



# Probation inspection domain two

## 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.

**Key:**

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.
<b>Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?</b>	<b>Bold text on a dark grey background</b>	A summary judgement question, answering a key question from the inspection standards.

# Contents

---

<b>1. Assessment</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the service user? .....	4
Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?.....	6
Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?.....	8
<b>2. Planning</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the service user? .....	18
Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting the service user's desistance?.....	21
Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe? .....	22
<b>3. Implementation and delivery</b> .....	<b>26</b>
Is the sentence/post-release period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the service user?.....	26
Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the service user's desistance? .....	29
Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people? .....	33
<b>4. Reviewing</b> .....	<b>35</b>
Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's compliance and engagement? .....	35
Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's desistance? .....	36
Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe? .....	38

# 1. Assessment

A 1 Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?		
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
A 1.1	Does assessment analyse the service user's motivation and readiness to engage and comply with the sentence?	Inspectors are looking for more than a simple statement about service user's motivation and readiness to engage and comply with the sentence. We expect to find a clear statement about the service users readiness, noting their past behaviour engagement on supervision, their own view of motivation to comply, and any supporting indicators. Evidence for this question may be found on formal assessment documents or in the case record. This question only refers to motivation and readiness to engage and comply with the sentence. Motivation to change is recorded in a later question. If a written self-assessment has been completed (such as OASys SAQ) this may contain useful information. There should be active consideration of barriers to compliance including assessment of previous breaches or enforcement and enforcement.
A 1.2	Does assessment analyse 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. 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 evidence might be found in OASys section 13, or the equivalent in local assessment tools. 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 access services and interventions, or may mean that 'one size fits all' services are not appropriate. Analysis 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. 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.
A 1.3	Does assessment consider the impact the service user's diversity and personal circumstances have on their ability to comply and engage with service delivery?	Having analysed relevant diversity factors and personal circumstances, we expect to see an account of the impact these have specifically on the requirements of the sentence and the ability of the service user to engage and comply. Evidence of effective practice might include assessments from partner agencies, depending on the needs of the case. Assessment should specify the potential impact for the individual of any relevant factors.
A 1.4	Is the service user meaningfully involved in their assessment and are their views taken into account?	Inspectors will look for a record of the service user's views, and some explanation of how these have been taken into account. Possible indicators for this are any written self-assessment, or sections of assessment tools, looking at the attitude of the service user. A detailed note on the case record of an interview with the service user, where these issues have been discussed and recorded, could be sufficient. We cannot know if the service user's views are taken into account in those cases where views are not recorded. Inspectors will also discuss this with responsible officers during interviews. The responsible officer will need to balance the views of the service user and the management of the case. Meaningful involvement could involve the use of interpreters, ongoing discussions or a single conversation-depending on the circumstances of the case.
A 1.5	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of engaging the service user?	We expect to see a clear written record of all the issues that are relevant to engagement with service user, in the locally-recognised case assessment format. For the NPS, and some CRCs, this will be on OASys. As some CRCs introduce new assessment tools, this will be the format we look for. While for other questions about assessment, we were looking a range of places for evidence, this question is about a single assessment document. We think this is important, as it forms a reference for any other staff needing to understand the case.
A 1 S	Summary judgement: Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?	Assessment should be sufficiently personalised, both engaging the service user in the assessment process, and assessing the factors that are likely to impact on their willingness and ability to comply with supervision. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the

		<p>strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient assessment of the most important factors.</p> <p>Relevant information from the service user may be taken into account here.</p>
--	--	---

<b>A 2 Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?</b>		
	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
A 2.1	Does assessment identify offending-related factors?	The assessment must identify and analyse the key factors that contributed to the index offence and other offending. Ideally, the evidence for this will be within an assessment document, but inspectors will also look at self-assessments, notes of interviews, and other available documents. For more complex cases, other more specialist assessments may be needed.
A 2.2	Does assessment analyse offending-related factors?	Assessment should identify offending related factors, and analyse how these factors have worked in the individual case to contribute towards the likelihood of further offending. There should be an understanding of the context of why the service user committed the offence, not just how, and it must also include an assessment of their attitude and/or motivation for the offence. This can be based on the interview with the service user, which identifies the reasons for the offence, and it can also be from information from the self-assessment tool. Information from the CPS documentation should be used by responsible officers, and any discrepancies in the information about the offence should be highlighted and explored with the service user.
A 2.3	In your opinion, which factors are most important linked to offending?	Inspectors look at available information, and identify what in their opinion are the most important factors, linked to offending. The factors we look at are attitudes to offending, family and relationships, thinking and behaviour, lifestyle (including friends and associates, drug misuse, alcohol misuse, education training and employment, and

		accommodation. These factors are selected because research shows they have the strongest link to likelihood of reoffending although it is not an exhaustive list. We expect the responsible officer to identify the main offending related factors and needs. These are dynamic attributes which when challenged, are associated with changes in the likelihood of reoffending.
A 2.4	Does assessment identify the service user's strengths and protective factors?	We expect assessment to identify the strengths service user has, and also any protective factors. Strength are those factors that support sustained 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, engagement with substance misuse treatment, pro-social activities and pastimes, stable supportive relationships. In some cases, inspectors might find that there are no strengths or protective factors.
A 2.6	Was the OGRS score calculated by the responsible officer at the start of the order or licence?	The offender group reconviction scale (OGRS) is a predictor of reoffending based only on static risks – age, gender and criminal history. It estimates the probability that offenders with a given history of offending will be re-sanctioned (reconvicted or given a caution, reprimand or final warning) that any recordable offence within one or two years of sentence, or release to custody. It does not define the probability that a particular offender will be re-sanctioned. An OGRS score should be calculated the court report stage, and then at the start of an order, release from custody or at review. The OGRS score should be considered by the case manager.
A 2.7	Is this service user subject to Integrated Offender Management?	Integrated Offender Management Schemes are multiagency arrangements putting in place intensive supervision for locally-selected priority offenders.
A 2.8	Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information?	We expect assessment to be based on all available sources of information. This could include current and previous records of supervision; assessments by other agencies, including youth offending services, health providers, specialist assessments and information about the custodial part of sentences. We expect that as much relevant information as possible has been sought to inform assessment. However, assessment should not be delayed unnecessarily if some information is not available. To be sufficient responsible officer should have taken account of the key relevant sources of information. It would not be sufficient to just list the issues, analysis is required. The level of information available will be variable depending on nature of the case. Our

		answer must be based on the sources of information it would have been reasonable for the responsible officer to access at the time of the assessment. Responsible officers should actively seek all relevant information, if needed escalation processes should be used to obtain key sources of information that are held by other agencies.
A 2.9	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of offending and desistance factors?	We expect to see a clear record of all the issues that are relevant to offending and desistance, in the locally-recognised case assessment format. We may be satisfied that other elements of assessment and engagement are sufficiently met in other parts of the case record but for this question we are looking for a single written record. For the NPS and some CRCs this will be a completed OASys assessment; in other CRCs it will be locally available tools.
<b>A 2 S</b>	<b>Summary judgement: Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?</b>	We are looking for sufficient assessment of the most important factors related to offending and desistance for the individual service user. Sufficiency is considered in terms of the overall level and nature of offending and desistance related needs, and assessment should be proportionate to the length nature of supervision. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient assessment of the most important factors. Relevant information from the service user may be taken into account here.

