



Her Majesty's  
Inspectorate of  
Probation

**Youth offending inspection**

**Domain three**

**Case assessment rules and guidance (CARaG)**

v2.4 August 2020

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:
Is there sufficient analysis of offending behaviour, including the child's attitudes towards and motivations for their offending?	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.
Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of the child's desistance?	Light grey background	A supplementary question, asked to provide additional background information about the case, but less strongly linked to summary judgement questions.
<b>Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?</b>	<b>Bold text on a dark grey background</b>	A summary judgement question, answering a key question from the inspection standards.

## Assessment

A 1	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	
	<p><b>'Assessment' includes all assessment activity, not just the preparation of a written assessment. We expect to see assessment that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for assessment to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific assessment tool or document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.</b></p>	
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
A 1.1	<p>Is there sufficient analysis of offending behaviour, including the child's acknowledgement of responsibility, attitudes towards and motivation for their offending?</p>	<p>Inspectors are looking for an analysis of the offending behaviour, which gives context as to <b>why</b> the child committed the offence, not just how. Information from police documents should be used, and any discrepancies between the police account and the account given by the child should be explained.</p> <p>We expect analysis to include an exploration of what happened and what the child thought about it, at the time and afterwards. It should also include an assessment of the child's acceptance of responsibility, and their attitudes to, or motivation for, the offence. The views of parents or carers are also important.</p>
A 1.2	<p>Does assessment consider the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child, utilising information held by other agencies?</p>	<p>Inspectors expect to see a meaningful exploration of any diversity factors relevant to the child. We recognise the nine protected characteristics (gender, age, race, religion and belief, disability, pregnancy and maternity, sexual identity, gender reassignment and marriage or civil partnership). We expect the case manager to go beyond simply listing any factors relevant to the individual child, and to analyse the impact on the child. Assessment should give an understanding of the child's lived experience and how this may affect their ability to engage in an intervention. This can include practical issues such as rurality and their ability to attend appointments, as well as personal issues, such as issues with attachment, speech and language needs, and learning difficulties or disabilities, including attention deficit hyperactivity disorder or autistic spectrum disorders. Consideration should be given to whether the child has experienced trauma, and what impact this may have on their ability to engage in an intervention. For Looked After Children, we expect assessment to take account the potential lack of trust children might</p>

		<p>have in professionals, or difficulties they might have in engagement, arising from their experiences of feeling unsupported or not cared for.</p> <p>Assessment should explain and analyse the wider familial context of the child's offending, and the social context within which the child is living. Information from parents and any other carers should be included. Inspectors will look for consideration being given to any identified issues that the parent/carer may have, such as mental health or drug or alcohol problems, and what impact this may have on the child. If the child is looked after, information should be gained from the child's social worker.</p> <p>We expect to see a check with children's social care and any education provider, and additional information should be sought from other partner or voluntary organisations that know the child, such as youth workers or support workers. Past assessments, where available, should be taken into account. Having analysed relevant diversity factors and personal circumstances, inspectors expect to see an account of the impact these have specifically on the requirements of the disposal and the ability of the child to engage and comply.</p>
A 1.3	Does assessment focus on the child's strengths and protective factors?	<p>Inspectors will look for a clear identification of the child's strengths, this should include personal characteristics such as resilience, a sense of self-efficacy or motivation to change. Strengths can be identified from the child, parent/carer or education provider, and could be identified from the interview process and any self-assessment.</p> <p>Protective factors can include those in relation to the child, such as positive use of leisure time, engagement in education, and factors in wider family and community networks. Inspectors will look for identification of any actual strengths and protective factors present, and also any which have the potential to be enhanced.</p>
A 1.4	Does assessment analyse the key structural barriers facing the child?	<p>Structural barriers are barriers that prevent the child from making sufficient access to universal services such as education or healthcare. School exclusion is a particularly significant structural barrier, as it can make a child vulnerable to involvement in county lines and criminal exploitation.</p> <p>Inspectors will look for an analysis of the impact that any structural barriers may have on the child. Assessment should also include consideration of how to overcome any structural barriers.</p>
A 1.5	Is sufficient attention given to understanding the child's levels of maturity, ability and motivation to change?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that consideration has been given to the maturity of the child. This should include anything that may have delayed maturity such as experiences of neglect, or a diagnosis of developmental delay or learning difficulty.</p>

