability, and consistency of provision, of appropriate community disposals in different parts of the country.

Summary of workshop 2: developing the case for a guideline or guidelines

In the second workshop, delegates were asked to consider which areas would be of most value for the Council to develop guidelines on and to provide reasons why these areas were chosen.

Rape and sexual assault

Delegates felt that rape could be distinguished from other offences because of the seriousness of the crime and may merit a guideline separate from other sexual offences. This would have a particular public value as it would help explain sentencing in some of the most high profile and sensitive cases.

It was felt that it would be beneficial to help the public understand the definition of both rape and sexual assault, which changed considerably with the introduction of the Sexual Offences (Scotland) Act 2009. There may be benefits in guidelines detailing the relevant aggravating and mitigating factors, to help address misunderstandings around sentences appearing to indicate one offence is more or less serious than another.

In relation to rape, areas such as incest, breach of trust, violence, and coercive control were suggested as requiring particular consideration.

Some delegates felt that the potential breadth of circumstances covered by the offence of rape may prove difficult to address easily and concisely within a guideline. It was suggested – but not unanimously agreed – that some sort of classification of these different circumstances might be useful. These would include aggravations rather than mitigations. There are already issues around assessing the possible breadth of circumstances, for example, with social security fraud where it could be argued that one large fraudulent payment is no less serious when compared with smaller amounts accrued over a lengthy period of time. If there are issues over quantifying this type of offence, it may be even more difficult for an offence of a sexual nature.

Historical offences

The complexity of these cases and the increasing number now before the courts was seen as supporting the case for a guideline being prepared.

Historical offences may present issues regarding the relative youth of an offender; there are inevitably challenges in assessing culpability (specifically as regards maturity and understanding) when sentencing an offence committed by a child or younger person who is now an adult. Delegates felt it may be useful to consider whether any interventions made are “developmentally appropriate”, i.e. taking into account the maturity and mental state of the offender at the time of the offence.

Discussion took place about how and whether someone’s good character or lack of offending since the offence should be taken into account when sentencing. Does the fact that an offence remained undetected or unreported for many years render it more serious, or should the offender be given credit for evidence of good character or remorse shown during the period? In addition, in historic abuse cases any victim may have had to live, for many years, with the feeling that the perpetrator had escaped justice, and may have been unable to move on and deal with the impact of the crime during those years.

Disparities between the sentencing options available under legislation applying to historic offences compared with those available for comparable current offences were also raised.

It was discussed that some older offenders can be in denial about their offending or the seriousness of its nature, particularly in historic cases, and there were concerns raised about the extent to which age should play a factor in sentencing. It was suggested that the old age of an offender would generally not result in the avoidance of a custodial sentence for a serious offence, but that it may be useful to clarify this point for public understanding in particular.

Delegates considered whether to address sentencing of older offenders within a historical offences guideline or as a separate guideline. This matter is discussed further immediately below.

Sentencing of older people

Delegates felt that sentencing the elderly carried significant challenges, particularly for offences which may be decades old. There may be health issues and/or disabilities to take into consideration, and the court must ascertain how genuine and relevant these are when deciding sentence.

There was some discussion as to the perceived lack of suitable sentencing options for older offenders, as most programmes - and prisons - are not specifically designed for older people, who may have a range of health issues. It was noted that there are often delays in sentencing or obtaining reports due to the illness of the offender; this can cause distress for victims and families.

When offenders are of considerable age, delegates felt it can be difficult to discern the purpose of conviction/sentence. Elderly prisoners may require 24 hour care; this raises questions for sentencers around the purpose of a sentence – for the elderly, is rehabilitation no longer possible? Is a sentence primarily for punishment? Might a custodial disposal be disproportionate, especially where public protection may no longer be a concern (due to age and/or ill health)? Might age affect capacity at the time of sentence, for example in relation to senility, and therefore impact on the utility of a sentence? There are questions about the rights of the offender as well as others involved in a case to consider when passing sentence. To what extent should length of sentence be influenced by an offender's older age?

In addition, it was noted that there are questions around how to define older age, and whether the issue is better framed in terms of the offender's relative health, mobility and/or capacity.

Offences involving children and younger people (both as victim and perpetrator)

Delegates felt it was difficult to impose sentences in cases involving children and young people which balance the needs and interests of all those involved (victims, offenders, families, and society more generally). It was noted that sentences could be very different depending on the purpose(s) selected by the sentencer, e.g. denunciation/punishment/rehabilitation/public protection.

