Inspection of Youth Offending Work
Arolygiad o Waith Troseddu Ieuenctid

HM Inspectorate of Probation
Arolygiaeth Prawf EM

Case Assessment Guidance

for

Full Joint Inspection (FJI)

and

Short Quality Screening (SQS)

Introduction

This Case Assessment Guide provides guidance to those undertaking case assessments as part of the Full Joint Inspection (FJI) and Short Quality Screening (SQS) of Youth Offending Work. It is designed to support consistent and appropriate judgements, irrespective of who undertakes the assessment.

The guide is also useful to those whose work we inspect, to understand the quality that we expect and how we make judgements, and so further support and encourage improvement.

It is to be read in conjunction with the HMI Probation Case Assessment Tool for Inspection of Youth Offending Work.

Within the case assessment tool there are four types of question:

Information Questions – these are factual and gather basic information about the case to inform subsequent data analysis, help the inspector identify relevant characteristics to inform their judgements, and ensure that the right questions are asked for the particular type of case.

Judgement Questions – are questions where the inspector is required to make a judgement about whether a particular aspect of work was done well enough. HMI Probation utilise the concept of "above or below the line" – if the aspect of work was done well enough to meet the needs of the case, it is above the line and will be judged as Sufficient. Otherwise it is below the line and will be judged as Insufficient.

Explanation Questions – when a judgement question has been marked as *insufficient* then an explanation question asks the inspector, using pre-coded options, to identify the reasons for their judgements. These details will be used in inspection reports to assist readers in understanding why we have made our judgements, and where specifically they need to focus improvement work.

Narrative Questions – at the end of each section of the case assessment tool is a question that enables the inspector to describe relevant characteristics of the case, or other contextual aspects that may have informed their judgements. These will be used by the Lead Inspector to understand the context of judgements when they write the report or explain the findings.

Sufficient / Insufficient

Many questions combine a number of linked aspects of work and their supporting processes into one question. In general we inspect against whether the appropriate outcome has been achieved, rather than whether a process has been followed precisely. To support inspectors to weigh the relative importance and quality of different aspects when making judgements they are provided with the following guiding principle:

"The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the work undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the work outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits or aspects where the work could be better, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is ***sufficient*** *within the context of the case, in particular where the deficit was unlikely to reduce the likelihood of a positive outcome. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular deficit may be such that it leads to a judgement of* ***insufficient****."*

HMI Probation approach to National Standards and professional discretion

The HMI Probation approach to inspecting professional flexibility is that clearer recording of the rationale behind decisions on the management of cases is required than was the case when there was greater reliance on explicit standards.

All decisions, in particular on the expected timing of assessments, plans and reviews, should be clearly recorded within the case record and reasons for decisions should be explained. Explanations should link relevant case characteristics to the decision i.e. they should be made according to the individual circumstances of that particular case.

Decisions should be defensible to meet the needs of the individual case, **not** the availability of resources.

Management oversight of decisions/rationale should, where appropriate, be undertaken and recorded on the case record.

In the absence of clearly recorded and defensible decisions HMI Probation will where relevant continue to use National Standards 2010, or current National Standards where these contain detailed expectations, as a minimum baseline for good practice.

How much of the case is inspected?

In both programmes the inspection period for case assessments commences at the start of sentence, or at the point of the initial assessment for that sentence if that is earlier (normally cases where a PSR has been requested). It then continues, through to the date of inspection.

In FJI the inspection focuses on delivery of the whole sentence to date, including interventions, outcomes and compliance.

In SQS, where many of the inspected cases will have commenced fairly recently, the focus post-sentence is on the period up to completion of the first assessment and plan, and the quality of any reviews of these that became due during the period up to the date of the inspection, along with compliance.

However, whilst specific questions are asked in each programme, if concerns about a case are recognised outside of these questions (normally with regard to risk of harm to others or self), whilst these will not normally affect inspection judgements, the inspector will ensure that they are addressed as if they were part of the inspection.

Asset Plus

This guide has been written with reference to use of Asset. AssetPlus is likely to be rolled out during the currency of this inspection programme. Whilst much terminology and detail will change in the move from Asset to AssetPlus, readers of this guidance should recognise that the principles underlying it, and the questions assessed by inspectors, are considered in general to read across into the AssetPlus environment – albeit that the information required may then be found in a different form or different place.

Layout of this guide

Entries within this guide are laid out as follows:

Column 1 – the question number within the case assessment tool

Column 2 – cross reference to the Inspection Criterion that this question contributes to.

Column 3 – a summary of the relevant quality indicators that inform this question

Column 4 – a more substantive narrative to assist the inspector in making their judgement.

Readers should note that not all questions are asked on every case. The case assessment tool should be used to identify the actual wording of each question and whether it is relevant to any particular case.

The guidance on individual questions in the case assessment tool is then followed by two appendices:

Appendix 1 – guidance on checking the dates that key pieces of work were completed; based on the YOT case management systems in common use.

Appendix 2 – a short overview for inspections in Wales, to assist inspectors in understanding where they need to be aware that arrangements may vary between England Wales.

HMI Probation is keen to receive comments on and improve our inspections. If you wish to comment on this Case Assessment Guide or Case Assessment Tool, please send your comments, with *"IYO Case Assessment Guide"* in the title line, to: enquiries.hmiprob@hmiprobation.gsi.gov.uk .

HMI Probation
revised January 2015

Change Control

The following amendments have been incorporated into this version:

Date	Question	Details
January 2013	Introduction	Added explanations of HMI Probation approach to professional discretion/ national standards and how much of the case to inspect in each programme
January 2013	1.5.1/ 1.5.2/ 1.5.3	Guidance on additional questions gathering information about how information was provided to the sentencing court
February 2013	1.5.2	Additional guidance on judging appropriateness of the method used to inform the sentencing court
February 2013	View 0 – various	Guidance on questions added for inspections in Wales about attention given to the Welsh language
February 2013	Various	Various minor amendments to add clarity or correct grammatical or spelling errors
March 2013	Appendices 1 and 2	Appendices 1 (checking dates when work was completed) and 2 (Inspecting in Wales) added
March 2013	12a	Additional guidance on use of MAPPA Category 3 and role of Responsible Authority
April 2013	Various	Additional questions and guidance added for use when *Interventions* module is inspected in FJI
April 2013	12a	Further guidance on MAPPA Category 3
September 2013	12a, 12c, 2.10.1	MAPPA guidance updated to reflect latest MAPPA Guidance 2012 v4
September 2013	Various	References to National Standards updated to reflect National Standards 2013
September 2013	1.9.3, 1.9.4	Additional questions added to assess the quality of Referral Order reports
September 2013	1.1.1, 1.4.1, 1.5.1	Additional guidance relating to referral orders, including on the boundary between assessment and planning in these cases
March 2014	2.1.0	Inspector asked to identify five priority areas for work to reduce likelihood of reoffending.
March 2014	3.8.1, 4.2.1	Additional guidance relating to Statutory Victim Contact scheme and Code of Practice for Victims of Crime
January 2015	Various	• adds question 1.5.3, used for courts module on an FJI • adds new questions 4.19.1/2/3 re monitoring offending behaviour and whether the CYP is less likely to offend • adds question 1.14 to monitor prevalence of CSE • amends the wording of some questions to focus them more clearly on the outcome desired from the piece of work (NB: this should NOT in any way change the meaning of the questions).

View 0 - Details

Question Number		Quality Indicators	Extended Guidance
1		This is the name of the inspector undertaking the assessment in this case.	This is the name of the inspector undertaking the assessment in this case.
2		This is asking whether the inspector in this case is either a Local Assessor or a member of HMI Probation staff.	This is asking whether the inspector in this case is either a Local Assessor (working alongside the HMI Probation team for the field work of this inspection process) or working direct for HMI Probation
3a		This is the Youth Offending Team which is being inspected during this inspection.	This is the Youth Offending Team which is being inspected during this inspection. Please indicate the YOT area from the drop down menu.
3b		This is the country in which this inspection is taking place.	This is the country in which this inspection is taking place. It is used to determine whether Welsh Language Scheme questions (9a to 9e and 13c) need to be asked in this YOT.
4		This is the gender of the child or young person.	This is the gender of the child or young person – select Male or Female from the drop-down box
5		This is the age in years AT THE START OF THE SENTENCE.	This is the age in years AT THE START OF THE SENTENCE. Do not include months of age or the actual date of birth. Please take care in answering this, in particular where the child or young person has received multiple sentences.
6		This is the race and ethnicity as recorded on the case record.	This is the race and ethnicity as recorded on the case record. Please indicate the answer from the drop down menu. Evidence of this will normally be found in the personal details section of the core assessment on the electronic case record and may also be detailed on any hard case file dependent on the local processes of the YOT in question. The ethnicity to be recorded by the case manager is the self-report of the child or young person – it is NOT the opinion of the YOT. If there is any doubt about how the ethnicity was determined this will influence judgements on questions in view 1 about the assessment of diversity factors, and should be explained in narrative question 1.20.
7. a		This is a factual question and is not the opinion of the inspector as to whether a child or young person should have been accommodated via Children Act processes.	**Has the child or young person been a Looked After Child . . . at any time during the sentence being inspected?** This is a factual question – it is NOT a judgement, and therefore should be answered factually irrespective of what is written in the case record. If, having examined the case record, the inspector cannot tell whether the child or young person is Looked After then answer NO to this question, and bear this in mind when answering later questions about assessment, including an explanation in narrative question 1.20 where appropriate.

			This information should be clearly recorded on the front sheet of Youth Offending Information System (YOIS)/Careworks. Details should also be found in Asset under the sections concerning 'care history', accommodation' and 'family and personal relationships'. A 'Child Looked After' is one who is provided with accommodation by a local authority in the exercise of its children's services functions, or who is in its care under a care order (Section 22(1)). There are many children's services functions which may involve the accommodation of a child or young person, but the most important are contained in Sections 20 (general powers and duties to accommodate children in need), 21 (duty to accommodate children on remand or in police protection) or 31 full care order. The youth offending team (YOT) has an obligation to check whether a child or young person and/or their parents/carers have already been provided with assessments and supportive interventions, whether there is a record of the family held by children's' social care and whether their child is or has been placed on a child protection plan/the child protection register. In particular, concerns such as vulnerability, either through harm from others or self-harm, must be recorded and action taken. Therefore the inspectors answer to this question will inform their judgements on many subsequent questions linked to diversity factors and vulnerability.
7. b		This is a factual question confirming whether this child or young person looked after originates from this YOT (i.e. it is their home area) or is placed within the geographical boundaries of the YOT (normally known as a host YOT) by another local authority.	This is a factual question asking for confirmation as to whether this child or young person looked after originates from this YOT (i.e. it is their home area) or is placed within the geographical boundaries of the YOT (normally known as a host YOT) by another local authority. It is important this information is clear in the case record, since it will inform the nature of work with allocated social workers, response to diversity factors and the assessment of vulnerability. Irrespective of where the home local authority is, the name and contact details of the allocated social worker should be clearly identifiable within the case record. If this is not the case it should be explained in the relevant narrative question.
8		This is a factual question and is not the opinion of the inspector as to whether Section 47 enquiries or a child protection plan should have been invoked. It relates to ANY POINT during the sentence under inspection, not solely to commencement.	**Has the child or young person been subject to a child protection plan or Section 47 enquiries at any time during the sentence being inspected?** This question is seeking to determine the facts of the case. It is not a judgement to be made by the inspector. The evidence to answer this question may come from talking to the case manager, but should be recorded clearly within the case record. The inspector would also want to see this information recorded within the Asset. If the inspector suspects that a child protection plan has been in place but this is not clear in the case record, or if insufficient efforts have been made to find out then this will inform the inspector's judgement on subsequent questions

			about the assessment of, planning for, and response to vulnerability and child protection. There is also an expectation that any activity/liaison with children's services relating to these enquiries is clearly recorded within the case diary and copies of any meeting minutes contained within the paper file. Section 47 of the Children Act 1989 places a duty on every local authority to make enquiries when it has *"reasonable cause to suspect that a child who lives, or is found, in their area is suffering, or is likely to suffer, significant harm"*. These are known as Section 47 enquiries. Children's social care has lead responsibility for undertaking these enquiries in conjunction with other agencies, in particular the police, health bodies and schools. The YOT, along with all other relevant professionals, must always be asked to contribute to S47 enquiries for children and young people known to them.
9a.		This is a factual question and is not the opinion of the inspector. This is the language that the young person preferred to speak, please indicate 'English', 'Welsh', 'Other' or 'Not Known'.	**What was the child or young person's preferred first language?** This question is asked only in inspections in Wales. To answer this question there must be evidence within the case record, or from the person interviewed, that the young person has been asked to identify their preferred language. Evidence of this will normally be found in the personal details section of the core assessment on YOT case management system and may also be found in any paper case file dependent on the local processes of the YOT in question. If no attempt has been made to check the preferred language, or this is **not known**, then this is likely to inform judgements on subsequent questions about diversity factors and barriers to engagement. Where **not known** is answered then please also provide any explanation for this that is available.
9b.		This is a factual question and is not the opinion of the inspector. There must be clear evidence in the case record that the young person was, or was not, offered the opportunity to have a Welsh speaking case manager. In the absence of any clear evidence the question should be answered 'not known'.	This and subsequent sub questions are only asked on those cases where the preferred language is recorded as Welsh or is not known. Unless it had been clearly established that the young person's preferred language was not Welsh they should have been offered the opportunity to be managed by a Welsh speaking case manager. There must be clear evidence in the case record that the young person was, or was not, offered the opportunity to have a Welsh speaking case manager. In the absence of any clear evidence the question should be answered 'not known'.
9c.		This is a factual question and is not the opinion of	Unless there is clear evidence within the case record that the child or young person had expressed a preference either 'yes' or 'no', this question should be answered 'not known'.

		the inspector. Unless there is clear evidence within the case record that the child or young person had expressed a preference either 'yes' or 'no', this question should be answered 'not known'.	The answer to this question should also inform judgements on questions in later views about diversity factors and barriers to engagement.
9d.		This is a factual question and is not the opinion of the inspector. This question should be answered as follows: 'Yes' - where a preference was expressed for a Welsh speaking case manager and one was provided. 'No' where the young person spoke Welsh and had expressed a preference for a case manager who spoke Welsh but one was not provided. 'Not Required' where the young person did not speak Welsh or where the young person had made it clear that they did not have a preference for their case manager to work with them through the medium of Welsh.	This question should be answered as follows: 'Yes' - where a preference was expressed for a Welsh speaking case manager and one was provided. 'No' where the young person spoke Welsh and had expressed a preference for a case manager who spoke Welsh but one was not provided. 'Not Required' where the young person did not speak Welsh or where the young person had made it clear that they did not have a preference for their case manager to work with them through the medium of Welsh. An answer of Yes or No should also inform judgements on questions in later views about diversity factors and barriers to engagement.
9e.		This is asking, **in the opinion of the inspector**, if the YOT have taken sufficient account of the young person's preference to work through the medium of Welsh where required.	Throughout the course of the sentence to date did the YOT take sufficient account of the preference to work using the Welsh language? Arrangements for assessments and planning and delivery of interventions should take account of the child or young person's expressed preference to work through the medium of Welsh. While it may not always be practical or possible to engage with the child or young person through their preferred medium of Welsh there should always be an indication within the case record that real attempts had been made to address those preferences sufficiently. This includes arrangements made and provided by the YOT directly and those provided by partnership agencies and external providers. Where it was not possible, the reasons should have been shared with the child or young person, their parents/carer, where applicable, and recorded clearly within the case record. Evidence from the responses to this question might contribute to the Leadership, Management & Partnership criteria and may constitute an area for follow-up in Week 2 of an FJI. The answer to this question should also inform judgements on questions in later views about diversity factors and barriers to engagement. NB: The answer to this question does not contribute to the scores for the four inspection themes.

10.a		This is the sentence as recorded on the case record. It should always be checked with the selected sample list for confirmation that the correct sentence is being inspected.	This is the sentence as recorded on the case record. . It should always be checked with the selected sample list for confirmation that the correct sentence is being inspected.
10.b		This is the total length of sentence, so on custodial sentences it is NOT just the community phase but the total sentence imposed (i.e. custody and community phases combined) and should be recorded in MONTHS	For custodial sentences is NOT just the community phase but the total sentence imposed (i.e. custody and community phases combined). For Youth Rehabilitation Order's the length of sentence is the length of the longest requirement. If, exceptionally, an indeterminate custodial sentence is being inspected, record this as 999.
10.c		This is a factual question relating only to custodial sentences.	**Has this child or young person been released?** This is a factual question relating only to custodial sentences, the evidence of which should be found in the case record, diary contacts or intervention screen.
11		This is the index offence based on the opinion of the inspector. It should normally be clear from the case record, which offence the YOT considers to be the index offence.	This is the index offence based on the opinion of the inspector. It should normally be clear from the case record, which offence the YOT considers to be the index offence. If this is unclear, then where more than one offence is involved, the inspector should make a judgement as to the index offence based upon gravity. The sentence under inspection will be as detailed on the selected sample list and should be checked carefully, particularly where a child or young person has been subject to more that one sentence.
12a		This is the opinion of the inspector as to whether this case was MAPPA eligible, NOT that of the YOT and should be answered accordingly.	**In the opinion of the inspector was this case MAPPA eligible at any time during the sentence being inspected?** If the inspector judges that this case met one of the three eligibility criteria for MAPPA consideration, then this question should be scored as YES irrespective of the YOT's actions in this regard and the MAPPA level that was applied. Conversely if the inspector judges that this is not a MAPPA case, this question should be answered as NO, irrespective of the actions of the YOT in making a referral. However if a case has been inappropriately identified as MAPPA case this is likely to inform the inspector's judgement in a subsequent question about the assessment of risk of harm. The MAPPA provide a management framework to strengthen the management of *RoH* presented by offenders. Offenders aged under 18 are subject to the same procedures as other MAPPA offenders, but additional considerations apply. For example, the MAPPA agencies have a statutory duty to have regard to the needs of the offender as a child. Therefore the Youth Offending Team and Children's Services must be present at a MAPP meeting when the case of an offender aged under 18 is discussed. There are three categories of offender eligible for inclusion in MAPPA as detailed in the *MAPPA Guidance 2012.* **Category 1 – Registered sexual offenders (RSOs).**

			The notification requirements relate to both cautions and convictions for offences listed in Schedule 3 to the Sexual Offences Act 2003. **Category 2 – Violent and other sex offenders.** This category is based on both CONVICTION and SENTENCE. It must be murder or another violent or other sexual offence, as listed in S15 of CJA 2003, which has attracted a determinate custodial sentence of 12 months or more, or any indeterminate custodial sentence. Detention and Training Orders of 12 months or more qualify under category 2, subject to the details of the offence, as it is the total length of sentence and not only the custody period that is counted. Offenders in this category could also have been: • Sentenced to a period of 12 months or more in custody and transferred to hospital under s.47/s.49 of the Mental Health Act 1983 • Detained in hospital under s.37 of that Act with or without a restriction under s.41 of the same. **Category 3 – Other dangerous offenders.** **In order to ensure that the MAPPA agencies remain focused upon those Category 3 cases where they can have greater impact, national guidance states that only those offenders who require management via Level 2 or 3 MAPPP meetings should be registered in Category 3**. This category is comprised of offenders not in either Category 1 or 2 but who are considered by the responsible authority to pose a risk of serious harm to the public which requires active multi-agency management. The person must have been convicted of an offence, or have received a formal caution or reprimand/warning. They must have committed an offence which indicates that they are capable of causing serious harm, normally a sexual or violent offence, but the offence does not need to listed in S15 of the CJA 2003. The offence may have been committed in any geographical location which means that offenders convicted abroad could qualify. This category is used in very limited circumstances where the features of a young person's offending behaviour, usually combined with other factors such as mental health for example, is so concerning that a multi-agency approach outside that available generically within YOT's is warranted. MAPPA supervision under this category would therefore be at level 2 or 3. **MAPPA management level -** Overall, whilst there is a correlation between level of risk and level of MAPPA management (the higher the risk, the higher the level), the levels of risk do not equate directly to the levels of MAPPA management. This means that not all high-risk cases will need to be managed at Level 2 or 3. Similarly,

			the complexities of managing a low/medium risk case might, in exceptional circumstances, justify it being managed at Level 2 or 3, especially where notoriety is an issue. In particular the need for joint working does not, of itself, indicate that the case should be managed at Level 2 or above, however neither does the inclusion of specialist secondees within the multi-agency YOT partnership necessarily mean that the case should not be referred to MAPPA and managed at level 2. Whilst any agency may refer a case for consideration as a Category 3 offender, it is ultimately for the responsible authority to determine whether the offender meets the criteria. **Responsible Authority (RA)** - The YOT will never be the responsible authority (RA). The RA is the primary agency for MAPPA. This is the police, prison and Probation Trust in each area, working together, normally through a Strategic Management Board. The RA has a duty to ensure that the risks posed by specified sexual and violent offenders are assessed and managed appropriately. The specific RA for an offender serving a current sentence is normally determined by the location of the case manager. The YOT is one of a number of bodies that have a duty to co-operate with the RA. It has a specific responsibility to refer to MAPPA **all** those for whom they are responsible who meet the eligibility criteria (*MAPPA Guidance 2012 S3.17).* The MAPPA coordinator is likely to be a police or senior probation officer located within the local Public Protection Unit – often in police premises. In the case of Children Looked After, there should be dual case management involving both the YOT and the local authority children's services department in any case where referral to MAPPA is required. In determining the RA for Children Looked After - where the offender is serving a sentence, the RA will be identified by the location of the Case Manager. Where the offender has completed a sentence but remains within MAPPA as either a Category 1 or 3 offender, then the place of residence is the determining factor.
12.b		This question is asking the inspector to judge which MAPPA category applied in this case.	This question is asking the inspector to judge which MAPPA category applied in this case, irrespective of what is recorded in the case record. MAPPA criteria guidance is given in question 12.a If more than one category applies then answer Cat 1 rather than Cat 2 or Cat 3, and Cat 2 rather than Cat 3 as appropriate.
12.c		This question is asking the inspector to judge which they consider to be the highest required level of MAPPA management.	This question is asking the inspector to judge which they consider to be the highest required level of MAPPA management. It is NOT the level at which the case was actually managed, where this is different. MAPPA Guidance states that 'The central question in determining the correct MAPPA level is: "What is the lowest level of case management that provides a defensible Risk Management Plan?" (*MAPPA Guidance 2012 S7.9)*

			It also says: "Levels of management and risk – the three different levels enable resources to be deployed to manage identified risk in the most efficient and effective manner. Although there is a correlation between level of risk and level of MAPPA management, the levels of risk do not equate directly to the levels of MAPPA management." (*MAPPA Guidance 2012 S7.7)* This means that not all high-risk cases will need to be managed at Level 2 or 3. Similarly, the complexities of managing a low/medium risk case might, in exceptional circumstances, justify it being managed at Level 2 or 3, especially where notoriety is an issue. In particular the need for joint working does not, of itself, indicate that the case should be managed at Level 2 or above, however neither does the inclusion of specialist secondees within the multi-agency YOT partnership necessarily mean that the case should not be referred to MAPPA and managed at level 2. <u>MAPPA management levels as specified in the 2012 MAPPA Guidance:</u> <u>a) Level 1 – Ordinary Agency Management</u> Level 1 management is the level that should be used in cases where the risk of harm posed by the offender can be managed by the YOT. This does not mean that other agencies will not be involved, only that it is not considered necessary to manage the case at Level 2 or 3. Within Level 1 management it may still be essential that information sharing takes place between agencies and there are multi-agency case management discussions as necessary. The highest proportion of MAPPA offenders in YOTs are likely to be managed at Level 1. <u>b) Level 2 – Active Multi-Agency Management</u> Cases should be managed at MAPPA Level 2 where the offender is assessed as posing significant risk of harm. This will generally be those classified as posing a high or very high risk of serious harm. However, not all cases classified as high or very high risk of serious harm will automatically require Level 2 management; neither should Level 2 management be restricted only to cases classified as high or very high risk of serious harm. There may be cases with a lower risk of serious classification where, due to their nature and circumstances, they require this level of management. These should be cases which: "require active involvement and coordination of interventions from other agencies to manage the presenting risk of harm or have been previously managed at Level 3 and the level of risk of harm has diminished, and/or the complexity of the multi-agency management required has reduced, and a MAPPA RMP for Level 2 has been firmly established." Example characteristics of a Level 2 case: • sexual offenders who are resistant to addressing their offending behaviour • violent offenders with additional risks of mental health problems and substance misuse • domestic violence offenders who misuse substances

			• unsuitable or unstable home circumstances • likely to reoffend and cause high level of serious harm to others • there is currently a lack of effective multi-agency working, and this needs to be coordinated to provide an effective MAPPA RMP. <u>c) Level 3 – Active Enhanced Multi-Agency Management</u> Level 3 management should be used where it is determined that the management issues require senior representation from the responsible authority and duty to cooperate agencies. This may be when there is a perceived need to commit significant resources at short notice and/or where there are significant media and/or public interest issues. Usually Level 3 management would relate to cases were the offender is classified as being a high or very high risk of serious harm (however, this does not mean all cases assessed as high or very high risk of serious harm will automatically require Level 3 management. In addition, there may be cases with a lower risk classification where, due to other factors, the case requires this level of management). These should be cases which: • present a risk of harm that can only be managed by a plan which requires close cooperation at a senior level due to the complexity of the case and/or because of the unusual resource commitments it requires or • although not classified as a high or very high risk of serious harm, there is a high likelihood of media scrutiny and/or public interest in the management of the case and there is a need to ensure that public confidence in the criminal justice system is maintained. Example characteristics of a Level 3 case: • imminence of reoffending: the offender is more likely than not to reoffend at any time with very serious consequences for others • sexual offenders who have an additional risk of generic violence • unwillingness to address offending behaviour • additional police intelligence suggesting ongoing offending behaviour • threats to kill, kidnap and harm to known children and young people or adults • children or young people who are registered as being at risk of significant harm • emotional instability and substance misuse • mental illness, psychological disorders and/or self-harm • distorted beliefs and thought patterns towards particular groups and/or individuals • need for additional/unusual use of resources to effectively manage the case • potential media interest in the case.
13a		Please select the role of the person being interviewed	Please select the role of the person being interviewed
13b		The inspector should confirm whether the case manager has already been interviewed within this inspection. This must be accurately recorded as it	The inspector should confirm whether the case manager has already been interviewed within this inspection. This must be accurately recorded as it affects the questions asked in View 5

		affects the questions asked in View 5	
13c.		This is a factual question. Please identify whether the interview with the case manager or other available person for interview was conducted in English or Welsh.	This is a factual question. Please identify whether the interview with the case manager or other available person for interview was conducted in English or Welsh.
14		FJI only - tick all modules which are included within this inspection.	Tick all modules which are included within this inspection. If only applies to FJI inspections, since SQS contains only a core module. Please consult with the Lead Inspector to confirm which modules apply in this inspection.