		<p>We expect to see some analysis of the child's ability to engage in the disposal. This should include consideration of the impact of any cognitive or emotional issues such as ADHD, autistic spectrum disorders, learning difficulty, speech and language needs or acquired brain injury.</p> <p>Assessment should be based on all the information identified and should also include an assessment of any past engagement, including any episodes of good or poor compliance.</p> <p>Assessment should reflect the child's motivation to engage in the disposal, and how well they have understood the implications of the outcome.</p>
A 1.6	Does assessment give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of the victim/s, and opportunities for restorative justice?	<p>Inspectors will look for an assessment of the needs and wishes of the victim, if known, on the viability of a restorative justice intervention. This should include any views the victim may have on reparation or any restorative activity, such as a letter of apology, shuttle mediation or direct reparation. It may also include any victim impact statement, which could later be incorporated into victim awareness work.</p> <p>If a victim does wish to be involved in a restorative activity there should be consideration of the victim's suitability to participate in this activity. Any requests from the victim should be balanced with the requirements of the disposal and an awareness of the timescales and status of the disposal. We recognise that in some cases, indirect restorative activity may be more appropriate.</p> <p>Assessment should also consider the capacity and capability of the child to comply with any restorative activity.</p> <p>NB Any issues about the safety of a victim are addressed later, in the section about keeping other people safe.</p>
A 1.7	Is the child and their parents/carers meaningfully involved in their assessment, and are their views taken into account?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the child has been interviewed as part of the assessment process, and the interview has taken into account the needs of the child. This should include consideration of a suitable venue, and the use of language or tools that the child is able to understand. There should be evidence in the assessment of the child's perspective on their behaviour. Reasonable effort should be made to include the views of the parent/carer of the child in the assessment. The needs of the parent/carer should also be taken into consideration when interviewing them.</p> <p>We expect to see use of interpreters where the child and/or parent/carer does not speak English as a first language. For a Looked After Child, the views of the social worker should be included.</p>

A 1.10	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of the child's desistance?	<p>A clear, written assessment guides the management of the case, and to allow others to access key information if required. HMI Probation do not require use of any specific assessment tool; but any document or process used should support recording of the factors that impact on the child's desistance.</p> <p>While for other questions about assessment, we are looking at 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 other staff needing to understand the assessment.</p>
<b>A 1 S</b>	<b>Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?</b>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient assessment for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than either a those for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child. Sufficient assessment will enable the right decision to be made about the disposal to be used, and the right interventions to be put in place.</p> <p>We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the important factors for the nature of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

<b>A 2 Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?</b>		
<p><b>'Assessment' includes all assessment activity, not just the preparation of a written assessment. We expect to see assessment that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for assessment to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific assessment tool or document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.</b></p>		
A 2.2	Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child?	Risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child may come from external sources or may relate to the behaviour of the child. Assessment should clearly identify the nature of risk, why that risk is present, and the likelihood and imminence of the risk to the child.

		<p>Examples of external sources of safety and wellbeing concerns include familial abuse or neglect, exploitation by older or more sophisticated offenders, sexual exploitation, or bullying.</p> <p>Internal sources of safety and wellbeing concerns could include mental or physical health concerns, substance misuse, risk-taking behaviour or low sense of self-worth.</p> <p>Having identified the safety and wellbeing concerns, assessment should analyse the potential impact of those concerns on the child. The safety and wellbeing assessment should consider the circumstances of the case and the context in which any safety and wellbeing concern is likely to occur.</p>
A 2.3	Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including other assessments, and involve other agencies where appropriate?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that information has been sought from other agencies regarding the safety and wellbeing of the child has been sought. That information should be referred to in the overall assessment of the safety and wellbeing of the child. This should include any assessments relevant to safety and wellbeing that have been completed by other agencies, such as child protection/child safeguarding, child sexual exploitation screening, return from missing episode interviews or police intelligence relating. If the child has engaged with other agencies in relation to their safety and wellbeing, information should be gained on how well they engaged with that agency and what facilitated or hindered this engagement.</p>
A 2.4	What is the classification of safety and wellbeing of the child, <b>according to the case manager?</b>	<p>Every case should have a classification of safety and wellbeing; this should be recorded accurately and consistently.</p> <p>There are four classifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low – no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome</li> <li>• Medium – some risk of safety and wellbeing concerns have been identified, but is unlikely to cause serious safety and wellbeing adverse outcomes unless circumstances change</li> <li>• High – high risk that a potential negative safety and wellbeing outcome will occur and the impact could be serious</li> <li>• Very high – the negative safety and wellbeing concern could happen immediately and the impact will be serious.</li> </ul>
A 2.8	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of the child's safety and wellbeing?	<p>A clear, written assessment guides the management of the case, and to allow others to access key information if required to keep the child safe. HMI Probation do not require use of any specific assessment tool; but any document or process used should support recording of the factors that impact on the child's safety and wellbeing.</p>

		While for other questions about assessment, we are looking at 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 other staff needing to understand the assessment.
<b>A 2 S</b>	<b>Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?</b>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient assessment for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence.</p> <p>Inspectors will consider the nature of offence and the circumstances and characteristics of the child. Sufficient assessment will enable the right decision to be made about the disposal to be used, and the right interventions to be put in place, paying due attention to the safety and wellbeing of the child.</p> <p>We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the important factors for the child. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact on the safety and wellbeing of the child in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