<b>A 3 Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?</b>		
	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
A 3.1	Were domestic abuse checks undertaken?	We expect the NPS to initiate domestic abuse checks with the police <b>in all cases</b> at the point a PSR is ordered by the court. Those checks, and responses from the police, should be clearly recorded on nDelius. We expect the NPS to be working with police forces to facilitate a clear, detailed and speedy response to all enquiries. It is



		<p><b>not</b> sufficient for the NPS to leave such checks for the responsible officer to conduct after a sentence has been imposed.</p> <p>If checks have been made at the report stage, and a clear response has been received and recorded on nDelius, there is no requirement for the responsible officer to repeat those checks at the start of a community sentence.</p> <p>Where there have been no checks made at court, or no response received, we do expect the responsible officer to make active checks at the start of a community sentence.</p> <p>Where the service user has been to custody, or where checks have been made as part of a previous period of supervision inspectors will consider the circumstances of the case to decide whether any earlier checks remain valid, or should be repeated ( prior to release in custody cases).</p>
A 3.2	<p>Are there <b>current</b> concerns about the service user being a perpetrator (or potential perpetrator) of domestic abuse?</p>	<p>All types of abuse within a home and/or familial setting should be considered, not just abuse within an intimate relationship. The cross-government definition of domestic violence and abuse (Home Office 2016) is: 'any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexual identity. The abuse can include, but is not limited to: psychological, physical, sexual, financial, emotional.</p> <p>The patterns of thinking and behaviour underpinning domestic abuse are likely to be enduring, so any information about previous domestic abuse is likely to indicate ongoing concerns, unless there is clear evidence why that is not the case.</p> <p>Assessment of risk of harm should consider all known previous and current domestic violence and abuse concerns, and should analyse whether there are any current concerns about domestic violence and abuse. Where current concerns are identified, inspectors will also consider whether planning, implementation &amp; delivery, and reviewing have taken the sufficiently into account.</p>
A 3.3	<p>Did child safeguarding information sharing take place?</p>	<p>We expect there to be child safeguarding information sharing with children's social care in all cases where the service user has children OR is in contact with children OR presents a potential risk of harm to children. This is to facilitate the effective sharing of information and must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• probation staff asking service users whether they live with or have caring</li> </ul>

		<p>responsibility for children and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• probation staff checking with children's services as to whether children are known to be in contact with the service user and if they are the nature of their involvement.</li> </ul> <p>We expect the NPS to initiate information sharing in all relevant cases at the point a PSR is ordered by the court. If information is not available to inform sentencing then it must be followed up again by the probation provider at the start of supervision. In cases where there is no PSR, information sharing should commence at the earliest possible opportunity; normally at the start of a period of supervision. Information that is shared at any time, including responses from children's social care, should be clearly recorded on the case management system.</p> <p>We expect the NPS and CRCs to be working with local authorities to facilitate a clear, detailed and speedy response to all enquiries.</p>
A 3.4	Are there any <b>current</b> child safeguarding or child protection concerns in relation to this case?	<p>An update to the government inter agency guidance on child safeguarding, "Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018", outlines how local partnership arrangements will change from September 2019. LSCBs will be replaced by "safeguarding partners". The partners i.e. local authority, police and clinical commissioning groups must make arrangements to work together with relevant bodies as they consider appropriate to safeguard children. The relevant bodies are defined in legislation and include NPS, CRCs and Youth Offending Teams. The transition period has already commenced and local areas are now free to implement the new arrangements.</p> <p>Any assessment of the risk of harm presented by the service user must consider whether there are any child safeguarding or child protection concerns in relation to the case. This could include concerns for children of the service user, or other children where the service user either lives with them or has significant contact with them (siblings, children of partners, children encountered through work or social activities). The concerns may be about the behaviour of the service user, or the behaviour of other people.</p> <p>Assessment should consider all known previous and current child safeguarding or child protection concerns, and should then form a view about whether there are any current concerns about child safeguarding or child protection. Where current concerns</p>

		are identified, inspectors will consider whether planning, implementation & delivery, and reviewing have taken these sufficiently into account.
A 3.5	Was the service user a source of these safeguarding or protection concerns?	It would not always be the service user who was the source of concerns about child safeguarding or child protection. In some cases, it could be the service user's partner or parent. We would expect the responsible officer to be aware of these cases, so as to be able to work jointly with other agencies involved, including children's services.
A 3.6	Does assessment clearly identify any risk of harm to others?	<p>In any assessment of risk of harm towards others, we expect any and all factors related to the risk of harm (not just factors related to risk of serious harm), to be set out. Harm includes physical harm, sexual harm and psychological harm. The risk of harm assessment should consider the circumstances of the case, and in what context harm is likely to occur. Information from any previous probation assessments of supervision, including OGRS and RSR scores, need to be considered. Where appropriate, additional assessment tools should be used. Information from the service user, and their family members if available, should be taken into account.</p> <p>HMI Probation uses the OASys definitions of serious harm and the levels of serious harm. "Serious harm is defined as an event which is life-threatening and/or traumatic, and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, can be expected to be difficult or impossible." Inspectors will expect to see assessment of all risk of harm posed by the service user, not just serious harm. The presence of external protective factors alone is not sufficient to support assessment of a lower level of risk of harm than would be the case were they absent.</p> <p>Principles for inspection Our key principle is that we inspect the quality of assessment overall rather than the use of any document, tool or process. We do not require the use of any specific assessment tool, but instead judge the quality of assessment in the round. We inspect against our published standards, not against the adherence of the NPS or CRCs to any specific policy regarding assessment.</p> <p>Specialist areas of assessment:</p> <p>Personality disorders The NPS has arrangements to obtain a formulation for some service users with a</p>

personality disorder.

#### Extremist offending

ERS is the Extremism Risk Screening tool, which should only be used by a trained probation officer, for cases deemed to be at risk of extremism or radicalisation. The definition being "individuals who are identified, through reporting in prison or the community, as vulnerable to engagement or have begun to engage in extremist activity". Inspectors will find further information about the tool in the following link: G:\GRH\_Office\Information and IT (Stephen)\InfoPath\CARaG Reference Documents\Extremism Risk Screen.pdf

#### Domestic abuse

The Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) is a specialist assessment tool for service users who have committed domestic abuse offences. It is available as part of OASys and as a stand-alone assessment tool. It is a checklist to 'aid professional judgement decisions, and combines both actuarial and dynamic risk factors that have an evidence base of increasing the likelihood of somebody causing harm to a current or previous intimate partner'. Items within the SARA assessment are scored, as a way of prioritising the most important risk factors in an individual case.

#### Assessment of men who have sexually offended

For men who have sexually offended we expect there to be specialist assessment. ARMS might provide us with this specialist assessment and as such provide a good source of evidence; but enough evidence of a sufficient, specialist assessment may come from elsewhere. The wording of our key questions and prompts reflects this, by not referring to specific tools. The NPS uses many different tools to inform assessments, assess risk and identify protective factors for those convicted of sexual offending. OASys is the assessment tool used by the NPS for all service users. It does not focus specifically on sexual offending, but provides the opportunity for responsible officers to gather a wide range of information about an individual and their needs and risk factors.

The Active Risk Management System (ARMS ) tool was introduced in 2015 (NOMS, 2015). While it is used as a risk assessment tool by police, it is used by the NPS to aid the understanding of dynamic risk and protective factors for men who have committed sexual offences. The NPS is responsible for completing ARMS assessments for those

registered sex offenders subject to probation supervision, where the NPS is the lead agency. It is only suitable for use with men who have committed sexual offences. Risk Matrix 2000 (RM 2000) is a tool used to predict the risk of reconviction for adult men convicted of sexual offences. It uses static information about an individual and their offending to provide an actuarial assessment of their risk of reoffending.

#### NPS requirements

NPS court staff or pre-sentence report authors complete RM 2000 assessments, prior to men being sentenced for their offences. Responsible officers are then required to complete OASys within 15 days of sentence, and ARMS within six weeks, and then to review the OASys assessment after completing ARMS. The Responsible officer should then regularly review OASys and ARMS to ensure that information remains meaningful and accurate in the light of changing circumstances. Our thematic inspection management and supervision of men convicted of sexual offences (2019) found that for many responsible officers, the task of completing an ARMS assessment was considered an add on, police toxic or box to tick, rather than being integral to good-quality risk assessment. We found many staff who felt there was a significant amount of duplication, having already completed the OASys assessment.