View 1 – Assessment

Question Number	Criterion	Quality Indicators	Extended Guidance
1.1.1	1.2.1	This question applies to the assessment produced for a PSR. If a PSR was not produced then it applies to the assessment produced immediately after sentence. Guidance on the exceptional circumstances where an assessment may not be required post sentence is included within the extended guidance button. In **referral order** cases this question also includes the quality of the report prepared for the panel, since that is the main method by which the assessment is communicated to them. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: • the assessment provides (both in the offence analysis and elsewhere) a clear analysis (complete and understandable to anyone who may need to read it) of the reasons why the child or young person committed the index offence and other relevant offences and what may help reduce their offending • the assessment includes and takes full account of the self expressed views of the child or young person and, where relevant, their parent/carer and/or significant others and seeks to triangulate these with other supporting or conflicting information • the assessment pulls through and takes account of any important information held elsewhere within the case record or by	**Have sufficient efforts been made to understand why this child or young person offended and what may help reduce their offending? [RR] [INT]** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. National Standards 2013 Section 4 state that "All children and young people entering the youth justice system benefit from a structured needs assessment (using the relevant YJB-approved assessment tool) designed to identify risk and protective factors associated with offending behaviour, likelihood of reoffending and risk of serious harm to others, and to inform effective intervention programmes" The inspector should therefore be satisfied that the needs of children and young people, related to why the child or young person has offended and what may help to reduce their offending, who have offended are thoroughly understood through timely and good quality assessment. The key source of evidence for this question will be Sections 1-12 of the assessment carried out using Asset and supported by any other specialist assessment(s) where these are needed. An assessment that is merely a clone of a previous one, without further evidence of it having been reviewed and updated, does not count as a completed assessment and therefore this question should be answered as NO. To count as "complete" the assessment should be completed and recorded on the IT system in an evidently complete form before the point at which the first review would be due. The inspector must form a judgement as to the date the particular assessment was completed, based on all available information, including: the case file, interview with the practitioner and audit-trail information. As an overarching principle *the initial assessment should be completed in a manner timely to the needs of the case*. Therefore, for example, in a case with increased offending the inspector should find evidence of the assessment

		others. • specialist assessments (e.g AIM2 or Speech & Language) have been undertaken, where required, and incorporated into this one If these aspects are sufficiently satisfied the inspector should then consider: • timeliness to suit the needs of the case. An assessment that is 'late' is likely to also be of insufficient quality unless there are particular circumstances in the case that justify this, or the 'lateness' of the assessment has not impeded the effective management of the case • the assessment is a comprehensive and balanced assessment of factors that can both lead to and reduce Likelihood of Reoffending. • positive factors relating to the child or young person, where these exist, are identified and clearly recorded in particular where these may help to reduce Likelihood of Reoffending • sufficient attention has been paid to diversity factors as they relate to offending and factors are clearly recorded • the evidence in the assessment is accurate, up to date, and as full as is reasonable to suit the needs of the case • evidence is consistent throughout the assessment • the use of Asset, as a structured assessment tool of Likelihood of Reoffending, is adequate – i.e. do the scores match the evidence and focus on Likelihood of Reoffending • home visits are used to inform the assessment in relevant cases.	beginning at the point of first contact with the child or young person with its completion not overly delayed unless there is clear evidence of appropriate reasons for this and the actions taken to remedy the position. The inspector must always apply a 'test of reasonableness', having taken into account all relevant information/evidence when assessing timeliness. If, in their opinion, the substantive completion was too late to meet the needs of the case then it should be assessed accordingly, irrespective of the date claimed for completion. This inspection is not an audit of national standards. Only in exceptional cases (e.g. where a child or young person has been subject to repeat YROs in quick succession, with similar requirements and following very similar offences, and there have been no other significant changes may it be acceptable to pull through an assessment from a previous intervention without renewed assessment. Otherwise where an assessment is just a copy the inspector should conclude that the assessment was not of sufficient quality, to suit the needs of the case. A check should always be made with the education provider and children's social care services. There should be evidence that contact has been made with them and a record of any relevant information received from them. This may include relevant aspects of their local context or family background. The issues of physical, emotional and mental health / substance misuse / education, training and employment / quality of care should also be specifically considered within the overall likelihood of re-offending assessment, even though there is a separate non-scoring question focussed on these factors. Positive influences such as supportive and pro-social factors must also be identified and assessed where these are present. For Referral Orders, the Youth Offender Panel Report (Referral Order Report) forms part of the assessment process as it is the medium through which the YOTs assessment of the child or young person is communicated to the Panel and should be a summary of that assessment. In considering assessment for Referral Orders inspectors should consider everything from point of sentence to the first Youth Offender Panel meeting to be part of the assessment process and the Youth Offender Panel onwards to be planning, delivery and review of interventions or outcomes. A sufficient assessment is one which may involve the case manager asking some quite difficult questions, not ignoring aspects of a child or young person's difference and taking into account their individual needs in the process. Whilst the quality of engagement is also scored in other parts of the inspection process, the inspector will need to be satisfied that sufficient engagement has taken place for the overall assessment to be meaningful and

			reflective of the child or young person's situation. Unless there is evidence that demonstrates that a sufficiently investigative approach has been taken to completion of the assessment it is unlikely that it will meet the needs of the case.
1.1.2.1	1.2.1	This question relates offending related behaviour only.	This question relates to offending related behaviour only. There are equivalent questions elsewhere focussed on other vulnerability and safeguarding factors. It is used primarily to inform partner inspectors in an FJI about detailed aspects of the work that they are specifically interested in. The same standards should be used be used when completing this question as applied in question 1.1.1 – but in this case restricted to each specific aspect of assessment.
1.1.3	1.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.1.4	1.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.2.1		The key to this question is – does it appear to you as the inspector that the YOT is treating this child or young person as though they have a disability. The inspector will therefore need to consider whether any of the following factors are present for the child or young person: • Physical impairment • Mental health or emotional state • ADHD • Hyperactivity • Statement of Special Educational Needs • Other learning difficulty or disability • Any other form of disability	**Does the child or young person have a disability?** This is not a scoring question but helps the inspector frame further questions and their judgements about the response of the YOT. In terms of the Disability Discrimination Act legislation, not all children and young people will have a diagnosed and recorded disability; some may be going through assessment. Children and young people can express a view on whether they think they have a disability but are not asked if they consider themselves disabled, as an adult would be. If, in your opinion, there were disability factors in this case which could have impacted upon the child or young person's ability to comply with the sentence, which the YOT had not adequately recorded or responded to, please use these to inform your judgements on relevant questions and record this in question 1.20
1.2.2		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.3.1	4.1.2	The inspector will need to consider how well the YOT has identified and understood whether any of the indicators below, and any other diversity factors that the inspector considers to be relevant, are present in the case, and what impact they may have on the effective engagement of the child or young person with the work of the YOT:	**Was sufficient effort made to ensure that diversity factors and barriers to engagement were understood?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient.

		• speech, language and communication needs • age or maturity • race or ethnicity • girls or young women • disability • Children Looked After • any other potential or actual discriminatory factors which could act as a barrier to engagement Whilst this list identifies a number of common factors that often need to be assessed and addressed, it cannot be exhaustive.	A sufficient assessment is one which may involve the case manager asking some quite difficult questions, not ignoring aspects of a child or young person's difference and taking into account their individual needs in the process. Questions relating to diversity are intended to capture two strands: firstly, the recognised groups of children and young people who can face discrimination due to race/ethnicity, culture, religion, disability, sexuality, age, gender, care status. The second strand is wider and can incorporate a range of factors which could pose a barrier to engagement e.g. children and young people who are themselves carers, young parents, rurality issues, those with literacy/language difficulties. The inspector should be mindful of this second strand in forming a judgement as to the sufficiency of diversity assessment and record any specific issues found in question 1.20. For Children Looked After diversity may be indicated in a number of ways including, for example, through separation from primary attachment(s) or through multiple placements and the resultant potential lack of stability in social and educational development which could impact detrimentally upon a child or young person's ability to fully engage with the work of the YOT. For girls and young women it is good practice to identify if she feels safe travelling to/from or being in the YOT building. Critically girls need to develop trusting relationships with workers, therefore best practice is to try and understand experiences of previous relationships, including their effectiveness and impact, e.g. where a girl has had a history of relationship breakdown with key carers, how has it effected her ability and willingness to trust others?
1.3.2	4.1.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.4.1	4.1.1	The over-riding factor in this question is the quality of engagement with the child or young person in carrying out the assessment. Therefore – if the engagement with the child or young person was not of a sufficient quality then the question, irrespective of the quality of engagement with others, must be answered NO. The inspector will need to consider how well the	**Was there sufficient engagement with the child or young person, parents/carers or significant others when seeking to understand the factors in this case?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the engagement in the assessment process meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient.

		engagement indicators below have been dealt with by the YOT to carry out the assessment: • the child or young person was met as part of the assessment process • the child or young person was allowed time to speak with the YOT worker alone • the child or young person was given sufficient opportunity to express their views • parents/carers and significant others were sufficiently engaged in the assessment process • parents/carers and significant others were given sufficient opportunity to express their views • the views of the child or young person and others are accurately reflected in the assessment	There should be evidence that the case manager has sought to engage the child or young person at the assessment stage – examples of this may be interviewing them at home; asking for a self assessment early in the process, using an interpreter, carrying out an assessment of basic skills, and interviewing the child or young person for appropriate lengths of time dependent upon their age, maturity and understanding and any relevant diversity factors. Clear evidence should be available that all communication with the child or young person is undertaken in a way that is appropriate to their age, understanding and preference. This will be particularly important for disabled children and young people and those for whom their preferred language is not English or where there are other speech / language / communication issues. The YOT office or child or young person's home may not be the most appropriate venue for communication with them and consultation and consideration should be evident as to where meetings should take place in order that they are as comfortable as possible. Similarly an assessment will be more accurate if parents/carers are engaged with it. Inspectors will be looking for evidence of the case worker attempting to engage with the child or young person's parents/carers and any significant others. There should be evidence that the case manager has accurately identified any parents/carers and significant others and then sought to contact them and include them in the assessment. There may be evidence of the YOT worker making telephone calls to parents/carers, contacting them via letter or completing home visits. With Children Looked After the case manager will need to identify key carers and seek to engage them with the assessment process. Similarly there may be an extended family or other community network which the YOT worker could indentify and then use within the assessment. This may particularly apply where there are difficulties in the relationship between the child or young person and the parent/carer who they live with. In the case of Referral Orders, engagement in the assessment also includes engagement in the preparation of the report. There should be evidence that the YOT worker has ensured that the contents of the report for the Youth Offender Panel have been shared and are understood by the child/young person and their parents/carers.
1.4.2	4.1.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.5.1		This is a factual question, not a judgement. In many cases advice will have been provided to the	**How was the sentencing court advised about sentencing options and the needs of the child or young person?**

		sentencing court through a combination of methods. Please select all that apply.	In many cases advice will have been provided to the sentencing court through a combination of methods. Therefore please identify all methods that were used. For example, if sentencing was undertaken using a breach report together with a verbal update then tick both the "Breach report" and the "Verbal update" options. When 'case record is unclear' is used please explain this in the explanation box at 1.5.3; for example if there is no record of engagement in court, or records are held elsewhere and are not accessible to the case manager. Where a Referral Order is made the only sufficient methods of advising the Court would be a new Pre Sentence Report (custody threshold cases), a verbal update to the Court from the YOT (regarding any previous pre-court interventions) or no new information provided – this should be explained in the text box. A Referral Order Report (Youth Offender Panel Report) is not a PSR and therefore should not be assessed as such, there are specific questions later in the assessment view to assess Referral Order Reports.
1.5.2		This is the opinion of the inspector. It is **NOT** asking whether the sentencing outcome was appropriate, **nor** whether a PSR was good enough. It is merely asking whether the methods used to provide advice to the court appear to have been the appropriate methods to provide it with the advice that was needed in light of *appropriateness for the case circumstances*. Judgements about the quality of work can be recorded in the next question or, as appropriate, in the subsequent questions about PSRs. Note: This is a temporary question included for information that does not contribute to the scored inspection judgements.	**In your opinion did this method(s) provide sufficient advice to the court when passing sentence?** Note: This is a temporary question included for information that does not contribute to the scored inspection judgements. This is asking whether the methods used to provide advice to the court appear to have been sufficient to provide it with the advice that was needed in light of *appropriateness for the case circumstances*. This question is NOT asking whether any report was of good quality (this is covered in a subsequent question) nor whether any report met the specific guidance about report types – **merely whether the method of providing advice to the court provided it with what it needed.** Prior to sentencing a young person to a community or custodial sentence courts will normally request a report from the YOT in order to assist them in determining the most appropriate sentence. Whilst it is for the court determine how they wish to be advised; if the YOT considers that that an alternative would better suit the needs of the case then they should seek to persuade the court about this. In the case of Referral Orders the YOT should still be asked to assist the court – for example by advising on the child or person's suitability for such a sentence. This is likely to be done verbally. It could be that the court imposes a Referral Order without any consultation with the local YOT however this is not usually considered acceptable. In cases where custody is being seriously considered a pre sentence report should be requested and in this circumstance it is good practice for YOT's to hold pre sentence panels in order to advise the

			court as to the likely content of a Referral Order contract. Reports to Court can be presented in several forms as detailed below. A Pre Sentence Report – with or without an addendum Specific sentence report - should assess the young person's suitability for a specific sentence indicated by the Court Stand down report - should be completed where they will facilitate the prompt conclusion of a case Breach report - where there is a risk of the existing order being revoked and re-sentenced the YOT should provide the court with alternative sentencing options. Verbal updates to court should be used to supplement any other report provided to court or to inform the court of additional information which has come to light since the preparation of any such report. YOT staff working in court should have sufficient information about the cases on the court list to enable them to assist the court to the best of their abilities. Verbal updates could be used to supply information about a young person's response to current orders. In determining whether the method used to advise the court was sufficient for the needs of the case being inspected the inspector should consider whether the court was provided with sufficient information and analysis to make informed decisions regarding sentencing. In this way, the YOT makes an important contribution to the sentencing process, while the court has the ultimate responsibility to determine the sentence.
1.5.3		Reports for courts are important in assisting courts to determine the most appropriate way of dealing with a child or young person. YOT staff are responsible for the preparation of reports for courts. There is specific guidance about the purpose of different report types and the circumstances in which they should normally be used. This can be found in the extended guidance for this question. This question – used solely in those FJI inspections which include a specific focus on court work - asks whether the report sufficiently met that guidance. A separate question (1.6.3) asks you to assess the quality of any PSR that was	**Specifically, was any written report produced of the appropriate type?** This question – used solely in those FJI inspections which include a specific focus on court work - asks whether the report sufficiently met that guidance. A separate question (1.6.3) asks you to assess the quality of any PSR that was provided. It is the YOT's responsibility to assist the court in determining the most suitable method of dealing with a young person who has offended. In discharging this responsibility, the YOT worker must also consider the seriousness of the offence/s, taking into account aspects of the offence that make it more or less serious as well as personal factors affecting the seriousness. Although differing in style, content and audience, reports for courts should always be based on a thorough assessment of the risks and needs of the child or young person. This should be done using Asset assessments and other relevant information sources, including the CPS 'advance disclosure' as well as specialist assessments and case records. .

		provided.	Ensuring that reports for courts are based on a thorough assessment of risks and needs does not preclude the use of existing reports, addendums/updates to existing reports or stand down/day of sentence reports (written on the day of the court hearing) where sufficient information exists to enable them to be completed. In many cases, with sufficient forward planning by the YOT, adequate information should be made available to enable sentencing to take place on the day. Reports should be of a high level of quality in terms of content, structure and style and should be free from any discriminatory language and stereotypes. Within the youth justice system, there are several types of reports that YOT workers will prepare: **Pre-sentence reports -** a written pre-sentence report must be provided in **all** cases where custody is being considered (as required by section 12, Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008) and may be requested in any other case where the court requests it – although a full PSR would not normally be requested where a custodial sentence was not being considered and where sufficient information is available on the day, or where the court is only considering suitability of a specific non-custodial sentence. An existing report may be used if it is still current – i.e. based on an assessment that is no more than three months old, offences are of a similar nature and there has been no significant change in circumstances or new information since then. On occasions a judge in a Crown Court may sentence, including to custody, without requesting a PSR – in particular if the case also involves adult offenders for whom a PSR is not requested. In general HMI Probation do not consider this to be good practice, for children and young people. Exiting reports can be submitted with an addendum if the above criteria are met but limited additional information is required to assist the court in sentencing. When information in pre-sentence reports for children aged 14 and under indicates they could have experienced domestic abuse and neglect case managers should seek permission from the court to gather further information to establish the nature and scale of the abuse and neglect so that this can be presented to sentencers to ensure that they are fully informed about the child's circumstances when making their sentencing decisions. **Specific Sentence report -** is a written report (which may be presented verbally) prepared with the purpose of assessing the young person's suitability for a specific sentence indicated by the court (e.g. a Reparation Order or where the court have indicated that they wish to impose a YRO with one or more requirements, such as an Attendance Centre Requirement or Activity Requirement). It may be available on the day of request where a current suitable assessment is available. Otherwise it may be produced within five working days. **Stand Down or Day of Sentence report -** a report can also be prepared on a stand down basis on the day of sentence (or exceptionally within five

			working days) where the following conditions exist: • it will facilitate the prompt conclusion of a case, and • where there is a recent *Asset assessment* available (undertaken within the last three months and where there has been no significant change in circumstances) unless the court are considering a first tier penalty other than a Reparation Order (i.e. where the court are actively considering discharge or fine) and/or where other recent relevant reports are available. Stand Down/Day of Sentence reports may be also be usefully undertaken where the court are unclear whether to impose a financial penalty/discharge, a Referral Order or a second Referral Order, but it wishes to ascertain the views of the YOT before making this decision. Additionally, Stand Down/Day of Sentence reports may be usefully undertaken if the court is inclined to impose one or more specific YRO requirements (such as a YRO with an Attendance Centre Requirement or a YRO with a Reparation Requirement, etc). In these circumstances the information contained in the Stand Down/Day of Sentence report should be limited to assisting the court in considering the specific sentencing options indicated or available. Stand Down/Day of Sentence reports **should not be used** where custody is being considered. **Breach report** – provides all relevant information relating to a child or young person's compliance with their sentence. It advises the court on the details of the breach, the child or young person's response to supervision, up to date assessment of risk and advice on how the YOT recommends the court proceeds. Where there is a possibility of the existing sentence being revoked and re-sentenced the breach report should provide the court with alternative sentencing options or, where appropriate, request completion of a full PSR. **Verbal update** – may be used to supplement any other report provided to the court, and to inform the court of additional information that has come to light since a report was prepared.
1.6.1	1.2.2	This could include a Specific Sentence Report or addendum to a previously prepared PSR. Inspectors should note that this question asks whether a report was <u>requested</u>, not whether it was actually provided. It is solely used to determine whether questions about the report are relevant to this case. Only written reports are considered for the purposes of this question - i.e. excluding verbal	**Was a pre-sentence report requested for this sentence?** This could include a Specific Sentence Report or addendum to a previously prepared PSR. Inspectors should note that this question asks whether a report was <u>requested</u>, not whether it was actually provided. It is solely used to determine whether questions about the report are relevant to this case. Only written reports are considered for the purposes of this question - i.e. excluding verbal updates.

		updates.	
1.6.2	1.2.2	The inspector will need to be satisfied that the three distinct domains of risk of harm, safeguarding and vulnerability needs and custody have been sufficiently addressed within the PSR and that, in the judgement of the inspector, the information, analysis and conclusions in the report are robust and stands up to critical scrutiny.	**Did the PSR contain:** **a)** a clear, thorough and sufficient explanation of *risk of harm to others* that applied in this case **b)** a clear, thorough and sufficient explanation of vulnerability and Safeguarding needs that applied in this case **c) sufficient attention to the impact of and alternatives to custody?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the report meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the report outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The inspector will need to be satisfied that the report clearly differentiates between risk of harm and safeguarding issues, whether caused through either offending or welfare routes and the potential impact of custody. The report should include both an accurate and appropriate analysis, and a clear and accurate statement of the level of risk of harm and vulnerability that exists in the case. Unless there is evidence that *all domains* have been based on the correct assessment then this question must be answered as NO For potential custody case reports the PSR must be clear about the vulnerability that applies both in custody and in the community. In relation to the risk of harm assessment within the PSR, the inspector will need to make a judgement as to whether sufficient specific attention is given to the needs of vulnerable victims. This could include additional assessment of victim needs through a victim liaison officer or contact with victim support services external to the YOT.
1.6.3	1.2.2	The inspector will need to consider how well the report stands up to scrutiny in a number of areas: • the report was prepared and available to the timeline requested by the Court • an up to date and accurate assessment of the likelihood of re-offending was used as the basis for the report • the report was sufficiently analytical and balanced, verified and factually accurate • the report was suitably concise and that grammar and spelling were satisfactory • *the report contains a thorough analytical*	**Overall, was a good quality pre-sentence report provided to the court?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the report undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the report outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The PSR should be prepared with this timescales notified by the requesting court and to the required format. Whilst national standards no longer prescribe the format of the report there would need to be a particularly strong reason to diverge from the common format in individual cases, unless the YOT has agreed an alternative appropriate format with the local youth court. The PSR should be well balanced, factually accurate and with verified sources of

		assessment of likelihood of reoffending, risk of harm and vulnerability • *the reports provides a clear and accurate picture of the child or young person, including where relevant, maturity and other relevant diversity or potential discriminatory factors* • risk of harm and vulnerability indicators are sufficiently assessed and addressed • the use of custody and its impact are sufficiently addressed when custody is a possible outcome • the report contains a clear and appropriate proposal that is commensurate with the seriousness of the offence.	information. The report should be based upon a current, analytical, assessment of the likelihood of reoffending, risk of harm to others and safeguarding needs of the child or young person. There should be clear evidence of the case manager making correct links between the evidence presented and ongoing likelihood of re-offending, risk of harm to others and safe guarding needs. Wherever relevant, reports should contain thorough assessment of health (including emotional or mental health and physical health), substance misuse and ETE needs. Whilst there is a separate question specifically assessing the attention given to diversity and potential discriminatory factors in a report, these should also be taken into account when answering this question, in particular where they would have an impact on the conclusions, r proposal or disposal. The flow of the report should lead logically to the conclusion and proposal which should be sufficiently robust as to gain the confidence of sentencers and be reflective of the seriousness of the offence(s) in light of sentencing guidelines. In appropriate cases the proposal should include conditions to manage or reduce the risk of harm to others. Diversity factors should be considered and their impact upon the child or young person's ability to comply with the proposed sentence clearly explained. The interventions proposed should aim to reduce further offending, including future risk of harm to others. Proposing interventions based on individual assessments of the likelihood of reoffending and risk of serious harm is likely to address these principles. Youth Justice Board case management guidance indicates that all reports provided to court should be: • Balanced • Impartial • Timely • Focused and analytical • Free from discriminatory language and stereotypes • Verified and factually accurate • Understandable to the child or young person and their parents/carers Guidance provided for question 1.6.2 should also be taken into consideration when answering this question.

1.6.4	1.2.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.7.1	4.1.1	The inspector will need to consider how well the child or young person and parent/carer took part in the preparation of the report and then make a judgement if this was sufficient for the needs of the case. Areas for the inspector to consider include: • whether on balance the report purpose and content would be understandable to the child or young person, their parent/carer and significant others • whether sufficient action was taken to ensure that they **did** understand the report • whether the report was provided in good time to the child or young person and parent/carer, so that any questions they might have could be addressed before it was used by the court • how well the views of the child or young person and their parent/carer and significant others are reflected in the report	**Were the child or young person and their parent/carer sufficiently engaged in the development of the pre-sentence report?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The language used in the report should be easily understandable by child or young person and their parent/carer and there should be evidence that the child or young person and their parent/carer understood the purpose of the report and crucially its content. The report will be more detailed and accurate if parents/carers are engaged with it. Inspectors will be looking for evidence of the case worker attempting to engage with the child or young person's parents/carers and significant others such as extended family or community links. There should be evidence that the case manager has accurately identified any parents/carers and significant others and then sought to contact the relevant people and include them in the report. There may be evidence of the YOT worker making telephone calls to relevant parties, contacting them via letter or completing home visits. With Children Looked After the YOT worker will need to identify key carers and seek to engage them with the report process. The inspector will also expect to find evidence that a copy of the report was made available to the child or young person and their parent/carer in advance of the court date and that this was done in a manner which enabled them to comment upon and ensure that they understood the report as necessary. Reliance on others, such as defence solicitors, to explain the report to the child or young person would not normally be considered to be sufficient engagement by the YOT. Understanding by the child and young person and their parent/carer of the purpose of the report, and its contents (e.g. why the YOT has said what it has) prior to it being used in court, can be valuable in helping get a sentence off to a good start, and to the development of a positive working relationship with the case manager.
1.7.2	4.1.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.8.1	4.1.2	The inspector will need to consider to what extent the report gives sufficient attention to diversity	**Did the pre-sentence report give sufficient attention to diversity factors and barriers to engagement?**

		factors and other barriers to engagement. The inspector must then form a judgement as to how well this is communicated to sentencers in terms of the potential impact upon the sentence. Indicators for the inspector to consider, as applicable to the particular case, are: • speech, language and communication needs • age or maturity • race or ethnicity • girls or young women • disability • factors related to Children Looked After • how well the YOT worker has addressed any other actual or discriminatory factors which could act as a barrier to engagement and therefore have an impact upon the sentence being proposed within the report	The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. Please note that all questions relating to diversity are intended to capture two strands: firstly, the recognised groups of children and young people who can face discrimination due to race/ethnicity, culture, religion, disability, sexuality, age, gender, care status. The second strand is wider and can incorporate a range of factors which could pose a barrier to engagement e.g. children and young people who are themselves carers, young parents, rurality issues, those with literacy/language and speech, language and communication difficulties. Consideration must be given to not just the identification of diversity and potential barriers to engagement within the report but critically to how well this has been explained with reference to any impact upon the sentence under proposal and the child or young person's ability to comply. To be sufficiently engaged in the development of the PSR there should be evidence that the individual needs of the child or young person and their parent/carer have been considered and, where indicated, acted upon to reduce and where possible remove barriers to engagement.
1.8.2	4.1.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.9.1	1.5.1	This question is not about whether 'boxes were ticked' in terms of gate keeping processes, but rather whether the YOT was effective in getting the right outcome – that is – is a *good enough* PSR produced. If the PSR is just good enough but not exemplary the inspector may want to consider this sufficient if there is evidence of change following managerial/supervisory intervention. The inspector will need to be mindful of the following indicators: • the required managerial/supervisory	**Were local management arrangements effective in ensuring the quality of the report?** The inspector should look for evidence of managerial oversight and quality assurance of Pre Sentence Reports. This could be through case diary entries, gate keeping forms or other recordings. If the report is clearly of good quality and there is evidence of management involvement in its assurance then this question should be answered as YES. Otherwise the inspector should be satisfied that - where indicated as necessary - changes and amendments to the report have been followed though and that the final version of the report sufficiently meets the quality indicators. If the report was of insufficient quality then by implication the management arrangements

		involvement has taken place • the report, as appropriate to the needs of the case, has been discussed with a manager/supervisor • reports are only given manager/supervisor sign off when reaching a sufficient level • where required improvements have been identified by a manager/supervisor the changes have taken place	were not effective in this case. The quality assurance process should stand up to robust investigation and be undertaken by suitably skilled and experienced managers or supervisors.
1.9.2	1.5.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.9.3		**Note: This is a temporary question included for information that does not contribute to the scored inspection judgements on an FJI** The inspector will need to consider how well the report stands up to scrutiny in a number of areas: • the report was prepared and available to the Panel a minimum of two working days prior to the Panel taking place • an up to date and accurate assessment of the likelihood of re-offending was used as the basis for the report • the report was sufficiently analytical and balanced, verified and factually accurate • the report was suitably concise and that grammar and spelling were satisfactory • risk of harm and vulnerability indicators are sufficiently assessed and addressed • YJB guidance indicates that the report generally should not make specific recommendations regarding the content of the contract rather it should provide information on the range of reparation and intervention opportunities which are currently available and can be included in the contract for any particular case.	**Overall, was a good quality report provided to the youth offender panel?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the report undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the report outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The main purpose of the report is to provide the panel with sufficient information about the child or young person and their circumstances to support them in agreeing an appropriate referral order contract with the child or young person and, where appropriate, their parents/carers. Where the report writer has considered it appropriate to make specific recommendations about the content of the contract to the youth offender panel then, whilst published guidance indicates that this is not normally appropriate, the inspector may conclude that it was appropriate to do so in the particular case. In any event, through the quality of analysis or otherwise, the report should make clear which offending related factors are the priorities to be worked on. The report should be based upon an ASSET assessment, any CPS advance disclosure, an assessment of the victim's wishes regarding reparation and restorative justice interventions, an assessment of the consequences of the offence and information from other relevant sources such as YOT case records, specialist assessments and information from other agencies. There should be clear evidence of the case manager making correct links between the evidence presented and ongoing likelihood of re-offending, risk of harm to others and safe guarding needs. The report should include in full any advisory observations made by the sentencing court regarding areas of concern which the panel was asked to consider.

			The key positive and risk factors identified in the ASSET should be highlighted so that these can be addressed in the programme of interventions to be included in the contract. It may indicate the type of reparation which is most appropriate in accordance with the victim's wishes. The panel report also should indicate clearly the level of interventions recommended for the rehabilitative elements in the contract in accordance with the Scaled Approach. The report should be balanced, impartial, focused and analytical, free from discriminatory language or stereotypes, verified and factually accurate and understandable to the young person and their parent/carer. In appropriate cases the report should consider interventions to manage or reduce the risk of harm to others. Diversity factors and barriers to engagement should be considered and their impact upon the child or young person's ability to comply with and benefit from the sentence clearly explained.
1.9.4		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.10.1	2.2.1	This question is about the entire assessment of risk of harm incorporating both the screening and, where required, a full assessment. In order to be sufficient both aspects (where required) must be good enough. Should the need for a full assessment be indicated but not completed, this question should be answered as NO unless sufficient evidence is provided and agreed by a manger/supervisor to support this as a defensible management over-ride decision appropriate to the circumstances of the case. Has the case manager acquired, pulled together and analysed all relevant information to sufficiently understand the risks to others posed by this young person? E.g. • Actual harm caused	**Was sufficient effort made to understand and explain the *risk of harm to others* posed by the child or young person?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. In deciding whether the assessment of risk of harm is sufficient the inspector should consider the following indicators: • an assessment of risk of harm has been completed using an agreed tool or tools • a risk of harm screening has been completed to a sufficient quality and is timely for the needs of the case • a full risk of harm assessment has been completed, where required, to a sufficient quality and is timely for the needs of the case • the nature (type) of the risk is clear and that the level of risk of harm is clear, including correct classification

		• Potential harm • Previous harm related behaviour • Any information around gang affiliation • Situational risks, e.g. custody and community If so, has this led to clear and defensible conclusions that are accurate and are clear to any others who may need to know them?	• relevant offences and relevant behaviours have been fully considered • sufficient account has been taken of actual and potential victims • MAPPA categories and levels are correct • where necessary information from other agencies has been sufficiently drawn upon in the assessment • the assessment recognises the breadth and complex nature of risk of harm • in custodial cases the assessment addresses both the custodial and community phases • where required, specialist assessments related to Risk of Harm have been undertaken and incorporated in the overall assessment The assessment should be completed and on the system in an evidently complete form before the point at which the first review is due and in any event in a timely manner for the needs of the case. Therefore in a case where a risk to identified victims is seen, the inspector would expect to see risk assessment expedited. Similarly in a case where little has previously been known about the child or young person and the index offence does not indicate risk of harm issues the inspector should take a reasonable view as to the timeliness of risk of harm assessment. For the risk of harm screening to be deemed complete it should be evident that a reasonable attempt has been made to answer the majority of the questions and that there are no critical omissions. The same standards apply to completion of the risk of harm screening as to the remainder of the initial assessment – see guidance in 1.1.1 There should be clear evidence of how the case manager formed their assessment and that this is based upon appropriate information sources including the views of the child or young person and parent(s)/carer(s), significant others and other agencies and previous assessments as appropriate. The inspector will be looking to find evidence of how the worker came to their assessment and of whether this makes sense in the overall picture of the child or young person. In particular the inspector will need to be satisfied that the assessment of risk of harm draws on the views and assessments of other agencies including those previously carried out by the police, prisons, children's social care services, education, health (including emotional or mental health and physical health) and others. Additionally, there should be evidence that relevant agencies have shared information and worked together effectively to ensure risk of harm is comprehensively assessed.

