



Probation inspection (CRC) domain three Case Assessment Rules and Guidance (CARaG)

HMI Probation, August 2019

Domain two and domain three standards, questions and prompts are supported by the domain two and three case assessment rules and guidance (CARaGs) respectively. These are a comprehensive set of published rules and guidance to be followed by inspectors and local assessors in their assessment of cases. The CARaGs promote transparency and consistency in our inspection of cases. Inspection staff and local assessors should use the appropriate CARaG as a reference document when assessing a case.

Guidance is provided in the CARaGs for questions and prompts. The CARaGs are regularly updated to ensure that they remain consistent with any changes that we make at standard, question and prompt level and so that they remain linked to evidence. The CARaGs also contain links where relevant to more detailed guidance and HMI Probation position statements in specialist areas.

Example	Question Format	Represents:
Does assessment identify offending-related factors?	Dark grey background	A question directly linked to a prompt in the inspection standards. The answers to these questions directly influence the summary judgement at key question level.
Were domestic abuse checks undertaken?	Light grey background	A supplementary question, asked to provide additional background information about the case, but less strongly linked to summary judgement questions.
Is this service user subject to Integrated Offender Management?	Light green background	A question asked for information gathering purposes; data may be used to inform enquiries in domain one.
Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?	Bold text on a dark grey background	A summary judgement question, answering a key question from the inspection standards.

Contents

1. Unpaid Work	4
Is the assessment and planning of unpaid work personalised?	4
Is unpaid work delivered safely?	6
Is the sentence of the court implemented appropriately?	8
2. Through the Gate	11
Does resettlement planning focus sufficiently on the service user's resettlement needs and on factors linked to offending and desistance? .	11
Does resettlement activity focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's resettlement?	16
Is there effective coordination of resettlement activity?	19

1. Unpaid Work

U 1 Is the assessment and planning of unpaid work personalised?		
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
U 1.1	Does assessment consider the service user's diversity and personal circumstances?	As a minimum, inspectors expect to see a fully completed, up-to-date diversity form, to set out any protected characteristics and any other relevant factors. We expect CRCs to use an unpaid work assessment form, adapted from the version provided in the unpaid work manual. A simple list of diversity factors and personal circumstances would not suffice. The nine protected characteristics are gender, age, race, religion and belief, disability, pregnancy and maternity, sexual identity, gender reassignment, and marriage or civil partnership. Other relevant issues may include rurality, employment patterns or caring responsibilities, educational difficulties, having grown up in local authority care, level of maturity etc. Any of these factors can make it difficult for service users to comply with an unpaid work requirement, or may mean that 'one size fits all' services are not appropriate. 'Consideration' would include a description of any of these factors that are relevant to the life of the service user, and a description of how these impacted on the life of the service user and their ability to complete unpaid work.
U 1.2	Does assessment consider the impact the service user's diversity and personal circumstances have on their ability to comply and engage with unpaid work?	Assessment should clearly take into account the impact of any relevant diversity characteristics and personal circumstances on the ability of the service user to carry out unpaid work. The potential impact of any factor and the degree to which it would need to be taken into account will vary according to the individual case. A number of factors can impact on the extent to which service users are able to engage with services; experience of having been in care, mental health problems and substance misuse can all contribute to this. Many users of adult probation services have had these experiences. Experience of such exclusion can make an impact on their ability to develop appropriate supportive networks, to form trusting relationships with professionals and their self-perception. People with recent care experience may not have access to a range of support networks, important for desistance. Inspectors will assess the impact of diversity and personal circumstances and the appropriateness of decisions made to sequence or delay the start of unpaid work. In some circumstances there may be very good reason, such as allowing