Where staff fully understood the relevance of ARMS, they had a better understanding of the triggers of, and factors linked to, the individual's sexual offending. Overall, however, we found that ARMS had been completed in isolation, and in just under three-quarters of cases it had not been used to inform other assessments all the delivery of work.

We found that the process of assessing service users using a multitude of tools was unwieldy. It results in duplication and in assessment been completed in isolation as opposed to having one accessible and comprehensive assessment. We made a recommendation to address this.

#### Summary

Assessment of men who have sexually offended should include specialist assessment to meet the HMIP standard. Assessment needs to be of sufficient quality and to have fully explored areas such as sexual preoccupation, opportunity to reoffend and commitment to desist from offending. Where this is not the case, then assessment would be insufficient.

A 3.7	Does assessment clearly analyse any risk of harm to others?	Following assessment of the factors related to risk of harm, these must be analysed. Analysis should identify the extent to which these factors are likely to influence future behaviour, and the possible consequences. It may be necessary for the responsible officer to undertake a full analysis of factors in order to justify an assessment that the risk of serious harm is low. Low risk of serious harm, does not equate to know risk of serious harm. Assessment should be informed by a range of sources including any previous assessments, the attitude of the service user, past and present behaviour, previous convictions, information from other agencies including children's services and police domestic abuse unit, and information from any other agencies involved in the case.
A 3.8	Does assessment identify who is at risk?	Assessment should identify, where possible any and all actual or potential victims, using the following categories; general public, known adults, children, staff and prisoners (if the case has a custodial element). Within those broad headings, assessment should be clear about any sub- groups that are more likely to be at risk, such as 'general public - peers in pubs/clubs', 'known adult - future partners', 'children - within family and friendship circles' or 'staff - police and security guards'. When assessing who might be potential future victims, we expect responsible officers to look for patterns of behaviours that are repeated and therefore likely to reoccur.
A 3.9	Does assessment identify the level and nature of risk?	<p>Assessment should be specific about exactly what harm might be caused and the circumstances when future harm is most likely to occur. The best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour.</p> <p>The level of serious harm is defined in terms of the likelihood of a serious harmful event happening.</p> <p>Definitions of levels of risk of serious harm are:</p> <p>Very High: There is an imminent risk of serious harm. The potential event is more likely than not to happen imminently, and the impact would be serious.</p> <p>High: There are identifiable indicators of risk of serious harm. The potential event could happen at any time and the impact would be serious.</p> <p>Medium: There are identifiable indicators of risk of serious harm. The offender has the potential to cause serious harm but is unlikely to do so unless there is a change in circumstances.</p> <p>Low: Current evidence does not indicate likelihood of causing serious harm.</p>

		Assessment should be clear about the level and nature of the risk presented to any/all categories of actual or potential victim.
A 3.10	Does assessment analyse any specific concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims?	<p>We expect assessment to be clear about whether or not there is ongoing risk to any victims of current or previous offences. Assessment should specify the nature and level of any ongoing risks.</p> <p>We also expect assessment to specify the nature of risks to any identifiable potential victims.</p>
A 3.11	What is the risk of serious harm classification of the service user <b>at the start of the order/licence, according to the responsible officer?</b>	<p>Inspectors will identify the level of RoSH set as part of the most recent assessment.</p> <p>We ask inspectors to record the level of risk of serious harm as defined by the responsible officer. This level must be explained and justified by a full written assessment, it is not enough simply to write in a report or case record that the level of risk of serious harm is medium, for example. The judgement must be based on all known behaviour, not just the current index offence. The absence of opportunity does not reduce the assessed level of risk of serious harm. For example, a known perpetrator of domestic abuse should not be assessed as low risk of serious harm just because in a relationship.</p> <p>It will not be sufficient to record, on nDelius or otherwise, 'medium risk of serious harm' without a full analysis being completed.</p>
A 3.12	What is the risk of serious harm classification of the service user <b>at the start of the order/licence, in the view of the inspector?</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>In exceptional circumstances, an inspector might judge that a case managed by a CRC should correctly be assessed as High RoSH. They will discuss that with the lead or deputy lead inspector, and will discuss whether the case should be escalated to the NPS.</p>
A 3.15	Does assessment of risk of harm draw sufficiently on available sources of	We expect assessment to be based on all available sources of information. This could include current and previous records of supervision; assessments by other agencies, including youth offending services, health providers, specialist assessments and

	<p>information, and involve other agencies where appropriate?</p>	<p>information about the custodial part of sentences. We expect that as much relevant information as possible has been sought to inform assessment. However, assessment should not be delayed unnecessarily if some information is not available. To be sufficient the responsible officer should have taken account of the key relevant sources of information. It would not be sufficient to just list the issues, analysis is required. The level of information available will be variable depending on nature of the case. Our answer must be based on the sources of information it would have been reasonable for the responsible officer to access at the time of the assessment. Responsible officers should actively seek all relevant information, if needed escalation processes should be used to obtain key sources of information that are held by other agencies.</p> <p>Information related to Terrorism Act (TACT) offences, including extremism, radicalisation and cases deemed to be "at risk" may not be openly available on OASys or approved assessment tools due to the sensitive nature of the intelligence. Assessments should draw on the available information and analyse the impact on a service user's vulnerability, personal circumstances, offending related needs and risk of harm. The assessment and screening process for "at risk" cases and TACT cases differ.</p> <p>Detailed information for "at risk" and TACT cases is available in the following documents: G:\GRH_Office\Information and IT (Stephen)\InfoPath\CARaG Reference Documents</p>
A 3.16	<p>Does assessment of risk of harm take into account past behaviour and convictions?</p>	<p>Information about current and previous convictions will come from prosecution documents and probation records. In some cases, there will be additional information from external sources such as police, VISOR, and MAPPA. Information about past (unconvicted) behaviour could come from a range of sources including the service user, their family members, and other professionals working with them. This may include responses to previous orders, juvenile behaviour and views of previous case managers. In some cases, there will be no previous convictions or information about past behaviour. Responsible officers should try and determine if past behaviours remain relevant, and the circumstances in which the behaviour may present. An example would be a return to drinking following a period of abstinence.</p>
A 3.17	<p>Was this a MAPPA case at any time during the sentence being inspected?</p>	<p><b>Category 1</b>  <b>All</b> current registered sex offenders are Category 1 MAPPA cases</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Check if sex offender registration is recorded on court papers or previous convictions</li> <li>- Remember that age and length and type of sentence are relevant to length of registration period</li> <li>- Is the registration still current?</li> <li>- Risk of serious harm level is not relevant</li> </ul> <p><b>Category 2</b>  Category 2 includes all service users who have been convicted of murder or any violent offence (Schedule 15 of the CJ Act 2003)</p> <p><b>AND</b>  Who are currently serving a custodial sentence of 12 months or more for that offence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Check the offence is on the schedule 15 list</li> <li>- Eligible sentences include Suspended custody and all indeterminate sentences</li> <li>- The length of the custodial sentence must be at least 12 months for a single offence (e.g. 6M + 6M consecutive for ABH X 2 does not count)</li> <li>- Risk of serious harm level is not relevant</li> <li>- Service user can be in prison or on licence</li> </ul> <p><b>Category 3</b>  These cases are <b>very</b> rare. If the service user has previously committed an offence which indicates he/she is capable of causing serious harm to the public, and, it is reasonable to consider that they might cause serious harm to the public which requires a multiagency approach at MAPPA level 2 or 3 to manage the risks, then the case can be referred to the local MAPPA coordinator for guidance about whether or not the case should be accepted as a MAPPA case. Category 3 cases can only be managed at MAPPA level 2 or 3.</p>
A 3.19	Is the case eligible for statutory victim contact, with at least one victim living within this NPS area?	Inspectors will use existing guidance (PI 48-2014) to identify whether cases are eligible or not. The victim contact scheme was set up on a statutory basis, stemming from the Criminal Justice and Court Services act 2000, and was updated by the Domestic Violence Crime and Victims Act 2004. The victim contact scheme requires that the NPS contacts and offers the victim contact scheme to victims of offenders

		who have committed a specified serious violent or sexual offence, for which the offender has been sentenced to 12 months or more in custody or detained under the Mental Health Act 1983. Victims who choose to participate in the victim contact scheme receive certain information about key stages of the offender's sentence from the NPS victim liaison officer (VLO). They may also make representations about the offender's licence or discharge conditions.
<b>A 3 S</b>	<b>Summary judgement: Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?</b>	Inspectors will take into account the nature and level of risk of harm in the case, and will look for a proportionate approach to assessment. They need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. Examples of such overriding factors might be inadequate checking or analysis of factors related to child safeguarding or domestic abuse. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient assessment of the most important.