<b>A 3</b>	<b>Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?</b>	
	<b>'Assessment' includes all assessment activity, not just the preparation of a written assessment. We expect to see assessment that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for assessment to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific assessment tool or document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.</b>	
A 3.1	Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risk of harm to others posed by the child, including identifying who is at risk and the nature of that risk?	<p>Inspectors will look for assessment that considers who is at risk from the child; the nature of that risk; and the impact and imminence of the risk. We expect assessment of the risk of <b>any/all</b> harm, not just <b>serious</b> harm.</p> <p>Risk to others can include behaviour that is or was intended to cause harm, such as a planned assault, or behaviour that either through recklessness or an unintended consequence could cause harm to another person. Examples of potential intended harm could include possession of a weapon, involvement in gang activities or sexual offending, whilst unintended harm could include driving offences or violent behaviour due to poor emotional management.</p>



		<p>If there is an identified person at risk (parent, sibling, peer, partner or ex-partner) this should be clearly identified, and the nature of that risk specified. Assessment should clearly state the nature of any risk to others is, why that risk is present, and the likelihood and imminence of the risk.</p> <p>Having identified the risk of harm factors, assessment should analyse the potential impact of those on risks presented the child. Use of specialised risk assessment tools should be referenced, for example where there has been sexual offending.</p>
A 3.2	Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including any other assessments that have been completed, and other evidence of behaviour by the child?	<p>Assessment should take into account any previous offending and other known behaviour. Inspectors will look for evidence that information from other agencies with reference to risk of harm from the child has been sought. This should include any additional assessments completed by other agencies. Information about previous disposals should be used, and information about concerning behaviour that did not result in the criminal outcome should also be referenced. This might include information from school about bullying behaviour, or police investigations or intelligence. There also should be a record of dynamic factors related to harm to others, such as attitudes, lifestyle and drug misuse. Information from available sources should be incorporated in the overall assessment.</p> <p>If the child has engaged with other agencies in relation to risk of harm, information should be gained on how well they engage with those agencies, and what facilitated or prevented that engagement.</p>
A 3.3	What is the risk of serious harm classification of the child, <b>according to the case manager?</b>	<p>Every case should have a classification for risk of serious harm, and this should be recorded accurately and consistently. There are four classifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low – no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome</li> <li>• Medium – some risk of harm concerns have been identified, but is unlikely to cause serious harm unless circumstances change. Can be managed under normal case management.</li> <li>• High – high risk that a potential risk of serious harm outcome will occur, and the impact could be serious. Case may need increased case supervision.</li> <li>• Very high – the risk of serious harm concern could happen imminently and the impact would be serious. Case will need increased case supervision.</li> </ul>
A 3.10	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of to keep other people safe?	<p>A clear, written assessment is necessary to guide the management of the case, and to allow others to access key information if required. HMI Probation do not set a specific model for this assessment tool, but it should identify the factors that impact on the child's risk of harm to others, and there should be a clear categorisation and a rationale for that decision. Even in cases where there are no factors related to risk of harm, or the level of</p>

		<p>risk of serious harm is correctly judged to be low, there should be a clear written record of this.</p> <p>For the other assessment questions, we look at 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 other staff that need to understand the assessment.</p>
<b>A 3 S</b>	<b>Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?</b>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient assessment for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than either a those for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence.</p> <p>Inspectors will consider the nature of nature the circumstances and characteristics of the child, and any risks they present to other people. Sufficient assessment will enable the right decision to be made about the disposal to be used, and the right interventions to be put in place, paying due attention to the safety of others.</p> <p>We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the most important factors. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact on the safety of others. So, in some circumstances a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

# Planning

P 1	Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	
	<p><b>'Planning' includes all planning activity, not just the preparation of a written plan. We expect to see planning that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for planning to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific planning document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the planning process in its entirety.</b></p>	
P 1.1	<p>Does planning set out the services most likely to support desistance, paying sufficient attention to the available timescales and the need for sequencing?</p>	<p>Inspectors look for planning which sets out activities that will support the child's desistance. Planning should build upon strengths of the child and increase protective factors. Planning should recognise the child's attitude towards their offending and aim to build positive engagement in meaningful activities, with the aim of reducing offending.</p> <p>Planning should set out what activities will be completed by the YOT and which by the child, and should be understandable by the child. It should be clear what the child is expected to do, and when they have achieved that outcome. Where the assessment has failed to identify desistance factors, inspectors still expect planning to address them.</p> <p>We expect to see evidence that the plan has been shared with, and understood by, the child, and their parent/carer.</p> <p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the planning addresses any key structural barriers that are preventing the child from achieving their potential. For example, how to achieve the child's reintegration into education; facilitate or improve access to mainstream services such as mental health or substance misuse; or planning to meet accommodation needs.</p> <p>Planned activities should normally be sequenced in order of priority. When this is not the case, there should be a clear explanation as to why; such as where initial work is needed to enhance engagement or increase motivation.</p> <p>Planned activities should be achievable within the timescales of the disposal. For very short interventions there should be consideration of exit planning and utilising community resources for when the disposal intervention is completed. In some cases, a disposal can be as short as one session, or up to three months intervention.</p>