		other requirements to be completed to provide the service user with further protective factors which in turn may increase the likelihood of successful compliance with UPW.
U 1.3	Does unpaid work build upon the service user's strengths and enhance their protective factors?	<p>Strengths are those factors that support and sustain desistance. They encompass external and/or social aspects of the person's life; and also internal and psychological factors. All strengths support desistance. Protective factors are those strengths that mitigate against criminogenic factors, not all strengths are protective factors. Examples of protective factors include stable accommodation, secure employment, prosocial activities and pastimes, and stable supportive relationships. Also important are having a place within a social group, and building a non-criminal identity. Depending on the individual circumstances of the service user, a number of those strengths can be enhanced by placement on an appropriate unpaid work project. While these aims may not be clearly recorded in individual cases, inspectors will use their judgement to decide whether this has been addressed sufficiently.</p> <p>The unpaid work operating manual suggests that, where possible and appropriate, up to 20% of the hours ordered can be spent in employment or education. Where the possibility of such activity is available it is envisaged that unpaid work provides a unique opportunity to engage service users in learning in a practical work setting. It can provide opportunities for service users to improve personal and practical employment related skills. This may include problem solving skills, working co-operatively with others, gaining knowledge of health and safety, improving basic skills or skills for life. Providers of unpaid work should seek to establish work placements which are able to provide formal vocational or skills for life qualifications for service users who are unemployed and whose offending reflects employment related needs. Providers of skills training must be able to enable service users to work towards a nationally recognised, qualification.</p> <p>Learning provision on unpaid work sites should also take account of local skills deficits and opportunities provided by local labour markets. Organisations working in partnership to deliver unpaid work, such as placement providers or local authorities, may also provide valuable employment opportunities for service users. Where possible, guaranteed interview arrangements should be established with placement providers and partner agencies. Arrangements of this nature can potentially provide opportunity for service users to move into paid employment following the completion of their unpaid work sentences.</p>

U 1.4	Is allocated work suitable, taking account of the service user's diversity and personal circumstances?	This question asks about suitability of work in terms of protected characteristics (pregnancy, disability etc) as well as other personal circumstances such as hours of employment and travel arrangements. While completion of unpaid work will necessarily have an impact on the life of the service user, this impact must be proportionate. For female service users we would expect to see that they have been offered a female-only placement.
U 1 S	Is the assessment and planning of unpaid work personalised?	<p>Inspectors will weigh up whether any strengths in the case outweigh any omissions. While the focus of this question is on assessment to facilitate completion of unpaid work, we would expect to see sufficient flexibility to ensure that unpaid work placements are personalised to suit the individual circumstances of the service user. In some cases, the lack of attention to diversity factors might override other positive work. The assessment process requires relevant information to be gathered to enable appropriate allocation to a work placement. Inspectors will take in to account the quality of information and the use made of it. In cases managed by the NPS, inspectors will expect the CRC to have taken reasonable steps to obtain all relevant information from the NPS responsible officer to support the unpaid work assessment.</p> <p>If a service user has not attended, inspectors will use the available sources of information to ensure the CRC has taken reasonable steps to manage the unpaid work requirement and also any other relevant factors.</p>

U 2 Is unpaid work delivered safely?		
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
U 2.1	Was the assessed level of RoSH at the start of the UPW requirement correct?	Inspectors will use their own professional judgement to determine whether the level of RoSH set by the responsible officer is correct. Cases identified as having a current concern about domestic abuse and/or child safeguarding should not be assessed as Low Risk of Serious Harm.