## 2. Planning

<b>P 1</b>	<b>Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?</b>	
	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
P 1.1	Is the service user meaningfully involved in planning?	We expect to find evidence of how the service user has been involved in developing plans. Service users should be able to make an active contribution to planning. The achievement of planned outcomes is dependent on sufficient involvement of the service user to be fully effective. This question will be answered negatively if there was insufficient evidence of discussion with the service user specifically about the plan for their sentence, or of planning documents being shared with them.

P 1.2	Are the views of the service user taken into account in planning?	Planning should identify set goals relevant to both the service user and the purpose of the sentence. Any enabling factors should be identified and built into the sentence plan. Where possible there should be evidence that the responsible officer sought to identify and address any potential barriers to achieving the planned outcomes. Inspectors need to be satisfied that engagement with the service user was appropriate to the individual, relevant and responsive to the needs of the case.
P 1.3	Does planning take sufficient account of the service user's <b>diversity and personal circumstances</b> which may affect engagement and compliance?	Careful consideration of service user's diversity and personal circumstances should be planned for, going beyond the needs of those in protected characteristic groups. This would include an understanding of, for example, the needs of service users who have care experience or people who pose a risk of self-harm or suicide. If responsible officer has assessed diversity and personal circumstances sufficiently, planning would be based on those needs already identified. If the assessment was insufficient, inspectors will judge planning on the basis of the needs they identify. Planning should be realistic. In some situations, the service user may not identify any specific issues, however in good practice responsible officers will consider the known and potential impact of discrimination and life experience. In sex offender cases, planning could include discussing with the police officer the style in which the ARMS joint interview will be undertaken, where the service user has specific learning needs or a personality disorder formulation advises a particular approach.
P 1.4	Does planning take sufficient account of the service user's <b>readiness and motivation to change</b> which may affect engagement and compliance?	Planning should follow on from the assessment of readiness and motivation to change and should address any identified obstacles or barriers to desistance.  In sex offender cases, planning should address how the responsible officer will work with service user to increase their motivation to take active responsibility for changing future behaviour. In these cases, planning should avoid any activity designed to reduce denial of previous behaviour.
P 1.5	Does planning set out how all the requirements of the sentence or licence/post-sentence supervision will be delivered within the available timescales?	Planning should take account all requirements of the sentence or licence. We expect to their to have been discussion of all legal requirements, to ensure that the service user understands what is expected of them. Planning should also be commensurate with the nature of the order/licence. So, for example, we would expect to see much less planning in a community order with a single requirement of 20 RAR days, than a licence in the case of a person who has committed sexual offences. For cases with

		RAR requirements, we expect planning to specify exactly what is required and how the work will be delivered.
P 1.6	Does planning set a level, pattern and type of contact sufficient to engage the service user and to support the effectiveness of specific interventions?	<p>The level, pattern and type of contact planned should be appropriate within the requirements of the sentence, proportionate to the case, and set at a level that meets the needs of the service user. There should be an explicit record of what/when/where contact will take place. Contact should occur in a suitable and safe place, that allows for effective case management. Service users, and responsible officers and other workers must be able to speak in private, to allow delivery of interventions, disclosure of sensitive information, effective challenge and support, and relationship and trust building. The organisations we inspect may have set minimum standards for the frequency of contact. Inspectors need to be aware of these policies, but will still make judgements based on whether or not the set level of contact meets the needs of the case. Where there are arrangements for flexible types of contact, inspectors will use their judgement about the appropriateness of such an arrangement.</p> <p>A RAR 'day' does not mean continuous activity throughout a whole day. All activities need to be enforceable. The activities that count as 1 day could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual face-to-face planned and structured sessions designed to address identified needs</li> <li>• A planned activity with a third-party provider</li> <li>• 2 or more separate planned activities or sessions in the same day</li> </ul>
P 1.7	Is there a clear, written record of the plan to engage the service user?	We expect to see a clear record of planning, in the locally-recognised case assessment format. We may be satisfied that other elements of planning are sufficiently met in other parts of the case record but for this question we are looking for a single written record. For the NPS and some CRCs this will be a completed OASys assessment; in other CRCs it will be locally available tools.
<b>P 1 S</b>	<b>Summary judgement: Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?</b>	Planning should be appropriate to the requirements of the sentence, and proportionate to the needs of the service user. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge

		whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning for the most important factors.
--	--	---

<b>P 2 Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting the service user's desistance?</b>		
---	--	--

	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
--	----------------------------	---

P 2.1	Does planning sufficiently reflect offending-related factors and prioritise those which are most critical?	<p>We expect planning to reflect the most critical offending-related factors in the case. If the assessment has been sufficient, planning should reflect factors identified in the assessment. Where assessment has been insufficient, inspectors will judge this question on the basis of the offending-related factors that in their opinion should have been identified. Sources of evidence would include a range of documents completed pre- or post-sentence. There should be some evidence of prioritisation of work to be undertaken. For example, if the service user is homeless, that factor should be addressed before more specific work on other offending-related factors. Effective practice would also consider exit planning and sustainability.</p> <p>Where an ARMS assessment has been completed (sex offender cases only) scores given to factors indicate the priority the practitioner should give to the identified actions; e.g. 'High' = must be done within a month. ARMS does not cover all planning requirements in the case. Planning in relation to factors such as licence conditions and specific treatment needs to be explained separately.</p>
-------	--	---

P 2.2	Does planning build on the service user's strengths and protective factors, utilising potential sources of support?	<p>Planning should include a focus on building on service user strengths protective factors. The plan should include those factors that have the potential to impact positively on the service user's behaviour and to support their desistance from further offending. Protective factors are the circumstances, lifestyle and personal factors that contribute indirectly to the service user leading of crime free more positive life. Relevant protective factors may include stable accommodation, secure employment, engaging with treatment for substance misuse or mental health, constructive leisure activities, stable and supportive relationships, and having friends and family with non-offending attitudes.</p>
-------	---	---

P 2.3	Does planning set out the services most likely to reduce reoffending and support desistance?	<p>Planning should set out clearly the range of services, activities and approaches to be used in the case. They should be in line with desistance literature, and appropriate for the individual service user. Inspectors will look to see what the responsible officer understands about the service user's needs underlying the offence when they select an intervention to addresses the needs, whether as part of a RAR or otherwise.</p> <p>Examples of activities could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programmes designed to address specific issues such as emotional management</li> <li>• Enforceable appointments with a specialist organisation to help achieve outcomes relating to housing or financial needs</li> <li>• Working with a mentor, for example to attend college, go to the library or help prepare a CV</li> <li>• Structured sessions with the responsible officer, third sector provider or in-house specialist to help improve an individual's ability to solve problems, make good decisions or access and maintain engagement with other services</li> </ul>
P 2.4	Is there a clear, written record of the plan to reduce reoffending and support desistance?	We expect to see a clear record of planning, in the locally-recognised case assessment format. We may be satisfied that other elements of planning are sufficiently met in other parts of the case record but for this question we are looking for a single written record. For the NPS and some CRCs this will be a completed OASys assessment; in other CRCs it will be locally available tools.
<b>P 2 S</b>	<b>Summary Judgement: Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting the service user's desistance?</b>	<p>Planning should be clear, proportionate and relevant. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning for the most important factors.</p> <p>Relevant evidence from the service user may be taken into account here.</p>