There was discussion around the careful and complex balancing required around taking action to allow the offender to effectively address their behaviour – which delegates noted might in this context be more likely to be related to personal circumstances than in other offences – while also addressing the needs of the victims and of the public.

Delegates discussed problems with accurately assessing the harm caused to children or young people as this can be very complex: the full extent of the harm may not be apparent for some time, and in some instances, a child may not understand that an offence has been committed against them and may even appear to consent. For example, in relation to “sexting” (which, in the context of these offences, is generally seen as involving young people as both senders and recipients of texts as distinct from situations where an adult is communicating indecently with a child) the relevant activity might be seen as ‘consensual’ by the parties involved. These cases may need to be distinguished from those involving the abuse of a position of trust, or from those where there was a significant age gap between the parties.

Delegates felt that sentencing could be particularly problematic where the offender is a young adult (aged over 18) whose offending behaviour involves an older child (aged 13-15); where one person is just over 16 and another just under (especially if

they are in a relationship); or where both parties are young children (aged under 13)⁵.

There was discussion of the relative seriousness of different offences and how and whether this should or could be captured by any general applicability guideline such as one focussing on sexual offences committed by young people.

It was also noted that the concept of “remorse” can sometimes be unhelpful in relation to young people, who may not be mature enough to demonstrate this in the way that an older person might; this could complicate the ability to participate in certain rehabilitative programmes.

There was some discussion of whether a guideline on sexual offences committed by young people would be necessary or premature, given a general guideline on sentencing young people is already under development. If a separate guideline on offences involving children and younger people were to be taken forward, consideration around how the two interact would be required.

Cyber-enabled offences

It was suggested that cyber-enabled sexual offences appear to be increasing. Additionally, delegates felt that the assessment of harm in non-contact offences can be difficult to assess – for example, sharing of intimate images (‘revenge porn’) can be particularly devastating in small communities – and that there is no significant body of case law to consult. This is further complicated by a perceived lack of risk assessment tools in sentencing for these offences.

Delegates felt that the scope of any guideline on cyber-enabled sexual offences would need to be considered carefully. Should all or only some cyber-enabled crimes

⁵ The Sexual Offences (Scotland) Act 2009 distinguishes an “older child” (aged between 13 and 15 inclusive) from a “young child” (aged under 13).

be treated (for the purposes of sentencing guidance) as standalone in nature or might some be best considered alongside other offences with similar characteristics? Indecent images was one topic which could potentially benefit from a guideline, given that there are different categories for offending (such as with social security fraud and road traffic cases) and many such cases are fairly readily quantifiable.

There was discussion on whether research on public awareness and perceptions of sentencing in this area may be particularly useful. Specifically, delegates felt that the public may perceive different priorities for cyber-enabled offending than contact offences. For example, in non-contact offences the risk of harm to the public may be perceived as low but there may be a significant need for deterrence, resulting in a severe sentence.

There were questions raised about whether undesirable and criminal activity of a sexual nature has in fact increased or if there has been a shift in the manner in which such activity is carried out.

Delegates raised concerns that any guideline on cyber-enabled offences would need to be kept up to date with any relevant technological advances and changes in offending methodology.

Summary cases

Delegates discussed how sexual crimes seem to be viewed by society as being quite different in nature to other types of crime. This leads to what appears to be a lack of public understanding about sexual offences at summary level and a perception that sentencing is lenient. Guidelines and the clear explanation of reasons for sentencing in cases dealt with at this level may be of assistance.

Offenders with mental health, illness and welfare issues

Delegates felt that there are significant difficulties in sentencing offenders with mental health difficulties. They noted that this was not a small problem, with delegates feeling that many of those who are in prison, or who are convicted, have some sort of issue in this area, meaning that their understanding of, and insight into, their offending behaviour is not sophisticated. This should not be used, or seen, as an excuse but it can increase the difficulty in sentencing.

Conclusion

It is clear from the presentations and discussions held over the course of the conference that the sentencing of sexual offences is a highly complex area, involving balancing the rights and interests of a number of different parties – the rights and interests of victims, those of offenders, and of the public. Sometimes these interests overlap; sometimes they appear to be at odds with one another and to be almost irreconcilable. The difficult task for sentencers is to try to reconcile these in a way which reaches a fair and proportionate balance of the competing interests of the individuals involved, and of society.