U 2.2	Does the delivery of unpaid work take account of risk of harm to other service users, staff and the public?	<p>The unpaid work assessment prepared by the responsible officer should identify any factors related to risk of harm and explain how they will be addressed. This includes both risks of harm that might present themselves on unpaid work placements, and other risks, including domestic abuse and child safeguarding. Where there are active factors related to risk of harm, such as domestic abuse or child safeguarding, we expect the responsible officer to take any steps necessary to assess and manage risks to other people that might arise outside unpaid work placements.</p> <p>Inspectors will bear in mind the written RoSH assessment, and the level and nature of any risks identified. If the service user presents a risk potential harm to other workers, CRC staff, beneficiaries or the general public, has this been taken into account and is it actively managed throughout the order? The arrangements for unpaid work should be sufficient to manage the individual risk of harm factors, in order to protect potential victims and support compliance. CRCs may use a code to alert supervisors to the risk of harm factors they need to be aware of, where specific actions are required for the supervisor these should be set out clearly.</p> <p>Where the offence has resulted in serious harm to an identified victim(s), reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that the work placement is appropriate (given the nature of the offence) and it does not risk contact between the service user and the victim(s). The primary responsibility for the risk of serious harm assessment lies with the responsible officer but all staff have a responsibility to contribute to this assessment. All staff directly involved in working with the service user must be aware of the risk factors the individual service user presents and ensure they understand their role in managing those risks. Ensuring that a placement can safely manage the risk posed by an individual service user is the first priority of unpaid work allocation.</p> <p>In cases managed by the NPS, it is the formal responsibility of the NPS responsible officer to assess risk of harm. We expect the CRC to ensure this is done sufficiently in all cases with unpaid work requirements. Where assessment by the NPS is not completed or is insufficient, we expect CRC to take reasonable steps to chase this information to ensure safe unpaid work placement.</p>
-------	---	---

U 2.3	Does unpaid work consider issues relating to the health and safety or potential vulnerability of the service user?	The assessment, whether Oasys or a local format, must set out any issues for the delivery of unpaid work relating to the health and safety or potential vulnerability of the service user. CRCs should have a unpaid work assessment form, adapted from the version provided in the unpaid work manual, which should outline health and safety or potential vulnerability of the service user. We expect the CRC to assess these factors even in circumstances where the service user has not attended.
U 2.4	Where the responsible officer is engaged in other activity/work with the service user, does regular communication take place?	<p>There must also be a routine system for keeping responsible officers up-to-date with information about the service user's attendance and behaviour. An efficient system needs to be in place to ensure that information is conveyed speedily, so that decisions can be made and action taken in a timely fashion. It is good practice for unpaid work staff to provide information about work undertaken and individual engagement during each session attended. If the service user has attended but failed to comply, the responsible officer should be provided with sufficient information to assist them to take the appropriate action.</p> <p>To answer this question, inspectors will access the records of unpaid work staff and the responsible officer. However, judgements will be based on the work of CRC Unpaid Work staff, not any response from the responsible officer.</p>
U 2 S	Is unpaid work delivered safely?	We expect service users to be allocated to work placements appropriate to any risk of harm factors, and where health and safety or vulnerability issues can be managed. Inspectors will weigh up whether any strengths in the case outweigh any omissions. In some cases, the lack of attention to risk of harm, health and safety or potential vulnerability factors might override other positive work. Inspectors will assess the suitability of the projects to manage and address the risk posed and the impact on potential victims.

U 3	Is the sentence of the court implemented appropriately?	
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance

U 3.1	Does unpaid work commence promptly	Inspectors need to understand that the contractual requirement is that the first work session must be arranged to begin unpaid work within seven calendar days of allocation or referral to the CRC. This excludes any public holidays, and the whole period between Christmas and New Year. The first work session may include induction activities, but the greater part of the session and work sessions thereafter must be devoted to work which benefits the community. There may be circumstances when an inspector judges that a longer timescale is necessary, so we do not inspect directly against the contractual requirement. Similarly, there may be circumstances when a quicker start to unpaid work would be reasonable.
U 3.2	Does unpaid work happen regularly?	<p>The unpaid work manual expects every service user to be instructed to attend for work on a weekly basis for seven hours until the requirement is completed. Unemployed service users are expected to attend more frequently.</p> <p>Inspectors will expect to see that regular instructions are given, to encourage compliance and swift completion of unpaid work requirements. They will also expect sufficient flexibility to be given to allow unpaid work to meet specific circumstances related to individual service users.</p>
U 3.3	Do arrangements for unpaid work encourage the service user's engagement and compliance with the order?	Inspectors will consider how arrangements for unpaid work seek to motivate service users to attend, and what efforts are made to encourage service users to make the most of the opportunities available through unpaid work. Every effort should be made to demonstrate what offenders have to gain by compliance and potentially to lose through non-compliance. Reasonable adjustments should be made to support the service user to comply with the order. Reviewing may make small changes, such as in time or location of unpaid work, and needs to be based on a good understanding of the service user's behaviour and needs. Where there have been any difficulties with compliance and/or engagement, this should be actively discussed and attempts made to find ways to overcome any barriers.
U 3.4	Are the reasons recorded for any missed UPW appointments?	For every missed appointment, we would expect a record of actions taken to find the reasons the appointment had been missed, and a record of the reasons given by the service user. In stand-alone cases, that is the responsibility of unpaid work staff. In cases with a separate responsible officer (including NPS cases), it is their responsibility. Where the CRC uses hub/call centre arrangements, inspectors will consider their role in