**P 3 Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?**

	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
P 3.1	Does planning sufficiently address risk of harm factors and prioritise those which are most critical?	<p>Planning should address all risk of harm issues, not just those related to risk of serious harm. Planning should prioritise the most critical factors. Although not all of these elements are necessary in every case, planning may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- restrictive interventions, such as conditions of licences and court orders</li> <li>- monitoring of compliance with restrictive interventions</li> <li>- constructive interventions including treatment programmes and one to one work</li> <li>- activity required to ensure safety of previous and potential future victims</li> </ul> <p>Where needed, planning will make appropriate links to the work of other agencies involved with the service user. Where service users are subject to a range of plans to manage risk, all actions should be coordinated. Contingency arrangements should be considered. The arrangements for sharing information about risk of harm should be clear.</p>
P 3.2	Does planning set out the necessary constructive and/or restrictive interventions to manage the risk of harm?	<p>Restrictive interventions may include control measures such as curfews, accommodation at Approved Premises, or monitoring of activities by the police. Where there are restrictive interventions, planning should indicate how compliance with the requirements will be monitored.</p> <p>Constructive interventions may include accredited programmes, RAR activities or one-to-one interventions designed to address factors linked to risk of harm.</p> <p>Inspectors will judge whether all reasonable constructive and restrictive interventions have been used, dependent on the needs of the case. In some cases, very few or no restrictive interventions may be required. All cases should have at least some constructive interventions.</p>
P 3.3	Does planning make appropriate links to the work of other agencies involved with the service user and any multi-agency plans?	<p>The content and rationale of other agencies' plans should be known to the responsible officer. Copies of the plans should be available on the case record. There should be integration between different plans, and they should support each other.</p> <p>Where a case is assessed as high/very high risk of harm, and significant multi-agency risk management is needed, it is essential that plans contained within MAPPA notes, child safeguarding records, ARMS and OASys are aligned, and make clear reference</p>

		to each other, to facilitate joint working and ensure emergency action can be taken safely if required.
P 3.4	Does planning set out necessary and effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that have been identified?	Contingency planning should be in place where an increase in the level of risk of harm could be anticipated. For CRC cases, contingency planning may include escalation of a case to the NPS. In medium risk of serious harm cases, contingency plans may be brief. More detailed contingency planning is needed for those presenting a high or a very high risk of serious harm. Contingency planning should be specific and address known potential threats. This could concern steps needed to protect known victims, or changes in supervision arrangements, including curfew variation or recall, to address other behaviour linked to risk of harm. Generalised phrases such as 'consult manager' or 'consider enforcement' are unlikely to be sufficient. Examples of contingency action could include referring the case to children's social care if a domestic abuse perpetrator forms a relationship with a person with children; moving a service user to approved premises; sharing information about risk of harm with organisations in contact with the service user; increasing the level of MAPPA management.
P 3.5	Is there adequate planning to address domestic abuse issues?	In cases where there are current concerns about domestic abuse, we expect to see that planning is in place to manage and reduce the risk of further abuse. This is necessary in all cases where domestic abuse is a feature, not just in those cases where there is an indicative offence. Planning should protect actual and potential victims, including children. Planning should specify any restrictive interventions, such as licence conditions (specified accommodation, exclusion areas, non-contact clauses) are to be delivered. Planning should also set out the arrangements for constructive interventions including accredited programmes. Planning needs to be coordinated with other agencies that may be involved such as children's services and MARAC. Planning should be in place for known victims and potential future victims, such as new partners and their children. If the risk management planning does not cover all potential victims, for example children witnessing domestic abuse, then the plan will not be sufficient. There may be occasions where it is not appropriate to share risk management information and actions with the service user, so inspectors will need to check with the responsible officer where such planning is recorded. MARAC registration can be one of a number of public protection flags and so will not be immediately obvious to observers. In the same way that action points/notes from MARAC can be filed discreetly either in the non-disclosable area of OASys or as an nDelius attachment. With the GDPR in mind, most MARACs should have an



		<p>information sharing protocol which provides an agreed method for recording MARAC in each of the relevant agency's recording systems.</p> <p>We do not prescribe specific action to be taken, but we are clear that probation services need to know how many and which cases have been referred to MARAC, and what action they need to take as a result of a MARAC. Responsible officers need to have easy access to information to manage domestic abuse effectively; they need to know there has been a MARAC, and relevant actions. The most effective way of doing this is to make sure MARAC cases are flagged on IT systems. In our thematic domestic abuse inspection, not all CRCs could locate their MARAC notes and some responsible officers were unaware that a MARAC had been convened, so were unable to take relevant action or know what measures had been put in place to protect victims. This can affect the quality of work with service users to manage their risk of harm to others. The nDelius registration guidance suggests that the flag can be added to both the perpetrator and victim. The NOMS domestic abuse guidance (2016) states that 'When sharing the RMP with the offender it is important to remember that it must not include information that could either place the victim at continued or increased risk, or prejudice any safety plan that has been put in place. The offender must not be told that the victim's case is being discussed at MARAC'.</p>
P 3.6	Is there adequate planning to address child safeguarding or child protection issues?	<p>There should be planning to address all child safeguarding or child protection concerns as soon as these become known to the responsible officer. Planning should include all potential child safeguarding issues and adverse behaviour by the service user which might impact on children. Planning should be in place whether or not children's services are currently involved in the case. Where there is involvement from children services, planning should be clear on who is leading on specific actions and any timescales set. In many cases there will be a specific named child or children around whom planning can be focused. However, in some cases the risk will be more generic, and planning will need to be centred on the service user's behaviour, for example those who pose a risk of child sexual exploitation. Planning should explicitly cover the required frequency of supervision and contact, including home visits.</p>
P 3.7	Is there a clear, written record of the plan to keep other people safe?	<p>We expect to see a clear record of planning, in the locally-recognised case assessment format. We may be satisfied that other elements of planning are sufficiently met in other parts of the case record but for this question we are looking</p>

		for a single written record. For the NPS and some CRCs this will be a completed OASys assessment; in other CRCs it will be locally available tools.
<b>P 3 S</b>	<b>Summary Judgement: Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?</b>	<p>Planning should cover all activity needed to protect identifiable victims or potential victims, should be clearly enough recorded to be accessible to anyone who needs access, and should be proportionate to the level of risk of harm in the case. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. In doing so inspectors must make their judgement against planning as a whole process of which the written plan is just one part. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. Examples of overriding factors might include inadequate planning to address any child safeguarding or domestic abuse factors. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning for the most important factors.</p>

### 3. Implementation and delivery

<b>D 1</b>	<b>Is the sentence/post-release period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the service user?</b>	
	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
D 1.1	Do the requirements of the sentence start promptly, or at an appropriate time?	We expect the requirements of an order or licence to be commenced promptly, unless there is a specific and defensible reason not to. In orders or licences with multiple requirements, we would expect the different requirements to be sequenced in a sensible fashion. This sequencing needs to be known by the service user and by any partner agencies who are delivering requirements. Service users should be able to access any specific requirements in good time, so that the completion timescale allows for consolidation work if needed. Inspectors will look at the case record and speak to the responsible officer about the rationale for sequencing. Inspectors will