It is the Council's hope that by creating sentencing guidelines in this area, we can offer some assistance in achieving this, and the contributions made by delegates will be invaluable in informing our work. In particular, the Council intends to consider the various points raised during the conference in deciding what the focus of any guideline or guidelines on sexual offences should be, how different topics in this area might be prioritised, and what additional evidence gathering may be required.

The Council would like to thank all those who participated in the conference.

ANNEX A – CONFERENCE PROGRAMME AND SPEAKERS’ BIOGRAPHIES

SENTENCING OF SEXUAL OFFENCES

[RADISSON BLU, 80 HIGH STREET, EDINBURGH, EH1 1TH](#)

FRIDAY 22 JUNE 0915-1630

PROGRAMME

TIME	ACTIVITY	MINUTES
0915	<i>Arrival and refreshments</i>	30
0945	Conference Chair’s introduction: Lady Dorrian, Lord Justice Clerk	10
0955	Presentation: Peter Conlong (Scottish Government, Justice Analytical Services): <i>Statistics/trends in sentencing for sexual offences</i>	20
1015	Q&A	20
1035	<i>Refreshments</i>	15
1050	Panel 1	60
	Lord Beckett <i>Overview of cases in the Scottish courts and the challenges in sentencing sexual offences</i>	

	<p>Sandy Brindley (Chief Executive, Rape Crisis Scotland)</p> <p><i>The experience of sexual offence complainers in relation to the sentencing process</i></p>	
	<p>Bruce Adamson (Children and Young People’s Commissioner in Scotland)</p> <p><i>Overview of issues to consider in relation to children and young people as both offenders and victims</i></p>	
	<p>Amanda Naylor (Assistant Director, Impact and Lead, Child Sexual Abuse, Barnardo’s)</p> <p><i>The complexity of experience, the offender-victim cycle; impacts on and outcomes for affected children and young people</i></p>	
1150	<i>Refreshments</i>	15
1205	Panel 2	50
	<p>Tom Halpin (Chief Executive, Sacro)</p> <p><i>Overview of services available, what constitutes successful approaches/outcomes, and how this might relate to the consideration of rehabilitation in the sentencing process</i></p>	
	<p>Lucy Coleman (Team Manager, Tay Project)</p> <p><i>Overview of the Tay Project, approaches to rehabilitation and management of offenders</i></p>	
	<p>Angela Holmes (Principal Psychologist, Scottish Prison Service)</p> <p><i>Risk assessment, psychological interventions, offenders’ backgrounds</i></p>	
1255	<i>Lunch</i>	45



1340	Presentation: Detective Superintendent Stuart Houston: <i>Recent trends in sexual offending</i>	30
1410	Q&A	10
1420	Workshop 1: Discussion of sentencing challenges and issues <i>Purpose: to identify and describe aspects of sentencing in sexual offences cases which are particularly problematic, for example in relation to particular offences, types of offender, victim, or any other aspects of a case and why.</i>	60
1520	Workshop 2: Developing the case for a guideline or guidelines <i>Purpose: to discuss the evidence base for preparing guideline(s) on sentencing sexual offences, and in particular to discuss the priority areas and scope for any guideline(s).</i>	60
1620	Conference close: Lady Dorrian, Lord Justice Clerk	10

SPEAKERS' BIOGRAPHIES

Peter Conlong, Scottish Government, Justice Analytical Services

Peter Conlong heads a team of economists, researchers, and statisticians in the Scottish Government's Justice Analytical Unit.

The team provides a wide range of advice on issues relating to the civil and criminal justice systems, including crime, sentencing, the prison population, and reoffending. He is an economist by background, and has over 12 years' experience in crime and justice issues. Prior to that he worked as an analyst in various areas of government including finance, economic development, and transport.

Lord Beckett

The Hon Lord Beckett was appointed a Judge of the Supreme Courts in May 2016.

John Beckett is a graduate of the University of Edinburgh and was admitted as a solicitor in 1986, working in private practice before being admitted to the Faculty of Advocates in 1993.

He was appointed an Advocate Depute in 2003 and took silk in 2005. He served as Principal Advocate Depute and then Solicitor General for Scotland in 2006.