		addressing compliance, and whether individual circumstances are given sufficient consideration.
U 3.5	Are professional judgements made in relation to missed appointments?	<p>We expect responsible officers to use their judgement in deciding whether to accept a reason given for any individual missed appointment. We expect decisions to be made with a view to encouraging compliance with the unpaid work requirement and completion of unpaid work hours; decisions need to take into account other requirements the service user may be subject to and relevant factors in their life.</p> <p>Where there is a pattern of non-compliance, we expect to see a clear rationale recorded if formal enforcement action is not taken. It is good practice for responsible officers to consult with managers to endorse such decisions.</p> <p>For stand-alone unpaid work requirements, this responsibility falls to unpaid work staff in the CRC.</p> <p>For cases with multiple requirements, and cases managed by the NPS, unpaid work staff need to monitor responses from the responsible officer about compliance with unpaid work, and initiate discussions if they believe the response is insufficient.</p> <p>Repeated failure to attend for acceptable reasons should be swiftly reviewed by the responsible officer so that a judgement can be made about whether the requirement is workable or if it should be returned to court with a view to revocation and resentencing.</p>
U 3.6	Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?	<p>Prompt formal enforcement action should be taken when needed and appropriate. If there have been several incidents of non-compliance, we would expect to see formal enforcement unless a clear rationale is set out for not doing this. For all decisions about formal enforcement, we expect responsible officers to bear in mind the overall level of compliance, any factors related to risk of harm or risk of reoffending, and the 'public interest' in enforcement. For cases with multiple requirements, including those managed by the NPS, we expect to see evidence of joint decision-making between unpaid work staff and the responsible officer.</p>
U 3.7	Were there any situations where work instructions were withdrawn, or the	<p>This could either be that a scheduled work party, or other work arrangements, were cancelled in advance, or where the service user actually attended the muster point expecting to work and was then sent home.</p>

	service user attended and was sent home?	
U 3S	Is the sentence of the court implemented appropriately?	We would normally expect at least one full day a week (or equivalent) of unpaid work to have been completed by the service user over the period up to the inspection fieldwork (more for workers where it is appropriate to instruct them to work intensively). Where that level of attendance not been achieved, we will judge whether the CRC has done what is reasonable to ensure compliance and implement the sentence of the court.

2. Through the Gate		
T 1	Does resettlement planning focus sufficiently on the service user's resettlement needs and on factors linked to offending and desistance?	
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
T 1.1	Is there a clear and timely plan for how the service user's resettlement needs will be addressed?	<p>When a prisoner first arrives into custody, a member of prison staff completes a Basic Custody Screening (BCS1). That is passed on to a member of CRC staff (often working for supply chain organisations) to produce the Resettlement Plan (BCS2). The quality of the BCS1 can be variable, but the CRC staff have no access to that part of the document to change or update any information that might have been recorded previously. The only part of the document that the CRC staff can edit, is the Resettlement Plan.</p> <p>The first resettlement plan is completed immediately after the prisoner arrives in custody. This may be many months, or even years, before they are due for release. CRCs are meant to address any immediate resettlement needs at that point, although in our recent thematic inspection we found very little work was done at the start of sentences.</p> <p>CRCs come back into the picture in the 12 weeks before release, when they are expected to review the Resettlement Plan and address any resettlement needs that are evident at that point. For prisoners serving a very short period in custody (less than three months), the pre-release Resettlement Plan may be the first one. The Resettlement Plan</p>