P 1.3	Does planning take sufficient account of the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child?	<p>Inspectors will look for planning that takes sufficient account of the diversity needs of the child. Planning should set out how these needs can be accommodated within the delivery of the plan. Where there are protected characteristics, or other relevant factors, inspectors expect to see an account of the impact these have on the ability of the child to engage and comply with the disposal.</p> <p>There should also be consideration of the social context and lived experience of the child. Planning should take into consideration the role of the wider family, both in the support they can offer, but also any caring role the child may have. Where the assessment has failed to identify diversity, familial or social context factors, inspectors still expect planning to address them.</p> <p>Planning should identify where activities and interventions will be delivered, and ensure this is achievable for the child. This might include both of rurality issues, level of family support and affordability. Planning should accommodate any educational and religious commitments of the child.</p>
P 1.4	Does planning take sufficient account of the child's strengths and protective factors, and seek to reinforce or develop these as necessary?	<p>Planning should build on the child's strengths and protective factors, whether or not they have been identified in assessment. This includes planning to develop internal strengths as well as external protective factors. Planning should actively facilitate the child's attendance at positive activities, and build on any existing positive activities that have been identified.</p>
P 1.5	Does planning take sufficient account of the child's levels of maturity, ability and motivation to change, and seek to develop these as necessary?	<p>Inspectors will look for planning that takes into consideration the maturity of the child and identifies the interventions that are the best suited for the needs of the child. There should be evidence that this has been a consideration when developing the plan.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the level of motivation of the child to address the issues that underlie the offending behaviour. Interventions should be identified that support and encourage the child to increase their motivation to change.</p> <p>Planning should reflect whether the nature of the intervention is entirely voluntary, and should set out any potential implications if the child does not engage.</p>
P 1.6	Does planning give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of the victim/s?	<p>Where a victim has expressed wishes in relation to the out-of-court disposal, these should be included in the planning. Planned activity may include direct or indirect reparation activities, a letter of explanation, victim impact statement, which can be used in victim awareness work, or other restorative activities. If a victim has not chosen to participate in a restorative disposal, their potential wishes could be included in planning, for example writing a letter of apology, to remain on file.</p>

P 1.7	Are the child and their parents/carers meaningfully involved in planning, and are their views taken into account?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the child and their parents/carers have been able to contribute and participate in the planning. If the child is estranged from parents then another person with caring responsibilities should be engaged with the planning. This could be a professional person, such as a support worker, or extended family member. 'Involvement' should be more than simply signing the planning documents, or completion of a self-assessment tool.</p> <p>The views from the child and their parents/carer should be clear, including what they believe will work for the them, such as information about preferred learning styles, suitability of timings for appointments and what will facilitate their engagement in the plan. This may include reference to their experience of previous contact with the YOT or other services, if applicable. We expect reasonable effort to be made to share the plan with the child and their parent/carer. If reasonable efforts to contact the parent or carer have not been successful, this does not necessarily result in a negative response.</p>
P 1.8	Is planning proportionate to the disposal type, with interventions capable of being completed within appropriate timescales?	<p>Inspectors will look for the planning being appropriate to the disposal, and to circumstances of the child. The minimum length of an out-of-court disposal is a single session and the maximum length is three months. Any activities identified in the plan should be capable of being finished within the time period. The level, pattern and type of contact planned should be appropriate within the expectations of the disposal, proportionate to the case, and set at a level that meets the needs of the child. In some cases, the needs of the case could be met with a single session; while in others, a high level of intervention would be expected. If the child has needs that are likely to extend beyond this timescale, the YOT should identify a community-based organisation to meet those needs.</p>
<b>P 1 S</b>	<b>Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?</b>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the desistance needs of the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than either a those for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Sufficient planning will enable the right interventions to be put in place. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning to address the important factors for the nature of the case.</p> <p>Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