			For custodial sentences the initial assessment of risk of harm to others must be completed prior to sentence and forwarded to the secure estate. The information detailed in the risk of harm screening and full risk of harm assessment regarding current and past behaviour should be comprehensive, accurate and, where relevant, judgements made. Accordingly, all relevant offences should be analysed and the sources of information recorded accurately, e.g. based on CPS, victim material or children's services information. Judgements, such as any concerns about 'targeting victims' and 'why they did it', should be backed up by evidence. In some cases information about past behaviour/offending may be limited. In these cases there should be evidence that the case manager has made efforts to gather as much evidence as possible about previous behaviour/offending and has compared this to what is known about the current behaviour/offending and assessed any possible links. We are looking for a high level of risk of harm awareness in the assessment and for evidence that the case manager has demonstrated an awareness of the complex nature of risk of harm. Therefore key areas to look for include: • assessment of all aspects of the offender's harmful and potentially harmful behaviour – this will include all harm and not just that which fits the definition of serious harm. • motivation and/or intent has been considered in relation to past/current/potential harmful behaviour • both static and dynamic factors relating to risk of harm have been addressed. In relation to dynamic factors it should be clear whether these are chronic or acute • the assessment demonstrates awareness of the importance of assessing the context in which harmful behaviour has occurred or may occur • relevant victim experiences have been taken into account. For example, in racially aggravated offences, in offences against children and young people, in offences against vulnerable victims, and in cases where there are 'repeat' victims. • a child or young person may not have settled into a regular pattern of behaviour so it is important to take into account incidents that seem to be one-offs. • any emerging patterns of harm-related behaviour are key indicators of the likelihood of future harmful behaviour. If there have been regular or repeated occurrences of a particular type of harm related behaviour this will generally signify a higher risk than isolated or occasional incidents. • completion of a full risk of harm should include consideration of any relevant diversity factors relating to the child or young person. Where there are missing pieces of information, there should be clear evidence as to how the

			case manager intends to find out the information. Where the screening (under Asset) has followed the YJB Guidance (and is therefore about serious harm) credit must be given for accurate answers. This may mean that a full risk of harm assessment is not required within the guidance. The inspector must make a judgement here as to whether or not the practitioner has properly applied the classification system they were working to at the time of the assessment. As long as the answers and the evidence support this, a practitioner cannot be penalised for applying the 'serious harm' criteria as defined by the YJB, as long as a sufficient assessment of risk of harm has been undertaken and recorded in a suitable place. NB: Under AssetPlus the YJB will expect all harm related behaviours to be considered, with the consideration of seriousness undertaking only at the final analysis and once the assessment is complete. Therefore their previous guidance will no longer apply. Diversity factors could relate to both the child or young person and the victim or potential victims and link directly to risk of harm issues. The case manager needs to have thought about what makes this individual pose a risk of harm *to* others and in what way diversity factors contribute to this. Any characteristics shared by victims which could indicate specific targeting should be identified. The importance of drawing on other assessments is that information/ judgements from other sources can be vital to the accuracy of assessment. For example, information supplied by the police, for instance via MAPPA, could identify previous unknown victims, information from children's services, could identify previous harmful behaviour towards other children and young people and educational assessments could provide evidence of the child or young person's behaviour within education. Information obtained from victims could be drawn upon to identify, for example, any bizarre elements to behaviour or specified targeting of victims. The YOT is responsible for identifying which of its cases are MAPPA eligible ones. This information should be recorded on the case management system. If the YOT has recorded the case as a MAPPA case but it does not meet the criteria please include details of this at question 1.20. Detailed MAPPA guidance can be found at question 12 in the Details view of this form. Where specialist assessment (e.g. AIM, ERASOR, SAVRY) are undertaken the outcome of these should be included and clearly recorded in the overall risk of harm assessment. The inspector should be able to review these assessments. If a specialist assessment related to Risk of Harm was required but not undertaken, it is likely that the inspector will score this question as Insufficient.
1.10.2	2.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20

		for this in question 1.20	
1.13.1	3.2.1	Vulnerability should be considered holistically. In particular it is much wider than child protection and includes all areas where the child or young person may be at risk of harm or their wellbeing is at risk. This can be from their own behaviour, whether it is linked to offending or not and whether it is deliberately intended to harm them or not, as well as any risk presented to them by others. Has the case manager acquired, pulled together and analysed all relevant information to sufficiently understand the safeguarding and vulnerability to this child or young person. E.g. • Harm from others • Harm to self (including both deliberate harm and any potential harm related to, for example lifestyle or substance misuse) • Vulnerability to Child Sexual or other Exploitation • Any information around gang affiliation • Situational risks, e.g. custody and community • Risk of harm to self that may result from the specific offending behaviours (e.g. carrying or use of weapons, or likelihood of revenge) If so, has this led to clear and defensible conclusions that are accurate and are clear to any others who may need to know them?	Was sufficient effort made to understand and explain the vulnerability and Safeguarding needs that applied in this case? The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. In deciding whether the assessment of vulnerability is sufficient the inspector should consider the following indicators: • the assessment is timely to suit the needs of the case • Asset (and where appropriate Common Assessment Framework [CAF]) form the backbone of the assessment • an investigative approach been taken by the YOT worker, which has gone beyond initial checks with children's services • a variety of sources have been used to investigate areas of concern (e.g. education provider, health specialist, domestic violence unit) • the assessment is clear about the exact nature of the vulnerability concerns • positive and protective factors have been considered • in custodial cases the initial assessment of safeguarding and vulnerability been completed prior to sentence • high thresholds in other services should not skew the assessment of safeguarding and vulnerability needs • specialist assessments should be undertaken where necessary Children or young people who have offended have increased vulnerability, and actions to address this will often be planned within the context of addressing reoffending. Therefore offending behaviour does not, in itself, automatically cause the assessment of vulnerability to be raised beyond Low. However, there may be particular aspects to the offending behaviour (e.g. recklessness, knife carrying, substance misuse, health needs, and relevant diversity factors) that should have an impact on the assessment of vulnerability and be addressed within that. Where indicators of vulnerability have been identified in the core assessment these should be pulled through and considered within the vulnerability screening (Asset), so that the assessment presents a complete and coherent analysis of the situation. The lack, in Asset, of a full assessment tool similar to the Risk of Serious Harm assessment, does not justify lack of a thorough assessment of vulnerability in individual cases, where this is required.

			There should be clear evidence of how the case manager formed their assessment and that this is based upon appropriate information sources including the views of the child or young person and parent(s)/carer(s), significant others and other agencies and previous assessments as appropriate. The inspector will be looking to find evidence of how the worker came to their assessment and of whether this makes sense in the overall picture of the child or young person. Additionally, there should be evidence that relevant agencies have shared information and worked together effectively to ensure vulnerability and safeguarding needs are comprehensively assessed. The case manager should have been pro-active in checking whether information is held by other relevant agencies – which may, depending on the case circumstances, include any of the agencies with which the YOT is associated. The following are some examples of what could be indicators of vulnerability and need to be considered in the assessment, but it is not an exhaustive list: • emotional/mental health, e.g. depression, self-harm, attachment issues, suicidal thoughts • being a Child Looked After • being subject to Child Protection investigations • in custodial cases the assessment is clear about the vulnerability that applies both in custody and in the community • environmental factors, e.g. inadequate housing, area they live in • parental behaviour, e.g. mental health needs, substance misuse, inconsistent parenting • behaviour of others, e.g. bullying, abuse, neglect, intimidation, exploitation, associates • events or circumstances, e.g. family separation, bereavement, change of care arrangements • being a young carer, for their own child or for other family members • own behaviour, e.g. substance misuse, type of offending, acting out, inappropriate responses to stress, weapon carrying • other reckless behaviour that shows insufficient regard to their own safety Questions in the (Asset) screening relating to custody should be answered even if custody is not immediately being considered as a sentencing option. There is the possibility that new offences may result in custody before the assessment is updated and therefore these questions are critical to ensure that immediate safeguarding issues are picked up and acted upon. HMI Probation consider that during the custodial phase of a sentence, assessment should be undertaken as if the child or young person could be released into the community at any time, so that these needs are never lost sight of, as well as reflecting the needs during the

			custodial phase. In Asset an overall rating should be allocated to this section ranging from '4 – very high' to '1 – low'. Note that Asset guidance makes it clear that '0' (none) is not an acceptable score. Where a child or young person has a wide range of vulnerability factors, this is also likely to lead to an increase in their level of vulnerability. The identification of protective and positive factors is critical to assessing vulnerability and safeguarding needs. Protective factors could include involvement with community/3rd sector provision (e.g. mentoring, substance misuse intervention or young carer support), utilising extended family support, returning to supportive structure such as re-engagement with education or health provision, or improvements in parenting. Where safeguarding needs have been identified by the YOT there should be clear evidence, in relevant cases, of how the YOT assessment draws upon and is integrated with the assessments of other agencies that are or may need to be involved with the child or young person. Where the YOT should have made arrangements for other specialist assessments to have taken place, and this has not happened – for example substance misuse, emotional or mental health issues or physical health assessment where this impacts upon safeguarding and vulnerability needs, then it is likely that this question will be scored as Insufficient.
1.13.1.2	3.2.1	This question is used to inform the work of Health, Education and Children's care inspectors during the second inspection field work week of an FJI. The inspector should already have taken account of these aspects in their overall judgement of the assessment of vulnerability and Safeguarding. This is not a scoring question.	The inspector should be satisfied that contact has been made with relevant agencies where the initial assessment suggests there may have been or should have been prior involvement with the child or young person. Sufficient attention should be paid to these factors in all assessments. However there are, in addition, specific requirements for contact with other agencies. A check should always be made with the education provider and children's social care services. There should be evidence that contact has been made with them and a record made of any relevant information received from them. Where there is no need identified for a particular service to be accessed, and this aspect of the assessment is sufficient, the inspector should score this as a positive response i.e. sufficient assessment has been made. Conversely if the inspector judges that contact should have been made with a particular agency and was not, then this must be scored as insufficient within the context of the child or young person's needs.

			For example, if the child or young person has no mental health needs that need to be addressed or investigated by the YOT and, to the best of the Case Manager's knowledge the child or young person has never accessed a mental health service, then there is no need for the practitioner to have accessed this source. However if a specialist assessment was required, for example following an initial screening, and this has not been undertaken, then the factor should be scored as insufficient.
1.13.2	3.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.13.3	3.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	Where required specialist assessments were not requested or undertaken please identify all that apply. When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.14.1		The inspector must assess if the case meets, or is likely to meet the threshold for Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) that requires action to be taken. This will normally mean that either the YOT or a local partner has identified this as a CSE case, there are investigations underway into whether this is a CSE case; or in the opinion of the inspector it should have been recognised as a CSE case or relevant investigations undertaken. For a **definition of CSE** please see the extended guidance. In assessing whether a child or young person is, or is at risk of being, a victim of sexual exploitation **careful consideration should also be given to the issue of consent** and whether they are capable of giving this. Further information is available in the extended guidance. However it means that CSE is potentially a child protection issue up until the age of 18 An assessment under section 17 of the Children Act 1989 must be undertaken in all cases where child sexual exploitation, or the likelihood of it, is suspected. The local authority, health and other partners must follow the process set out in the *Framework for assessment of children in need*	**In the opinion of the inspector was child sexual exploitation (CSE), or the need to undertake CSE investigations, present in this case (relating to this child or young person) at any point?** This question is to help HMI Probation monitor the scope of CSE within YOTs. It should also assist the inspector in focussing their judgements, particularly around assessment and planning for vulnerability and safeguarding. **Whenever an inspector answers this question 'Yes' they should carefully consider whether sufficient actions are being taken to safeguard the child or young person, and if not then they must consider implementing the HMI Probation Action & Alert procedure. This equally applies where, from the information available, the inspector considers that potential CSE has been identified relating to another child or young person other than the one who is subject of this case and question, unless there is sufficient clear information that this has been identified and is being addressed by relevant agencies.** The inspector must assess if the case meets, or is likely to meet the threshold for Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) that requires action to be taken. This will normally mean that either the YOT or a local partner has identified this as a CSE case, there are investigations underway into whether this is a CSE case; or in the opinion of the inspector it should have been recognised as a CSE case or relevant investigations undertaken. **What do we mean by CSE?** "Sexual exploitation of children and young people under 18 involves **exploitative situations**, contexts and relationships **where children or young people (or a third person or persons) receive 'something' (e.g. food, accommodation, drugs, alcohol, cigarettes, affection, gifts, money) as a result of them performing, and/or another or others performing on them, sexual activities.** Child sexual exploitation can occur through the use of technology without the child's

		and their families. **Whenever an inspector answers this question 'Yes' they should carefully consider whether sufficient actions are being taken to safeguard the child or young person, and if not then they must consider implementing the HMI Probation Alert procedure.** **This equally applies where, from the information available, the inspector considers that potential CSE has been identified relating to another child or young person other than the one who is subject of this case and question, unless there is sufficient information that this has been identified and is being addressed by relevant agencies.** In any case where CSE has been identified the details should be summarised in Q1.20.	immediate recognition; for example being persuaded to post sexual images on the Internet/mobile phones without immediate payment or gain. In all cases, those exploiting the child/young person have **power over them by virtue of their age, gender, intellect, physical strength and/or economic or other resources**. Violence, coercion and intimidation are common, involvement in exploitative relationships being characterised in the main by the child or young person's limited availability of choice resulting from their social/economic and/or emotional vulnerability." *Source: Department for Education 2012.* **Typical local authority CSE checklist:** Local Authorities use the indicators below, or a similar checklist, to inform their CSE Risk Assessments. "**These indicators are a guide and do not replace, but should assist the exercise of professional judgement.** **1. Lower Level Indicators - one or more indicators identified:** • Regularly coming home late or going missing • Overt sexualised dress • Sexualised risk taking including on Internet • Unaccounted for monies or goods • Associating with unknown adults • Associating with other young people at risk of or subject to CSE • Reduced contact with family and friends and other support networks • Sexually transmitted infections • Experimenting with drugs and/or alcohol • Poor self image • Eating disorders • Superficial self harm 2. **Medium Level Indicators - any of the above and ONE or more of these indicators:** • Getting into cars with unknown adult • Associating with known CSE adults • Being groomed on the internet • Clipping- (offering to have sex for money or other payment and then running before sex takes place) • Disclosure of a physical assault with no substantiating evidence to warrant a S47 enquiry, then refusing to make or withdrawing a complaint • Being seen in CSE hotspots (i.e. Houses, recruiting grounds) • Having an older boyfriend/girlfriend • Non school attendance or excluded due to behaviour • Staying out overnight with no explanation

			• Breakdown of residential placements due to behaviour • Unaccounted for money or goods including mobile phones, drugs and alcohol • Multiple Sexually Transmitted Infections • Self harming that requires medical treatment • Repeat offending • Gang member or association **3. High Level Indicators - any of the above and ONE or more of these indicators:** • Child under 13 engaging in sexual activity with another over 15 years • Pattern of street homelessness and staying with an adult believed to be sexually exploiting them • Child under 16 meeting different adults and exchanging or selling sexual activity • Removed from known 'red light' district by professionals due to suspected CSE • Being taken to clubs and hotels by adults and engaging in sexual activity • Disclosure of serious sexual assault and then withdrawal of statement • Abduction and forced imprisonment • Being moved around for sexual activity • Disappearing from the 'system' with no contact or support • Being bought / sold / trafficked • Multiple miscarriages or terminations • Indicators of CSE in conjunction with chronic alcohol and drug use • Indicators of CSE alongside serious self harming • Receiving rewards of money or goods for recruiting peers into CSE It is recommended that whenever a child or young person presents with **One High Level Indicator** action should be taken. The earlier the intervention the better chances of success." **CSE and Gangs checklist:** The following alternative lists of warning signs and vulnerabilities in relation to CSE and Gangs was identified in Appendix 3 (as part of the *SeeMe HearMe* framework) by the Office of the Children's Commissioner inquiry *If only someone had listened* . *Source: OCC Nov 2013*, "The following are typical **vulnerabilities in children prior to abuse**. • Living in a chaotic or dysfunctional household (including parental substance use, domestic violence, parental mental health issues, parental criminality) • History of abuse (including familial child sexual abuse, risk of forced marriage, risk of honour-based violence, physical and emotional abuse and neglect) • Recent bereavement or loss. • Gang-association either through relatives, peers or intimate relationships (in cases of gang-associated CSE only).

			• Attending school with children and young people who are already sexually exploited. • Learning disabilities. • Unsure about their sexual orientation or unable to disclose sexual orientation to their families. • Friends with young people who are sexually exploited. • Homeless. • Lacking friends from the same age group. • Living in a gang neighbourhood. • Living in residential care. • Living in hostel, bed and breakfast accommodation or a foyer. • Low self-esteem or self-confidence. • Young carer. The following signs and behaviour are generally seen in children who are **already being sexually exploited**. • Missing from home or care. • Physical injuries. • Drug or alcohol misuse. • Involvement in offending. • Repeat sexually-transmitted infections, pregnancy and terminations. • Absent from school. • Change in physical appearance. • Evidence of sexual bullying and/or vulnerability through the internet and/or social networking sites. • Estranged from their family. • Receipt of gifts from unknown sources. • Recruiting others into exploitative situations. • Poor mental health. • Self-harm. • Thoughts of or attempts at suicide. Any child or young person displaying several vulnerabilities from the above lists should normally be considered to be at high risk of sexual exploitation. There should be evidence that the case worker and the YOT have investigated to determine the risk, along with preventative and protective action as required. However, it is important to note that children and young people without pre-existing vulnerabilities can still be sexually exploited. Therefore, any child or young person showing risk indicators in the second list, but none of the vulnerabilities in the first, should also be considered as a potential victim, with appropriate assessment and action put in place as required."

			Consent: It is important to bear in mind that: • a child under the age of 13 is not legally capable of consenting to sex (it is statutory rape) or any other type of sexual touching; • sexual activity with a child under 16 is also an offence; • it is an offence for a person to have a sexual relationship with a 16 or 17 year old if they hold a position of trust or authority in relation to them; • where sexual activity with a 16 or 17 year old does not result in an offence being committed, it may still result in harm, or the likelihood of harm being suffered; • non consensual sex is rape whatever the age of the victim; and if the victim is incapacitated through drink or drugs, or the victim or his or her family has been subject to violence or the threat of it, they cannot be considered to have given true consent and therefore offences may have been committed **For further guidance** read: *Working with children and young people who experience running away and child sexual exploitation: An evidence-based guide for practitioners. Barnardo's. (2013)*
1.15.1	I.2	Please read the extended guidance	**Interventions module only: Has the suitability and eligibility of the child or young person for specific interventions to address reoffending been sufficiently considered?** This question is asking you to decide whether the case manager has assessed the young person's needs accurately and that the planned intervention meets those needs. It is also you to decide whether an accurate assessment of suitability for that particular intervention has been made. Many issues may impact on the suitability of an intervention, for example the time and place of the intervention may be inappropriate, in the inspector's view, despite the planned intervention meeting an assessed need. Therefore in making your judgement you should consider: - Does the intervention take place at an appropriate time and venue? - Does the method of delivery suit a young persons learning style? - Are there any diversity issues, e.g. gender, that make the intervention inappropriate or difficult for the young person to access? - Is the level of dosage appropriate for the level of risk posed? - Does attendance at an intervention increase the risk posed by or to a young person? Effective practice can be described as being based on three principles - risk – in general the higher the likelihood of re-offending the more intensive and extended should be the supervision programme - needs – interventions/requirements that target needs related to offending are likely to be

			more effective - responsivity – interventions/requirements, which match the child or young person's learning styles and engage them, are likely to be more effective. The inspector should be convinced that these principles have been adhered to in the assessment of suitability of interventions.
1.15.2	I.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.16.1	1.2.1	The inspector will need to be satisfied that, <u>throughout the sentence being inspected,</u> reviews of the likelihood of re-offending assessment have been undertaken as required, have been completed in a timely fashion and to a sufficient standard. Indicators to be considered by the inspector are: • reviews of the assessment of the likelihood of re-offending were undertaken regularly as required • reviews were timely and of sufficient quality • review of the assessment was undertaken immediately post sentence when required (see detailed guidance) • reviews during the custodial phase of a sentence were sufficient • in custodial cases a sufficient review was undertaken on release in to the community	**Was there sufficient review throughout the sentence of the reasons for offending and what may reduce this?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the review(s) undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the review outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. Assessments of the likelihood of reoffending should be critically and analytically reviewed in line with the needs of the case. National Standards 2013 4.4 states that assessments should be maintained under continual review and updated where necessary to reflect changes in circumstances, risks and needs. As a minimum, National Standards 2013 4.5 state that reviews should be undertaken: • at a maximum of 6 monthly intervals, or • where, in the judgement of the case manager, any identified changes in the young person's life are so significant as to warrant a revision, or • prior to any decision to vary levels of contact in line with the scaled approach model, and • at the conclusion of the YOT supervision as part of the case closure process. National Standards 2013 9.31 indicates that custodial cases should be reviewed in line with the above. HMI Probation considers that significant change should trigger review of the likelihood of re-offending assessment over and above the minimum requirements. Where the case recording is insufficient for the inspector to form a view of whether significant change has taken place, the National Standard requirement should be used as a benchmark. Examples of significant change triggering a review of the assessment are: • the child or young person has been 'out of contact' with the case manager for a period of time e.g. during a period of failed appointments leading to breach action • the child or young person resumes excessive alcohol use or returns to illicit drug use

			• the child or young person moves out of stable accommodation • the child or young person's lifestyle becomes chaotic and they fail to engage with support services • the child or young person receives a new sentence which in itself acts as a significant change. The only exception to this would be where a child or young person has received several similar YROs for similar offences in a short period and there has been no other significant change for them which would otherwise require a review of the assessment • evidence of further offending behaviour • other intelligence suggesting changes to the likelihood of re-offending Case managers should be able to anticipate and identify if risk factors relating to previous behaviour and/or offending are recurring, for example loss of stable accommodation or return to substance use. Alternatively, there could be cases where there are no previous indicators but behaviour suggests some concern such as associating with people who are known to offend or hold pre offending or anti social beliefs. This should again trigger consideration of a review of the assessment. In order to score this question as YES the quality of the reviewed assessment(s) should be sufficient - refer to guidance given in 1.13 .1. A review which is merely a clone of a previous assessment must be judged by the inspector as insufficient.
1.16.2	1.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.17.1	2.2.1	The inspector will need to form a judgement that throughout the sentence under consideration sufficient review was undertaken of the assessment of risk of harm. The inspector will need to consider a number of indicators: • reviews of the assessment of risk of harm were undertaken regularly as required • reviews were timely and of sufficient quality • review of the assessment was undertaken immediately post sentence when required • reviews in custody were sufficient • sufficient review was undertaken on release in to the community • reviews were undertaken following any other relevant significant change.	**Was there sufficient review throughout the sentence of the *risk of harm to others* posed by this child or young person?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the review(s) undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the review outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The inspector must decide if the risk of harm has been reviewed and if this has been done sufficiently well for the case circumstances. The minimum national standards for reviews of risk of harm are the same as for likelihood of reoffending (see question 1.16.1 or National Standard 2012 4.5). Examples of triggers for a review following significant change include: • new or revised information including police intelligence and any relevant victim liaison feedback • a lack of contact, in particular if this indicates disengagement from protective/harm

		In order to fully recognise the need for reviews the YOT worker (and any other worker involved) will need to have a sufficient understanding of the nature of risk of harm work.	reducing services, • further relevant offending behaviour (including allegations thereof) • in a custodial case, a request for ROTL • increases in substance misuse where this is a factor in risk of harm • threats to staff or others, or relevant inappropriate behaviour or disclosure during YOT supervision • changes to any other indicator in the assessment of Risk of Harm. • failure to comply with restrictive conditions in the sentence or licence • failure to engage with relevant offending behaviour work, or other aspects of the Risk Management Plan. The standards for sufficient quality are the same as those that applied to the initial assessment of Risk of Harm (see question 1.10.1). The risk of harm classification and MAPPA category and level, where applicable, must be clear and accurately recorded within the review, especially since this may have changed since the initial assessment. Any changes to the assessment should be clearly communicated to all relevant workers and partners. The inspector should be looking for evidence of effective interagency risk assessment work where appropriate to the needs of the case. This is likely to include agencies working together well in the review of the assessment of risk of harm, and could include multi agency risk assessment review through mediums such as risk review meetings, information sharing and intelligence exchange. In custodial cases the review must remain clear about the risk of harm that applies both in custody and the community. A review which is merely a clone of a previous assessment of risk of harm must be judged by the inspector as insufficient.
1.17.2	2.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.18.1	3.2.1	The inspector will need to form a judgement that throughout the sentence under consideration sufficient review was undertaken of the assessment of safeguarding and vulnerability needs. The inspector will need to consider a number of indicators: • reviews of the assessment of safeguarding and vulnerability were undertaken regularly as required • reviews were timely • reviews were of sufficient quality	**Was there sufficient review throughout the sentence of the safeguarding and vulnerability needs in this case?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the review(s) undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the review outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. Safeguarding is a dynamic process being kept under continuous review according to changes in circumstances and new information becoming available. It is important that the

		• a review was undertaken immediately post sentence when required • reviews in custody were sufficient • sufficient review was undertaken on release in to the community • reviews were undertaken following any significant change In addition to formal reviews YOT workers should be mindful of safeguarding in every contact that they have with the child or young person.	assessment of safeguarding is viewed as a continuous process. Whilst the formal mechanism for review will be alongside a full review of the assessment of likelihood of reoffending. See National Standard 4.5 and question 1.61.1 for further details, this alone is not sufficient. In answering this question the inspector should be satisfied that in addition to the above formal process the case manager continually assesses and reviews safeguarding and is mindful of this within each contact with the child or young person. The following are examples of indicators of vulnerability, but this is not an exhaustive list. Changes to any of these is likely to be considered a significant event and so trigger a review of the safeguarding and vulnerability assessment: • emotional/mental health, e.g. depression, self-harm, attachment issues, suicidal thoughts • being a Looked After Child • being subject to Child Protection investigations • in custodial cases the assessment is clear about the vulnerability that applies both in custody and in the community • environmental factors, e.g. inadequate housing, area they live in • parental behaviour, e.g. mental health needs, substance misuse, inconsistent parenting • behaviour of others, e.g. bullying, abuse, neglect, intimidation, exploitation, associates • events or circumstances, e.g. family separation, bereavement, change of care arrangements • being a young carer, for their own child or for other family members • own behaviour, e.g. substance misuse, type of offending, acting out, inappropriate responses to stress, weapon carrying • other reckless behaviour that shows insufficient regard to their own safety In addition the receipt of relevant intelligence or other information from other agencies, including but not restricted to commencement of child protection enquiries, is likely to trigger the need for a review. To judge the review as sufficient, the inspector will need to be satisfied that the review of the safeguarding assessment gathers and records the most up to date and relevant information relating to young people's risks and needs. A review which is merely a clone of a previous assessment of safeguarding and vulnerability must be judged by the inspector as insufficient. The quality of the assessment completed at each review should be sufficient - refer to guidance given in 1.13.1.
1.18.2	3.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 1.20
1.20a		To assist the Lead Inspector please provide a very	To assist the Lead Inspector please provide a very brief pen picture of the offending and

		brief pen picture of the offending and other key characteristics of the case, to provide context for them when reading your comments.	other key characteristics of the case, to provide context for them when reading your comments.
1.20b		Please summarise the key characteristics of this case that influenced your judgements on the understanding and explanation of reasons for offending, risk of harm to others and safeguarding. Please include how the case manager ensured that these were fully understood, or mistakes that were made in this. This should NOT be a repeat of your answers to the individual questions, but rather should help the Lead Inspector understand the context in which those judgements have been made. In particular please include further details whenever you have used "**Other**" as the explanation for insufficiency. Please specifically comment any CSE indicators that you have found in this case. In FJI please include specific comments pertinent to the additional modules being inspected. Please include comment on strengths found in the case, do not just focus on insufficiency. Please include specific comment on the advice provided to the sentencing court, in particular where you considered this to be inappropriate.	Please summarise the key characteristics of this case that influenced your judgements on the understanding and explanation of reasons for offending, risk of harm to others and safeguarding. Please include how the case manager ensured that these were fully understood, or mistakes that were made in this. This should NOT be a repeat of your answers to the individual questions, but rather should help the Lead Inspector understand the context in which those judgements have been made. In particular please include further details whenever you have used "**Other**" as the explanation for insufficiency. Please specifically comment any CSE indicators that you have found in this case. In FJI please include specific comments pertinent to the additional modules being inspected. Please include comment on strengths found in the case, do not just focus on insufficiency. Please include specific comment on the advice provided to the sentencing court, in particular where you considered this to be inappropriate.