		<p>we are inspecting is the first one, and any subsequent reviews, completed 12 weeks or less before release. We expect CRCs to commence this pre-release planning as early as possible in the 12 week pre-release period, or we will not judge the plan as timely.</p> <p>Judgements made by inspectors will be based on the work of the CRC alone (represented by the resettlement plan), not the work of prison staff or others (as recorded in the earlier sections of the BCS). We still expect the CRC to complete a resettlement plan when the service user has refused contact and/or when operational reasons prevent an interview taking place. Inspectors will take into account what it would have been reasonable for the CRC to do in such circumstances, where they just have existing records on which to base their planning.</p> <p>A sufficient resettlement plan will set out clear actions to address the most significant of the six resettlement needs the CRC are contracted to deliver. Inspectors will refer all available information to determine how the assessor has reached this decision and will expect to see relevant information recorded in each section to explain which needs have been identified, and which have not. In circumstances where the CRC has correctly identified that the prisoner has no resettlement needs, this question will be answered positively.</p>
T 1.2	Does the plan sufficiently draw on available sources of information?	We would expect the plan to draw on all available information about the service user. This might be records held in the prison, or information from prison staff and the responsible officer in the community. Information from current or recent OASys assessments should also be taken into account.
T 1.3	Is the service user meaningfully involved in planning their resettlement and are their views taken into account?	Inspectors will look at all available records to judge the extent to which the service user has had meaningful involvement in planning their resettlement. Details of the interview must be recorded in the service user's personal resettlement plan on the OASys platform. There may also be evidence in nDelius; but the main source of evidence will be the resettlement plan, as that is accessible to all staff in prisons and the community. If operational difficulties in the prison or refusal prevented the CRC having contact with the service user, the inspector will answer 'No'.
T 1.4	Does the resettlement plan identify the service user's strengths and protective	Evidence for this question will come from the resettlement workers interview with the service user, the resettlement plan, and any other records (such as OASys) that it would have been reasonable for the resettlement worker to access. Resettlement workers

	<p>factors, and consider ways to build upon these?</p>	<p>should use a range of sources to inform their assessment and planning. It is insufficient to rely on the interview alone. Inspectors will not assume that resettlement staff have access to information on nDelius, unless it is evident that nDelius is available in specific prisons.</p> <p>Strengths are those factors that support and sustain desistance. They encompass external and/or social aspects of the person's life; and also internal and psychological factors. All strengths support desistance. Protective factors are those strengths that mitigate against criminogenic factors, not all strengths are protective factors. Examples of protective factors include stable accommodation, secure employment, prosocial activities and pastimes, and stable supportive relationships. Also important are having a place within a social group, and building a non-criminal identity. Depending on the individual circumstances of the service user, a number of those strengths can be enhanced by accessing services or support prior to release.</p>
T 1.5	<p>Does the plan take sufficient account of the service user's diversity and personal circumstances?</p>	<p>Evidence for this question will come from the resettlement workers interview with the service user, the resettlement plan, and any other records (such as OASys) that it would have been reasonable for the resettlement worker to access. Resettlement workers should use a range of sources to inform their assessment and planning. It is insufficient to rely on the interview alone. Inspectors will not assume that resettlement staff have access to information on nDelius, unless it is evident that nDelius is available in specific prisons.</p> <p>The nine protected characteristics are gender, age, race, religion and belief, disability, pregnancy and maternity, sexual identity, gender reassignment, and marriage or civil partnership. 'Consideration' would include a description of any of these factors that are relevant to the life of the service user, and a description of how these impacted on the life of the service user and their ability to resettle successfully. The potential impact of any factor and the degree to which it would need to be taken into account will vary according to the individual case. A number of factors can impact on the extent to which service users are able to engage with services; experience of having been in care, mental health problems and substance misuse can all contribute to this. Many users of adult probation services have had these experiences. Experience of such exclusion can make an impact on their ability to develop appropriate supportive networks, to form trusting relationships</p>