P 2	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	
	<p><b>'Planning' includes all planning activity, not just the preparation of a written plan. We expect to see planning that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for planning to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific planning document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the planning process in its entirety.</b></p>	
P 2.1	<p>Does planning promote the safety and wellbeing of the child, sufficiently addressing risks?</p>	<p>Planning should include both work to be done directly with the child and parents/carers, and work to be done by the YOT, potentially on a multi-agency basis. The child and parents/carers should be involved in the planning to address safety and wellbeing. Where the assessment has failed to identify safety and wellbeing needs, inspectors still expect planning to address them.</p> <p>Planning should identify activities, services and interventions that address any safety and wellbeing concerns. Planning should also strengthen existing protective factors in the case. Planning should make it clear who is to complete actions, and how the child will know when the desired outcomes been achieved.</p> <p>Planning should be proportionate to the nature of the disposal and to the circumstances of the child, so planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution, may be less detailed than that of a youth conditional caution or post-court disposal.</p>
P 2.2	<p>Does planning involve other agencies where appropriate, and is there sufficient alignment with other plans (e.g. child protection or care plans) concerning the child?</p>	<p>Planning may involve some delivery of actions by other agencies. Where this is the case, it should be clear in the planning. Where the child is subject to other plans, for example, child protection planning, the YOT plan should be co-ordinated with, and make reference to, any other plans managed by other agencies. We expect to see clear information sharing arrangements.</p> <p>Planning should recognise and build on any internal and/or external controls and interventions necessary to keep the child safe.</p> <p>Where more than one agency is involved, it should be very clear which agency will lead on each activity, and how they will communicate with each other about work with the child.</p>
P 2.3	<p>Does planning include necessary contingency arrangements for those risks that have been identified?</p>	<p>We expect to see clear contingency planning, which recognises the factors which may lead to a change in the level of safety and wellbeing of the child. Planning should set out actions to take if these factors change, and the risk to the child increases or decreases.</p>

		Contingency planning should be specific and identify who should complete the actions and by when. It is not sufficient simply to state that planning will be reviewed if the perceived risk changes.
<b>P 2 S</b>	<b>Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?</b>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the safety and wellbeing needs of the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than either those for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Sufficient planning will enable the right measures to be put in place to keep the child safe. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning to address the important factors for the nature of the case.</p> <p>Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

<b>P 3</b>	<b>Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping people safe?</b>	
	<b>'Planning' includes all planning activity, not just the preparation of a written plan. We expect to see planning that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for planning to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific planning document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the planning process in its entirety.</b>	
P 3.1	Does planning promote the safety of other people, sufficiently addressing risk of harm factors?	<p>Planning should identify activities and interventions that minimise any identifiable risk of harm to others, and should address all factors relevant to keeping other people safe. Planning should include both work to be done directly with the child and parents/carers, and work to be done by the YOT, potentially on a multi-agency basis. The child and parents/carers should be involved in the planning to address the safety of others.</p> <p>Planning should specify who is to complete the activities, and how the child knows when the outcome has been achieved. Planning should address all factors relevant to keeping other people safe, irrespective of whether they had been identified at the assessment stage.</p>

		<p>Planning should be proportionate to the nature of the disposal and to the circumstances of the child, so planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution, may be less detailed than that of a youth conditional caution or post-court disposal.</p>
P 3.2	Does planning involve other agencies where appropriate?	<p>Planning may involve some delivery of actions by other agencies. Where this is the case, it should be clear in the planning. Where the child is subject to other plans, for example, MAPPA, the YOT plan should be co-ordinated with, and make reference to, any other plans managed by other agencies. We expect to see clear information sharing arrangements.</p> <p>Planning should recognise and build on any internal and/or external controls and interventions necessary to keep other people safe.</p> <p>Where more than one agency is involved, it should be very clear which agency will lead on each activity, and how they will communicate with each other about work with the child.</p>
P 3.3	Does planning address any specific concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims?	<p>Inspectors will look for planning that minimises any risk to identifiable or potential victims. There should be clear communication with the victim worker, and clear planning to keep actual victims safe.</p> <p>Planning should identify actions and interventions to address risks to others, including peers, people in authority, family members and other children.</p>
P 3.4	Does planning set out necessary contingency arrangements to manage those risks that have been identified?	<p>We expect to see clear contingency planning, which recognises the factors which may lead to a change in the level of risk to others presented by the child. Planning should set out actions to take if these factors change, and the risk to others increases or decreases.</p> <p>Contingency planning should be specific and identify who should complete the actions and by when. It is not sufficient simply to state that planning will be reviewed if the perceived risk changes.</p>
<b>P 3 S</b>	<b>Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping people safe?</b>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the risk of harm issues in the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than either a those for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Sufficient planning will enable the right measures to be put in place to keep other people safe. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning to address the important factors for the nature of the case.</p>



Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

## Implementation and Delivery

<b>D 1</b>	<b>Does service delivery support the child's desistance?</b>	
D 1.1	Are the delivered services those most likely to support desistance, with sufficient attention given to sequencing and the available timescales?	<p>We recognise there is little published evidence of effectiveness of specific interventions in connection with work delivered to children as part of out-of-court disposals. We believe that a strength-based approach, tailored to the needs of a child, is likely to have a positive impact on desistance.</p> <p>Inspectors will look at the specific interventions and services actually delivered to the child, and the reasons for choosing them. They will judge the appropriateness of the amount and nature of interventions delivered, based on the circumstances of the case. Interventions should build upon the strengths of the child, and enhance any protective factors. There should be a clear rationale about why specific interventions have been delivered, and how they meet the needs of the child. Interventions should start in a timely manner. Where a child has not engaged in interventions, we expect to see adjustments made to planned work to increase their engagement. Where interventions have not been delivered as identified, there should be a clear explanation recorded, and planning should be adjusted.</p> <p>Where several interventions to support desistance are planned, they should be sequenced and delivered in order of priority. We expect to see an explanation of any changes to sequencing, for example to enhance engagement or increase motivation.</p> <p>Interventions to support desistance can be very brief for some out-of-court disposals. In some cases, a single session can be sufficient, but in more complex cases interventions can last up to three months.</p> <p>If the intervention is voluntary, such as for a community resolution, and the child has not engaged, inspectors will make a judgement about the level of effort, skills and tenacity used to try to engage the child in delivery of interventions.</p>
D 1.3	Does service delivery reflect the diversity and wider familial and if	Inspectors expect interventions to be delivered in a way which takes into account the diversity needs of the child. This includes recognising protected characteristics, and other factors, such as

	<p>social context of the child, involving parents/carers or significant others?</p>	<p>self-identity or living in a rural area. We expect interventions to suit the needs of the child. Appointments should be made at times and places that are suitable for the child. There should be evidence that the child is able to understand and respond to the interventions being offered. Reasonable adaptations should be made to meet the needs of the child. Consideration should be given to wider familial circumstances, including the child's lived experience, and their role in the family. If it has been recognised that the child has experienced trauma this should be responded to appropriately.</p> <p>For Looked After Children, we expect the local authority social worker to be involved in delivery of interventions.</p> <p>Feedback should be given to the child on how they have engaged in the intervention, and the child's views should be gained on their experience of the intervention. This could be done after each intervention session, or as part of the closure process. Feedback should be given to parents/carers as to how the child has engaged and consideration should also be given to how the parent/carer can reinforce and support the interventions, for example encouraging parent/carer to support desistance based activities.</p>
<p>D 1.4</p>	<p>Is sufficient focus given to developing and maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents/carers?</p>	<p>Service delivery should aim to maintain a positive working relationship with the child and parent/carer. There should be evidence that the child's preferred method of communication has been used. If there are difficulties in the working relationship, we expect to see efforts made to explore the reasons for this and consideration of possible resolutions. We expect workers involved with the child to motivate them and reinforce positive behaviour. This may include the use of motivational interviewing techniques, pro-social modelling or other communication and support methods. Inspectors will need to be satisfied that the worker has not adopted a 'one size fits all' approach to their work with the child, but has judged best way to work to maximise the potential for a successful outcome.</p>
<p>D 1.5</p>	<p>Is sufficient attention given to encouraging and enabling the child's compliance with the work of the YOT?</p>	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence of effective engagement with the child, and their parent/carer, going beyond simply attending appointments. We expect to see reasonable attempts to engage parents/carers to support the work of the YOT.</p> <p>In youth conditional caution cases, if the child does not comply with the conditions, the case should be referred back to the police to consider prosecution. In youth caution cases, the interventions are entirely voluntary, and there are no consequences for non-compliance. In community resolution and other lower-level disposals, the local operating model will set out whether or not to refer the case back to police if the child does not comply. We expect the case manager to have a clear understanding of the legal position in their YOT, and this should be understood by the child and their parent/carer. For statutory disposals there should be evidence</p>

		the case manager has responded to incidents of non-engagement using a clear measured, and motivating approach to encourage compliance.
D 1.6	Does service delivery promote opportunities for community integration, including access to mainstream services?	Most out-of-court disposals are short, so the need to refer to mainstream services should be considered as early as possible from the start of the disposal. There should be evidence of how the YOT will support access to mainstream services, which could include evidence of supporting the child at the first appointment or session with other agencies. We expect to see that the YOT has supported any existing engagement with community services, and attention should be paid to ensuring the YOT intervention does not distract from this. Every effort should be undertaken to ensure the child accesses universal services, such as education or healthcare. If the child is likely to need further intervention after the completion of the out-of-court disposal, the YOT should actively support this transition.
D 1.7	Is the delivery of services proportionate to the type of out-of-court disposal, and completed within the required timescales?	The delivery of services should be in line with the nature of the disposal, as a maximum the disposal should be designed to be completed within a three-month period. In many cases the intervention could be completed much sooner; sometimes a one-off session can be appropriate. Delivery of services should start promptly and a disposal should not extend beyond the three-month period simply because there was a delay in planning and delivering services. The only exception to this may be when there have been delays in setting up a restorative process.
<b>D 1 S</b>	<b>Does service delivery support the child's desistance?</b>	Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of the service delivery undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the service delivery outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the service delivery is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the service delivery may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. Interventions to support desistance can be very brief for an out-of-court disposal, in some cases as little as one session can be sufficient, but in more complex cases interventions can be longer, to the maximum of three months.  If the child has not engaged, whether the disposal is voluntary or statutory, this does not necessarily result in a negative response. Inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort, skills and tenacity the YOT has shown in the engagement of the child.