He became a sheriff in 2008 and was appointed as an Appeal Sheriff on the establishment of the Sheriff Appeal Court in 2015. He was appointed a Temporary Judge in September 2008 and has presided regularly in the High Court and Court of Session.

Sandy Brindley, Chief Executive, Rape Crisis Scotland

Sandy Brindley has been Chief Executive of Rape Crisis Scotland since 2017, and was National Coordinator prior to that from 2003 when the national organisation was established.

Prior to her involvement with Rape Crisis Scotland, Sandy worked at the Rape Crisis Centre in Glasgow for 8 years.

Sandy has been a member of the advisory groups for both the Scottish Law Commission and the Crown Office reviews of rape and sexual offences.

She is a member of several strategic working groups to improve responses to rape, including the Scottish Government's Joint Strategic Board on Violence against Women and Girls, and the Crown Office Expert Group on Sexual Offences.

Sandy has also been heavily involved in the development of several national public awareness campaigns including "This is not an invitation to rape me", "Not ever", and #ijustfroze.

She was also instrumental in setting up the Scottish Women's Rights Centre which provides free legal advice to survivors of gender-based violence and aims to improve women's legal rights through strategic litigation.

Bruce Adamson, Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland

Bruce is a lawyer who has over 20 years of experience in children's rights. Originally from New Zealand, he moved to Scotland in 2002.

A Member of the Children's Panel for 13 years, he has worked directly with vulnerable children and their families, listening to their experiences and making decisions about their safety and wellbeing.

Mr Adamson has been on advisory boards for several public authorities and civil society organisations and is a former Chair of the Scottish Child Law Centre. As legal officer at the Scottish Human Rights Commission, he was central to the development of law, policy and practice covering the broad spectrum of children's rights.

In 2013, he was the United Nations Representative for the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, representing institutions from over 100 countries to improve human rights in Scotland and across the world.

Mr Adamson has acted as an international expert for the Council of Europe, the European Union and the OSCE. Working in emerging democracies in the Western Balkans and Ukraine, he has helped to improve the situation for children in some of the most challenging situations in Europe.

He has also been a member of several international projects, including one on the reform of the European Court of Human Rights and another on increasing the ability of national parliaments to act as human rights guarantors.

The Role of Commissioner

The Children and Young People's Commissioner is appointed by Her Majesty the Queen and has legal duties defined by the Commissioner for Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2003. In particular, he must:

- promote awareness and understanding of the rights of children and young people,
- review law, policy and practice to examine their effectiveness in respecting the rights of children and young people,

- promote best practice by service providers,
- promote and commission research on matters relating to the rights of children and young people,
- encourage the involvement of children and young people in his work, and – in particular – consult with them on the work that he should be doing to improve the rights of children and young people.

Amanda Naylor, Assistant Director Impact – UK lead for Child Sexual Abuse, Barnardo’s

Over the past 20 years, Amanda has worked extensively within the third sector, international development and social care, focused on contextual safeguarding, inclusive practice with disabled children and justice for child victims.

Currently Amanda heads up the delivery of Barnardo’s 10 year strategy on child sexual abuse, incorporating child sexual exploitation and harmful sexual behaviours, designing and implementing innovative and responsive services across the UK’s 4 Nations.

Amanda sits on both the Centre of Expertise for CSA Advisory Board and the NOTA Advisory Board and has central involvement with key Government initiatives on the range of CSA issues.

Prior to this Amanda led on the creation of Victim Support’s children and young people programme - co-designing services with vulnerable young victims and witnesses who experienced the most serious crime and academic partners.

Tom Halpin, Chief Executive, Sacro

Tom Halpin took up his appointment as Chief Executive at Sacro on 17 August 2009. Prior to this, he was Deputy Chief Constable of Lothian & Borders. Tom is currently a board member of the Scottish Police Authority and chairs the Criminal Justice Voluntary Sector Forum.

A Chartered Director (C.Dir FIOD), he has held a number of Non-Executive roles including a Member of the University Court at Glasgow Caledonian University.

Awarded the Queen's Police Medal in 2008 Honours, he is married with two grown up children. Tom now resides with his wife Elizabeth in Edinburgh but still retains close connections with his native Glasgow where his children and wider family remain.

Recent projects carried out by Sacro include:

Shine

Shine is a national mentoring service for women offenders. The service is provided as a public social partnership (PSP); a strategic partnership between public and voluntary sector organisations.