View 2 – Planning

Question Number	Criterion	Quality Indicators	Extended Guidance
2.0.1 (was 2.6.1)	1.3.2	The inspector will need to look for evidence of sufficient planning for the totality of the sentence i.e. both custodial and community phase planning to be delivered as a single integrated sentence. Further there should be evidence of sufficient review during the custodial phase of the case. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • The initial custodial plan is timely and reflects the YOT assessment of needs, irrespective of whether these will be addressed by custodial staff. • The plan reflects the views of the child or young person and is based upon active engagement with them • There is clarity over which aspects are to be delivered in custody and which in the community so that the whole sentence is reflected and responsibility for delivery is explicit • The plan has a focus on resettlement sufficient to the circumstances of the case • The plan is reviewed sufficiently for the needs of the case	**Was there sufficient planning throughout the custodial phase of the sentence for work to reduce reoffending?** This question relates to the plan as agreed with the child or young person at a custodial planning meeting – it is NOT any separate internal plan that may have been developed but not integrated into the custodial plan. The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this plan is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The sentence plan produced in custody should be a plan for the whole sentence, not just the custodial element. It should not be constrained by the availability of interventions in the establishment. The case manager should have recognised this and included targets that need to be delivered if necessary when the child or young person is released into the community. The case manager may also need to consider the need to advocate for a move to an establishment that does offer the required interventions. Under National Standards 2013 9.16-9.18 the sentence plan should include objectives and targets assigned to the young person, the YOT and secure establishment staff, to be achieved during the child or young person's custodial stay and post release. Therefore a plan that focuses solely on behavioural, educational and other practical arrangements for delivery of the custodial phase of the sentence is unlikely to be sufficient. The inspector will need to consider how well the custodial plan reflects NS 2013 9.17-9.18 within the circumstances of the case in that they: • Have been produced in a timely manner – an initial planning meeting to agree the sentence plan should be held within 10 days of the custodial sentence being made unless there is clear evidence as to why this could not take place • Clearly reflect the YOT assessment of those factors most likely to reduce

			offending • Identify what aspects are to be delivered during each of the custodial and community phases of the sentence and clearly reflect the whole sentence • Have been developed with sufficient involvement of the child or young person and their parent/carer • Have sufficient focus on resettlement planning throughout the custodial phase of the sentence. This may cover arrangements for: education/training/employment, offending behaviour work, accommodation, health and mental health provision, other relevant issues (including whether the child or young person should be assessed by children's services as a 'child in need' under s17 of the Children Act 1989), engaging with parents/carers, managing any risk issues in relation to victims, managing any risk of serious harm to others, MAPPA issues and details of reporting arrangements on day of release • reflecting the views of the child or young person and, where appropriate, their parent/carer • Detail the responsible staff or agency for delivery of differing parts of the plan either in custody or in the community which are parts of the overall integrated plan to reduce the likelihood of re-offending • Have been maintained and reviewed as necessary as per National Standards 2013 4.5. National Standards 2013 (9.27) states a level of contact with the young person and their parents/carers should be maintained consistent with supporting them through the custodial part of their sentence and in order to plan properly for their resettlement back into the community. In no cases must the frequency of contact be less than every 2 months. Whilst National Standards set a benchmark for the timelines the inspector should be making a judgement based upon appropriateness to the case needs and therefore some variance in dates is not necessarily indicative of insufficiency in the overall case as long as it had no detrimental impact on the running of the case.
2.0.2	1.3.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.1.0	1.3.1	The inspector is asked to identify ***up to*** five highest priority factors in reducing the likelihood of reoffending. (NB: If you consider that less than five factors are priorities for work in the case then only select the number that you consider are required). Later in the form inspectors will be	The inspector is asked to identify ***up to*** five highest priority factors in reducing the likelihood of reoffending. (NB: If you consider that less than five factors are priorities for work in the case then only select the number that you consider are required). Later in the form inspectors will be asked to make judgements on planning for, delivery of, and progress against these specific priority areas.

		asked to make judgements on planning for, delivery of, and progress against these specific priority areas. **Because this is a key question that contributes to the routing of those later questions; if you go back and change an answer to this question please ensure that you also review your answers to the later questions.** The focus here is on the highest priority areas for reducing the **likelihood of re-offending**. Whether a factor may be important for one of the other domains should not influence the judgement on this specific question unless it is also a priority for the reduction in likelihood of re-offending. This question is ***not*** asking what the case manager in the case identified as the highest priority areas but ***is*** asking **in the opinion of the inspector** what were the highest priority factors for reducing the likelihood of reoffending.	**Because this is a key question that contributes to the routing of those later questions; if you go back and change an answer to this question please ensure that you also review your answers to the later questions.** The focus here is on the highest priority areas for reducing the **likelihood of re-offending**. Whether a factor may be important for one of the other domains should not influence the judgement on this specific question unless it is also a priority for the reduction in likelihood of re-offending. For example a young person may be vulnerable because they are truanting from school therefore ETE would be a factor in the vulnerability assessment but if their offending behaviour is not linked with their absence from school it is unlikely to contribute to the likelihood of re-offending. This question is ***not*** asking what the case manager in the case identified as the highest priority areas but ***is*** asking **in the opinion of the inspector** what were the highest priority factors for reducing the likelihood of reoffending. Whilst these *may* be the highest scoring areas of the assessment the Inspector will need to make their judgement based on the sufficiency of the assessment, any other information available within the case record and the needs of the case. This question is based upon the inspector's view of the case requirements. The areas of work and objectives in the intervention plan should explicitly link to the highest priority factors related to the likelihood of re-offending that were identified by the Inspector in this case. The intervention plan produced should therefore reflect the key needs that have been identified in relation to the child or young person. The Inspector should be mindful of the period of time that they are inspecting over and therefore when assessing the priority areas only identify areas that should realistically have been worked on in the delivery and planning cycles that our inspection is focussing on.
2.1.1	1.3.1	This question applies to the plan produced at the start of YOT intervention with child or young person. It is based on the inspector's view of the needs in the case. In gauging whether there has been sufficient planning the inspector will need to consider how well the following indicators are addressed within the plan produced: Quality indicators: • It (the plan) meets the needs of the case circumstances and is targeted on those factors most likely to reduce offending and the outcomes from the relevant	**Was there sufficient planning in place for work to reduce likelihood of reoffending?** This question is based upon the inspector's view of the case requirements. It is about the effectiveness of case managers in developing a sentence plan that addresses the needs within the case. In custodial cases this is about the plan produced for release – i.e. the plan for the community phase of the sentence. For Referral Orders the plan to be inspected is the Referral Order Contract agreed between the child or young person and the panel. If a contract has not been agreed then it is most unlikely that the inspector will assess that planning was sufficient. If there are differences between the written contract and any implementation of that onto the case management system then, before making their judgement, the inspector will need to consider how much difference these may make to the management of the sentence and in particular to its

		assessment. • It is timely to the needs of the case • It sets clear, specific and achievable goals that are relevant for, and meaningful to, the child or young person. • It is sequenced according to risk of harm, offending related need and, in appropriate cases, safeguarding needs. • It gives sufficient priority to strengthening or reinforcing positive factors. • Its goals include the intensity of delivery, which are responsive to appropriately identified diversity factors, potential discriminatory factors and the circumstances of the individual. • It clearly reflects the views of the child or young person and, where relevant, their parents/ carers on priorities for change. • It gives sufficient priority to restorative justice and meeting the needs of victims. • It gives sufficient attention to health (including emotional or mental health and physical health) and substance misuse needs, in particular as these relate to likelihood of reoffending. • It gives sufficient attention to ETE needs, in particular as these relate to likelihood of reoffending. • It gives sufficient attention to living arrangements and parenting capacity, in particular as these relate to likelihood of reoffending.	delivery as the panel intended. The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall planning to address likelihood of reoffending is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. Where the plan has not been written using the normal tools for the YOT (e.g. if it was handwritten with the child or young person) then the inspector may judge that this was sufficient as long as it meets the needs of the case **and** has been sufficiently communicated to others who may need to be aware of it. The plan should be timely and appropriative to the case circumstances. National Standards 2013 specify that plans resulting from assessments must be completed within 10 working days for Detention and Training Orders, 15 working days for Youth Rehabilitation Orders and 20 working days for Referral Orders. Whilst this question is based on the inspector's assessment of the needs in the case, the intervention plan should also reflect the key needs that have been identified in the assessments carried out relating to the child or young person. The areas of work and objectives in the intervention plan should explicitly link to the main factors relating to offending in this case irrespective of whether they were identified in the initial assessments. Planning that seeks to link children and young people into locally preferred interventions, without consideration of their appropriateness to the particular circumstances, is likely to be insufficient. Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bounded (SMART) objectives and targets which are demonstrably linked to the identified factors should be evidenced, which specify review dates and contain actions to address resettlement/transfer needs as appropriate to the needs of the case. Intervention plans should be sequenced according to risk of harm, offending related need and, in appropriate case safeguarding needs and should, where appropriate, give sufficient attention to strengthening positive or protective factors. The planning should clearly reflect the views of the child or young person and, where relevant, their parents/ carers on priorities for change. However this question is NOT judging whether the plan was understandable to the child or young person or whether they were involved in its development. These aspects are assessed in a subsequent question.

			Objectives, including the intensity of delivery, should respond appropriately to diversity factors or potential discriminatory factors and the circumstances of the individual child or young person and, where appropriate, their family; in so much as these could act as barriers to engagement. This must include consideration of and, where indicated, actions to reduce the impact of speech, language and communication difficulties. Similarly (and although also assessed specifically within Q2.1.2) emotional, mental and physical health, ETE, substance misuse and care arrangements (in terms of their impact upon the potential for re-offending) should be included within the overall judgement on the quality of planning. Planning should also be co-ordinated and intervention plans and targets integrated with any other relevant specialist plans (National Standards 2013 8.7) ISS plans can be standalone or within a subsidiary plan but should always contain the elements and should be integrated into the main plan. The core elements of ISS are: • education, training (especially basic literacy and numeracy) and employment • interventions to tackle offending behaviour • reparation to victims or the community in conjunction with National Standard 8: Planning and delivering interventions in the community • assistance in developing interpersonal skills • family support • a curfew supported by electronic monitoring plus two surveillance checks a day; the existence of a tag may count as one of these contacts" The inspector will also need to consider whether there has been sufficient consideration to responding to the needs of the victim, through restorative approaches and the provision of information to them.
2.1.2	1.3.1	This question is used to inform the work of partner inspectors during the second inspection field work week of an FJI. The inspector should already have taken account of these aspects in their overall judgement of the sufficiency of planning. This is not a scoring question.	The areas of work and objectives in the intervention plan should explicitly link to the factors related to the likelihood of re-offending that were identified by the inspector in this case. The intervention plan should reflect the key needs that have been identified in relation to the child or young person. Specific attention should be paid to the aspects of work identified in this question in relation to their impact on the likelihood of re-offending or, conversely, where these factors could act as a positive or protective factor should be built upon in the intervention planning. The not applicable option should be used where there was no requirement for planning to address this particular factor.
2.1.3	1.3.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20

		for this in question 2.20	
2.2.1	I.2	Please refer to the detailed guidance	**Did the initial planning for work to address likelihood of reoffending clearly outline what interventions were to be provided and how they were to be delivered?** This question is asking you to decide whether the plans that are in place clearly identify interventions specifically to address the likelihood of reoffending. To answer this question positively there will need to be clarity about exactly which intervention is to be delivered – just making reference to the offending related area to be worked on is not sufficient. It is also asking you to consider whether the plans make clear the arrangements and methods for how these interventions are to be delivered. This is in both a practical sense, as in who is going to deliver it where and when, but also the method, so that it takes into account any learning needs or diversity issues.
2.2.2	I.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.3.1	4.1.2	This question contains two strands: firstly the recognised groups who may face discrimination, and secondly the wider consideration of diversity factors that may act as a barrier to access to services or effective engagement. The inspector must consider whether sufficient attention has been paid to these factors within the planning, as barriers to engagement. Quality indicators: • The plan identifies potential barriers to engagement and access to services, including learning needs, disability and other discriminatory or diversity factors and plans are put in place to mitigate their impact. • Where identified, speech, language or communication needs of children and young people receive specific attention so that methods of working suit their individual needs. • Plans to address, barriers to engagement, where identified, are clearly communicated to all involved in the case. • The plan details the specific attention to be given to vulnerability and health and	**Did the initial planning give sufficient attention to barriers to engagement and diversity or potential discriminatory factors?** This question is based on the inspector's assessment of diversity factors in this case, irrespective of whether they were identified in the assessments. The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this plan is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. All questions relating to diversity are intended to capture two strands: firstly, the recognised groups of children and young people who can face discrimination due to race/ethnicity, culture, religion, disability, sexuality, age, gender or care status. For Children Looked After this could include factors such as separation from attachment figures or multiple placements and resultant loss of stability. The second strand incorporates a wide range of factors which could pose a barrier to engagement, e.g. children and young people who are themselves carers, young parents, rurality issues or those with literacy/language difficulties or whose first language is not that in which the YOT normally operates. Vulnerability, health and well being, where these are barriers to engagement, should be given sufficient attention in planning. In all relevant cases, specific attention must be given to understanding and addressing the speech, language or communication needs of children and young people; so that methods of working suit their individual and often complex needs. Having made an assessment of any potential barriers to engagement, the planning should show how, as far as is appropriate to the needs of the case, services will be delivered to best reduce the potential impact of the factors identified.

		well-being needs where these act as a barrier to engagement	Examples of how this might be done include identifying and planning how to address: • different methods to be used • staff to be involved in terms of how this could impact upon any barriers to engagement – for example if ETE is an issue but the child or young person has a particularly negative view of education staff • environmental factors such as difficulty accessing the YOT • timeliness factors such as regular scheduling of appointments • reminder systems for those with speech, language and communication needs • how parents or carers could be supportive in reducing barriers to engagement. In all cases where there are potential barriers to engagement to be addressed, the planning should ensure that these have been clearly communicated to all involved in the case and the inspector will need to be satisfied there is sufficient evidence that this has happened.
2.3.2	4.1.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.4.1	4.1.1	This question relates to the inspector's view on how well the child and their parent/carer and significant others were involved in the planning. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • The plan was developed with sufficient active involvement of the child or young person and their parents/carers and any significant others • Planning clearly reflects the opinions on priorities for change of the child or young person and their parents/carers • The plan has been provided to the child or young person and their parents/carers • The plan is written in language the child or young person can understand and is	**Were the child or young person and their parent/carer or significant others sufficiently involved in the planning?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this plan is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. In order to increase the child or young person's ownership of and commitment to the plan, it should be discussed with them and agreed prior to it being finalised. Evidence of this active participation should be found in the contact log or elsewhere in the file. A signature on the intervention plan is not sufficient on its own to indicate active and meaningful involvement. A plan that is written by the case manager and then presented to the child or young person without any realistic opportunity for them to contribute to or influence it is unlikely to be sufficient. The use of a self assessment by the child or young person to inform objective planning may often be useful evidence of meaningful involvement; as long as relevant outcomes from the self-assessment are reflected in the plan and the child or young person has been assisted to understand the link.

		meaningful to them • The custodial plan evidences effective engagement with children and young people additional to the requirements of formal planning meetings. .	Similarly, there should be clear evidence of consultation with parents/carers in the planning process. Evidence of this active participation should be found in the contact log or elsewhere in the file. Both the child or young person and their parent/carer should be provided with a copy of the plan. Planning should also, where relevant, incorporate the views of any significant others. This may for example involve extended family members in delivery of part of the plan, as well as anyone else capable of exerting a positive or protective influence. For meaningful engagement in the planning process throughout contact with the child or young person to be evidenced, the plan should be meaningful to children and young people, being written in language that they understand and clearly reflecting their opinions on priorities for change to maximise the potential for ownership of the plan. In custodial cases, the inspector may need to look for evidence of engagement with the child or young person outside formal planning meetings. This could include separate substance misuse planning, health needs planning or similar.
2.4.2	4.1.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.8.1	2.3.1	This question relates to planning to manage risk of harm for the duration of the sentence, which will include both custodial and community phases of custodial cases. This also includes planning for risk of harm in cases where a formal risk management plan is not required. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • Planning differentiates between risk of harm to be managed within the overall intervention plan and factors to be planned for within a formal risk management plan • The response is clear and sufficient for the circumstances of the case • A risk management plan has been produced in a timely fashion where	**Was there sufficient planning for work to manage risk of harm to others?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall planning to manage risk of harm is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The N/A option should only be used where there was no requirement for planning to address risk of harm, but the inspector should be mindful that all aspects of risk of harm to others should be planned for and not just those requiring a formal risk management plan. Risk of harm includes any and all indicators or incidents of harm to others and that this should be the benchmark upon which work to manage risk of harm is planned, since even an assessment of LOW risk of *serious* harm does NOT necessarily indicate that there are no risk of harm issues that need to be addressed. However cases assessed as medium or higher risk of *serious* harm will always require development of a formal plan to manage risk of harm (RMP). Therefore all risk of harm issues, including where a formal plan is not required, should be considered within the overall sentence planning. For example – a child or young person may require a substance misuse service as they have previously offended in a violent manner when under the influence of alcohol and caused harm to another. If the assessment is that

		indicated as necessary • Planning sufficiently addresses victim issues • The impact of diversity factors is given sufficient attention within risk of harm planning where indicated • Potential changes in risk of harm are anticipated within the plan which includes contingency arrangements sufficient for the case circumstances • Clear communication of planning takes place appropriate to the needs of the case and within explicit information sharing arrangements • Interventions related managing risk of harm are incorporated within the sentence plan and linked to associated plans as determined by case circumstances • MAPPA issues have been sufficiently addressed within the planning to manage risk of harm	alcohol use is the prime factor to be targeted and that in other circumstances violent behaviour is unlikely, a specific risk management plan is unlikely to be required. Conversely, if investigation indicates a risk of ongoing violent behaviour where alcohol, although a factor is not the prime reason for risk to others, then a specific plan targeting thinking, beliefs, attitudes or the need for external controls may be required. Planning must always consider risk to specific victims, where relevant. This should reflect information gathered from any victim workers who have been involved in the case. There should be evidence that the case manager has given thought to the victim's safety and acted on this appropriately. Where a formal plan to manage risk of harm (RMP) is required, this should be completed in a timely fashion for the needs of the case, and the level and nature of risks identified. The resultant plan to manage risk of harm should be clear and specific, appropriate to the circumstances of the case, be precise about roles and responsibilities for delivery; where indicated by the circumstances of the case agencies should work together well in the planning of risk of harm work and this should be evidenced within multi agency planning meeting minutes, in case diary entries or similar. Arrangements for sharing information about the case with partners or others should be clear and precise and the inspector should find evidence that plans have been communicated to and agreed with all those involved in their delivery. The inspector should form a view as to whether the case manager has anticipated changes in risk of harm/acute factors wherever feasible, and included sufficient contingency planning within the overall plan. Examples of this may be an increase in substance misuse, where this has previously been a trigger for harm related behaviour; or where protective factors are reduced for example the ending of a service. The inspector will require evidence that, where a risk of harm to others is present in a case, the Intervention plans include actions to manage that which are then sequenced according to the risk. The plans may include use of MAPPA, which should be clearly recorded. In custodial cases plans should be clear regarding what actions to manage risk of harm are to be undertaken in custody and which in the community, together with who is responsible for delivery. For all cases where risk of harm issues are to be managed, the inspector should be clear that where necessary barriers to engagement and diversity or other potentially discriminating factors have received sufficient attention. This will include speech, language and communication needs which may be complex and impact in a number of ways upon the ability of the child or young person to comply with the risk management plan. **NB:** Increasingly the RMP, VMP and Intervention Plans are combined into a single document.

			HMI Probation is content with this approach and recognises that it has a number of advantages. However it must not result in dilution of the quality of the plans to address the separate domains and, in particular for RMPs and VMPs, it must be made clear that relevant objectives are included because of the risk of harm or vulnerability. Where these objectives are not achieved then the inspector is likely to assess the planning to be insufficient.
2.8.2	2.3.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.9.1	2.3.1	This question relates to planning to manage all risk of harm issues during the custodial phase of any sentence. This also includes planning for all risk of harm issues which incorporate cases where a formal risk management plan is not required. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • Planning differentiates between risk of harm that can be managed within the overall intervention plan, and where a specific risk management plan is required • Planning is based upon assessment • The response to risk of harm issues is clear and sufficient for the circumstances of the case • A risk management plan has been produced in a timely fashion where indicated as necessary • The plan sufficiently addresses victim issues • The impact of diversity issues is given sufficient attention within risk of harm planning where indicated • Potential changes in risk of harm are anticipated within the plan which includes contingency arrangements sufficient for	The not applicable option should be used where there was no requirement for planning to manage risk of harm during the custodial phase of the sentence, for risks that may apply either in custody or the community, but the inspector should be mindful that all risk of harm issues should be planned for and not just those requiring a formal plan to manage risk of harm to others. The guidance contained within 2.8.1 should also be referred to for this question. Particular reference should be made to the planning for release which should commence in a timely fashion reflective of the needs of the case. This could include reference to children's services where a child or young person is likely to be homeless upon release. Arrangements for inter-agency information sharing should be specific, along with responsibility for actions to manage risk of harm both within custody in preparation for release and during the community phase of the sentence. Within custodial plans it should be clear regarding what actions to manage risk of harm are to be undertaken in custody and which in the community, together with who is responsible for delivery. Planning should not be constrained by the range of interventions available within the secure establishment. Where interventions are required that are not immediately available then planning should consider how else they can be delivered. HMI Probation consider that, in order to avoid difficulties caused by sudden release from custody, for example following a successful appeal, planning to manage risk of harm during the custodial phase of a sentence should take the approach that the child or young person could be released without notice.

		the case circumstances • Clear communication of risk planning takes place appropriate to the needs of the case and within explicit information sharing arrangements • Interventions related to managing risk of harm are incorporated within the sentence plan and linked to associated plans as determined by case circumstances • MAPPA issues have been sufficiently addressed within the planning	
2.9.2	2.3.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.10.1	2.3.1	This question is about how well the YOT has engaged with MAPPA and whether this was sufficient for the circumstances of the case. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • The case was recognised as MAPPA eligible and referred or notified in a timely fashion • The initial MAPPA management level was correct • MAPPA meetings were held as required by the circumstances of the case • The YOT attended MAPPA meetings • The MAPPA management plan is sufficient to the circumstances of the case • Key agencies, including children's services, attended and contributed to	**Was there sufficient engagement with MAPPA in the assessment and planning for this case?** The YOT is responsible for identifying which of its cases are MAPPA eligible ones, and for referring to MAPPA all those for whom they are responsible who meet the MAPPA eligibility criteria (*MAPPA Guidance 2012 S3.17*). This information should be recorded on the case management system. The inspector will already have judged whether MAPPA involvement was required in this case. This question will only be asked when MAPPA involvement at level 2 or 3 was required. If this is a MAPPA case as per the guidance but the YOT has not recognised this (or not recognised it in a timely fashion) then effective use has not been made and this question should be answered as NO. The YOT will determine whether a MAPPA case needs to be managed at level 2 or above. Once it has decided that a case required level 2 or level 3 management it **must** be referred to MAPPA. Referral to MAPPA should occur once a child or young person has been identified as fitting one of the categories for eligibility. Case managers should always discuss a MAPPA eligible identification with an appropriate manager. This discussion should be referenced on the case record. Identification should normally be carried out during the initial assessment of an offender – referrals should therefore be made during or following the period of initial assessment. The identification should take place within three days of sentence (*MAPPA*

		MAPPA meetings	*guidance 2012 S23.9*). For cases in custody, referral/notification should take place at least six months prior to possible release. In some cases referral may become required due to changes in the child or young person's circumstances (e.g. commission of a further offence leading to a revised assessment of *risk of harm to others*). In such cases referral should occur once a child or young person has been identified as having become eligible for MAPPA. Each case should be managed at the lowest level necessary to provide an effective Risk Management Plan which balances public protection with the rights and needs of the child or young person. Where the YOT case worker believes that this is a case which requires active multi-agency management at MAPPA level 2 or 3, he or she will complete the MAPP meeting referral document. This will be endorsed by his or her manager and sent to the MAPPA Co-ordinator. The referral must include information about why the case would benefit from active multi-agency management beyond what the YOT can offer. The nature of the case might suggest that it will attract local or national media attention, or that there is a need for additional multi-agency resources to manage the potential risks of harm. This referral will be reviewed using local procedures and, where the case meets the agreed threshold (taking into account the needs of the young person as well as the risk of harm he or she presents), a level 2 or 3 MAPP meeting will be arranged. If the young person is in custody, this referral should take place at least 6 months before his or her release date to allow effective Risk Management Plans to be put in place. The case manager should ensure that the identified management level agreed by the MAPPA meeting is recorded correctly. Refer to guidance at question 12 for further details of MAPPA management levels. Where a YOT has referred to MAPPA and MAPPA have declined the referral inappropriately there should be evidence that the YOT have escalated this through the appropriate channels. In forming a judgement as to effective use of MAPPA the inspector should also look for evidence of the case manager or other YOT representative attending MAPPA meetings and following through on actions noted. Whenever a referral relating to a child or young person is made by any agency other than the YOT, the YOT must attend the meeting as it may well have information relating to the case. A YOT manager who is senior enough to act as consultant to the MAPP meeting Chair should also be present at all meetings where a child or young person is being discussed, to ensure that the additional factors are properly and fully addressed. This should help to identify potential additional resources that may be required. If, as part of the MAPPA RMP, licence conditions are discussed, it is essential that any

			additional licence conditions proposed are proportionate to the level of risk identified. The YOT manager is not there to represent the local authority – there should also be evidence in MAPPA cases involving a child or young person of children's services attending MAPPA meetings and making an effective contribution to inter agency management of risk of harm where appropriate. As far as the MAPPA agencies are concerned, there should be a statutory basis for sharing information. This exists for the agencies who make up the Responsible Authority or who have a duty to co-operate with it. Section 325(4) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 ("CJA 2003") expressly permits the sharing of information between these agencies for MAPPA purposes. ***Disclosure,*** on the other hand, is the sharing of specific information about a MAPPA offender with a third party (not involved in MAPPA) for the purpose of protecting the public. The third party could be a member of the public such as a victim, an employer, a person forming a relationship with an offender, or a person acting in a professional capacity but not party to the MAPP arrangements. In order to ensure that the proper considerations have been taken into account, no decision about disclosure can be made unless a senior representative of both the YOT and Children's Services are present at the MAPP meeting. The YOT worker should consider informing the LSCB when disclosure is made. As in all cases, decisions on disclosure should be recorded on the MAPPA minutes or, in a level 1 case, on the agency's own recording system. **ViSOR** - <u>YOTS and Mental Health Services and Teams must provide relevant data for updating ViSOR cases</u> **Category 1 (Registered Sexual Offenders)** All Category 1 offenders will have a ViSOR record and a nominated police Offender Manager who is the owner of the record. The YOT case worker or relevant Mental Health case worker must contact the police Public Protection Unit to inform them that he or she is involved in the case, provide his or her contact details, and obtain details of the police officer responsible for managing the record. The YOT / Mental Health Service and Team and the police will be expected to work closely together to manage the case, with each informing the other of any significant changes or developments. This will allow the police to keep the ViSOR record updated. Where the case is managed at level 2 or 3, the MAPP meeting will also identify new information which should be entered on ViSOR. **Category 2 (Violent Offenders)** The YOT / Mental Health Service and Team must ensure that the MAPPA Co-ordinator is kept informed of significant changes and events, for example, the date of release from custody

			and the date of expiry of supervision. Where the case is managed at level 2 or 3, the MAPP meeting will identify new information which should be entered on ViSOR. This must be supplied quickly to the Probation Trust ViSOR Administrator for action. **Category 3 (Other Dangerous Offenders)** The MAPP meeting will identify which new information should be entered on ViSOR, e.g. updating risk assessments, a change of personal circumstances, arrests and other intelligence pertinent to the effective MAPPA management of the case. The YOT / Mental Health Trust and Team must supply this promptly to relevant ViSOR staff.
2.10.2	2.2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.12.1	3.3.1	This question relates to planning to address all safeguarding and vulnerability needs for the duration of the sentence, which will include both custodial and community phases of custodial cases. This also includes planning to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs in cases where a formal vulnerability management plan is not required. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • Planning differentiates between safeguarding and vulnerability that can be addressed within the overall intervention plan, and where a specific vulnerability management plan is required • Planning is based upon assessment • The response to safeguarding and vulnerability needs is clear and sufficient for the circumstances of the case • A vulnerability management plan has been produced in a timely fashion where indicated as necessary • The impact of diversity issues is given	**Was there sufficient planning for work to address safeguarding and vulnerability?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this plan of intervention is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The not applicable option should be used where there was no requirement for planning to address safeguarding or vulnerability, however the inspector should be mindful that all safeguarding and vulnerability issues should be planned for and not just those requiring a formal vulnerability management plan. Diversity factors or other potential discriminatory issues which may act as barriers to engagement should receive specific attention and be sufficiently taken into account in planning to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs, in particular in planning how necessary actions will be delivered. Vulnerability is wider than child protection and includes all areas where the child or young person may be at risk of harm. This can be from their own behaviour, either offending related or not, as well as any risk presented to them by others. Offending behaviour does not, in itself, automatically cause this assessment of vulnerability to be raised beyond low and indicate the need for a formal management plan. However, there may be particular aspects to the offending behaviour (e.g. recklessness, knife carrying or substance misuse) that should have an impact on the assessment of vulnerability. The following are some examples of indicators of vulnerability but is not an exhaustive list: • Emotional/mental health, e.g. depression, self-harm, attachment issues

		sufficient attention within safeguarding and vulnerability planning where indicated, including the involvement of children's services staff in cases of Children Looked After • Potential changes in safeguarding and vulnerability needs are anticipated within the plan which includes contingency arrangements sufficient for the case circumstances • Clear communication of safeguarding and vulnerability planning takes place appropriate to the needs of the case and within explicit information sharing arrangements • Interventions related to planning to address safeguarding and vulnerability are incorporated within the sentence plan and linked to associated plans as determined by case circumstances • Interventions to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs are prioritised within the circumstances of the case • Where indicated, planning for addressing safeguarding and vulnerability issues both within and post custody is sufficient	• Children who are Looked After • Family, including siblings, e.g. criminality, violence within the home, involvement with significant others, i.e. gangs, offenders • Environmental factors, e.g. inadequate housing, area they live in • Parental behaviour, e.g. mental health needs, substance misuse, inconsistent parenting • Behaviour of others, e.g. bullying, abuse, neglect, intimidation, exploitation, associates • Events or circumstances, e.g. family separation, bereavement, change of care arrangements • Own behaviour, e.g. substance misuse, type of offending, acting out, inappropriate responses to stress, weapon carrying • Being a young carer, for their own children or other family members • Other reckless behaviour that shows insufficient regard to their own safety. Any actions required to reduce barriers to engagement, which are linked to vulnerability, should be addressed within the planning. There should be sufficient contingency planning for the needs of the case. Interventions should be sequenced according to safeguarding needs, balanced with those to manage risk of harm or reduce likelihood of reoffending, and be integrated within the overall intervention plan. The inspector should consider whether all necessary referrals are identified to safeguard and protect the child or young person. For children looked after, the inspector should be looking for meaningful involvement of the child or young person's social worker or key worker in the planning. If that is not sufficient then it is unlikely that they will assess the overall planning as sufficient. In custody cases, the plan should be clear as to which actions are to be delivered in custody and which in the community phase, together with who is responsible for delivery. **NB:** Increasingly the RMP, VMP and Intervention Plan are combined into a single document. HMI Probation are content with this approach and recognise that it has a number of advantages. However it should not result in dilution of the quality of the plans to address the separate domains and, in particular for RMPs and VMPs, it must be made clear that relevant objectives are included because of the risk of harm or vulnerability. Where these objectives are not achieved then the inspector is likely to assess the planning to be insufficient.
2.12.2	3.3.1	This question relates to how well safeguarding and vulnerability needs have been planned for with specific reference to health needs, substance misuse, ETE and care arrangements and whether	These aspects of the plan will already have been taken into account in your judgement on the previous question. This question is used to inform the work of partner inspectors during the second inspection fieldwork week of an FJI. The not applicable option should be used where there was no requirement for planning to

		this was sufficient for the needs of the case. This question is used to inform the work of partner inspectors during the second inspection field work week of an FJI inspection. The inspector should already have taken account of these aspects in their overall judgement on the quality of planning. This is not a scoring question.	address safeguarding or vulnerability but the inspector should be mindful that all relevant safeguarding and vulnerability issues should be planned for and not just those requiring a formal management plan. The inspector will need to consider whether YOT multi agency resources were used appropriately with specific reference to planning for health needs, substance misuse, ETE and care arrangements as they impact upon safeguarding and vulnerability. For each domain, N/A should be used if there was no need for planning in this area.
2.12.3	2.3.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.13.1	3.3.1	Planning in custody for work to address safeguarding needs during the custodial period was sufficient and appropriate for the case circumstances Quality indicators: • Safeguarding and vulnerability needs had been shared with the custodial establishment at the start of the sentence and those needs had been responded to by the establishment • Sufficient contributions to planning to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs were made by the YOT, children's services and any other appropriate agencies • The custodial plan was produced to sufficient quality and was timely to the needs of the case	The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this intervention plan is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The not applicable option should be used where there was no requirement for planning to manage safeguarding or vulnerability but the inspector should be mindful that all relevant safeguarding and vulnerability issues should be planned for and not just those requiring a formal vulnerability management plan. The following are some examples of what could be indicators of vulnerability but is not an exhaustive list: • Emotional/mental health, e.g. depression, self-harm, attachment issues • Children who are Looked After • Family, including siblings, e.g. criminality, violence within the home, involvement with significant others, i.e. gangs, offenders • Environmental factors, e.g. inadequate housing, area they live in • Parental behaviour, e.g. mental health needs, substance misuse, inconsistent parenting • Behaviour of others, e.g. bullying, abuse, neglect, intimidation, exploitation, associates • Events or circumstances, e.g. family separation, bereavement, change of care arrangements • Own behaviour, e.g. substance misuse, type of offending, acting out, inappropriate responses to stress, weapon carrying • Being a young carer, for their own children or other family members • Other reckless behaviour that shows insufficient regard to their own safety