		make their judgements based on the work and interventions actually delivered, rather than those planned for.
D 1.2	Is sufficient focus given to maintaining an effective working relationship with the service user?	<p>Inspectors will assess the effectiveness of the working relationship between the service user and the responsible officer, as evidence shows this relationship will facilitate and support desistance from offending. Discussions with the responsible officer and the contact log should give a sense of the nature of the relationship between service user and responsible officer. Sufficient focus may include the responsible officers approach to the service user's individual needs, and evidence of challenge. Research shows that people are most likely to respond to punishment when they feel they have been treated fairly. Punishments that are felt to be random, unjust or deliberately intended to demean can trigger defiance and a process of "rejecting one's rejecters". Desistance research indicates that people who successfully desist from offending, usually attributed this to a particular staff member who made a difference, rather than because of any particular intervention they attended. Research found that probationers were most likely to credit their probation officer for helping them desist from offending when the officer was seen as being committed, fair, and encouraging; and the relationship was seen as active and participatory. These are the attributes inspectors will be trying to identify.</p> <p>In cases where there is a high level of non-compliance, inspectors will judge whether the responsible officer has taken reasonable steps to understand the reasons for non-compliance, and use a bespoke approach to attempt to improve this.</p> <p>In sex offender cases, a delivery style that avoid shaming, labelling and stigmatisation is important.</p>
D 1.3	Are sufficient efforts made to enable the service user to complete the sentence, including flexibility to take appropriate account of their personal circumstances?	<p>We expect responsible officers to make reasonable efforts to enable the service user to overcome any barriers to compliance. This may include adapting services to meet the diversity needs and personal circumstances of the individual service user. Inspectors will look for evidence of efforts made by the responsible officer, and staff in partner agencies, to mitigate any barriers to engagement. Where an accredited programme is a requirement, we expect attention to be paid to preparing the service user for attendance on the programme. We expect responsible officers to exercise professional judgement about the balance between flexibility and the need to deliver the requirements of the sentence. Discussion with the responsible officer (and service</p>

		user, if they consent) and reference to case records may give an indication of how individual needs are met.
D 1.4	Was there a proportionate level of contact with the prisoner before release?	Prisoners should receive sufficient contact prior to their release from prison. We recognise that CRC contracts are silent on this issue, as a minimum we would expect to see a letter to a prisoner giving the name of their responsible officer, and a response from the responsible officer to any communication from the prisoner or prison staff. In most NPS cases, we expect higher level of contact, including visiting or video conference, proportionate to the risk of harm and offending needs. Responsible officers should recognise any support provided by Through the Gate arrangements, if these are delivered in the prison from which the prisoner is released. The responsible officer should ensure that services offered meet the actual needs of the service user. Responsible officers should also be in contact with the offender management unit, and other prison department that been working with the individual prisoner. We expect responsible officers to be proactive in discovering what interventions have been delivered in custody, and to identify if there is any outstanding offending behaviour or risk reduction work needs to be undertaken.
D 1.5	Are risks of non-compliance identified and addressed in a timely fashion to reduce the need for enforcement actions?	In some situations, where risk of serious harm is high, we expect enforcement action to be swift following any non-compliance. In most other circumstances we expect reasonable efforts to be made to engage with the service user at the earliest stage of any non-compliance, before any formal enforcement action (breach or recall) is taken. Inspectors will look for use of a variety of ways to engage, for example phone calls or a home visit. This is a balanced judgement, as it must be clear that when professional judgement is used this is appropriate, and that service users do not inappropriately dictate the management of the case.
D 1.6	Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?	This question refers to early enforcement action including issue of warning letters or applications to vary licence conditions, as well as formal action such as breach or recall. 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.

D 1.7	Are sufficient efforts made to re-engage the service user after enforcement actions or recall?	The responsible officer should work pro-actively with service users who have been subject to warnings, breach proceedings or recall. Where a service user has been recalled to prison, work starts immediately to prepare for release. On community orders, we will look for evidence of actions taken to re-engage the service user including a discussion about the reasons for enforcement, and how to avoid that in the future. Working through challenges such as this can strengthen the nature of the working relationship with the responsible officer, and can be critical part of the service user' s desistance journey.
<b>D 1 S</b>	<b>Summary Judgement: Is the sentence/post-custody period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the service user?</b>	<p>Inspectors need consider whether all reasonable actions have been taken to implement the legal requirements of court order or post-release supervision. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and Inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient delivery and engagement.</p> <p>Relevant evidence from the service user may be taken into account here.</p>

<b>D 2 Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the service user's desistance?</b>		
	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
D 2.2	Are the delivered services those most likely to reduce reoffending and support desistance, with sufficient attention given to sequencing and the available timescales?	Service delivery should be proportionate to the nature and length of the order/licence. We will look for interventions including include work delivered individually or in a group, by the responsible officer or partner agencies, or external mainstream services. For delivered services to support desistance, they need to address both external and internal factors in the life of the service user. Consideration should be given to level and rate of maturity, as increasing maturity often accompanies a reduction in reoffending.

D 2.4	Where possible, does the delivery of services build upon the service user's strengths and enhance protective factors?	<p>Strengthening bonds with non-offending partners and family also support desistance, as does time spent with non-offending friends, and the service user's own children. Family and intimate attachments can give lives a sense of purpose, meaning and direction. Individuals who devote themselves to raising their children or caring for elderly parents will find that crime and imprisonment is incompatible with such roles. Reduction in abuse of alcohol and substances is often associated with desistance. Service users who find steady employment - particularly if it offers a sense of achievement, satisfaction or mastery - are more likely to stop offending. Generating and maintaining hope and motivation are powerful influences towards desistance, and the role of the responsible officer can be crucial here. Service users who find ways to participate in and/or contribute to society, their community, or their families, appear to be more successful at giving up crime. The opportunity to mentor, assist or enhance the life of other people. An approach that does not depend on having a criminal identity is important. People with criminal records who do not define themselves purely as "offenders" but see themselves as basically good people who made a mistake may find it easier to desist. Being believed in has a strong and encouraging influence on many service users, and supports the development of hope. Many service users are strongly encouraged by someone else believing that they can and will change, that they are good people, and that they have something to offer society or other people.</p>
D 2.5	Is the involvement of other organisations in the delivery of services sufficiently well coordinated?	<p>Where other agencies or organisations are delivering services to the service user, we expect to see the responsible officer coordinating that activity. If the delivery of services has been well co-ordinated, we are likely to find a clear rationale and sequencing, and services that complement and reinforce progress made. In some cases, there will be no other organisations involved so no need to co-ordinate work.</p> <p>RAR activities can be delivered by a sub-contracted provider (where there are arrangements to monitor attendance, as these are legally enforceable), an in-house specialist or by the RO. When the RO is delivering RAR interventions, this should be recorded as such, as it's distinct from their offender management activity. The RO should ensure the service user is engaging with the process and making progress.</p> <p>All appointments instructed by the RO, whether delivered by the RO or other RAR provider, are enforceable.</p>

		The RO should be assessing whether the person's needs are being met through the planned interventions and making changes if appropriate. The provider of the RAR activity should be reporting back on attendance, progress and suggested next steps.
D 2.6	Are key individuals in the service user's life engaged where appropriate to support their desistance?	We expect responsible officers to engage with key individuals in the service user's life, to support desistance. Given the evidence of the central role played in supporting desistance by parents and partners, probation staff should consider all ways possible to support and maintain these crucial relationships. The responsible officer should be able to identify who key individuals are, and describe how they have engaged then to support the service user's desistance. Examples might include support to the service users partner and family to reinforce the benefits of living an offending free life. In some circumstances, there may be other professional workers with a key role in the life of the service user.
D 2.7	Please record the total number of contacts with the service user during the current period of supervision:	We record the total number of planned contacts with the service user during the current period of supervision. In combination with information about the level of need and risk of the service user, and the nature of the order/licence, this supports inspectors to make a judgement about whether the level and nature of contact is sufficient to reduce reoffending and support desistance.
D 2.8	How many responsible officers had been assigned to this case since the start of the order or licence? <b>Enter number only</b>	We record the number of responsible officers who have been assigned to the case since the start of the order or licence. In an ideal world, a single responsible officer for the whole period is likely to be more effective than when more responsible officers are involved. We do not set a target for the number of officers, but overall this gives us an indication about the extent to which services are delivered in line with desistance theory. We do not count contacts with duty officers, officers covering for short-term absence, or unscheduled attendance.
D 2.9	Is the level and nature of contact sufficient to reduce reoffending and support desistance?	The sufficiency of the nature and level of contact will vary depending on the level of risk and need in the case. Inspectors will take into account the nature, length and requirements of the order or post-release supervision. Where contact has been insufficient, inspectors will identify whether that was because insufficient contact was offered, or because of non-compliance of the service user. The responsible officer must also undertake additional offender management activities, which include motivation, promoting and sustaining hope, supporting compliance, enforcement, public protection and overseeing the overall direction and sequencing of activities in