Fearless

Fearless is a support service for any man, or LGBTI+ person experiencing domestic abuse. Fearless offers non-judgmental, one-to-one support for individuals experiencing domestic abuse.

Forth Valley Caledonian Project

The Caledonian System is an integrated approach to address domestic abuse by men towards a female partner or ex-partner.

The Caledonian System works with men convicted of domestic abuse related offences to reduce their reoffending and improve the lives of women, children and the men.

Fife – Arrest Referral

This service engages with people at the point of arrest whose offending is linked to drug or alcohol misuse.

Lucy Coleman, Team Manager Tay Project

Lucy Coleman is the Team Manager for the Tay Project, which is the sex offender assessment and intervention team that covers the Tayside Community Justice area, and has been since 2010. The team are responsible for pre-sentence and pre-release assessments for sex offenders and developing treatment pathways accordingly to address risk and need. This includes both 1:1 work and group based intervention via MFMC and tailored individual treatment packages. Lucy treatment manages all intervention delivery by the team and is herself an accredited MFMC Practitioner. She is trained in the use of various risk assessment tools such as SA07, RM2000, RSVP and AIM2 (for assessment of youth/adult sexual offending), SARA (for assessment of domestic abuse), SAM (for assessment of stalking behaviour), and OAsys and LSCMI (for general offending behaviour). Prior to joining the Tay Project, Lucy worked with the National Probation Service firstly as a Probation Officer and then Team Manager. She specialised within high risk offender management including Public Protection case management, Management of an Approved Premises residential unit for high/very high risk of harm violent and sexual offenders, and held lead roles with MAPPA, MARAC (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference) and Preventing Violent Extremism.

Lucy also provides consultation for complex cases involving sexually harmful behaviour for Children & Families services within the Tayside area and hosts quarterly Complex case discussions with her team. These are open for all professionals to refer to, and are a forum for enhancing knowledge and understanding and supporting ongoing continuous professional development. Lucy currently sits as a Complex Case Advisor for PVG Scotland, is the community Chair for the National Joint SPS and Community MFMC (Moving Forward Making Changes) Treatment Management Delivery group, and also holds the role of Secretary for NOTA (National Organisation for the Treatment of Abusers) Scotland.

For more information on the Tay Project, please see this short video:

[The Tay Project: Dundee City Council - YouTube](#)

Angela Holmes, Principal Psychologist, Scottish Prison Service

Angela Holmes has been a practising Chartered Forensic Psychologist since 2004. She has qualifications of BSc Hons Psychology and MSc Forensic Psychology and experience of working with high risk mentally disordered offenders for over 15 years. Angela has worked within the NHS for approximately 10 years in maximum, medium and low security psychiatric environments and finally a forensic community mental health service, as a highly specialist forensic psychologist. More recently she has worked as a Senior Psychologist with adolescents and young people within secure care across Scotland.

Angela's role has primarily been concerned with risk assessment, risk management and treatment interventions. During this time, she has conducted research into violence risk within and out-with psychiatric environments and has acted as a consultant lead clinician for a MAPPA implementation steering group in the community. She has also worked as part of a Home Office research team, evaluating

the implementation of accredited offending behaviour programmes across the National Probation Directorate in England and Wales.

Angela has been an Accredited Risk Assessor with the Risk Management Authority since 2007 and is competent in the administration of risk assessment tools used within this report.

Angela is currently employed by Scottish Prison Service, as the National Lead for risk and violence, working with long-term high risk violent and sexually violent offenders. She was the Head of Psychology at HMP Shotts between 2011 and 2018 and now as Principal Psychologist at Headquarters, Edinburgh.

Detective Superintendent Stuart Houston, Police Scotland

Detective Superintendent Houston is currently attached to Specialist Crime Division with oversight of the National Rape Task Force and the National Human Trafficking Unit.

DSU Houston has completed 22 years with the majority of his service within Criminal Investigation having previously worked within the Major Investigation Team, Edinburgh Division CID and the Police Scotland College. He is a trained Senior Investigating Officer and has led investigations in relation to murder, human trafficking, and serious and organised crime, both at a local and national level. Within his current role, DSU Houston has responsibility for the co-ordination of human trafficking incidents in Scotland, including prevention, awareness raising and investigations. In relation to rape and sexual crime, he has oversight of the investigation, continuous improvement and partnership engagement in this business area.