			Planning should clearly identify which actions are to be delivered in custody and which in the community phase. A custody planning meeting should be held within 10 working days at which point safeguarding should be revisited and, where indicated, a plan of sufficient quality drawn up. HMI Probation consider that where there is vulnerability then, during the custodial phase of a sentence, planning should be undertaken as if the child or young person could be released into the community at any time, and should be reviewed appropriately. The inspector should see evidence of planning in the same way as for children and young people within the community. In addition, any vulnerability within the secure estate should also be addressed and planned for which should include access to the required services either from the establishment or on an in-reach basis. This may include children's services. For Children Looked After, whose care status remains whilst the child or young person is in custody, child welfare processes such as regular child care reviews, must be maintained. Consequently the home local authority social worker should be involved in the planning process in custody as this will increase the integration of post release placement plans. All actions to address safeguarding should be documented within overall plan or a specific management plan which is integrated with the overall plan appropriate to the case circumstances.
2.13.2	3.3.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.15.1	1.3.3	This question is asking whether the reviews of the plan held within the duration of this sentence were sufficient to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • Reviews were undertaken where necessary in a timely fashion and to a sufficient quality • The plan was revised as required based upon review	**Was there sufficient review, throughout the sentence, of plans to reduce the likelihood of reoffending?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this intervention plan is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The not applicable option should be used where there was no requirement for a review of the planning. This could for example be because it is too early in the sentence; there is no need in this area and therefore no need for planning, that the sentence ended swiftly pre any review being required. The inspector is looking for progress to have been reviewed as required by the needs of the case and as triggered by significant events, if appropriate. This question is not just asking if review of the plan has been completed but also about its quality and whether **in the**

			inspector's opinion there are regular reviews, at appropriate times, of the effectiveness and appropriateness of intervention plans which respond appropriately to the changing needs of the child or young person. Examples of significant events that may prompt a review include: • when a child or young person has been 'out of contact' with the case manager for a period of time e.g. during a period of failed appointments leading to breach action • when a child or young person may resume excessive alcohol use or returns to illicit drug use • when a child or young person moves out of stable accommodation • when a child or young person's lifestyle becomes chaotic and they fail to engage with support services • evidence of further offending behaviour or intelligence in support of an increase in the likelihood of reoffending • intelligence from victim services regarding contact or possible intimidation to a previously identified victim If there is a defensible decision recorded about the frequency and circumstances in which reviews would be undertaken, and this has been adhered to, then the inspector may conclude that reviews, as long as they are of good quality, are sufficient. In the absence of other evidence the NS are an appropriate benchmark upon which to base the timeliness of reviews. <u>National Standards 2013, 4.5-4.6 state:</u> For all orders ensure that a formal review of progress against plans is held either: • at a maximum of 6 monthly intervals, or • where, in the judgement of the case manager, any identified changes in the young person's life are so significant as to warrant a revision to the plan, or • prior to any decision to vary levels of contact in line with the scaled approach model, and at the conclusion of the YOT supervision as part of the case closure process For the inspector to judge that reviews were sufficient, it is likely that there will need to be evidence that the case manager has monitored and recorded progress against existing plans through gathering and recording the most up to date and relevant information relating to the child or young person's risks and needs. For a judgment that the review is timely to the needs of the case, the resulting reviewed plan must be completed within 15 working days of the initiation of this review. Where the young person is already subject to an existing intervention plan and is

			resentenced during its duration the case manager should have ensured that this plan was reviewed and amended where necessary. Reviews need to be genuine and not just a technical exercise. In particular they should include evidence of progress to date, involve and reflect the input of key agencies, take account of the child or young person's (and where appropriate a parent/carer's) views about progress, and include any alterations needed to the plan as a consequence of the review.
2.15.2	1.3.3	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.16.1	2.3.1	This question is asking whether the reviews of the plan held within the duration of this sentence were sufficient to manage and reduce the risk of harm. The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • Reviews were undertaken where necessary in a timely fashion and to a sufficient quality • The plan was revised as required based upon review	**Was there sufficient review, throughout the sentence, of plans to manage and reduce risk of harm to others?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this intervention plan is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The N/A option should be used where there was no requirement for a review of the planning to manage risk of harm to others. This could be because the sentence is too early in its running, there is no need in this area and therefore no need for planning or that the sentence ended swiftly pre any review being required. The guidance given for 2.15.1 is pertinent to this question but the inspector should also be mindful of the specific requirements of work to manage risk of harm management as given below: Planning of work to manage risk of harm should be reviewed alongside intervention plans and referral order contracts at appropriate points within the sentence. Any case could have a significant change which requires the assessment of risk of harm to be reviewed, which may also prompt review of planning, and the inspector should be alert to this within the case. Some examples of significant changes are: • when a child or young person has been 'out of contact' with the case manager for a period of time e.g. during a period of failed appointments leading to breach action • when a child or young person may resume excessive alcohol use or returns to illicit drug use and this has been linked to risk of harm issues • when a child or young person moves out of stable accommodation which had been acting as a protective factor against risk of harm • when a child or young person's lifestyle becomes chaotic and they fail to engage with

			support services • evidence of further offending behaviour or intelligence linked to an increasing risk of harm to others • intelligence from victim services regarding contact or possible intimidation to a previously identified victim Case managers should be able to anticipate and identify if risk factors relating to previous behaviour and/or offending are recurring, for example loss of stable accommodation or return to substance use. Alternatively, there could be cases where there are no previous indicators but behaviour suggests some concern such as associating with people who are known to cause harm to others. For MAPPA cases, the inspector will need to be satisfied that reviews have included MAPPA issues and that MAPPA actions have been integrated in the reviews as appropriate. In custodial cases the inspector will need to form a judgement as to whether plans are sufficiently clear as to what actions to reduce risk of harm are to be undertaken in custody and that the outcome / progress of those actions in regularly reviewed and adapted as necessary.
2.16.2	2.3.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.17.a	3.3.1	This question is asking whether the reviews of the plan held throughout the duration of this sentence were sufficient to address safeguarding and vulnerability issues The inspector will need to consider how well the indicators below have been addressed: Quality indicators: • Reviews were undertaken where necessary in a timely fashion and to a sufficient quality • The plan was revised as required based upon review	**Was there sufficient review, throughout the sentence, of plans to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the plan of intervention meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the plan outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this intervention plan is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The not applicable option should be used where there was no requirement for a review of the planning to address safeguarding and vulnerability. This could be because the sentence is too early in its running, there is no need in this area and therefore no need for planning or that the sentence ended swiftly pre any review being required. The guidance given for 2.15.1 is pertinent to this question but the inspector should also be mindful of the specific requirements of work to address safeguarding and vulnerability as given below: Safeguarding and vulnerability must be regularly and thoroughly reviewed, and following a significant change that might give rise to concern – this could include the reduction of protective factors or increase in risk factors associated with safeguarding needs such as

			homelessness, increased substance misuse or known associations with other offenders who present a risk to children or young people. The inspector will therefore need to be satisfied that reviews have been timely to the needs of the case and that changes in safeguarding factors are identified swiftly and acted upon appropriately. This could include planning to refer or re-refer to other agencies such as children's services or substance misuse agencies. In custodial cases the inspector will need to form a judgement as to whether sufficient attention has been given to safeguarding and vulnerability needs in preparation for release into the community and that these have been reviewed as appropriate within the custodial phase of the sentence.
2.17.2	3.3.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 2.20
2.20		Please briefly summarise the key factors that have influenced your judgements in this section. This should NOT be a repeat of your answers to the individual questions, but rather should help the Lead Inspector understand the context in which those judgements have been made. To assist the Lead Inspector please include sufficient relevant case characteristics to help them understand the case. In particular please include further details whenever you have used "Other" as the explanation for insufficiency. When summarising the key factors, remember that you have assessed decisions and actions taken in light of *appropriateness for the case circumstances*.	Please briefly summarise the key factors that have influenced your judgements in this section. This should NOT be a repeat of your answers to the individual questions, but rather should help the Lead Inspector understand the context in which those judgements have been made. To assist the Lead Inspector please include sufficient relevant case characteristics to help them understand the case. In particular please include further details whenever you have used "Other" as the explanation for insufficiency. When summarising the key factors, remember that you have assessed decisions and actions taken in light of *appropriateness for the case circumstances*. Please include comment on strengths found in the case, do not just focus on insufficiency.

View 3 – Delivery of Interventions (FJI only)

Question Number	Criterion	Quality Indicators	Extended Guidance
3.1.1	1.4.2	This question is asking the inspector to form a judgement on the consistency between what was assessed/planned by the YOT and what was done (irrespective of what the inspector thinks *should* have been done). Judgements on the quality and appropriateness of the actual interventions delivered are made in questions 3.7.1 onwards. Quality indicators: • The assessment is completed at the required point(s) in sentence • A plan has been produced which clearly indicates the interventions to be delivered • The link between the plan and intervention delivery is clear • Planned interventions have been delivered	**Were the interventions delivered to reduce reoffending sufficiently consistent with the identified reasons for offending and the planning of work in the case?** This question is asking whether the YOT delivered, with regard to reducing reoffending, what it had identified as required and had planned to do. It is therefore based on the YOT assessment and plan, and NOT on the opinion of the inspector of what should have been done in the case. It is about the ability of the case manager to translate their assessment and plan into actual delivery of interventions. Subsequent questions (3.7.1 onwards) will assess whether, in the opinion of the inspector, the appropriate interventions were delivered to satisfy their judgement on the needs of the case, and whether these were of good quality. Care should therefore be taken to avoid answering the subsequent questions against this one – other than to the extent that unless delivered interventions were substantive then they are likely to lead to a NO answer to this question. The inspector will need to form a judgement on whether delivered interventions were focused on reducing the likelihood of reoffending. Interventions to manage risk of harm and, in appropriate cases reduce vulnerability are dealt with in Q .3. 3 and 3.5. If the inspector judges that required interventions were not planned for primarily because the needs were not reflected in the assessment, this will already have been dealt with in View 1 and **would not be relevant to this one**. For the inspector to judge that sufficient consistency is evidenced, the intervention plan should reflect the key needs that have been identified in the assessments carried out by the YOT relating to the child or young person. Consequently the areas of work and objectives in the intervention plan should explicitly link to the factors related to offending identified from the assessment of likelihood of re-offending using Asset. The intervention as stated in the sentence plan should have been delivered as planned, to the extent appropriate to the current stage of the sentence. In cases where the assessment and plan are not consistent or the delivery of interventions appears unrelated to either it is likely that this question will be answered as NO. Where there is a delay to the delivery of specific interventions, or a change in their

			sequence, then the reasons for this should be clearly explained in the case record – if there is a clear and defensible rationale for the change then the inspector may answer YES to this question, however if there is no clear rationale the inspector can conclude that interventions were not delivered in line with the assessment and plan. For example, where the case manager has subsequently identified an urgent need which must take priority or they identify motivational concerns or barriers to engagement that need to be addressed before intervention can commence this should be recorded within the case record. Where diversity factors or other potential barriers to engagement have been identified in the YOT assessment the plan should be clear as to how these will be managed in order to reduce their impact upon the success of the interventions delivered. If the child or young person is being supervised in line with the Scaled Approach then the amount of work in the plan will vary dependent upon the Scaled Approach level. The higher the level the more complex and involved the plan should be with more involvement from others, and therefore the greater will be the volume of intervention that should be delivered by the current stage of the sentence. For example a plan for children and young people on the intensive level is likely to include more significant involvement from others such as substance misuse services, health services, education worker, etc. In custodial cases this question refers to the plan produced on release.
3.1.2	1.4.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.2.1	1.4.2	This question is asking the inspector to make a judgement on whether sufficient reviews of planned and delivered interventions were undertaken where required to support the reduction in likelihood of re-offending Quality indicators: • Reviews of the planned and delivered interventions were undertaken as required • Reviews were timely to the circumstances of the case • Reviews were of sufficient quality to the circumstances of the case • The reviews led to the delivery being adapted as required to the circumstances of the case	**Was there sufficient review of interventions delivered to reduce reoffending?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the reviews meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall there has been sufficient review of interventions within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient. The overarching principle is that interventions should be responsive to changes for the child or young person and regularly reviewed in line with the needs of the case. Therefore whilst the formal mechanism for review will be alongside a full review of Asset, this alone is not sufficient. The inspector should be satisfied that in addition to the above formal process the case manager continually assesses and reviews likelihood of re-offending and is mindful of this within each contact with the child or young person; continually reviewing the effectiveness and appropriateness of delivery and seeking to adapt it to the responsiveness and motivation of the child or young person.

			Whilst National Standards 2013 detail requirements for reviews of assessments and plans the review of interventions is not specifically referred to. HMI Probation considers that reviews of plans cannot be sufficient unless they are informed by a review of progress on the interventions – i.e. you can't do one properly without the other. Whilst the inspector will need to be satisfied that sufficient reviews have taken place appropriate to the full needs and circumstances of the case, National Standard 2013 4.5 lay out a benchmark for the timeliness for formal reviews of progress against plans which the inspector can consider in the absence of other evidence: • at a maximum of 6 monthly intervals, or • where, in the judgement of the case manager, any identified changes in the young person's life are so significant as to warrant a revision to the plan, or • prior to any decision to vary levels of contact in line with the scaled approach model, and • at the conclusion of the YOT supervision as part of the case closure process. Examples of significant change triggering a review of delivered interventions to reduce likelihood of re-offending could be: • A child or young person disengaging from services • Completion of tasks or a programme which has effected change for the child or young person • Further offending behaviour or intelligence of offending behaviour • Changes in living circumstances such as a parent/carer leaving or returning to the home, homelessness or other situational factors • A fresh sentence being made on a child or young person who is already under supervision
3.2.2	1.4.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.3.1	2.4	This question is asking the inspector to form a judgement on the consistency between what was assessed/planned by the YOT and what was done in <u>managing the risk of harm to others</u> (irrespective of what the inspector thinks should have been done) Quality Indicators: • An initial assessment was produced • A plan has been produced which clearly	**Were the interventions delivered to manage risk of harm to others consistent with the assessment and plan of work in the case?** This question is asking whether the YOT delivered, with regard managing risk of harm to others, the interventions it had identified as required and had planned to do. It is therefore based on the YOT assessment and plan, and NOT on the opinion of the inspector of what should have been done in the case. It is about the ability of the case manager to translate their assessment and plan into actual delivery of interventions. Subsequent questions will assess whether, in the opinion of the inspector, the appropriate interventions were delivered to satisfy their judgement on the needs of the case, and

		indicates the interventions to be delivered • The link between the plan and intervention delivery is clear • Planned interventions have been delivered	whether these were of good quality. Care should therefore be taken to avoid answering the subsequent questions against this one – other than to the extent that if any delivered interventions were not substantive then they are likely to lead to a NO answer to this question. The inspector will need to form a judgement on whether delivered interventions were focused on managing the risk of harm to others. Delivery of interventions to reduce the likelihood of re-offending and, in appropriate cases address safeguarding and vulnerability are dealt with in Q .3.1.1 and 3.5.1. Guidance given in question 3.1.1 remains pertinent to this question. If the inspector judges that required interventions were not planned for primarily because the needs were not reflected in the assessment, this will already have been dealt with in View 1 and **would not be relevant to this one**. For the inspector to judge that sufficient consistency is evidenced the areas of work and objectives in the intervention plan to manage risk of harm should explicitly link to the factors identified within the Asset assessment of risk of harm. In cases where the assessment and plan are not consistent or the delivery of interventions appears unrelated to either it is likely that this question will be answered as NO. Where the relevant assessment identified a risk of harm to actual or potential victims (including past victims), planned actions taken to monitor and protect the safety of these victims throughout the sentence, particularly for those deemed vulnerable, should be prioritised. The N/A option should be used where, in the assessment of the inspector, there were no risk of harm factors which required intervention.
3.3.2	2.4	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.4.1	2.4	This question is asking whether **in the opinion of the inspector** interventions which were required to manage risk of harm have been delivered. This question is based upon the judgement of the inspector as opposed to the assessment produced by the YOT. Quality Indicators: • The YOT recognised interventions which were required to manage the risk of harm indicators in this case • The YOT (or other agency as agreed)	**Were the required interventions delivered throughout the sentence to manage risk of harm to others?** The focus of this question moves on to whether the YOT delivered the correct interventions to manage risk of harm to others, irrespective of whether they had been correctly identified in the assessment and planning. This question recognises that sometimes the right things are done, even though the thinking that led to the delivery of interventions is unclear. Where that happens credit should be given for "doing the right thing" Therefore the inspector will be looking for evidence that the YOT was responsive to what was going on in the case and focusing throughout on protecting the public through responding to the circumstances they found in front of them and delivery of the correct interventions.

		delivered the required interventions to manage risk of harm indicators in this case • The YOT was reflective to changes in the case circumstances and adapted interventions as required	Subsequent questions will assess the quality of interventions that were delivered in this case – this question is restricted to whether, in the opinion of the inspector on the needs of the case, the right things were done. However to count as being "done" an intervention must be substantive. Before answering this question the inspector will need to form their own view, using the information that would have been available at the time, on what the needs of the case were. The N/A option should be used where, in the opinion of the inspector, there were no risk of harm factors which required attention during the delivery of the sentence. The inspector should be looking for confirmation that the YOT has recognised risk of harm indicators within the case and acted on them appropriately. Indicators which are likely to trigger the need for specific interventions to manage the risk of harm may include: • when a child or young person has been 'out of contact' with the case manager for a period of time e.g. during a period of failed appointments leading to breach action • when a child or young person may resume excessive alcohol use or returns to illicit drug use and this can appropriately be indentified as linked to risk of harm behaviour • when a child or young person moves out of stable accommodation and this can appropriately be indentified as linked to risk of harm behaviour • when a child or young person's lifestyle becomes chaotic and they fail to engage with support services and this can appropriately be indentified as linked to risk of harm behaviour • evidence of further offending behaviour or intelligence relating to further risk of harm related offending behaviour • intelligence indicating an increase in risk of harm to others If the inspector is able to identify risk of harm indicators which are not recognised by the YOT and then not addressed through appropriate intervention delivery AND this is a critical deficit in the full case circumstances this should result in a NO answer to this question.
3.4.2	2.4	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.4.3	2.4	See guidance on 3.4.1	**In this custodial case were the required interventions delivered throughout the custodial phase to manage risk of harm to others?** See guidance on 3.4.1
3.5.1	3.4	This question is asking the inspector to form a judgement on the consistency between what was assessed/planned by the YOT to address	**Were the interventions delivered throughout the sentence to address safeguarding and vulnerability consistent with the assessment and plan of work**

		safeguarding and vulnerability and what was done (irrespective of what the inspector thinks *should* have been done) Quality indicators: • The assessment is completed at the required point(s) in sentence • A plan has been produced which clearly indicates the interventions to be delivered • The link between the plan and intervention delivery is clear • Planned interventions have been delivered	**in the case?** This question is asking whether the YOT delivered, with regard to addressing safeguarding and vulnerability, the interventions it had identified as required and had planned to do. It is therefore based on the YOT assessment and plan, and NOT on the opinion of the inspector of what should have been done in the case. It is about the ability of the case manager to translate their assessment and plan into actual delivery of interventions. Subsequent questions will assess whether, in the opinion of the inspector, the appropriate interventions were delivered to satisfy their judgement on the needs of the case, and whether these were of good quality. Care should therefore be taken to avoid answering the subsequent questions against this one – other than to the extent that unless delivered interventions were substantive then they are likely to lead to a NO answer to this question. The inspector will need to form a judgement on whether delivered interventions were focused on addressing safeguarding and vulnerability. Delivery of interventions to reduce re-offending and, in appropriate cases, manage risk of harm is dealt with in Q .3.1.1 and 3.3.1. Guidance given in question 3.1.1 remains pertinent to this question, If the inspector judges that required interventions were not planned for primarily because the needs were not reflected in the assessment, this will already have been dealt with in View 1 and **would not be relevant to this one**. For the inspector to judge that sufficient consistency is evidenced the areas of work and objectives in the intervention plan to address safeguarding and reduce vulnerability should explicitly link to the factors identified within the Asset assessment. In cases where the assessment and plan are not consistent or the delivery of interventions appears unrelated to either it is likely that this question will be answered as NO. The N/A option should be used where, in the assessment of the inspector, there were no safeguarding and vulnerability needs which required specific intervention.
3.5.2	3.4	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.6.1	3.4	This question is asking whether **in the opinion of the inspector** interventions which were required to address safeguarding and vulnerability have been delivered. This question is based upon the judgement of the inspector as opposed to the assessment produced by the YOT. Quality Indicators:	**Were the required interventions delivered throughout the sentence to address safeguarding and vulnerability?** The focus of this question moves on to whether the YOT delivered the correct interventions to address safe guarding and reduce vulnerability, irrespective of whether they had been correctly identified in the assessment and planning. This question recognises that sometimes the right things are done, even though the thinking that led to the delivery of interventions is unclear. Where that happens credit should be given for "doing the right thing" Therefore the inspector will be looking for evidence that the YOT was responsive to what

		• The YOT recognised interventions which were required to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs in this case • The YOT (or other agency as agreed) delivered the required interventions to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs in this case • The YOT was reflective to changes in the case circumstances and adapted interventions as required	was going on in the case and focusing throughout on protecting the child or young person and reducing their vulnerability through responding to the circumstances they found in front of them and delivery of the correct interventions. Subsequent questions will assess the quality of interventions that were delivered in this case – this question is restricted to whether, in the opinion of the inspector on the needs of the case, the right things were done. However to count as being "done" an intervention must be substantive. Before answering this question the inspector will need to form their own view, using the information that would have been available at the time, on what the needs of the case were. The N/A option should be used where, in the assessment of the inspector, there were no safeguarding and vulnerability needs which required specific intervention. In particular the inspector should be satisfied that all necessary immediate action is taken to safeguard and protect the child or young person, and any other identified child or young person. This could include referrals to community agencies or children's services and may be based upon factors such as changes to: • emotional/mental health, e.g. depression, self-harm, attachment issues • Children who are Looked After • family, including siblings, e.g. criminality, violence within the home, involvement with significant others, i.e. gangs, offenders • environmental factors, e.g. inadequate housing, area they live in • parental behaviour, e.g. mental health needs, substance misuse, inconsistent parenting • behaviour of others, e.g. bullying, abuse, neglect, intimidation, exploitation, associates • events or circumstances, e.g. family separation, bereavement, change of care arrangements • own behaviour, e.g. substance misuse, type of offending, acting out, inappropriate responses to stress, weapon carrying • Being a young carer, for their own children or other family members • Other reckless behaviour that shows insufficient regard to their own safety If the inspector is able to identify safeguarding and vulnerability needs which are then not recognised by the YOT or addressed through appropriate intervention delivery AND this is a critical deficit in the full case circumstances this should result in a NO answer to this question.
3.6.1.1	3.4		

3.6.2	3.4	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.6.3	3.4	See guidance on 3.6.1	**In this custodial case were the required interventions delivered throughout the custodial phase to address safeguarding and vulnerability?** See guidance on 3.4.1
3.7.1	1.4.2	This question is asking **in the judgment of the inspector and not that of the YOT's assessment** whether required interventions were delivered to address likelihood of re-offending needs. That is – did the YOT deliver the right interventions based upon the inspector's assessment of needs in the case? Quality Indicators: • The YOT recognised interventions which were required to address the likelihood of re-offending in this case • The YOT (or other agency as agreed) delivered the required interventions to address the likelihood of re-offending in this case • The YOT was reflective to changes in the case circumstances and adapted interventions as required	**Based on the inspectors assessment of the needs in this case to reduce reoffending; was sufficient work done with this child or young person where required, to address each of the priority factors identified in question 2.1.0?** This question is based on the inspector's judgment of the needs of the case, irrespective of what was in the YOT assessment and planning. It is about the effectiveness of the delivery of the right services to meet the needs of the child or young person who has offended, irrespective of whether the choice was made using formal approved processes or otherwise. The quality of assessment and planning, and how well the delivery linked to these has already been dealt with in previous questions. This question does NOT focus on the quality of delivered interventions, solely on whether the right interventions were delivered. The quality of interventions is addressed in subsequent questions. However to count as being delivered an intervention must be substantive. Before answering this question the inspector will need to identify where they feel interventions to reduce the likelihood of reoffending should have been delivered up to the current point in the sentence. The inspector should then decide whether an intervention to address the likelihood of re-offending was required within each potential offending related factor in the case up to this point in time. The inspector should be mindful of the length of sentence and its intensity and form a view as to whether, in the full case circumstances, it is reasonable to expect an intervention to have been delivered in any of the identified at this point in the sentence. Where the need for an intervention is identified the inspector should record whether delivery of this was substantive **and** to a sufficient dosage for the needs of the case (YES) or not (NO). Therefore if an intervention was required and delivered but NOT to a sufficient dosage to meet the needs of the case then this question would be answered as NO with an explanation provided in question 3.20. If the inspector does not identify that an intervention should have been delivered to address any factor, that factor should be scored as N/A.
3.7.2	1.4.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20

		for this in question 3.20	
3.8.1	1.4.1	This question requires the inspector to make a judgement on a number of factors related to reducing the likelihood of reoffending. That is – whether what was delivered was of sufficient quality. Quality Indicators: • Interventions delivered where based on clear selection of their suitability which included appropriateness for the child or young person • The sequencing of interventions was appropriate to the individual needs of the child or young person and the case circumstances • Interventions had a clear delivery structure with clarity of aims and objectives, and intensity and duration of delivery • Interventions included the practice of new skills or changed behaviours and were in line with effective practice • The child or young person was sufficiently prepared for the intervention and their response to it is clear	This question, and the subsequent question, focus on whether the interventions that were actually delivered were of sufficient quality. Previous questions asked whether the right things were done, therefore the inspector should take care to avoid repeating that judgement here. **a)Were materials and other resources, used in the community for interventions to reduce re-offending, of good quality** Interventions should be focused with a clear aim and rationale with a basis in effective practice. To be of good quality the materials and other resources used for interventions to reduce the likelihood of re-offending should challenge the child or young person's thinking and behaviour with the aim of achieving a positive shift. They should be sufficiently flexible to be able to respond to the level of motivation, age and maturity, speech, language and communication needs and other diversity factors. The use of standard packages, such as *Teen Talk* or the AIM2 programme, for those who have committed sexually harmful behaviour, should ensure a level of quality; if guidance on their delivery is followed. However, packages that are designed for adults, such as *Targets for Change,* may not be as appropriate depending on the age and maturity of the child or young person. Interventions should be delivered in a way that enables the child or young person to engage more effectively taking into account any diversity, disability and other needs that they had. This includes adequately preparing the child or young person for the work, using materials that respond to their learning styles and employing structured work and support that enables the child or young person to apply and evaluate their learning. Where no interventions were delivered, N/A should be used **b) Were interventions in the community sufficiently delivered as their design intended them?** In terms of integrity of intervention delivery, the inspector will need to be to clear as to what the interventions actually were and where this is not clear, the inspector is likely to find that design was not implemented sufficiently well. In general interventions lose their integrity and effectiveness if not delivered sufficiently in line with their design. Any resources used should follow effective practice principles and there should be evidence of the case manager being sufficiently proficient in the intervention's delivery. In general case managers should be able to explain how interventions should have been delivered, and how the actual delivery reflected that; with any departure sufficiently defensible. For specific programmes such as AIM2 and Teen Talk the inspector should be clear that the

			case manager or delivering YOT worker understands the programme and has received sufficient guidance and training in its delivery. Where no interventions were delivered, N/A should be used **c) Did delivery of interventions give sufficient attention to restorative justice?** The inspector will be seeking evidence of active consideration of RJ and the needs of victims in all relevant cases, and if no evidence that reasonable efforts were made to contact a victim can be found then the answer should be NO. The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime (2013) states that if the offender in the case is under the age of 18, the victim (and their parents or guardian) are **entitled** to take part in Restorative Justice where available through the Youth Offending Team. The Youth Offending Team is required to give the victim information about what they do to help the victim decide whether they want to take part in Restorative Justice. They will also put measures in place to make sure any Restorative Justice activity the victim agrees to take part in is safe and victim led. (NB: Further details of the Victims Code can be found in the entry for question 4.2.1) Victims can ask the police not to share their details with a Youth Offending Team if they do not want to take part in Restorative Justice. The inspector will need to confirm that information gathered from any victim workers who have been involved in the case has been considered and, where appropriate, included in the interventions delivered to reduce likelihood of reoffending. This may include consideration of corporate victim needs where a child or young person has offended against a business, shop or similar and may, in these cases, be represented by a previously negotiated impact statement between the corporate enterprise and the YOT. The inspector should be looking, either on the case record or in discussion with the case manager, for evidence that the requirements of the Victims Code have been met in all relevant cases. (NB: National Standards 2009 indicated the need for active consideration of RJ in all relevant cases. This has been replaced with a requirement to meet the needs of the Victims Code) **If there is no evidence that reasonable efforts were made to contact a named victim, where this would have been appropriate, then it is unlikely that sufficient consideration has been given, and therefore the answer would be NO.** Interventions giving sufficient attention to RJ and victim needs could include RJ

			conferences, letters of apology, mediation (either shuttle or direct) or agreements for specific types of reparative activity. In general the victim should be involved in the decision on which interventions may be appropriate, or in the case of reparation have had the opportunity to do so, for these to count as restorative. Requirements which relate to victim safety, such as no contact, exclusion, prohibited activities, are effective immediately after sentence/release from custody. Where there has been no opportunity to deliver interventions related to restorative justice and meeting the needs of victims (such as where there is no named victim, no take up of victim contact or a victim can not be traced) this question should be answered as N/A **d) Was sufficient attention given to reinforcing positive factors in interventions to reduce reoffending?** In assessing whether sufficient attention has been given to reinforcing positive factors to reduce the risk of re-offending the inspector will firstly need to consider what positive factors existed in the case and where attention to them may contribute to a reduction in the likelihood of reoffending. They then need to judge how well these have been identified by the YOT and then to what extent they have been capitalised upon. Examples of interventions which aim to build upon existing or developing positive factors include involvement in community projects, sports or activity interests, re-involvement in family networks through family group conferencing or similar. Where the inspectors considers that there are no relevant positive factors linked to reducing the likelihood of re-offending this question should be scored as N/A **e) Was there an appropriate balance between interventions delivered to reduce re-offending, manage risk of harm and address vulnerability?** The balance between reducing the likelihood of re-offending, managing the risk of harm and addressing safeguarding and vulnerability needs is central to effective management of the case. The inspector should be looking for a balance which promotes victim safety and addressing safeguarding needs as a priority but in which delivery of intervention to reduce likelihood of re-offending is still given sufficient attention. Where the inspector finds that one domain takes precedence, the expectation exists that there should be a clear audit trail of the decisions leading to this and of plans to include other necessary interventions as the sentence is delivered. Therefore, taking into account the individual needs of the child or young person, the case manager should have assessed which of the planned interventions has priority and sequenced them accordingly, including those interventions to be delivered by partner agencies. Punitive and restrictive (curfew, reparation) requirements should commence as soon as possible and rehabilitative