		<p>the order. These appointments do not count as RAR days and the officer can offer as many of these as they feel are necessary during the course of the order. There will also be other unstructured discussions between the officer or others and the service user to support them in addressing their identified needs. These discussions are crucial to the building of a positive relationship with the service user, but do not count as RAR days.</p> <p>Where a service user is attending an accredited programme or other structured intervention, effective delivery should include regular appointments with the responsible officer while the programme or other work is being undertaken.</p>
D 2.10	Are local services engaged to support and sustain desistance during the sentence and beyond?	<p>We expect there to be some exit planning, so that service users are able to continue to access services locally to support them once their supervision has ended. Access or referral to such services during the sentence should provide an introduction to help that would be available in the future. There should be evidence of referrals and advice given to service users about local services. In some cases, signposting will be sufficient. In others the responsible officer may need to arrange visits and meetings to support relationship building.</p> <p>The service user cannot be instructed to attend more RAR days than those given in their sentence. The RAR days do not necessarily need to be spaced out for the duration of the sentence, they can be completed whenever is most appropriate.</p> <p>After completing the RAR activities to address the risk of reoffending, the RO can signpost the service user to further support if needed.</p>
D 2 S	<b>Summary Judgement: Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the service user's desistance?</b>	<p>Inspectors will take into account what it was reasonable to expect the responsible officer and others to deliver, given the nature and type of supervision. Where non-compliance has been a significant issue in the case, this will not necessarily result in a negative judgement. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not</p>



		looking for perfection, but for sufficient implementation and delivery for the most important factors. Relevant evidence from the service user may be taken into account here.
--	--	---

<b>D 3</b>	<b>Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?</b>	
------------	---	--

	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
D 3.1	Is the level and nature of contact offered sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?	Contact with service users should be sufficient to deliver constructive interventions, monitor risk of harm, and to provide the responsible officer with opportunities to make an ongoing assessment. For cases assessed as presenting high or very high risk of serious harm, weekly contact should be maintained other than in exceptional circumstances. The nature of contact should reflect the level and nature of the risk of harm; if necessary it should include planned and unplanned home visits, face-to-face meetings, and meetings at different times of day.
D 3.2	Is sufficient attention given to protecting actual and potential victims?	<p>In all cases, whether or not the Statutory Victim Contact scheme applies, we expect responsible officers to identify whether there is a previous victim or other identifiable potential victims who could be at risk of harm. This is often the situation in domestic abuse or child protection cases. Inspectors will look for active management in the case that gives priority to victim safety. Evidence could include ensuring that the place of residence or employment does not increase the risk to any victims; active liaison with police, children’s social care or other agencies; discussion with employers or employment agencies about restrictions on employment; use of MAPPA and ViSOR to access and share information; minimising contact through appropriate consideration of unpaid work placements, reporting times, programme allocation, etc. Most of the restrictive requirements and conditions available in orders and licences are intended to protect known or potential victims. These conditions can be varied, if necessary, after the start of the order or licence.</p> <p>Effective delivery would include active monitoring of any licence conditions or other orders (such as restraining orders, sexual harm prevention orders, domestic violence prevention orders).</p>

		In NPS cases where there is a victim eligible for Statutory Victim Contact, inspectors will look at the work done to maintain contact with the victim(s), and will gather information that is used to make judgements in domain 3 inspection of victim work. That information may also be used to influence the judgement in domain 2, of the implementation and delivery of services to support the safety of other people.
D 3.3	Is the involvement of other agencies in managing and minimising the risk of harm sufficiently well-coordinated?	We expect to see evidence of regular and effective communication between all agencies involved in the case, to manage and reduce risk of harm. Multi-agency forums (eg MAPPA/MARAC) must be effective, including the right people to allow effective actions to be taken. There should be evidence of effective challenge and escalation, including by senior managers, if difficulties cannot be resolved. In some cases, there will be no need to undertake multi-agency work.
D 3.4	Are key individuals in the service user's life engaged where appropriate to support the effective management of risk of harm?	We expect responsible officers to engage with key individuals in the service user's life, to support desistance. Given the evidence of the central role played in supporting desistance by parents and partners, probation staff should consider all ways possible to support and maintain these crucial relationships. The responsible officer should be able to identify who key individuals are, and describe how they have engaged then to support the service user's desistance. Examples might include support to the service users partner and family to reinforce the benefits of living an offending free life. In some circumstances, there may be other professional workers with a key role in the life of the service user.
D 3.5	Are home visits undertaken where necessary to support the effective management of risk of harm?	We expect to see home visits used in all cases where there are child safeguarding or domestic abuse issues, unless there is a specific reason for not doing this (for example, the service user is resident in approved premises). In other cases, it may be good practice to conduct home visits to understand the circumstances in which the service user lives, and to meet partners and other family members.
<b>D 3 S</b>	<b>Summary judgement: Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?</b>	We expect responsible officers to take reasonable steps to keep other people safe, including ensuring that constructive and restrictive interventions are delivered. Delivery should be proportionate to the level and nature of factors related to risk of harm in the case. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the

		evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. Examples of overriding factors might be where there had been insufficient work done to address child safeguarding or domestic abuse factors. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient implementation and delivery for the most important factors.
--	--	--

## 4. Reviewing

R 1 Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's compliance and engagement?		
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
R 1.1	Does reviewing consider compliance and engagement levels and any relevant barriers?	We expect to see active monitoring of the level of compliance and/or engagement, and any difficulties with either should be actively discussed with the service user. Responsible officers should be constantly reviewing whether the approach they are taking is having the desired impact. The purpose should always be to check whether the initial planning is still adequate for the case.
R 1.2	Were any necessary adjustments made to the ongoing plan of work to take account of compliance and engagement levels and any relevant barriers?	Reasonable adjustments should be made to planning, to support the service user to comply with the order. Reviewing may make small changes, such as in time or location of appointments, and need to be based on a good understanding of the service users' 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.
R 1.3	Is the service user meaningfully involved in reviewing their progress and engagement?	The views of the service user should be central to any reviewing. Evidence may include details of discussions recorded on the case record; changes to any plans or assessments; or a new self-assessment questionnaire.
R 1.4	Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of actions to implement the sentence?	As cases being inspected will be approximately 6-7 months old, we would not always expect to see a formal written review of compliance and engagement at the time of inspection, unless there had been a significant change. That could be formal breach action or recall, or a significant improvement or deterioration in the level of motivation

		or engagement. In cases where supervision has terminated, we would expect to see a written review of progress made.
<b>R 1 S</b>	<b>Summary judgement: Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's compliance and engagement?</b>	We expect responsible officers to be alert to any changes in the level of compliance and engagement. In cases where compliance is generally good, little or no reviewing will be required. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient reviewing of the most important factors.