		with professionals and their self-perception. People with recent care experience may not have access to a range of support networks, important for desistance.
T 1.6	In your opinion, what resettlement needs did the service user have before release?	<p>Inspectors will identify whether the service user had needs in connection with accommodation; finance benefit and debt; ETE; having been a domestic abuse victim; having been a sex worker; other complex needs. The other complex needs include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Young adult males - Women - Foreign Nationals - Recalled Offenders - People with learning difficulties and disabilities - Care Leavers - Black, Asian and Minority Ethnicity (BAME) prisoners - Ex-Armed Service Personnel <p>The type of needs under each pathway may include:</p> <p>Accommodation - To obtain safe, settled accommodation, to maintain safe, settled accommodation, to increase an individual's ability to obtain and maintain safe, settled accommodation.</p> <p>ETE - To obtain suitable employment, to maintain suitable employment, to increase an individual's ability to obtain and maintain suitable employment.</p> <p>Finance, benefits & debts - to reduce / eliminate debts, to maximise income, to improve money management skills</p> <p>Personal, relationships and community - Personal physical health needs met or improved, personal mental health needs met or improved, positive personal relationships built and maintained, prison health care provider arranges primary and secondary care appointments whilst in custody and on release, social investment in community built and maintained.</p> <p>Victims of domestic abuse - To increase safety of the individual (and any children living with the offender), to support the individual in dealing with the impact of the abuse, support the individual to better identify risk factors and networks of support.</p> <p>Previous sex worker - Increase safety of the individual, support the individual in dealing with the impact of the abuse, support the individual to better identify risk factors and networks of support.</p> <p>Other complex needs - Structured support (mentoring) TTG that also helps build</p>

		<p>resistance to peer influence, access to appropriate translation services to facilitate engagement with resettlement services and applications processes, support in understanding resettlement processes and case status for FNOs, help to engage with advocacy interventions. help to access and support to engage with accredited immigration services and structured help and support TTG to access and engage with resettlement services and social care service providers in the community.</p> <p>Insert a link here to a reference document - this should include the pathways, outcomes and actions (insert after training)</p>
T 1.7	In your opinion, was the correct level of need identified for each applicable resettlement pathway?	<p>Each of the TTG pathways has been separated into three levels of service however due to the different needs of individuals, provision is not exclusive to any one level and could include services identified in each level to fit their resettlement needs. The level of need can be found in the resettlement plan against the action. The pathways may appear more than once which indicates more than one action is required against the pathway. Inspectors will assess the highest level that applied in each case and if this has been correctly identified by the CRC.</p> <p>Level 1 – This is activity that applies to all offenders regardless of need – this is focused around assessment, resettlement planning and signposting. It is assumed that all offenders will receive all aspects of level 1 services.</p> <p>Level 2 – This applies to anyone with an identified need. The activity should be need driven so it is anticipated that not all activity in level 2 would apply to all offenders.</p> <p>Level 3 – This applies to anyone with an identified need(s) and additional complexity or vulnerability. It is assumed that they will also receive level 1 and relevant level 2 services.</p> <p>Where the service user has needs from the six core Through the Gate services, we expect CRCs to plan to meet those needs. If the service user is in prison for a short period only, it is reasonable for the CRC to prioritise the most pressing needs. Where there are other needs, not the direct responsibility of CRCs, we expect the resettlement plan to reflect how in the prison those needs are going to be met.</p>
T 1.9	Does the resettlement plan take account of factors related to risk of harm?	The resettlement plan is not a plan to manage risk of harm. However, as a minimum there should be no contradictions between what the resettlement plan proposes, and