			(education, addressing substance use, family relationships) elements should be run after or in parallel providing obstacles to engagement are removed. The decision to delay any rehabilitative intervention should however be recorded with clear explanations which are defensible in relation to whether the sequencing was appropriate or not. Where there is has been no opportunity to deliver interventions – for example where a child or young person quickly absconds and can not be traced – this question should be scored as N/A.
3.8.1.1		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.8.2	1.4.1	This question is asking the inspector to form a judgement on the overall quality of the interventions delivered and how well the interventions delivered matched the principles of Effective Practice.	**Overall, were the interventions delivered to reduce reoffending of sufficient quality, and delivered in accordance with the principles of effective practice?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the work undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the interventions delivered outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the quality of delivered interventions is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient. Effective practice is defined as practice that produces the intended results. In the case of children and young people who offend, effective practice should lead to the outcomes of: reduced offending, increased public protection and improved wellbeing of the child or young person. Effective practice can be described as being based on three principles – all of which should be evidenced in the delivery of requirements of an order. The principles relate to: • risk – in general the higher the likelihood of re-offending the more intensive and extended should be the supervision programme • needs – interventions/requirements that target needs related to offending are likely to be more effective • responsivity – interventions/requirements, which match the child or young person's learning styles and engage them, are likely to be more effective. Effective practice is about systematic and planned interventions which ensure that every aspect of the supervision of a child or young person contributes to the achievement of the desired outcomes. The inspector will need to feel confident that the work in the case being assessed has taken

			a holistic approach incorporating all the above three principles which has been focused on clearly defined outcomes. To be of good quality interventions should be designed and delivered in a way that is likely to achieve change or maintain change wherever possible, and should relate to the child or young person's capacity and motivation. Exercises should, for example, reflect the child or young person's age/maturity/culture/literacy levels. The quantity of each intervention that is delivered should also be sufficient, bearing in mind the circumstances of the case, other interventions that need to be delivered, and what could reasonably be achieved. The inspector will therefore be considering to what extent the intervention delivered has been matched to the individual characteristics of the child or young person. In addition to the need to prepare the child or young person appropriately for the intervention, there will usually need to be some follow-up work to reinforce any new skills/changes developed during the delivery of the intervention and the inspector will need to consider how well this has been incorporated in the intervention delivery. In general the delivery of interventions can not be considered to be of sufficient quality if the required interventions, according to the needs of the case, were not delivered. Therefore if any element of Q3.7.1 was answered as NO then particular care should be taken by the inspector before answering this question to weigh its importance relative to other work done in this case.
3.8.3		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.10.1		This question is about whether the sentence was delivered as one integrated process with no significant gaps or inconsistency between the custodial and community phases and with YOS staff appropriately involved in line with the needs of the case Quality indicators: • The custodial plan provided a clear plan for the whole sentence • The custodial plan included sufficient attention to resettlement including, where	**Was this custodial case delivered as a single integrated sentence?** A custodial sentence is a single sentence that normally has two phases, one in custody and one in the community. However sometimes it may appear to be treated as two different sentences and perceived as such by children and young people, so that on release they consider that they have completed their sentence. This is incorrect and when it occurs this question should be answered as NO. Sufficient focus should be given to addressing likelihood of reoffending, managing risk of harm, protecting the child or young person and reducing their vulnerability as appropriate throughout the sentence. It is not acceptable for work to reduce likelihood of reoffending to be excluded from sentence planning during the custodial phase of the sentence. Delivery of interventions in custody may be constrained by the establishment resources;

		appropriate, use of ROTL to support resettlement • The custodial plan sufficiently addressed likelihood of re-offending and interventions to be delivered in custody • The YOT case manager and other staff were sufficiently involved in custodial planning • Effective communication between community and custodial staff took place, with sufficient communication between community staff and the child or young person • The link between work completed in custody and in the community is sufficient	however the sentence plan should not be so constrained. To aid integration of the two phases of the sentence the YOT worker should be proactive in ensuring that as far as is possible the child or young person receives interventions during the custodial phase in line with the assessment. Where there is a need that cannot be met due to constraints within the establishment, the YOT worker should plan to overcome that barrier, for example by pursuing a transfer to a more appropriate establishment, or engage external resources and negotiate their use by the establishment, or deliver an intervention themselves. For example where a child or young person wants to sit the General Certificate in Secondary Education (GCSEs) that have been disrupted by custody, the YOT worker will pursue the possibility and not be a passive observer of the process. In this way the YOT worker is moving towards a situation of increased re-integration for the child or young person on their resettlement back into the community. In some cases it may be appropriate to deliver an intervention following release from custody, but that intention should be made clear in custodial plans and be clearly understood by the child or young person. Where interventions are reviewed and are ineffective, the YOT worker should promote the use of different interventions. They should also have taken sufficient steps to ensure that they have gathered the child or young person's response to the interventions which they have received. The inspector should look for evidence within the case that sufficient attention has been given to resettlement during the custodial phase of the sentence so that community sentence plans draw on and complement work undertaken in custody. This could include the transfer of information on work completed in custody onto community agencies who will continue with the service delivery or a referral to a community agency following the disclosure of a new need in custody. Specifically the inspector should be satisfied that there is good and effective communication between all workers involved in the case, including health, ETE, children's social care and substance misuse workers as appropriate with clear communication between services in custody and then on release into the community. There should also be evidence that sufficient attention has been given to resettlement during the custodial phase of the sentence and that community sentence plans draw on and complement work undertaken in custody. For resettlement – this can include use of Release On Temporary Licence (ROTL) to support accommodation, family networks and ties or ETE provision.

3.10.2		This question is asking whether in the judgement of the inspector sufficient interventions to address likelihood of re-offending were delivered during the custodial phase for the needs of the case	**Specifically, were sufficient interventions delivered during the custodial phase to address reoffending?** To be sufficient, in answer to the question, the required interventions should have been delivered **AND** they should have been delivered to a sufficient quality. The inspector should refer to their judgement in 3.8.a and 3.10.a in answering this question. As an overarching principle, the interventions to address likelihood of reoffending should be consistent with the assessment and plan of work in the case. Therefore the inspector will want to be clear that the custodial plan and delivery was based upon a relevant assessment and that interventions commenced in a timely fashion. There should be specific attention in the delivery of interventions in custody to resettlement and re-integration post release and this should include, where indicated as an offending risk in the assessment, work to address health, substance misuse, ETE or care arrangement needs. All interventions delivered to reduce likelihood of re-offending should be responsive to reviews of likelihood of reoffending and progress made, along with the needs and abilities of the child or young person. Where an assessed need relative to likelihood of re-offending is present but there is no intervention either planned or available in the establishment, the inspector will expect to see evidence of proactive work by the YOT to remedy the situation. This could include work to provide services from an outside agency, a request for a move to a more suitable establishment where the individual needs of the child or young person can be met or other actions. However if, in the opinion of the inspector, delivery of an intervention during the custodial is so important that it should not wait until release, and this has not happened due to unavailability or other inappropriate reasons, then this question should be answered as NO. NB: This question does not contribute to the overall inspection scores for the YOT.
3.10.3		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.12.1	2.4	This question is asking about the activeness and effectiveness of risk of harm management throughout the delivery of interventions. That is – was the delivery of work to manage risk of harm **sufficiently responsive to what was going on in the case and of good quality**? The focus throughout should be on protecting the public through delivery with the YOT responding to the	**Was there sufficient active and effective management of risk of harm to others throughout the delivery of interventions in this case?** This question is about the quality of work undertaken, during the delivery of the sentence, to manage risk of harm to others, and whether that work responded sufficiently to changing circumstances. It is based on the opinion of the inspector about what should have been done, not on the assessment and plans of the YOT, which will have been addressed in previous questions. NB: This question is about case management, it is NOT about oversight of practice by line

		circumstances they found in front of them. The inspector will be looking for evidence that the YOT has anticipated, indentified and responded to changes in the case circumstances, and that the work they have undertaken is of good quality. Quality Indicators: • The management of risk of harm was given sufficient priority with both planned intervention and necessary interventions delivered to a good quality • The management of risk of harm gave sufficient priority to protecting identifiable victims • Where indicated, engagement with MAPPA was sufficient and effective • Engagement with other multi agency forums was sufficient and effective • The review of risk of harm management was sufficient with changes to risk of harm recognised and the response appropriate • Home visits were carried out, where necessary, as part of the active management of risk of harm	managers, which is dealt with in view 4. The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the management of risk of harm meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in this outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the delivery of work to manage risk of harm is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. This question may be answered as 'N/A' if the child or young person presented no risk of harm to others at the start of the order and continued to demonstrate no propensity towards developing a risk of harm to others throughout the sentence. In all cases where a risk of harm to others and/or risk of serious harm has been identified, the inspector should look for evidence that this has been both addressed and contained and that YOT staff and other agencies working with the child or young person understand the risk of harm posed by them and the agency's contribution to its management. This question is about the quality of work delivered so it will not be sufficient to see evidence just of risk of harm management processes (e.g. MAPPA, specific risk management plans, multi agency risk management forum) rather, there will need to be sufficient evidence that actions have made a difference, and the case manager has ensured risk of harm containment measures have been implemented or changes to risk of harm have been identified and actively responded to. Therefore changes in risk of harm factors should be identified swiftly and acted upon appropriately, including use of breach proceedings in appropriate cases to protect the public. The inspector will need to be satisfied that appropriate contingency planning has taken place for change factors which could reasonably be anticipated – for example a return to substance misuse, a renewed association with an offending peer where risk of harm factors are presented, the removal of protective factors – and that where necessary contingency plans have been enacted. The inspector will need to see evidence that the Interventions to manage risk of harm, whether constructive or restrictive, are delivered as required, are appropriate to the circumstances of the case, and are of good quality (see guidance for 3.8.1), irrespective of whether they had been identified during the assessment and planning. For this to have occurred there will need to be evidence that active management measures have been implemented, are monitored and effective, e.g. • Curfew restrictions have been monitored and there is evidence that the child or young person has kept to the curfew requirements

			• Restrictive conditions to contain risk of harm *to others*, e.g. a non contact licence condition, have been monitored and there is evidence of compliance by the child or young person • Breach/enforcement action has been taken swiftly in response to possible raised risk of harm *to others*, e.g. in response to loss of contact • Monitoring of substance use, when related to risk of harm, has occurred and any inappropriate use by the child or young person has been responded to appropriately • MAPPA and/or other risk of harm management forums have been convened, and actions arising from them effectively delivered • There has been active liaison with victim workers (and where necessary the probation victims unit) and other relevant agencies involved in the management of risk of harm to ensure effective joint working with others involved in the case to manage risk of harm to actual/identified and potential victims. • Case managers have thought "risk of harm" throughout their contact with the child or young person • Purposeful home visits have been carried out in accordance with the assessed level of risk of harm throughout the course of the sentence and that such visits may be multi agency where indicated by the circumstances of the case – e.g. jointly with a police officer where intelligence is being sought or confirmed. The case manager should have clearly identified the objectives of the home visit (including recording these in any specific plan to manage risk of harm or contact log as appropriate) and should be seeking to address those objectives during the visits. The inspector should also find evidence that risk of harm is regularly and thoroughly reviewed at appropriate times for the circumstances of the case and following a significant change that might give rise to concern, and that interventions are amended as appropriate. Significant change include joint working with the local Probation Trust and other YOTs to ensure the continuity of services to manage risk of harm when a child or young person reaches 18 or moves out of area and may be especially noted in cases of Children Looked After who may be subject to repeat moves.
3.12.2	2.4	This question is asking whether MAPPA and any other multi-agency risk management arrangements made an effective contribution to the management of risk of harm, during the delivery phase of the sentence. Quality indicators: • Where necessary, YOT case managers and all other relevant staff contributed effectively to MAPPA processes and other	**Specifically were MAPPA and other multi-agency arrangements effective in the management of risk of harm to others in this case?** This question may be answered as 'N/A' if there was no requirement for involvement in MAPPA or other multi agency meetings to manage risk of harm. This question is NOT just about whether MAPPA and any other relevant process took place as required, but rather it is about whether it was effective in making a positive and sufficient difference to the management of risk of harm in this case. The inspector should be satisfied that the case was correctly identified as a MAPPA case at

		multi-agency meetings relating to risk of harm which included following through actions from meetings • - these multi-agency processes made a positive and effective contribution to the effective management of risk of harm, as their purpose intended	an early stage and that required processes were then activated. However to be effective MAPPA processes should have led to positive outcomes which were clearly focussed on and contributed to improving the management of risk of harm to others. Where a case did not initially meet MAPPA criteria but this changed – for example further intelligence on risk factors, further offending behaviour which caused a risk of harm to others – the inspector should expect to see consideration of re-referral within the case.
3.12.3		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.14.1	3.4	This question is asking about the activeness and effectiveness of work to address safeguarding and vulnerability throughout the delivery of interventions. That is – was delivery to manage safeguarding and vulnerability responsive to what was going on in the case and of good quality? The focus throughout should be on protecting the child or young person from their own behaviour or the behaviour of others through delivery of interventions with the YOT responding to the circumstances they found in front of them, and that the work they have undertaken is of good quality. The inspector will be looking for evidence that the YOT has anticipated, indentified and responded to changes in the case circumstances. Quality indicators: • The management of safeguarding and vulnerability was given sufficient priority with both planned intervention and necessary interventions delivered to a good quality • Where indicated as necessary, the YOT has taken all immediate action to protect the child or young person or any other identified child or young person • Referrals necessary to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs have	**Was there sufficient active and effective management of safeguarding and vulnerability throughout the delivery of interventions in this case?** This question is about the quality of work undertaken, during the delivery of the sentence, to address safeguarding and reduce vulnerability, and whether that work responded sufficiently to changing circumstances. It is based on the opinion of the inspector about what should have been done, not on the assessment and plans of the YOT, which will have been addressed in previous questions. NB: This question is about case management, it is NOT about oversight of practice by line managers, which is dealt with in view 4. The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the work undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the work outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this piece of work is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. This question may be answered as 'N/A' if the child or young person presented minimal safeguarding needs at the start of the order and continued to demonstrate no propensity towards developing safeguarding or vulnerability needs throughout the order. This question relates to the broad needs that are necessary to ensure that a child or young person receives services relevant to their safeguarding and vulnerability (in particular where vulnerability *is related to their offending behaviour*) but also to any immediate action that is necessary to protect the child or young person under supervision or any other identified child or young person. To consider that the active management of the delivery of interventions to address safeguarding and vulnerability was sufficient the inspector will need to consider whether:

		been made • The YOT has had sufficient engagement with multi agency forums which has included joint working with children's social care where necessary • In custodial cases the YOT undertook sufficient engagement with the establishment • The review of risk safeguarding and vulnerability needs was sufficient with changes to safeguarding and vulnerability recognised and the response appropriate • Home visits were carried out, where necessary, as part of the active management of safeguarding and vulnerability	• Interventions to promote safeguarding and reduce vulnerability receive sufficient priority • Interventions to promote safeguarding and reduce vulnerability are delivered as planned, appropriate to the case circumstances and are of good quality (see guidance to Q3.8.a in relation to quality of interventions) • YOT staff and all relevant agencies work together effectively to promote the safeguarding and reduce the vulnerability of the child or young person. Where other agencies are working with a child or young person, there should be joint planning and clarity over role and responsibility. • Specifically, each agency's work (both the statutory and voluntary sectors) should integrate with the others, feeding into them where appropriate, e.g. care plan, protection plan, pathway plan or personal education plan • Safeguarding and vulnerability should be regularly and thoroughly reviewed and further actions taken where needed. • Staff should "think safeguarding" throughout their contacts with children and young people. • In particular where indicated by changes in circumstances, all necessary immediate action should be taken to safeguard and protect the child or young person, and any other identified child or young person. • Purposeful home visits are carried out in accordance with any safeguarding needs throughout the course of the sentence, allowing the case manager to gather further insight in to the family and its needs in a way that office based contact can not do. • In custodial cases the secure establishment is made aware of vulnerability needs as soon is practicable, i.e. prior to sentence or upon reception at the latest and that where indicated these needs are acted on. In custodial cases sufficient attention is given to safeguarding and vulnerability needs in preparation for release into the community.
3.14.2	3.4	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.16.1	1.5	Where a transfer to probation or to/from another YOT takes place this should be clear on the case file. Quality indicator: • Where transfer took place, joint working with the local Probation Trust and other YOTs facilitated the smooth transfer of cases and the continuity of services.	Limited guidance is provided – this is a straight YES or NO factual question. However if a transfer has taken place the inspector should take particular care to check that dates of transfer, so that they inspect only the required portion(s) of the case. If the inspector's judgement is that a transfer probably took place but this is not clear from the case records this question must be answered as YES, with an explanation provided at question 3.20.

3.16.2		The inspector should be careful to identify all transfers, whether in or out of the area, which have taken place in the case during the sentence under inspection. Particular care is required in cases of Children Looked After who may have experienced a number of placements within the life of the sentence.	The inspector should be careful to identify all transfers, whether in or out of the area, which have taken place in the case during the sentence under inspection. Particular care is required in cases of Children Looked After who may have experienced a number of placements within the life of the sentence.
3.16.3	1.5	The inspector is being asked to make a judgement as to whether, when cases are transferred, joint working with the local Probation Trust and other YOTs ensures the continuity of services to manage risk of harm, reoffending, safeguarding and the effective delivery of the sentence. Quality Indicator: • When transfer took place, the YOT complied with local protocols which, where necessary, included clear discussion with Probation regarding transfer arrangements • The transfer was appropriate to the child or young person's vulnerability • The child or young person and their parents were sufficiently involved in the transfer process • Completion of the transfer is clear from the case record • The transfer took place with clear agreement about timings and responsibilities • The transfer took place with timely provision of all required information to/from the YOT • Where other partners were providing intervention services, they were sufficiently involved in transfer arrangements • There was sufficient focus on maintaining motivation and engagement during the transfer process	**If the case was transferred in or out, was joint working effective in facilitating a smooth transfer and continuity of services to address:** **Reoffending** **Risk of harm to others** **Safeguarding** **Effective delivery of the sentence?** The inspector should look for explicit evidence of effective joint working to facilitate a smooth transfer to the probation trust or to/from another YOT including: • That local (and where indicated national) transfer protocols have been complied with. National Standards 2013 8.3 "Follow relevant local and YJB guidance when transferring cases within the YOT, between YOTs or to the local probation area/trust (as outlined within the local YOT probation protocol)". • That the YOT has given credible consideration to transfer and, where this does not take place, the reasons for continuing to supervise the child or young person within the YOT is clearly recorded and is defensible to the needs of the case. This could be reasons of continuation of services where a similar service is not available in adult services or another YOT or where the individual needs of the child or young person can best be met by completing the sentence with the existing YOT. It should not be based upon ease of service delivery alone. • That specific attention has been made to care arrangements for Children Looked After which will include notification of statutory reviews to the receiving YOT and agreement as to YOT representation within these plus feedback and information sharing mechanisms • That there is clear evidence of the timeliness of transfer - the date for the Trust or YOT to assume responsibility is agreed and noted, most likely within the case diary entries but possibly within a transfer assessment or updated intervention plan • That all relevant assessments and plans have been reviewed and updated as necessary including with progress to date and any continuing diversity factors or barriers to engagement. This will include the ASSET assessment, the intervention plan, any required specific management plans for risk of harm or safeguarding and vulnerability needs and possibly MAPPA plans. That updated information has been shared in a timely fashion ahead of the agreed transfer date

			• That where indicated by the specific circumstances of the case, a three way transfer meeting has been arranged. This may depend upon geographical factors but wherever possible (e.g. within one locality area or to/from an adjacent area) a three way transfer meeting is good practice and will help the child or young person maintain compliance in their move to adult criminal justice services or to/from another YOT. It may be that transfer to adult services is undertaken by a dedicated worker with the YOT – most typically but not exclusively the seconded probation officer. In more complex cases it may be that a three-way hand over is required irrespective of the geographical difficulties. • That the transfer has been completed and the case appropriately closed off to the YOT All the above guidance about transfers out applies equally to transfers in from another YOT.
3.16.3	1.5	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.18.1	4.1.1	The child or young person and their parents/carers are meaningfully engaged throughout the delivery of the sentence Quality indicators: • In custodial cases, there was sufficient engagement with the CYPO and their parents/carers outside of formal planning meetings • There was sufficient involvement of the child or young person and their parents/carers and significant others in reviews of progress and their views were sufficiently reflected • There was sufficient involvement of parents/carers and significant others in the delivery of interventions • Staff developed and maintained positive relationships with the child or young person and their parents/carers • For Children Looked After, evidence of the social worker being sufficiently	**Were children and young people, and their parents/carers or significant others, meaningfully and sufficiently engaged throughout the delivery of the sentence?** The inspector should look for explicit evidence that the child or young person and their parent/carer and where appropriate significant others, such as extended family members or community workers, have been meaningfully engaged throughout sentence delivery including: • For meaningful engagement in the delivery and review of the sentence, the inspector will need to be satisfied that parents and carers are involved as appropriate throughout the delivery of the sentence, particularly to support the work of the YOT. Evidence of this could be found through case diary entries, particularly with reference to home visits and any specific parenting or family work which could possibly involved other agencies such as children's services. Where increased offending behaviour risks are identified within the family, the inspector should be finding additional family contact and a higher level of home visits. Other examples of engagement with the family could include use of family meetings or family group conferencing, liaison with extended family network or use of interpreters or members of the community for additional support where indicated • Following on form the plan, the inspector should be looking for evidence that the child or young person and their parents/carers and significant others are meaningfully involved in reviews of progress which clearly reflect the child or young person and parent/carers views on progress made and future priorities for change. As with the planning the inspector should be looking for evidence that individual needs including speech, language and communication needs and other potential discriminatory factors have been considered and that reviews have taken these into

		involved in delivery and review of interventions whether in the community or custody • There is sufficient evidence of support, motivation and positive reinforcement being provided to the child or young person	account. • The inspector should be satisfied that any workers involved with the child or young person have sought to maintain a positive working relationship with the child or young person, motivate them and reinforce positive behaviour. This can include the use of motivational interviewing techniques, pro social modelling or other communication and support methods. Critically the inspector will need to be satisfied that the worker has not adopted a 'one size fits all' approach to their work with the child or young person but has assessed their individual needs and the best way to work to maximise the potential for a successful outcome to the sentence. • During the custodial phase the inspector should be satisfied that, appropriate to the needs of the case, YOT staff have sufficient direct involvement with children and young people. Inspectors should take particular care to check that practitioners are engaging with children and young people on their own outside of the formal planning meeting, since this is vital to ensuring that planning is able to reflect the genuine voice of the child or young person • For Children Looked After the local authority social worker should be involved in delivery of interventions, particularly where they are cross cutting with welfare needs and where additional motivational support may be required when the child or young person is away from the YOT. This could also include joint work with the YOT case manager on family reintegration, or otherwise to promote safeguarding and address vulnerability needs.
3.18.2	4.1.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 3.20
3.20a		Please briefly summarise the key factors that have influenced your judgements in this section. This should NOT be a repeat of your answers to the individual questions, but rather should help the Lead Inspector understand the context in which those judgements have been made. To assist the Lead Inspector please include sufficient relevant case characteristics to help them understand the case. In particular please include further details whenever you have used "Other" as the explanation for insufficiency. When summarising the key factors, remember that you have assessed decisions and actions	Please briefly summarise the key factors that have influenced your judgements in this section. This should NOT be a repeat of your answers to the individual questions, but rather should help the Lead Inspector understand the context in which those judgements have been made. To assist the Lead Inspector please include sufficient relevant case characteristics to help them understand the case. In particular please include further details whenever you have used "Other" as the explanation for insufficiency. When summarising the key factors, remember that you have assessed decisions and actions taken in light of *appropriateness for the case circumstances*. Please include comment on strengths found in the case, do not just focus on insufficiency.

		taken in light of *appropriateness for the case circumstances*.	
3.20b		**Interventions module only:** The lead inspector will benefit from having details of the interventions that were actually delivered to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. Please identify each intervention clearly and provide comments on each as requested in the question.	**Interventions module only:** The lead inspector will benefit from having details of the interventions that were actually delivered to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. Please identify each intervention clearly and provide comments on each as requested in the question.

View 4 – Initial Outcomes

Question Number	Criterion	Quality Indicators	Extended Guidance
4.1	2.1	In the inspectors' judgement, has the risk of harm posed by this individual to others has been reduced since the sentence began?	This question is based on the opinion of the inspector. It is not a scored judgement; rather it determines whether outcome questions related to risk of harm are relevant to this case. The not applicable option should ONLY be used where there were no indicators of risk of harm to others in the initial assessment; that the assessment was, in the judgement of the inspector, correct and there has been no change throughout the sentence to date
4.2.1	2.1	This question is asking whether the YOT has effectively managed the risk of harm to identifiable and potential victims including through accurate assessment, planning and delivery of services. Quality indicators: • Sufficient assessment has taken place to identify actual and potential victims and the nature of the risk of harm to them • Sufficient planning has taken place to manage risk of harm to identifiable and potential victims • The work required to manage the risk of harm to others has been undertaken by the YOT or others • Where indicated, MAPPA processes have been used effectively in managing the risk of harm to identifiable and potential victims	**Where there is an identifiable victim or identifiable potential victim is there sufficient evidence that the risk of harm to them has been effectively managed?** The overarching principle is that work to manage risk of harm increases the safety of actual and potential victims. This must begin with a quality assessment which clearly specifies the nature and level of risk to actual and potential victims, including the public and staff, and responds appropriately to any diversity or potential discriminatory factors in the case. Assessment of risk of harm should be timely to meet the needs of the case, of sufficient quality and be regularly reviewed to reflect any known or anticipated changes in risk of harm level or nature. In managing risk of harm to identified or potential victims a comprehensive and current plan to manage risk of harm is completed where required and it covers risk to specific victims where applicable. Plans to manage risk of harm are consequently clear and specific, appropriate to the circumstances of the case, with a clear link between assessment and the plan. In managing the risk or harm to others it is essential that priority is given to delivery of constructive interventions related to risk of harm, and monitoring of restrictive interventions. This may include multi agency working, which may include MAPPA or other risk management processes. Similarly actions in relation to management of risk to victims identified through MAPPA or other management processes must be completed and information shared as necessary for the needs of the case and the protection of identified and potential victims. The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the work undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in management of risk of harm to victims outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the work to manage risk of harm to victims has been sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of

			a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. If Statutory Victim Contact (see explanation of Victim Contact Scheme below) applied to this case; and the YOT has not: - taken sufficient steps to check that appropriate processes are in place - ensured that all cases that meet the offence and sentence criteria are notified to the probation service - supported the work of the victim liaison officer (VLO) then the inspector would normally answer NO to this question. The N/A option should be used where there is no identifiable actual or potential victim. **The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime (2013)** states that Youth Offending Teams must: • make sure any Restorative Justice initiatives involving the victim are in line with recognised quality standards, such as the Restorative Service Standards; • consider whether to invite the victim to a Restorative Justice activity; • keep victims' personal data securely and separate from data relating to offenders; • when contacted by victims, explain the Youth Offending Team's role to allow victims to make an informed choice on whether they wish to participate in Restorative Justice activities; • consider when it is inappropriate to offer Restorative Justice given the sensitivities of the case and/or the vulnerability of the victim, particularly in cases involving sexual or domestic violence, human trafficking, stalking and child sexual exploitation. **It is important that no-one is pressured into Restorative Justice**; • obtain the written consent of any victims willing to engage in direct victim reparation or restorative processes; • consult with victims and the community (where appropriate) about reparation placements and willingness to engage in restorative processes; • ensure that any reparation activity required of a child or young person under a court order or an out of court disposal is set out in writing, specifying the type of activity, dates, times and duration. This must be explained fully to the child or young person and his or her parents/carers; • ensure victims' safety by providing all necessary safeguards throughout the preparation for the Restorative Justice activity and the activity itself; • ensure appropriate training is provided to staff working with victims. Victims are **entitled** to the following from the Youth Offending Team: • information about the progress of the offender's case; • information on victims' services if you want to get any additional support; • to take part in Restorative Justice (if suitable).