<b>R 2 Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's desistance?</b>		
	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
R 2.1	Does reviewing identify and address changes in factors linked to desistance and offending?	Reviewing should be used to take stock of the service users progress to date and to give strong optimistic messages about the potential for desistance. Reviewing should cover both improvement and deterioration, on small and large-scales. It should identify what has been effective and what has been achieved, as well as work that is still outstanding, or needs to be reconsidered or redesigned. The completion of any requirement of an order/licence should lead at least to an informal review with the service user. Being charged with a new offence will also be considered as a change in factors linked to desistance and offending, and we would expect to see some discussion with the service user about any new allegations. In sex offender cases ARMS factors should be reviewed whenever there is a significant change or when an action has been due to be completed. Such reviewing could be evidenced by a note on the case record, so long as changes are communicated to all those working with the service user.
R 2.2	Were any necessary adjustments made to the ongoing plan of work to take account of	Necessary adjustments might be changing the way particular issue is to be addressed; referrals to outside agencies; identifying additional work necessary as a

	changes in factors linked to desistance and offending?	result of a new offence; ending work that has succeeded. Reviewing should always involve the service user, and make sure their views are taken into account.
R 2.3	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on building upon the service user's strengths and enhancing protective factors?	Reviewing should focus on strengths not just risks. Much work with service users focuses on identifying and targeting risk factors – factors that increase the likelihood of reoffending. Often, less attention is paid to identifying and building personal strengths. Service users find this bias to be de-motivating. Therefore, a focus on strengths is an important part of helping someone desist. Staff who have low expectations of service users can create self-fulfilling prophecies which encourage recidivism. Staff who have high expectations of others are more likely to increase determined attempts to change. It is important that reviewing is used to mark achievements along the journey towards desistance. Reviewing can provide feedback on the distance travelled, and recognise the effort made to make changes.
R 2.4	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies working with the service user?	Where necessary, information should be sought from other agencies working with the service user. This can provide additional feedback or challenge.
R 2.5	Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of the progress towards desistance?	As cases being inspected will be approximately 6-7 months old, we would not always expect to see a formal written review of desistance at the time of inspection, unless there had been a significant change. That could be a positive or negative change to the key factors related to offending and desistance, including completion of a substantial piece of work or commission of a new offence. The outcome of any RAR intervention or other specific work needs to be recorded including a statement of whether the desired outcomes that were agreed as part of the initial sentence plan have been achieved. In the case of RAR requirements, the responsible officer needs to confirm to the service user that this counts as the completion of the RAR. If fewer days have been completed were ordered by the court, the officer needs to record the rationale for taking this decision, a description of the progress that's been made and the outcome achieved. Similar principles apply to pieces of work being delivered by other organisations, or on a one-to-one-basis by the responsible officer.
<b>R 2 S</b>	<b>Summary judgement: Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the service user's desistance?</b>	We expect responsible officers to be alert to any changes in factors related to desistance, and have active discussions with the service user about these. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from

		background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient reviewing of the most important factors.
--	--	---

<b>R 3</b>	<b>Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?</b>	
------------	--	--

	<b>Inspection question</b>	<b>CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance</b>
R 3.1	Does reviewing identify and address changes in factors related to risk of harm?	<p>We expect to see ongoing reviewing of risk of harm even in cases where the assessed level of risk of harm is low. Informal reviewing would be evidenced by continuing enquiries about relationships, contact with children, level of substance misuse, behaviour and any reoffending. It may also consist of information from relatives or other professionals, including police intelligence. We expect responsible officers to have an enquiring mind. Any new behaviour that might be linked to risk of harm must be spotted, analysed, and taken into account in any reviewing of planned activity. In some cases, there may be no new information that necessitates reviewing of risk of harm.</p> <p>In cases assessed as high/very high risk of harm, reviewing activity should be ongoing to ensure the risk management plan is working. Evidence of reviewing could include multi-agency meetings or discussions, or consultation with a manager, and do not always need to be completed on OASys or ARMS. In relevant sex offender cases, we would expect RM2K to be reviewed in any circumstances where there is a change in information related to one of the factors, as this has the potential to change the score.</p> <p>Where the assessed level of risk is increased or decreased, we expect there to be a clear rationale for that.</p> <p>Where the original assessment of risk of harm was insufficient, but there have been no subsequent changes in factors related to risk of harm, inspectors will not</p>

		necessarily score negatively for the absence of reviewing; that judgement will be made on the basis of the level of ongoing alertness to all factors related to risk of harm.
R 3.2	Were any necessary adjustments made to the ongoing plan of work to take account of changes in the risk of harm?	Changes will be made to the ongoing plan of work in response to changes in the nature of any risk of harm, not just to the assessed level, in order to manage and reduce risks. Based on their knowledge of the case, inspectors will decide if the right changes have been identified in response to changing/increased risk. This might include making checks about new partners; considering the impact of a pregnancy or the ending of a relationship, both of which can increase the level of risk of harm; increasing the level of contact or home visits; referrals to other agencies. For significant changes in risk of harm factors, it may be necessary to completely reassess the level of risk of harm. For CRC cases, that might result in case escalation to the NPS. In some circumstances, it would be reasonable for responsible officers to seek advice from their manager. If the NPS does not accept a case through the escalation process, any advice on managing the case, given by the NPS to the CRC, should be considered for the ongoing management of the case.
R 3.3	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in managing the service user's risk of harm?	<p>Information from other agencies is critical in reviewing risk of harm. In domestic abuse cases, we expect to see a regular dialogue with police domestic abuse staff about any new reported behaviour. In cases where children's services are working with a child in contact with the service user, we expect to see regular communication with social workers. Responsible officers should always attend multi-agency meetings, including MARAC, MAPPA and Child Protection meetings. If during any reviewing, additional information comes to light this must be shared with relevant agencies, so that they are appraised of key information in the case. This question must be marked no if there is a lack of professional curiosity, if the risk is seen in isolation from other agencies and if reviewing does not lead to action that you consider necessary. If the perpetrator is not in a relationship, then reviews should consider the potential for harm, if a new relationship were to begin.</p> <p>Reviewing of cases with known domestic abuse issues should be alert for points when risk is likely to be increased, including entering a new relationship, failure to cooperate with children's social care, return to substance use or deteriorating mental health. Reviews must include any other agencies involved in the case. In cases where domestic abuse issues had not previously been identified, responsible officers need to</p>

		<p>be professionally curious and alert to spot when issues arise.</p> <p>Responsible officers must be alert to the potential of safeguarding and child protection issues, throughout the span of the order/licence. Where there are known concerns, these should be monitored and reviewed. Where new concerns are identified, action to protect children should be the priority. In all cases information sharing will be critical, responsible officers should not assume that other agencies know about situations and circumstances, that they are aware of. Reviewing could involve a fresh referral of the child to children's services, or participation in multiagency reviewing. Planning by the responsible officer should be adapted in light of the outcome of any external reviews. Probation staff can make a significant contribution to child safeguarding, but to do this they need to understand their role and responsibilities and how to represent the views of their organisation. Records should evidence effective contribution to reviews.</p>
R 3.4	Is the service user (and, where appropriate, key individuals in the service user's life) meaningfully involved in reviewing their risk of harm?	The nature and level of involvement of the service user should depend on the nature and extent of the risk of harm. The responsible officer should be able to relate how they have considered the views of the service user and, where appropriate, any key individuals in the service user's life. Service users should know what is expected of them to reduce risk of harm, reviews should consider progress towards this.
R 3.5	Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of the management of the service user's risk of harm?	As cases being inspected will be approximately 6-7 months old, we would not always expect to see a formal written review of risk of harm at the time of inspection, unless there had been a significant change. That could be a positive or negative change to the key factors related to risk of harm; including a repeat or escalation of previous risk-related behaviour, emergence of new risk-related behaviour, or allegations of a new (harmful) offence.
<b>R 3 S</b>	<b>Summary Judgement: Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?</b>	We expect responsible officers to be active in seeking and verifying information which may have an impact on keeping other people safe, throughout the whole period of supervision. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all of the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. Information from background and supplementary questions is of less weight than answers to the questions directly related to prompts. In some cases, the evidence will be overwhelmingly positive or negative. In other cases, the situation will be more finely balanced, and inspectors need to judge whether the positive factors outweigh



		<p>the negative factors, bearing in mind the weight and potential impact of each different factor. In some cases, a single negative factor may outweigh a number of positive factors, because of the consequences of it being overlooked. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient reviewing of the most important factors.</p>
--	--	--