<b>D 2</b>	<b>Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child?</b>	
D 2.1	Does service delivery promote the safety and wellbeing of the child?	Inspectors will assess whether the services, activities and interventions that are delivered directly to the child are those most likely to promote safety and wellbeing. Where assessment

		<p>failed to identify safety and wellbeing factors, inspectors still expect service delivery to address them. Inspectors will consider what is was reasonable to expect to be delivered, given the nature and type of intervention.</p> <p>Service delivery could include interventions and controls that will promote the safety of the child. It could also include interventions that develop internal strategies for staying safe, such as self-esteem work, or with parents to monitor potential and manage behaviour. There should be evidence of the intended impact of the interventions and how the child has responded to it.</p> <p>If no services were delivered due to the non-engagement of the child, inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort shown in delivering appropriate services to the child.</p>
D 2.2	Is the involvement of other organisations in keeping the child safe sufficiently well utilised and coordinated?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence of how the YOT has worked with other agencies to manage and promote the safety and wellbeing of the child. We expect the YOT to be active in referring children to other agencies, including child safeguarding arrangements. If other agencies are involved with delivering work to support the safety and wellbeing of the child, that work should be well coordinated with a clear record of the role of each agency, and clear information sharing arrangements.</p> <p>The YOT should support the child to engage with other agencies as required, and should seek feedback about how the child has engaged with those agencies.</p> <p>The work of the other agencies should link to, and support, the work of the YOT to assist in promoting the safety and wellbeing of the child. In some cases, it is possible for all the relevant work in connection with safety and wellbeing to be delivered by other organisations, but the YOT should still seek feedback.</p>
<b>D 2 S</b>	<b>Does service delivery promote the safety and wellbeing of the child?</b>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of the work to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the service delivery outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the service delivery is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the service delivery may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Whether the child has engaged or not, inspectors will expect the YOT to recognise their overarching responsibility for child safeguarding, and to ensure multi-agency safeguarding arrangements are used where necessary.</p>

<b>D 3</b>	<b>Does service delivery effectively support the safety of other people?</b>	
D 3.1	Is sufficient attention given to the protection of actual and potential victims?	<p>Where a specific victim has been identified, interventions delivered should contribute to keeping that victim safe. If victim safety will be increased by restorative work, or victim awareness intervention, this should be considered.</p> <p>We expect to see a response to any reasonable wishes from victims in connection with youth conditional caution requirements. There should be regular liaison with the victim worker if involved. There should be evidence of consideration of the protection of any actual or potential victim, irrespective of whether a victim has engaged in a restorative intervention. If no services were delivered due to the non-engagement of the child, inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort shown in attempting to deliver appropriate services.</p>
D 3.2	Are the delivered services sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?	<p>Inspectors will assess whether the services, activities and interventions that are delivered directly to the child are those most likely to promote the safety of other people. Where assessment failed to identify risk of harm factors, inspectors still expect service delivery to address them.</p> <p>Service delivery could include interventions that develop internal strategies for managing and reducing risky behaviour, such as managing emotions or knife crime work, or external controls, such as curfew, which may be available on a youth conditional caution. There should be evidence of the intended impact of the interventions and how the child has responded.</p> <p>We also expect to see joint work with other agencies, when required. Inspectors will consider what is would have been reasonable to expect the case manager and others to deliver, given the nature and type of intervention.</p> <p>If no services were delivered due to the non-engagement of the child, inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort shown in attempting to deliver appropriate services.</p>
<b>D 3 S</b>	<b>Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?</b>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of work to support the safety of other people meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the service delivery outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this service delivery is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the service delivery may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Service delivery to promote safety of other people can be very brief, in some cases as little as one session can be sufficient, but in more complex cases interventions can be longer, to the maximum of three months.</p>

Whether the child has engaged or not, inspectors will expect the YOT to recognise their overarching responsibility for public protection, and to ensure risk of harm to other people's minimised.