Victim Contact Scheme

Under the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004, Probation Trusts have statutory responsibilities in relation to victims (and their families) under prescribed circumstances. This is known as the Victim Contact Scheme. The responsibility for the delivery of statutory victim contact remains with the National Probation Service under the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms.

The Youth Justice Board has issued guidance to youth offending teams regarding their responsibilities for ensuring that victims entitlements are met in cases where statutory victim contact applies. Under this Act both probation trusts and YOTs have responsibilities in relation to the victims (and their families) of an offender who either:

- receives a sentence of imprisonment of 12 months or more after being convicted of a sexual or violent offence (NB: a 12 month DTO satisfies this requirement, even though half of it is normally served in the community)
- is convicted of a sexual or violent offence and receives a Restricted Hospital Order
- is transferred to prison under the Mental Health Act 1983 with a Restriction Direction
- receives a Hospital and Limitation Direction.

For the purposes of this legislation, a qualifying sexual or violent offence is one of the following:

- murder or an offence specified in Schedule 15 to the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (c. 44)
- an offence in respect of which the patient or offender is subject to the notification requirements of Part 2 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 (c. 42))
- an offence against a child within the meaning of Part 2 of the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act 2000.

Under the Victim Contact Scheme the qualifying victim is entitled to a specific minimum range of services, as follows:

- ask for conditions to be put on the offender if they are released. For example, these could include conditions that the offender is not allowed to make contact with them in any way;
- be told when the offender is released from prison or hospital and any conditions put

			on them which relate to them; • be told about any other important information which the Youth Offending Team (or Probation Trust) think the victim should be told; • be told that they can choose at any time not to take part in the Victim Contact Scheme. If a victim chooses to take part in the Victim Contact Scheme they will be assigned a Victim Liaison Officer (VLO) who will act as their point of contact. They keep victims informed about important stages in the offender's sentence. They also make sure that the victim's views and worries are shared with the prison or Parole Board when they are discussing whether to release the offender. The victim liaison officer is required to: • contact victims of sexual and violent offences when the offender was sentenced to a custodial sentence of 12 months or more • establish whether the victim wants to be informed of any conditions to which the offender may be subject on release which affect them or their family (these are usually non-contact or geographical exclusion conditions) • establish whether the victim wants to make any representations regarding conditions to the body considering release, which, in recent times, has been extended to include the opportunity to submit a victim personal statement • offer the same service to the next of kin and other family members in cases where the victim died as a result of the offence. Where the victim has decided to participate in the victim contact scheme, the victim liaison officer should contact the YOT case manager to ensure that he or she is fully aware of the victim's views so that they can be properly considered within sentence-planning. Where YOTs have engaged with a victim for the purposes of delivering a restorative intervention, they should agree with the victim liaison officer how both agencies will work together to support the victim. If the offender is under 18 and is being supervised by a Youth Offending Team, the Youth Offending Team will contact the victim of the offence directly if the victim is not receiving support under the Victim Contact Scheme. **Serious Further Offence Victim Summary Reports** A serious further offence is defined as a serious violent or sexual offence under Schedule 15A of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 which attracts a maximum of 14 years imprisonment or an indeterminate sentence.

			The responsibilities for Youth Offending Teams are the same as those for the probation trust where an offender commits a Serious Further Offence (SFO) while they are under statutory supervision, or shortly after this supervision has ended. The supervising agency will carry out a SFO Review (or Serious Case Review (SCR)) to investigate how the case was managed and whether or not there are any lessons to be learned to improve future practice. In the case of particular kinds of SFO (murder, manslaughter or death by dangerous driving; rape, assault by penetration, or a sexual offence against a child under 13 years of age; or an attempt of any of the above) where the offender was charged on or after 1 April 2013, the victim is entitled to ask for a Victim Summary Report of the SFO Review. The victim or bereaved close family member of the victim is **entitled** to receive a Victim Summary Report even if they have decided not to opt in to the Victim Contact Scheme.
4.2.2	2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.3.1	2.1	This question is asking whether, on balance, the YOT has managed risk of harm to others sufficiently well in this case. That is overall across the sentence to date was the work good enough in managing risk of harm to others or were any deficits critical to the management of risk? Quality indicators: • Sufficient assessment has taken place to identify actual and potential victims • Sufficient planning has taken place to manage risk of harm to identifiable and potential victims • The work required to manage the risk of harm to others has been undertaken by the YOT or others • Where indicated, MAPPA processes have been used effectively in managing the risk of harm to identifiable and potential	**Overall, has the YOT done enough to keep to a minimum this individual's risk of harm to others?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the work undertaken during the sentence to date meets the needs of the case to protect the public – i.e. does sufficiency in the work outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that on balance work to manage risk of harm to others is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The overarching principle is that all necessary steps have been taken to keep risk of harm to a minimum within the needs of the case and that management is defensively appropriate to the circumstances of the case. As such, there should be evidence of the steps made to identify the victim(s) wherever reasonably possible and, where identification has not been possible, of the steps taken and any outstanding action with a timeline for delivery. The assessment of risk of harm should be considered sufficient within the context of the case and the inspector should refer back to Q1.10.1 and Q1.10.2 in making a judgement. Similarly planning should be appropriate to the case circumstances and in forming a

		victims • Sufficient attention has been paid to the sustainability of changes made to reduce the risk of harm to others	judgement the inspector should refer back to Q2.8.1 and Q2.8.2. This will include effective uses of MAPPA where indicated. Further reference should be made to Q3.3.1 and 3.4.1 which concern the delivery of interventions. For the inspector to judge that overall the risk of harm has been sufficiently well managed they should be confident that the work identified as necessary has been delivered to an appropriate quality by either the YOT or, where agreed, others. Sufficient attention should have been given to the sustainability of any progress made, evidence for which is likely to be found in work to reinforce progress made, in support plans for once the YOT withdraws from the case, or in referral to other support mechanisms.
4.3.2	2.1	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.4.1	2.5	This question is asking the inspector to form a judgement on how well the quality of risk of harm work was supported by effective management oversight which was appropriate to the case circumstances. Quality indicators: • Where required by the needs of the case, management oversight has been provided in a timely manner • Management oversight has addressed any deficiencies in assessment or planning to manage risk of harm • Management oversight has ensured that the YOT or others delivered required services • Where required, the use of internal forum has been effective in ensuring the quality of services '	**Was oversight by management effective in ensuring the quality of risk of harm work in this case?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of management oversight of risk of harm work meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall management oversight is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The N/A option should be used where there is no requirement for management oversight If risk of harm indicators exist but have not been identified or addressed, and reasonable information or monitoring systems could have identified these, this would indicate insufficient management oversight. However managers cannot be hold accountable for things that they could not reasonably have been expected to know. Effective management oversight of risk of harm includes elements of quality assurance (including, but much more than, countersigning), staff supervision, dealing with developing areas of concern in individual cases and facilitating improvements in practice. It is particularly focussed on ensuring that actual or potential victims in individual cases are sufficiently protected from harm. To be considered sufficient oversight should identify any deficits in practice, ensure that remedial actions are identified and that practitioners confirm that required actions have been taken, although the precise nature of confirmation may vary depending on the experience of the practitioner. Just asking for tasks to be undertaken, without ensuring they have been done, is not effective oversight and would indicate that this question be answered as insufficient.

			In order to provide effective oversight, managers should themselves understand the assessment and planning processes regarding indicators of raised risk of harm and be able to recognise both good and insufficient practice within the needs of the case. To be considered as sufficient, management oversight should focus on getting the required service delivered including ensuring that barriers to delivery are overcome Full risk of serious harm assessment should be countersigned by a manager and be of sufficient quality. It may be the case that this can not be completed electronically, in which case a signed paper copy should be contained in the file or other appropriate evidence provided. Similarly any formal plan to manage the risk of harm to others (RMP) should have evidence of management oversight and agreement of the plan recorded, either on the plan itself or within the case record. In order for management oversight of risk of harm assessment to be judged effective, there should be additional evidence (e.g. the case diary recording discussions between the case manager and manager, through any local risk management meeting notes or supervision notes) that there has been management involvement in the case.
4.4.2	2.5	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.6	3.1	In the inspectors' judgement, have the safeguarding and vulnerability factors for this individual to been reduced since the sentence began?	This question is based on the opinion of the inspector. It is not a scored judgement, rather it determines whether outcome questions related to vulnerability and protecting the child or young person are relevant to this case. The not applicable option should ONLY be used where there were no indicators of safeguarding or vulnerability needs in the initial assessment; that the assessment was, in the judgement of the inspector, correct and there has been no change throughout the sentence to date.
4.7.1	3.1	This question is asking whether, on balance, the YOT has addressed safeguarding and vulnerability sufficiently well in this case. That is overall across the sentence to date was the work good enough in addressing safeguarding and vulnerability or were any deficits critical to the management of risk? Quality indicators: • Sufficient assessment has taken place to identify safeguarding and vulnerability	**Overall, has the YOT done enough to keep this child or young person safe, either from themselves or from others?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the work undertaken throughout the sentence to date to protect and reduce the vulnerability of the child or young person meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the work outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall work to protect the child or young person is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The principle is that accurate assessment of safeguarding and vulnerability needs is acted

		needs • Sufficient planning has taken place to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs • The work required to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs has been undertaken by the YOT or others • Sufficient attention has been paid to the sustainability of actions to address safeguarding and vulnerability	upon where indicated in an appropriate manner, delivering services at the right time and by the right agency with a clear focus on keeping the child or young person safe and reducing their vulnerability. As such, the inspector will need to be satisfied that, within the context of the case, the assessment, planning and crucially delivery of work to protect the child or young person and reduce their vulnerability is sufficient. This may include joint working with multi agency partners including the police, prisons, children's social care services, education, health (including emotional or mental health and physical health) and others where indicated as necessary. The inspector should first be satisfied that the YOT has appropriately identified any safeguarding and vulnerability needs. Following from this, that these have been appropriately planned for with the right services delivered which are appropriate to the circumstances of the case, and are of good quality with regular and thorough review which is responsive to changing circumstances and consequently reflective of the up to date position. Sufficient priority should be given to the delivery of interventions to promote safeguarding and reduce vulnerability. The delivery of services should be responsive to the nature and level of risk to the child or young person, and respond appropriately to diversity or potential discriminatory factors. This includes both in custody and the community where necessary.
4.7.2		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.8.1	3.5	This question is asking the inspector to form a judgement on how well the quality of safeguarding and vulnerability work was supported by effective management oversight which was appropriate to the case circumstances. Quality Indicator: • Where required by the needs of the case, management oversight has been provided in a timely manner • Management oversight has addressed any deficiencies in assessment or planning to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs • Management oversight has ensured that the YOT or others delivered required	**Was oversight by management effective in ensuring the quality of work to address safeguarding and vulnerability in this case?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the work undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the work outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall oversight by management is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The N/A option should be used where there is no requirement for management oversight. If safeguarding and vulnerability needs exist but have not been identified or addressed and reasonable information or monitoring systems could have identified these, this would indicate insufficient management oversight. However managers cannot be hold accountable for things that they could not reasonably have been expected to know. Effective management oversight of Safeguarding includes elements of quality assurance

		services • Where required, the use of internal forum has been effective in ensuring the quality of services	(including, but much more than, countersigning), staff supervision, dealing with developing areas of concern in individual cases and facilitating improvements in practice. It is particularly focussed on ensuring that young people themselves are sufficiently protected from harm from themselves or others. In order to provide effective oversight, managers should themselves understand the assessment and planning processes, indicators of raised vulnerability needs and be able to recognise both good and insufficient practice. To be considered sufficient, oversight should identify any deficits in practice; ensure that remedial actions are identified and that practitioners confirm that required actions have been taken, although the precise nature of confirmation may vary depending on the experience of the practitioner. Just asking for tasks to be undertaken, without ensuring they have been done, is not sufficient. Effective managerial oversight may also involve escalation of issues such as unmet need or gaps in service provision through the correct channels in the relevant agencies to ensure that gaps in service delivery are corrected. Similarly any formal plan to address safeguarding and vulnerability (VMP) should have evidence of management oversight and agreement of the plan recorded, either on the plan itself or within the case record.
4.8.2		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.10.1	4.3	This question is asking whether the case manager gave sufficient attention appropriate to the case circumstances to the child or young person's health and wellbeing in relation to any potential barriers to engagement which could impact upon a successful sentence outcome. That is – they did everything reasonable to make the environment in which the sentence was delivered conducive to a positive outcome. Quality indicator: • Referrals which are required to promote health and well being of the child or young person have been made • Staff provided appropriate levels of	**Overall, did the YOT give sufficient attention to the health and well-being outcomes for this child or young person (in so far as this may act as a barrier to successful outcomes from the sentence)?** The inspector should judge whether the overall quality of the work undertaken meets the needs of the case – i.e. does sufficiency in the work outweigh any insufficiency. Therefore whilst there may be deficits the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the attention paid to health and well-being is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely whilst there may be many strengths the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of Insufficient. The N/A option should be used where there were no health or well being needs which could have acted as barriers to successful outcomes from the sentence. The inspector will need to make a judgement that sufficient attention has been paid to health and well being needs which could potentially act as barriers to engagement to ameliorate the potential of these upon sentence outcome.

		support to the child or young person • Interventions which were required were delivered with agencies co-ordinating their work well • Sufficient attention was given to continuity of services post custody and re-integration in to the community • Sufficient attention was paid to the sustainability of improvements in health and wellbeing	In particular, the inspector will need to see evidence that required referrals are made to address health (including emotional or mental health and physical health), substance misuse, ETE, social care and other needs relating to the health and well-being of the child or young person. If appropriate referrals are made there should be evidence of agencies working together to coordinate necessary interventions to promote the health and well-being of the child or young person. Where indicated, this should include co-ordination of services between the custodial establishment and the child or young person's community to aid re-integration and maximise the possibility of a successful sentence outcome. Sustainability should be evidenced with sufficient consideration given and, where relevant, plans in place to promote the health and wellbeing of the child or young person after the sentence ends, through the use of robust exit plans and community resources.
4.10.2	4.3	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.12	1.1	This question is asking for the inspector's opinion of whether sufficient progress has been made in relation to factors more likely to make the child or young person re-offend at this point in the sentence. It is not based upon the YOT's assessment but, firstly, upon the inspector's judgement of which factors are linked to likelihood of re-offending and then, secondly, upon progress made to this stage in sentence.	**In the opinion of the inspector, has sufficient overall progress been made at this stage, where required, in relation to the individual priority factors identified in question 2.1.0 which made this individual more likely to offend?** The N/A option should be used, against each offending related factor, where in the judgement of the inspector there was no significant link between likelihood of re-offending and that factor, which needed to be addressed during the sentence to date. The inspector is required to make a clinical judgement based on their knowledge of the case, in order to decide which factors related to offending have improved since the start of the sentence. Inspectors must note that this question relates solely to factors linked to likelihood of re-offending – it does not include areas that may have been a problem from the risk of harm, safeguarding or wellbeing perspective, but were not linked to likelihood of re-offending. To answer this question the inspector must first decide which offending related factors existed at the start of the sentence that needed to be addressed during supervision, regardless of how they were scored in Asset. The inspector must then decide which of these factors should have been addressed during the course of the sentence being inspected to date, bearing in mind the nature, intensity and length of the sentence along with any diversity factors in the case. All other factors should then be answered 'N/A'. For each of the factors which they have identified the inspector must make a judgement based on all the evidence available to them whether that factor has reduced. Each of the remaining factors should be answered as either 'YES' (reduced) or 'NO' (not reduced).

			Evidence may come from a range of sources, including Asset reviews, contact logs, details of work completed with the child or young person, information received from parents/carers and other agencies involved in work with the child or young person. Reduction in the Asset score is not the critical deciding factor as, for example, there may be evidence that has yet to manifest itself in a reduction in the score.
4.13.1	1.1	This question is asking for the inspector's opinion as to whether, since sentence/release from custody there has been a reduction in A) Frequency of offending B) Seriousness of offending And is a clinical judgement based upon their understanding of the case.	**Does there appear to have been a reduction (since the start of the sentence/ release from custody) in:** **a) Frequency of offending** **b) Seriousness of offending?** To answer these questions the inspector needs to make a clinical judgement about whether behaviour **since the commencement of the sentence** is an improvement on the offender's previous pattern of behaviour. The 'YES' answer should be used for **both** questions where: • there has been **no further offending,** and this is an improvement on the previous pattern of behaviour. The appropriate 'YES' answers should be used where: • there has been further offending but the frequency and/or seriousness has reduced relative to the previous pattern. The appropriate 'NO' answers should only be used: • when there has been a continuance of offending behaviour similar to or worse than previously. The Insufficient Evidence answers should be used when any of the following apply: • this is a first offence • there has been a long period of time since the previous offence • the child or young person has offended very infrequently • the child or young person has been in custody without the opportunity to reoffend • the inspector otherwise considers that there is insufficient history on which to form a judgement. Note: if the child or young person has been convicted, since the start of the sentence being inspected, of an offence committed prior to the current sentence, then this additional offence should be considered as part of the previous pattern of behaviour – it should not be considered as part of subsequent offending
4.13.2	I.4	Please refer to the detailed guidance	**Interventions module only: Did the delivery of interventions make a sufficient contribution to reducing reoffending?** This question is asking you to determine whether the interventions that were actually

			delivered made an impact upon any outcomes in relation to likelihood of reoffending. You should consider: - Were the correct interventions delivered to meet the assessed needs? - Were interventions available where a need was identified? - Were those interventions of good quality and delivered along the lines of effective practice? - Did the delivery of interventions follow the risk, needs, responsively principles? - Did the child or young person complete the intervention? - Is there evidence that they engaged with the intervention? - Is there feedback from the intervention, either from the young person, the facilitator or case manager?
4.13.3	I.4	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.14.1	1.1	This question is asking whether there is sufficient evidence within the case that attention has been given to the sustainability of positive changes after the end of the sentence. Quality indictor: • Positive sustainable outcomes have been achieved which will be sustainable by the child or young person post the ending of the sentence	**Has the YOT given sufficient attention to ensuring that positive outcomes are sustainable following the end of the sentence?** This question is looking at one important aspect of the exit strategy developed or applied by the case manager. The case manager should be seeking to maximise the likelihood that any progress that has been made during the custodial or community phase of a sentence, is sustained following its completion. For this question to be answered positively there will need to be evidence that the case manager has demonstrated quality and persistence in developing any positive change/learning the child or young person has made during the period of supervision. There will also need to be evidence that the case manager has created opportunities for this positive change to be continued beyond the end of the period of supervision, for example by developing links with community agencies who can continue to support/develop the child or young person. This may involve 'signposting' them to appropriate agencies or may involve having created links as part of an intervention plan exit strategy objective. If there is evidence of positive change for the child or young person but further support is needed to reinforce these after the end of the sentence, and no plan is in place to address this, the inspector may wish to score this question as a 'NO'. The 'N/A' option applies when it is too early in the sentence to consider sustainability post sentence. It also applies where there have been no positive outcomes where action could reasonably have been taken to support sustainability.
4.16.1	4.1.2	Actual and potential barriers to engagement have received sufficient attention so as to reduce their impact within the context of the case needs. Quality indicators:	**Overall, has sufficient attention been given to identifying and responding to diversity factors and actual or potential barriers to engagement?** This question is looking at whether, overall during the sentence to date, the case manager has sufficiently assessed, planned for and implemented actions to support the child or

		• Sufficient assessment took place to identify potential barriers to engagement, including speech, language and communication needs, and plans were developed to reduce their impact upon a successful outcome to the sentence • Where necessary, assessments and plans were clearly communicated to others involved in delivering the sentence • Sufficient attention was given to vulnerability, health and well being, physical, emotional or mental health in so far as they acted as potential or actual barriers to engagement Where the inspector identifies the presence of actual or potential barriers to engagement which have <u>not</u> been recognised by the YOT, an answer of 'NO' to this question is likely	young person's ability to benefit from their sentence; since the likelihood of successful outcome is increased through identifying and then responding to barriers to effective engagement. Potential barriers to engagement and access to services, including learning needs, disability and other discriminatory or diversity factors should be assessed and where appropriate, plans put in place to mitigate their impact. The inspector should be satisfied that the specific areas of vulnerability, physical and emotional or mental health and wellbeing have been considered and, where indicated, plans and actions put into place to reduce their impact upon the child or young person's ability to engage, and these have been delivered as required. This is likely to involve the case manager working collaboratively with YOT colleagues or community services where necessary. The inspector should be satisfied that specific attention is given in all cases to understanding and addressing the speech, language or communication needs of children and young people so that methods of working suit their individual needs. Assessments of, and plans to address, barriers to engagement should be clearly communicated to all involved in the case. Evidence of this could be found within case diary entries, the asset assessment or in other specific plans on the case. There should be clear plans for actions to manage potential barriers to engagement which include roles and responsibilities where necessary. Where the inspector identifies the presence of actual or potential barriers to engagement which have <u>not</u> been recognised by the YOT, an answer of 'NO' to this question is likely.
4.16.2		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.17.1	4.2	This question asks the inspector to form a judgement as to whether sufficient effort has been made to ensure the sentence has been delivered as the court intended it, through the YOT doing all they could to maximise the likelihood of the sentence being met. Quality indicators: • The child or young person and their parents/carers were clear what was expected of them • Sufficient attention was paid to motivation with the child or young person which included	**Was sufficient attention given to ensuring that the child or young person engaged with the YOT and the requirements of the sentence were met?** This question is about whether the case manager has done all they can to support the child or young person in meeting the requirements of the sentence and runs as a thread from the first contact of the child or young person and their parent/carer with YOT through to exit strategies. The overarching principle is that the child or young person knows what is expected of them to successfully complete the sentence, and receives the necessary support and encouragement to facilitate its delivery. In forming a judgement the inspector should therefore be looking for evidence of the child or young person and, where appropriate their parents/carers, understanding the requirements of the sentence. This could be through an induction pack, notes of an introductory meeting or other method evidenced in the case record.

		addressing any barriers to engagement which were present, including the impact of any learning difficulties • Reporting requirements were sufficient and any additional requirements of the sentence were addressed • The child or young person was able to access the YOT and the impact of the YOT's location upon the sentence was addressed	The file should contain evidence of all the requirement of sentence being implemented, and these being explained to the child or young person and their parent/carer in ways which are clear and can be understood. Accurate assessment of barriers to engagement and the case manager having a variety of skills and tools available to meet any potential barriers should be evidenced on the file or in case manger discussion. This must include actions to reduce the impact of any potential discriminatory factors which could reduce the likelihood of the sentence requirements being met. Case managers should also ensure that where the child or young person fails to comply with the sentence there is an appropriate response, including breach action where appropriate. Again the inspector should look for evidence of this response being appropriate to the circumstances of the case but equally that it defensible is to the needs of the case. The inspector should also consider to what extent the indicated Scaled Approach level has been reflected in the appointments given. For cases inspected under National Standards 2009 the following standards are in place: • Standard level – a minimum of 2 appointments per month for the first three months reducing to a minimum one appointment per month thereafter • Enhanced level – a minimum of 4 appointments per month for the first three months reducing to a minimum of two appointments per month thereafter • Intensive level – a minimum of 12 appointment in the first three months reducing to a minimum of 4 appointment per month thereafter For cases inspected under the 2013 National Standards, Standard and Enhanced levels remain the same but the Intensive SA level is reduced to a minimum of 8 contacts per month for the first three months and 4 contacts per month thereafter. The inspector should take a considered view on what level of reporting was actually appropriate to the case needs and circumstances and form a view as to whether this was met or not. The inspector should consider whether, where appropriate and within the needs of the case, early revocation could have been used to increase the likelihood of a successful outcome.
4.17.2		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.18.0	4.2		
4.18.1	4.2	This question is asking the inspector to form a judgement as to whether the child or young person did all that was asked of them by the YOT	**Did the child or young person comply with the requirements of the sentence?** This question is about whether the child or young person has complied with the sentence

		i.e. their compliance was sufficient for the needs of the case. Quality indicators: • The YOT has understood the reasons for non compliance and taken appropriate actions to support compliance • The YOT has engaged sufficiently with parents/carers and significant others to support compliance • The YOT has addressed unacceptable behaviour by the child or young person • The YOT has correctly recognised unacceptable misses • Breach action is taken where required in a timely fashion	sufficiently well to satisfy the requirements of the court. The requirements of the sentence are those set by the court order and implemented by the YOT. For example, under a YRO with activity (e.g. reparation days) and supervision requirements the child or young person must have carried out the days imposed by the court and reported to the frequency required by the YOT in relation to their Scaled Approach intervention level. If there is a curfew requirement or licence condition the child or young person must have adhered to this. However, a test of reasonableness within the context of he case should apply here, taking account of the whole period of supervision. For example, if a child or young person has missed one appointment in the early stages of a sentence whilst chaotic aspects of their circumstances were being stabilised or relevant diversity factors were being addressed, then the inspector may choose to recognise this as sufficient compliance but after initial difficulties. The inspector should also recognise that an answer of 'YES (fully)' to this question removes the opportunity in the next question to assess the YOT's response to non-compliance, and to give credit where this is appropriate. By contrast, if there are multiple absences that have been marked as acceptable, but the inspector considers that these judgements were inappropriate, then they are likely to assess this as being non-compliant. Similarly, if there are absences where the YOT judgement is either unclear or not recorded this is likely to lead to a judgement of non-compliant. This is not just about attending appointments. When undertaking their order the child or young person should have engaged and behaved appropriately. For example, if they are under the influence, abusive, or refuse to participate then this should be considered as non-compliance. Statutory attendance can also be included when this is with workers other than the YOT case manager, but is under their direction. Case managers should have expressed their commitment to the child or young person and where necessary their parent/carer through a variety of ways – such as being accountable, working within a motivational framework, following through on promised actions, being flexible and reflexive to changes for the child or young person such as lessening contact levels or allowing absence at times of family stress where appropriate to the case circumstances. The N/A option should only be used if there was no opportunity for the child or young person to comply, e.g. where they were in custody and were not released during the lifetime of the inspected sentence, or where the sentence was revoked for reasons other than non-compliance before there was an opportunity for the child or young person to attend.
4.18.2	4.2	This question is asking the inspector to form a	**Where the child or young person has not fully complied was the response of the**

		judgement as to whether the response of the YOT was, in relation to compliance, and in all the case circumstances, sufficient.	**YOT sufficient?** The inspector is being asked to form a judgement on how well the YOT dealt with compliance and enforcement of the sentence. A suitable response should include, where appropriate, actions to encourage or support future compliance. For example, a home visit, discussion with parents/carers if appropriate, appropriate actions to remove barriers to compliance, an interview with the case manager/and or line manager or review of the sentence plan with the child or young person, or specific motivational work. The inspector should also take into account any relevant diversity factors in the case, and the removal of barriers to compliance where this is appropriate. This could, for example, include not commencing enforcement action too early in a case where a child or young person is experiencing a chaotic lifestyle with multiple housing moves, but taking a more flexible approach to reporting until circumstances stabilise. Similarly for a child or young person with learning disabilities that make it difficult for them to organise adherence to dates and times but presenting a low risk of harm more flexibility, along with appropriate additional support, may be applied than to a child or young person posing a high risk of harm to others. As a benchmark for compliance and enforcement action, the inspector can make reference to National Standards 2013, but should be mindful of the individual case circumstances in forming their judgement as to appropriateness of actions taken: <u>Referral Orders</u> • Failures to attend – follow up within one working day by telephone, home visit or letter • Determine whether the reason is acceptable or unacceptable. • If the explanation is unacceptable (or no explanation is given), issue a formal written warning within 24 hours. Following two formal warnings where a further unacceptable failure to attend takes place or there is a single serious unacceptable failure to comply: • Convene a youth offender panel meeting within ten working days to determine whether the child or young person will be referred back to court. • If they are referred back to court ensure that this takes place within ten working days of the panel meeting. For Referral Orders breach is in the context of the contract rather than the order. Therefore any decision to return the case to court following breach must be taken by a properly constituted panel, NOT by the YOT. Once a contract has been signed, the offender needs, wherever possible, to be referred back to court, for non-compliance with the referral order contract, within the compliance

			period. The Panel's decision to refer the offender back to court must be taken at a panel meeting before the expiration of the compliance period of the contract. The last opportunity to do this is at the final meeting. However, once a contract has taken effect and the Panel has referred the offender back to court for breach, if the offender is present before the court, then the courts powers - to revoke the referral order and re-sentence for the original offence - are exercisable even if the period for which the contract has effect has expired (whether before or after the referral of the offender back to the court), Paragraph 5(6), Schedule 1 to the Powers of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000 refers. The Act also refers to breach in terms of the young offender failing to attend the first meeting and to agreeing a contract at the first meeting. In either situation the young person should be referred back to the court within the currency of the order. <u>Other orders</u> <u>YRO and DTO community supervision</u> • Follow up all failures within one working day by telephone, home visit or letter • Determine whether the reason is acceptable or unacceptable • If the explanation is unacceptable (or there is no explanation within 24 hours) issue a formal written warning within 24 hours. Where two formal warnings are given (for YROs within the 12 month warned period) and a further unacceptable failure to attend takes place: • Breach action must be initiated within five working days unless, in exceptional circumstances, breach action is stayed with the authorisation of the YOT manager. Where there is a single serious unacceptable failure to comply, breach action can be initiated immediately; however, this should only be considered in exceptional circumstances. Where a child or young person withdraws their willingness to comply with a treatment requirement: • The YOT case manager should return the case to court for revocation/amendment as unworkable <u>Long-term custodial sentences (S90/91 Powers of Criminal Court (Sentencing) Act 2000; S226/228 Criminal Justice Act 2003)</u> If licence conditions (including reoffending) are breached or there is behaviour that constitutes a heightened risk of serious harm to others, recall of the child or young person must be considered. A decision not to recall must be approved by the YOT manager and be properly evidenced and recorded. Decide whether a fixed term recall, standard recall or emergency recall is required. This

			must be agreed and signed off by the YOT/senior manager. Where a decision is made to initiate recall: • Complete request for recall report within 24 hours • Submit supporting paperwork to Public Protection Casework Section of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) within 24 hours. *National Standards 2013 10.25.*
4.18.3	4.2	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20	When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 4.20
4.19.1		This question is asking if the young person has either come to the attention of the police for alleged offending, been arrested, charged with an offence, received a caution, been convicted of a further offence or has been convicted of breaching their order/licence.	This is a straight Yes/No/ Don't Know factual question. It does not contribute to the 'score' for the YOT. If the inspector's judgement is that the young person has either come to the attention of the police for alleged offending, been arrested, charged with an offence, received a caution, been convicted or has breached their order/licence, but it is not clear from the case records, the relevant sub-section of this question must still be answered YES. Please note that these questions relate to all offences, including those allegedly committed before the start of the sentence? The Don't Know option would normally indicate that the inspector was unable to find sufficient evidence of effective monitoring by the case manager, and that there is therefore no evidence to indicate use of the Yes or No option.
4.19.2		This question is asking if the responses from the YOT to any of the alleged or confirmed incident(s) are sufficient? In particular the inspector will want to see evidence that the incidents have been recognised, investigated and acted upon in a timely and appropriate manner.	**Was the response of the YOT to these incident(s) sufficient?** The inspector should be looking for confirmation that the YOT has recognised the impact of the new behaviour, e.g. be it alleged or confirmed, and has acted accordingly. Any new concerns in regards to risk of harm and safety and wellbeing indicators within the case should also be clearly recorded and acted on appropriately. Quality Indicators; • The YOT have investigated the incident and recorded the outcome. This should include meeting the young person to challenge their behaviour, and where necessary meet with the parent/carer • Clear evidence of the YOT meeting/liaising with the relevant other workers/agencies • The offence/alleged behaviour is clearly recorded by the YOT. • Information is analysed in respect of patterns of offending and seriousness of offending.