		what would be reasonable as part of a risk management plan. For example, in a case where there are known factors related to domestic abuse, the resettlement plan should make it clear how any proposed accommodation after release will take these factors into account.
T 1 S	Does resettlement planning focus sufficiently on the service user's resettlement needs and on factors linked to offending and desistance?	<p>This question refers to the work of the CRC during the custodial part of the sentence, to plan necessary resettlement activity in the six key areas.</p> <p>In making a judgement, inspectors will take into account the range of answers to the questions in this section and weigh up whether any strengths outweigh any deficits or omissions. Sometimes the importance of a single strength or deficit will outweigh a larger number of other strengths or deficits.</p> <p>If the resettlement plan simply records factors to be addressed and marks them as completed on the BCS2 resettlement plan on the same date, this may not be sufficient, unless there is evidence of implementation activity.</p> <p>Inspectors will bear in mind the level of need/complexity in the case, and what is reasonable to achieve in the last 12 weeks before release, or the time the service user actually spends in the resettlement prison if that is shorter.</p> <p>In cases there were no resettlement needs, inspectors can make a positive judgement, where there was no work the CRC needed to plan to deliver. Similarly, in cases where any/all resettlement needs were being met by the responsible officer or prison staff, and the CRC had checked that out, inspectors can make a positive judgement, on the basis that there was nothing additional the CRC was required to plan for.</p>
T 2	Does resettlement activity focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's resettlement?	
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
T 2.1	Was sufficient work completed to address resettlement needs?	<p>Inspectors will have previously identified the relevant resettlement needs in this case. They need to remember that the CRC has a responsibility to address the five core factors only.</p> <p>For other factors, TTG resettlement staff need to be aware of them, and take them into account in their other work, but they do not have to deliver any services directly.</p> <p>Inspectors will expect to see a record of interventions delivered and the outcome in the resettlement plan. Any signposting activity to another provider should be followed up to</p>

		check the outcome, and the follow up should also be recorded within the resettlement plan.
T 2.2	Are resettlement services delivered in line with the service user's resettlement needs, prioritising those which are most critical?	It might not be reasonable, or possible, for the CRC to address all of the needs of an individual service user in the pre-release period. In such cases, inspectors will identify which were the most urgent resettlement needs, and whether they were met. In cases where all resettlement needs were appropriately being met by the responsible officer in the community, the inspector will answer 'No, there were no resettlement needs'.
T 2.3	Wherever possible, do resettlement services build upon the service user's strengths and enhance their protective factors?	This could be evidenced by the way that any reviews of resettlement plans are written, and how they describe the interaction with the service user. Also, nDelius might give evidence of communication with the responsible officer which describe the level and nature of contact. Strengths and protective factors will be individual to each service user, some examples may include family and personal relationships in the community, employment opportunities upon release, motivation and willingness to engage with relevant departments in custody to address substance misuse, educational needs etc.
T 2.4	Does resettlement activity take sufficient account of the service user's diversity and personal circumstances?	Evidence for this could come from the way CRC staff engaged with the service user during their time in custody; specific support they provided for resettlement needs; the nature of planned resettlement activity; reviews of resettlement plans; and any communication with the responsible officer. If the service offered was 'one size fits all', inspectors will probably answer negatively. The nine protected characteristics are gender, age, race, religion and belief, disability, pregnancy and maternity, sexual identity, gender reassignment, and marriage or civil partnership. 'Consideration' would include a description of any of these factors that are relevant to the life of the service user, and a description of how these impacted on the life of the service user and their ability to resettle successfully. The potential impact of any factor and the degree to which it would need to be taken into account will vary according to the individual case. A number of factors can impact on the extent to which service users are able to engage with services; experience of having been in care, mental health problems and substance misuse can all contribute to this. Many users of adult probation services have had these experiences. Experience of such exclusion can make an impact