## Joint Working

J 1	Are the YOT's recommendations sufficiently well-informed, analytical and personalised to the child, supporting joint decision making?	
J 1.1	Are the recommendations by the YOT for out of court disposal outcomes, conditions and interventions appropriate and proportionate?	<p>For all youth cautions we expect the YOT to be consulted as part of decision-making. We believe it is good practice to consult the YOT prior to making decisions about other out-of-court disposals. For second or subsequent youth cautions we recognise YJB guidance that police should refer the child to the YOT for assessment prior to making a decision about the disposal.</p> <p>Recommendations made by the YOT for any out-of-court disposal conditions and interventions should be in keeping with the nature of the offence and the needs of the child. Recommended interventions should be realistic and achievable by the child. The duration of any recommended interventions should be proportionate to the nature of the case and the seriousness of the offence. They should be achievable within a maximum three-month time scale, but could often be achieved within a shorter time period.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to restorative outcomes in the broadest scope, such as reparation or letters of apology. Where YOT recommendations are not followed, there should be evidence of the reasons for that decision.</p> <p>We expect to find clear evidence that the child and their parent/carer have been consulted about the recommendations and understand what is expected of them.</p>
J 1.2	Do the recommendations consider the degree of the child's understanding of the offence and their acknowledgement of responsibility?	<p>The recommendations made by the YOT should take into consideration the child's understanding of the offence, and their acknowledgement of responsibility for their offending. If the child does not admit to the offence, an out-of-court disposal is not a suitable outcome.</p>
J 1.3	Is a positive contribution made by the YOT to determining the disposal?	<p>For any youth caution cases, we expect the YOT to be fully involved in joint decision-making. We expect to see evidence of the contribution made by the YOT to joint decision-making.</p> <p>We believe use of a joint decision-making panel is good practice, for all types of out-of-court disposal. Where a panel is not used, we may judge the case negatively, if we believe an inappropriate disposal is used as a consequence of the YOT not being invited to contribute to decision-making.</p>

J 1.4	Is sufficient attention given to the child's understanding, and their parents'/carers' understanding, of the implications of receiving an out of court disposal?	<p>There should be clear evidence that the child and their parent/carer fully understands the implications of receiving the imposed out-of-court disposal. As a minimum, there should be a signed record that explains the implications of the disposal. Children and parents/carers should be made aware of what information is retained on the police computer, and how that may be used in the future. All youth cautions and youth conditional cautions are recorded on the PNC. Even a community resolution could be disclosed as part of a future enhanced check with the disclosure and barring service.</p> <p>It should also be made clear that the child and their parent/carer understand whether they are required to comply with the out-of-court disposal, and the consequences of non-compliance; or whether engagement is voluntary. In youth conditional caution cases, if the child does not comply with the conditions, the case should be referred back to the police to consider prosecution. In youth caution cases, the interventions are entirely voluntary, and there are no direct consequences for non-compliance, but non-compliance with interventions can be referred to in any future criminal cases.</p> <p>In community resolution and other lower-level disposals, the local operating model will set out whether or not to refer the case back to police if the child does not comply. We expect the case manager to have a clear understanding of the legal position in their YOT, and this should be understood by the child and their parent/carer.</p>
J 1.5	Is the information provided to inform decision making timely to meet the needs of the case, legislation and guidance?	<p>We recognise that the police should refer all cases to the YOT within 24 hours of a case being deemed suitable for an out-of-court disposal, and the YOT should provide feedback within 10 days if assessment is required. If those timescales are not met, inspectors will consider reasons for the delay, and the impact on the child and the decision-making process. Timeliness of overall processes is a YOT partnership responsibility. In some cases, delay may be appropriate to seek information from a victim or another agency. We may judge a case negatively if there is a delay for inappropriate reasons.</p>
J 1.6	Is the rationale for joint disposal decisions appropriate and clearly recorded?	<p>We expect to find clear evidence of the decision-making process that applies to the individual child. This should include clear rationale for the reasons for the nature of the imposed disposal and the type of intervention intended to be delivered.</p>
<b>J 1 S</b>	<b>Are the YOT's recommendations sufficiently well-informed, analytical and personalised to the child, supporting joint decision making?</b>	<p>We expect to see local processes that support recommendations from the YOT and joint decision-making. Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of the recommendations meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the recommendations outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the recommendations are sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the</p>



recommendations may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the recommendations is appropriate to the case. If local arrangements mean recommendations have not been made, inspectors judge the impact of that absence on overall decision-making in the case.

<b>J 2</b>	<b>Does the YOT work effectively with the police in implementing the out of court disposal?</b> (Only asked in YCC cases)	
J 2.1	Does the YOT inform the police of progress and outcomes in a sufficient and timely manner?	The YOT must inform the police when the child completes the requirements of a youth conditional caution successfully. This should be done promptly.
J 2.2	Is sufficient attention given to compliance with and enforcement of the conditions?	The YOT should respond appropriately to situations where the child has not complied with the requirements or conditions of a youth conditional caution. There should be evidence that efforts have been made to improve the child's engagement. The YOT should use the child's preferred method of communication, and engage parents/carers to encourage compliance. Any decision to allow the youth conditional caution to remain in place despite failures to comply with conditions should be clearly recorded and be in the best interests of the safety to others as well as the child.
<b>J 2 S</b>	<b>Does the YOT work effectively with the police in implementing the out of court disposal?</b>	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the joint working undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the joint working outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the joint working is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the joint working may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.