			• Consideration has been given to whether information about convicted offences or alleged offending prompts a Review including of reoffending, risk of harm and Vulnerability. • Changes in planning and interventions reflect the seriousness and case stage (for example, interventions are less likely to change if matters are un-convicted, unless there are risk of harm or vulnerability concerns, or the behaviour has been admitted). • Convicted offences and cautions lead to offending behaviour, risk of harm and Vulnerability reviews. • MAPPA and/or other risk of harm management forums have been convened, and actions arising from them effectively delivered • Where required, there has been active liaison with victim workers (and where necessary the probation victims unit) and other relevant agencies involved in the management of risk of harm to ensure effective joint working with others involved in the case to manage risk of harm to actual/identified and potential victims Where, in the opinion of the inspector, the incident identified in question 4.19.1 leads to an increased risk of serious harm to others the inspector will also need to see evidence of risk of harm management processes (e.g. MAPPA, specific risk management plans, multi agency risk management forum) being implemented as required – even where the active management of risk of harm has already been assessed in view 3. Where, in the opinion of the inspector, the incident identified in question 4.19.1 leads to increased concerns about the child or young person's safety or well being the inspector will also need to see evidence that vulnerability or child protection procedures have been implemented as required - even where the active management of safety and wellbeing has already been assessed in view 3. If the inspector has identified through case records that the young person has either come to the attention of the police for alleged offending, been arrested, charged with an offence, received a caution, been convicted of a further offence or has been convicted of breaching their order/licence and the YOT hasn't sufficiently responded by undertaking the required actions (see above quality indicators) this should result in a 'NO' answer to this question. The N/A option should ONLY be used in those cases where NONE of the options in question 4.19.1 was answered as YES or No.
4.19.3		This question is asking whether, in the inspectors opinion, the child or young person is less likely to re-offend that they were when they were sentenced.	**Overall, in the opinion of the inspector, is this child or young person less likely to re-offend than they were when the sentence started?)** (In all cases please explain your reasons in Q4.20)

		It is therefore a clinical judgement to be made by the inspector based on all of the evidence available to them. Please refer to the full guidance for further information. In all cases the detail ands reasons for your judgement must be explained in question 4.20.	This is a clinical judgement to be made by the inspector based on all of the evidence available to them. Sources of evidence are many and varied. They could include assessments, discussion with the case holder, records of the child or young person's behaviour whilst under supervision and their response to supervision, evidence from police intelligence (e.g. if following checking there has been a substantial reduction in intelligence about poor behaviour when previously it was frequent and concerning, then this may help support an answer of YES to this question), evidence from specialist workers (substance misuse, mental health etc) where this relevant to offending, behaviour at school, self report and views of parents/carers etc. In order to answer this question with a 'YES' (The Child or Young Person is less likely to offend) the inspector should be satisfied that there is sufficient evidence for the decision to be defensible. **If in the opinion of the inspector the answer to this question is 'YES' (i.e. less likely to offend) the evidence available from YOT records may include some of the following**: • Police intelligence checks have been completed and evidence no further incidents • The Child or Young Person is in a stable supportive living environment • The Child or Young Person is engaged in Education Training or Employment • The Child or Young Person is receiving positive support from family/carers • The Child or Young Person has continued to avoid their pro-criminal peer group • The Child or Young Person is fully engaged with the YOT and intervention provided • The Assessment has reduced and the inspector agrees with the reasoning behind this reduction. • Key offending behaviour factors have been addressed and there is evidence of this impacting on the young person's thinking or behaviour since the beginning of the Order. • Purposeful home visits have been completed by the YOT which confirm the Child or Young Person is settled and in receipt of the necessary support. **If in the opinion of the inspector the answer to this question is 'NO' (no identifiable change) the evidence available from YOT records may, for example, include some of the following;** • Police intelligence checks highlighting the child or young person is associating with pro-criminal peers, name in incidents of ASB. • Child or Young Person not fully engaging with YOT intervention • Child or Young Person not engaged in Education, Training or Employment. • Child or Young Person's Parents/Carers not fully engaged in YOT intervention. • Key offending behaviour factors haven't been addressed and there is evidence of

			this impacting on the young person's thinking or behaviour. **If in the opinion of the inspector the answer to this question is 'NO' (more likely to offend) the evidence available from YOT records may, for example, include the following;** • Police intelligence checks highlighting the child or young person is involved with alleged incidents of offending behaviour • Child or young person has been 'out of contact' with the case manager for a period of time e.g. during a period of failed appointments leading to breach action • Child or Young Person not engaged in Education, Training or Employment • family, including siblings, e.g. criminality, violence within the home, involvement with significant others, i.e. gangs, offenders • environmental factors, e.g. inadequate housing, area they live in • parental behaviour, e.g. mental health needs, substance misuse, inconsistent parenting • events or circumstances, e.g. family separation, bereavement, change of care arrangements • own behaviour, e.g. substance misuse, type of offending, acting out, inappropriate responses to stress, weapon carrying • Other reckless behaviour that shows insufficient regard to their own safety • when a child or young person may resume excessive alcohol use or returns to illicit drug use and this can appropriately be indentified as linked to risk of harm behaviour • Child or Young Person moves out of stable accommodation and this can appropriately be indentified as linked to risk of re-offending behaviour • Child or young person's lifestyle becomes chaotic and they fail to engage with support services and this can appropriately be indentified as linked to risk of re-offending behaviour • evidence of further offending behaviour or intelligence relating to further risk of harm related offending behaviour • intelligence indicating an increase in risk of harm to others
4.20		Please briefly summarise the key factors that have influenced your judgements in this section. This should NOT be a repeat of your answers to the individual questions, but rather should help the Lead Inspector understand the context in which those judgements have been made. To assist the Lead Inspector please include sufficient relevant case characteristics to help	Please briefly summarise the key factors that have influenced your judgements in this section. This should NOT be a repeat of your answers to the individual questions, but rather should help the Lead Inspector understand the context in which those judgements have been made. Please always comment on how the case manager monitored and responded to alleged or proven reoffending, and what systems were in place to support this To assist the Lead Inspector please include sufficient relevant case characteristics to help them understand the case.

		them understand the case. In particular please include further details whenever you have used "Other" as the explanation for insufficiency. When summarising the key factors, remember that you have assessed decisions and actions taken in light of *appropriateness for the case circumstances*.	In particular please include further details whenever you have used "Other" as the explanation for insufficiency. When summarising the key factors, remember that you have assessed decisions and actions taken in light of *appropriateness for the case circumstances*. Please include comment on strengths found in the case, do not just focus on insufficiency.

View 5 – Management and Leadership

Question Number	Criterion	Quality Indicators	Extended Guidance
5.1.1	1.5.1 2.5.1 3.5.1	This question is asking In the opinion of the inspector did the case manager in this case have the right resource and sufficient of them to deliver work to: a) reduce the likelihood of reoffending b) manage risk of harm to others c) address safeguarding needs in this case	To deliver effective case management across the range of areas of work (likelihood of re-offending, risk of harm to others and safeguarding) case managers should have access to an appropriate range of interventions and services including the ability to pathway a child or young person into partner agencies as required. In answering this question, inspectors should be considering what is *sufficient* for case managers to be effective practitioners. The YJB Self Assessment Tool (January 2012) details high quality service availability in terms of how well the range and type of interventions are used by case managers to ensure: • Identified needs are met • Resources are suitable for different learning styles, ages and genders • Resources are current and • Are linked to robust assessments In cases where a case manager reports gaps in core (universal) or specialist services or staff, the inspector should note the nature of this within question 5.10 and also any escalation undertaken by the case manager in this regard. Special attention should be paid to the needs of children or young people who may present with speech, learning or communication difficulties or other potential barriers to engagement including disability. Resources should be sufficiently flexible for use with a range of diversity factors and staff should competent in their use, which may require additional training/guidance/supervision. Examples of the sufficiency and insufficiency of resources include: Likelihood of reoffending • The YOT has a variety of interventions available to be delivered in different ways to match individual needs (sufficient) OR • Only one style of intervention is available which is not designed for flexible delivery to be matched to the individual needs of the child or young person (insufficient) Risk of harm to others • The YOT has a variety of programmes or interventions are available which

			specifically target risk of harm behaviours such as weapons awareness or violent offending (sufficient) OR • There are no specific interventions available which seek to target risk of harm behaviours Safeguarding and vulnerability • The YOT has resources and interventions available to deal with a wide variety of safeguarding and vulnerability needs such as alcohol use, sexual health or self harming behaviours (sufficient) OR • There is alack of available access to specific services to address safeguarding and vulnerability needs – for example no health provision (insufficient)
5.1.2		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 5.10	If there were gaps in resources then identify all aspects that apply. When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 5.10
5.1.3		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 5.10	Where there is insufficient access to services, please identify all services that apply. When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 5.10
5.1.4		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 5.10	Where there were gaps in the availability of interventions, please identify all gaps that apply. When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 5.10
5.1.5		When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 5.10	Where interventions were not suitable for specific diversity factors, please identify all factors that apply. When 'other' is used please indicate the reasons for this in question 5.10
5.2	4.4.2	This question is asking the inspector to form a judgement as to whether staff supervision or other quality assurance processes made a positive difference or not in this case. It is the view of the inspector NOT that of the case manager which is being sought. The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10	**In the opinion of the inspector is there evidence that staff supervision or other quality assurance arrangements have made a positive difference to this case?** To answer this as a YES the inspector should be satisfied from the case file and from discussion with the case manager that sufficient oversight, guidance and quality assurance has been provided to make a positive difference to this case. There should be evidence that the oversight has been appropriate for the case circumstances and that it is defensible to the needs of the case Quality assurance should operate within a sound framework which is well embedded in the YOT and includes induction and training and supervision of new staff, allocation of work to appropriately skilled staff and regular formal supervision. The case manager should understand the QA processes and be able to explain how they have been applied in this case. Note: This question is NOT asking whether the case was well managed as a result of QA – it is asking whether QA made a positive difference to it.

			The inspector will need to form a judgement as to how well the supervising/ line manager should have known the case. For example – with a high risk of harm to others case, or a case with child protection or safeguarding needs, the expectation is that the supervising/line manager would be aware of the case in some detail, including actions to manage or address the presenting factors and responsibility for completion of those actions. With a lower risk case or one with no safeguarding needs to be addressed, it is likely that the manager will have less detailed knowledge and this is not in itself indicative of insufficient oversight. However, if it was reasonable for the manager to take a more detailed interest in the case for any reason then this 'light touch' would not be seen as sufficient. Reasons for this could include that a case manager has known developmental needs, the case has previously been assessed at a higher scaled risk of harm level or with safeguarding concerns or that the case manager is a new worker subject to induction processes. Evidence may be taken from a variety of sources including case diary entries, report gate keeping processes, recorded and signed off comments upon risk or vulnerability screening documents or plans, from case discussion minutes or other localised processes such as risk management panels. The inspector should be satisfied that where indicated as necessary changes, amendments and actions have been followed though and that this has made a positive difference to the case. To be answered positively, the inspector should be satisfied that managerial or quality assurance requests have been actioned appropriately and that any divergence from this is well document with sound reasoning evidenced.
5.3 1.5.1 2.5.1		This question is related to the overall performance of the YOT and NOT to the specific case just inspected. It is asking if, in the opinion of the inspector, the case manager has a sufficient understanding of: a) effective practice principles b) local policies and procedures for managing the risk of harm c) local policies and procedures for the management of safeguarding d) local polices and procedures for supporting effective engagement and responding to non compliance The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10	**This question checks various aspects of the understanding of the case manager.** The inspector will need to form a judgement based upon their discussion with the case manger together with evidence from the case recording especially with regard to reasoning, decisions and actions appropriate to the case circumstances and then apply this to the overall performance of the YOT. The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10 A) <u>Effective Practice Principles</u> There is an increasing body of literature that identifies ways of working with offenders that reduce reoffending rates. This includes studies of individual programmes, meta-analyses (Lipsey 1995) and reviews of the literature (Mulvey et al 1993, Sherman et al 1997). The broad principles of effective practice can be summarised as follows (McGuire 1995,Chapman and Hough 1998, Utting and Vennard 2000, Andrews 1995, Underdown 1998): • Risk classification: the level and intensity of intervention should reflect the risk (likelihood) of reoffending

	3.5.1		• Targeting offending-related needs: interventions are more likely to be successful if they target needs/problems that support or contribute to offending • Responsivity: programmes are more effective if they take into account the preferred learning styles of the child or young person who has offended. This often requires active and participatory methods. • Multi-modal: results of meta-analyses indicate that effective programmes are those addressing the multiple problems of children or young people who have offended. • Programme integrity: programmes should be well-designed with clear statements of the aims and methods appropriate to these objectives • Dosage: programmes need to be of sufficient intensiveness and duration to achieve their aims. • Community-based: these tend to be more effective than institutionally based programmes, although programmes that adhere to the other 'what works' principles can still contribute to a reduction in reoffending regardless of the setting (Andrews 1995).
	4.4.2		B) <u>Local policies and procedures for managing risk of harm to others</u> The case manager should be able to describe local policy and procedure, including the effective use of forums such as multi agency risk panels and MAPPA arrangements, and how partner agencies are involved in such arrangements to ensure effective integrated management of risk of harm to others. The case manager should be aware of the requirements locally for managerial oversight of risk of harm assessment and planning and delivery/review and be able to state how these apply to practice. C) <u>Local policies and procedures for the management of safeguarding</u> The case manager should be able to describe local policy and procedure, including the effective use of forums such as vulnerability or safeguarding panels and child protection and welfare arrangements, and how partner agencies are involved in such arrangements to ensure safeguarding needs are addressed through integrated management. The case manager should be aware of the requirements locally for managerial oversight of safeguarding and vulnerability assessment and planning and delivery/review and be able to state how these apply to practice. D) <u>Local polices and procedures for supporting effective engagement and responding to non compliance</u> The case manager should be able to describe local policy and procedure, including the effective use of forums such as pre breach panels or compliance / re-engagement meetings with children or young people and their parent / carer. The case manager should be aware of the requirements locally for managerial oversight of non compliance and be able to state how these apply to practice within the case circumstances and in relation to National Standards where local policy is in line with these. There should be evidence of the case

			manager prioritising work engage children and young people through the sentence in their practice. The case manager should be able to describe how they apply a principle of being defensively appropriate to the needs of the case in decision relating to non compliance and enforcement.
5.4.1		This is a factual question to identify the working role of the person who normally countersigns the case manager's work.	This is a factual question to identify the working role of the person who normally countersigns the case manager's work.
5.4.2	4.4.2	This question is related to the overall performance of the YOT and NOT to the specific case just inspected. It is asking if, the opinion of the case manger being interviewed, their manager has, and applies, the skills and qualities required of an effective manager with reference to: • Assessing the quality of the case manager's work • Assisting the case manager to develop their work • Supporting the case manager in their work through being actively involved in cases as appropriate to their needs • providing effective and supportive supervision to the case manager The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10	**This question seeks views on the capability and performance of immediate line managers.** This is the judgement of the case manager and NOT that of the inspector. In order to effectively assess the quality of work, the supervising manager should have a sound understanding of the principles of case assessment appropriate to the case circumstances. The manager should be able to provide critical feedback and provide sufficient opportunities for case discussion and professional development to be taken forwards which may include identification of training for case managers or, in specific cases, capability processes. The supervising manager should be actively involved in cases through regular oversight appropriate to the context of each case and the experience and knowledge of the practitioner. The person who countersigns the case manager's work should be sufficiently experienced, skilled and employed in a role with sufficient authority to make necessary changes to report work, risk findings, plans and so on. This will normally be a senior practitioner (countersigning for some case managers who typically run lower risk and lower vulnerability cases) a middle manager or (where a team manager is the responsible case manager) a senior manager. It is unlikely that the counter signer is of the same grade but, if this is found, please include a note within the question 5.10 of any concerns this has raised in the case's overall management. The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10
5.5	4.4.2	This question is related to the overall performance of the YOT and NOT to the specific case just inspected. It is asking if, the opinion of the case manger being interviewed, their manager is sufficiently active in the oversight /countersigning and management of risk of harm and safeguarding work The inspector should record relevant items from	**In the opinion of the case manager, would they describe the countersigning/ management oversight of risk of harm and Safeguarding work as an effective process?** The case manager should be encouraged to think about how their manager is effective and active in supporting the work of the case manager and in quality assurance process therein. In answering this question the inspector should bear in mind that this is the opinion of the case manager and not that of the inspector. Active management would include rolling back assessments and reports etc but that this is not merely a procedural role (for example through e-mail) but includes elements of

		the discussion in 5.10	discussion and, for the case manager, development. Further evidence could be found within supervision processes which the case manager recognises as developmental and not merely performance management or through regular case discussions. The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10
5.7.1	4.4.2	This question is related to the overall performance of the YOT and NOT to the specific case just inspected. It is asking whether, in the opinion of the case manager being interviewed, there are sufficient opportunities for their training and development needs to be met for their current role and for any future roles, and whether they have received sufficient training to be able to deliver interventions effectively. The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10	**In the opinion of the case managers, are their training and skills development needs met to:** **a) To undertake their current job?** **b) For future development?** **c) To deliver interventions?** Again this is the opinion of the case manager. In terms of current and potential future roles, please note within question 5.10 any issues which arise, such as inability to access training, particularly in relation to seconded staff or part time staff and the provision of core local authority training. Note should also be made of any omissions reported by case managers in relation to induction processes upon commencement of their role in the YOT. The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10 Only use the N/A option for part C if the case manager's role does not involve the delivery of interventions. However in this case please also explain the circumstances and how the case manager is able to sufficiently plan the delivery of interventions.
5.7.2	4.4.2	This question is related to the overall performance of the YOT and NOT to the specific case just inspected. It is asking if, In the opinion of the case manager being interviewed, if they sufficiently trained to recognise and respond to speech, language and communication needs or other diversity or potentially discriminating factors The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10	Speech, language and communication skills are the building blocks for learning. There is much research evidence which shows the links between oral language skills and: • Literacy skills • Social and emotional development • Behaviour • Attainment In particular research evidence shows that a significant proportion of children and young people who have offended have some degree of Speech Language or Communication Need (SLCN). The impact of SLCN can be significant and wide-ranging. Consequently case managers should have the skills and understanding to both recognise and respond to SLCN appropriately. Over the past year the YJB have put on a number of events for practitioners designed to increase their awareness of and ability to respond appropriately to SLCN. In terms of diversity or other potential discriminatory factors, case managers should have a broad understanding of diversity and how individual and environmental characteristics can impact upon a child or young person.

			The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10
5.8	4.4.1	This question is related to the overall performance of the YOT and NOT to the specific case just inspected. It is asking, In the opinion of the case manger being interviewed, how well the culture of the organisation positively promotes learning and development. The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10	Aspects to consider are not just the availability of training and development, but any actions undertaken by the YOT to ensure that staff can access it and use it to develop their skills in their day to day roles. For example – • Active encouragement to identify and take up learning opportunities • Time being made available post training for case managers to practice new skills and consolidate them with this existing experiences and tools. • Secondment opportunities. • Regular in house workshops, skills sharing, peer learning events • Peer review and evaluation The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10
5.9	4.4.1	This question is related to the overall performance of the YOT and NOT to the specific case just inspected. It is asking if the case manager understands the priorities of the organisation, especially in relation to the impact upon their own role. The inspector should record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10	The case manager should be able to state what their organisation's local priorities are and the impact upon their role/their own part in the overall organisation. If the case manager is uncertain of their organisation's priorities please note any reasons for this (for example - lack of induction, supervision etc) within question 5.10. The inspector should also record relevant items from the discussion in 5.10
5.10		Please record the key discussion points from the questions in this view.	Please record the key discussion points from the questions in this view. In an FJI inspection this information will also be useful to the Lead Inspector in planning focus groups and other investigations during the 2nd fieldwork week.
5.15.1			**Alert cases only: Has this case been escalated using the HMI Probation Alert process?** This question is used solely as part of the HMI Probation audit trail of cases where the assessor has chosen to use the HMI Probation Alert and Action process to escalate the case for urgent remedial action. It is therefore a factual answer for HMI Probation purposes only, and does not of itself contribute to the assessment of the case.
5.15.2			**Alert cases only: How are the details being forwarded to the Lead Inspector?** This question is used solely as part of the HMI Probation audit trail of cases where the assessor has chosen to use the HMI Probation Alert process to escalate the case for urgent remedial action. It is therefore a factual answer for HMI Probation purposes only, and does not of itself contribute to the assessment of the case.

Appendix A

Checking the timeliness of assessments and plans

Introduction

This appendix offers guidance on how to interrogate the **YOIS** and **Careworks** systems in order to establish when pieces of work were completed or modified.

Guidance about **Childview Youth Justice** and other systems will be added once it is available.

Why we need to check when work was actually completed

Sufficiency includes three aspects – was the piece of work completed, was it timely to meet the needs of the case, and was the completed piece of work of sufficient quality. We assess each of these, taking into account a range of qualitative judgements, before producing a single overall answer to the question of whether it is of sufficient quality.

In judging the timeliness of an assessment/review/plan the inspector needs to decide what date they consider that it was completed. (Normally, subject to override by defensible professional discretion, initial assessments should be completed within 10 working days for Detention and Training Orders, 15 working days for community sentences and 20 working days for Referral Orders. These coincide with the standards for completion of initial plans, based on the principle that assessment informs planning).

However the date that work was actually completed is not always apparent from the date recorded against it on the case record. Therefore it is important that inspectors check that the date when work was recorded on the case record as being completed is sufficiently congruent with the date that it was actually done, with any discrepancy explored with case managers and judgements about sufficiency properly informed.

The assessment of the date that a piece of work was completed will be made as your best judgement, based on the evidence that you are able to collect from:

- examining the case record
- interviewing the practitioner
- interrogating the system, where you are able to do so readily
- checking against the information provided on the list of cases being inspected.

How useful and /or accessible aspects of this evidence will be may vary considerably.

The information available to the inspector may either confirm or contradict the date recorded on the system for completion of a piece of work, but often some ambiguity will remain. Therefore it will often be a matter of the inspector's best judgement.

YOIS

In order to check on YOIS you need to be in the relevant window for the document you want to interrogate. This is done via searching for and selecting the required case and then opening the required assessment/review/plan.

At the top of the screen is a bar of navigation buttons the last of which is "Help". Upon selection of the *Help* button a list of options appear, one of these is "Updated" (quick key, F9). The inspector should select this option. The Help-Updated tool records each occasion when the document was created or modified. A new, small, window will open with a list of dates and operators. These are the dates that the document was created/modified together with the operator that created/modified the document.

If the window that appears just has a number in the operator column for the first entry, and no further entries, this indicates that the document is a duplicate of a past document. For example the first save will record the original Asset ID number if the Asset has been duplicated from a previous record, and subsequent entries will record the operator name of the person accessing the record. If no other entries are present this suggests that no amendments have been made. It is therefore unlikely that the assessment was completed on that date unless the practitioner can offer firm evidence to the contrary.

It is not unusual for there to be several dates in the box that appears, as some YOIS systems are set to auto-save upon closure and therefore each time the document is viewed there will be an entry, and work is often undertaken over several sessions. For the purposes of inspection the inspector should check that the date of the Asset, that is the date recorded on the Asset profile, correlates with a date of creation/modification in the *Updated* screen. If there is any discrepancy the inspector should seek to establish, with the case manager, why this is the case, to inform judgements on timeliness and sufficiency.

Careworks

To check on Careworks, first search for a client and open their record. On the left hand navigation panel the inspector should select the top option *personal details*.

The *personal details* screen has a number of tabs available along the top, one of which is *audit*. Upon selection of the *audit* option a full chronological list will appear which records every event that has happened within this file. This list is likely to be extensive. As it will appear in chronological order the inspector/practice assessor can review all actions taken from any given date by scrolling through.

In order to simplify this, the inspector can choose to export some or all of these details into Excel, and choose what details they would like to export, by clicking on the *Export* option. The method for doing this is intuitive, once you have the *Export* screen open. For example, after selecting E*xport* you can select to export details only relating to assessments and documents, making it easier to scan for when an assessment/document was first created, and each time it has been modified or updated.

The inspector should check, for example, that the date the Asset assessment was completed, that is the date that has been recorded on the Asset profile, correlates with the date of creation/modification in the audit screen. If there is any discrepancy the inspector should seek to establish, with the case manager, why this is the case; in order to inform judgements on timeliness and sufficiency.

Appendix B

Inspecting in Wales

This appendix, offering additional guidance on inspecting in Wales, is to be read in conjunction with the case assessment guidance and case assessment form.

Introduction

The youth justice system in Wales is, as in England, made up of a number of agencies working together. Responsibility for the services delivered by them is shared between the UK and Welsh governments, and in particular arrangements for those devolved to the Welsh government may differ from those in England. Therefore inspectors should be aware of potential differences in terminology, arrangements for delivery of services and policies and procedures. They should seek to understand local arrangements, particularly with regard to devolved responsibilities, before making comments on these.

Welfare services (health, social care, education and housing) are devolved to the Welsh Government. Criminal Justice services (police, courts, prisons, delivering sentences of the court, preventing reoffending) are reserved to the UK Government.

As the youth justice system in Wales is provided by both devolved and non-devolved organisations the Youth Justice Board and Welsh Government work together to ensure the system is effective.

The same benchmarks for quality and sufficiency of practice are applied when inspecting in Wales and in England.

In addition, in Wales, the Welsh and English languages are treated as equal, which may have particular implications for service delivery where a child or young person, their parent/carer or victim prefer to communicate in Welsh.

Changes to InfoPath form and areas for additional consideration

- **View 0 – Details**

Specific questions (3b, 9a-e, 13c) relating to the language preference of the child or young person and their preference for being managed using Welsh are asked in all inspections in Wales. The Case Assessment Guide provides help entries for each of the additional questions.

Throughout the remainder of the InfoPath form inspectors will need to be mindful of the potential cultural and linguistic differences between work in England and Wales and the impact these may have.

- **Assessment, Planning and Delivery of Interventions (Views 1, 2 and 3)**

Throughout the Assessment, Planning and Delivery of Interventions questions inspectors will need to take particular care to consider if the work has been undertaken in a manner that is sensitive to the cultural and linguistic needs of the child or young person, their parents/carers, and where applicable their victims. This is especially pertinent when considering the sufficiency of assessments, plans and delivery of interventions, and whether diversity factors and barriers to engagement have been given sufficient attention.

Specific consideration will need to be given to the Welsh language preference of the child or young person and/or their parents/carers. The questions that were asked in the '*Details*' view around the child or young person's first language, being offered the opportunity of a Welsh speaking case manager, and the YOT giving sufficient attention to the young person's preferences in terms of the Welsh language, will particularly inform judgements about work to address diversity factors and barriers to engagement.

Attention to cultural and linguistic needs and the impact of these upon the child or young person's engagement with the YOT may be particularly important where they are being supervised in a locality which predominately speaks either English or Welsh and their preferred language is the opposite. Therefore it will be helpful for inspectors to understand the extent to which English and Welsh languages are prevalent in the locality being inspected. Where the child or young person is in custody there will need to have been consideration of cultural and linguistic needs in the overall management of their sentence and in the delivery of services in custody, in particular where a Welsh speaker is placed in a secure establishment in England.

While it may not always be practical or possible, in particular in a first meeting, to engage with the child or young person in Welsh, where there is a clear preference for this; there should always be evidence that real attempts had been made to address the preference sufficiently, for example through the use of an interpreter in subsequent sessions. In any event there should be clear actions to addresses any consequences of difficulty in providing services in Welsh, for example if an assessment or court report is delayed or there is difficulty engaging in group work.

All services commissioned through public bodies must be able to be delivered in Welsh where required. This includes arrangements made and provided by the YOT directly and those provided by partnership agencies and external providers. Where exceptionally it was not possible, this should have been escalated to ensure it is resolved and the reasons should have been shared with the child or young person, their parents/carers, where applicable, and recorded clearly within the case record.

- **Initial Outcomes and Management of Practice (Views 4 and 5)**

In determining whether management oversight of practice has been effective, inspectors will need to consider whether there has been sufficient support and attention by managers to ensuring that cultural and linguistic needs have been addressed in assessment and planning and that required resources are available and services have been delivered when there is a preference expressed to work through the medium of Welsh.

- **Partner Engagement (View 7 – FJI only)**

Evidence drawn from case assessments in relation to the availability of resources from devolved services as well as the cultural and linguistic needs of the child or young person and their parents/carers, and how these have impacted on the YOT's ability to deliver services and to achieve outcomes, might contribute to the Leadership, Management & Partnership criteria. Inspectors will need to be mindful of this and highlight any areas that may constitute an area for follow-up by partner inspectorates or HMI Probation in fieldwork week 2 of an FJI.