		<p>on their ability to develop appropriate supportive networks, to form trusting relationships with professionals and their self-perception. People with recent care experience may not have access to a range of support networks, important for desistance. Inspectors will look for examples such as This could be in terms of the way CRC staff engaged with the service user during their time in custody, or the specific support they provided for resettlement needs. If the service offered was 'one size fits all', inspectors will probably answer negatively.</p>
T 2.5	Does resettlement activity take sufficient account of any factors related to risk of harm?	<p>Inspectors will consider only factors related to risk of harm that are also linked to resettlement factors. For example, was full risk information shared with providers of accommodation or ETE services? Were the locations of victims and potential victims, and any potential prohibitive licence requirements, recognised before referrals were made to services in the community? Inspectors will consider the risk of harm related information available through other assessments, such as OASys or case allocation tools and the extent to which this was considered as part of resettlement activity.</p>
T 2 S	Does resettlement activity focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's resettlement?	<p>This question refers to the resettlement activity delivered by the CRC and others in connection with the six key resettlement factors. To make their judgement inspectors will take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - work delivered directly by CRC staff based in the prison - work delivered by CRC supply chain organisations, or others following referral by TTG staff, in the prison or community <p>In situations where the prison staff or responsible officer are delivering appropriate resettlement services, and the CRC has recognised this, we do not expect the CRC to deliver additional services. An example of this would be where a responsible officer is making an accommodation referral, and the CRC indicates through the resettlement plan they are aware of this and tracking the outcome.</p> <p>Inspectors will bear in mind the level of need/complexity of the case, and what it is reasonable for the CRC to achieve in the pre-release period, which will be no more than 12 weeks, and sometimes less.</p> <p>Inspectors will answer the question positively, if the CRC had done most or all that they could have been expected to do; and negatively, if significant resettlement activities</p>

		(related to the six key factors) were required and had not been delivered by the CRC or others at their request.
T 3	Is there effective coordination of resettlement activity?	
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
T 3.2	Is there effective coordination of resettlement activity with other services being delivered in the prison?	Pre-release co-ordination includes gathering information from other prison departments or agencies working in the prison about their involvement with the service user. As a minimum, this will be recorded on a review of the resettlement plan, along with outcomes relating to resettlement activity delivered by the CRC. Additional evidence of coordination may be found in the case record on nDelius, but we do not assume Through the Gate staff are able to make entries direct onto nDelius.
T 3.3	Is there effective communication with the responsible officer in the community, prior to and at the point of release?	In this question, we are only looking at communication from the Through the Gate resettlement worker, not from the responsible officer or others. In many cases, full completion of the resettlement plan and reviews will be sufficient evidence of communication. Additional evidence might be found on nDelius, but we do not assume Through the Gate resettlement workers are able to make direct entries to nDelius. If the content of the plan and any reviews is insufficient, inspectors will answer this negatively. We do expect responsible officers to read the resettlement plans in their cases.
T 3.4	Do resettlement services support effective handover to local services in the community?	We expect a review of the resettlement plan to confirm any arrangements made for handover to community services such as substance misuse or benefits agency appointments. This might be the detail of appointments made, or information for the responsible officer to follow up after release. Additional evidence may be available on nDelius, but we do not assume Through the Gate resettlement workers are able to update nDelius directly.
T 3 S	Is there effective coordination of resettlement activity?	This question refers to the coordination of arrangements surrounding the release, by the CRC resettlement team. We expect the CRC to provide the responsible officer with full information about all the resettlement services they have delivered directly, or used in the supply chain. We also expect the CRC to provide the responsible officer with information about other activities that have been taking place in the prison, that are not directly linked

		<p>to TTG. However, if it is clear there is already sufficient communication such as between a responsible officer and the prison offender management unit, inspectors will not expect to see additional activity by the CRC.</p> <p>A full review of the resettlement plan will often give sufficient evidence for this question. Additional evidence may be found on nDelius, but we do not assume Through the Gate resettlement workers are able to make direct entries on nDelius. Inspectors will bear in mind the level of need/complexity, and what it is reasonable for the CRC to achieve in the last 12 weeks before release (or the actual time in custody, if shorter). Inspectors will weigh up whether any strengths outweigh any deficits or omissions.</p>
--	--	--