



Her Majesty's
Inspectorate of
Probation

Youth offending inspection

Domain two

Case assessment rules and guidance (CARaG)

v 6.5 September 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.
Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	Bold text on a dark grey background	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>'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 offending, circumstances and the type of sentence. We look for evidence from a range of sources, including case records and the interview with the case manager. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for assessment during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>	
	Inspection question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
A 1.1	Is there sufficient analysis of offending behaviour, including the child's attitudes towards and motivation for their offending?	<p>Inspectors are looking for an analysis of the offending behaviour, which gives context as to why the child committed the offence, not just how. Where there has been previous offending, we expect assessment to identify and incorporate information relevant to the current offence as well as any previous offending history. Information from prosecution documents should be used, and any discrepancies between the prosecution 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	Does assessment consider the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child, utilising information held by other agencies?	<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 living in a rural area or their ability to attend appointments, as well as personal issues,</p>

		<p>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 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.</p> <p>For children in custody, assessment should seek relevant information from the institution. 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 or potential 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. Inspectors will look for identification of periods where there has been no offending, and exploration of what the child felt was going well for them at that time.</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, and their likelihood of engaging with the court disposal?	<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 sentence. 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. Assessment should reflect the child's motivation to engage in the sentence, 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>

		NB Any issues about the safety of a victim are addressed later, in the section about keeping other people safe.
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>
A 1 S	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the sentence. Sufficient assessment for a child with limited offending history, may be less detailed than for those more heavily convicted. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all the questions in this section, and weigh up, whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the important desistance factors. 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. For example, assessment which failed to take into account a child's learning disability, may be judged insufficient, even if it covered all other factors relevant to desistance.</p>

A 2	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?	
	<p>'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 offending, circumstances and the type of sentence. We look for evidence from a range of sources, including case records and the interview with the case manager. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for assessment during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>	
A 2.2	Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child?	<p>Inspectors will look for assessment of safety and wellbeing which identifies any risks to the child. Inspectors will look for how the assessment identifies any risks to the safety and wellbeing to the child, from either external sources or the behaviour of the child themselves. Examples of external sources of safety and wellbeing concerns include whether the child is being exploited, criminally or otherwise, by more sophisticated offenders, or being sexually exploited, if a child is subject to any child protection planning, or being bullied.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the impact on the safety and wellbeing of the child from their own behaviour. This should include identification of any physical or mental health concerns, missing from home episodes, substance misuse or risk-taking behaviour that may place them at risk.</p> <p>Having identified the safety and wellbeing concerns, assessment should then analyse the potential impact of those concerns on the child. The safety and wellbeing assessment should consider the circumstances of the case and what context the safety and wellbeing concern is likely to occur. Assessment should clearly identify the risk, state what the risk to safety and wellbeing is, why that risk is present, and the likelihood and imminence of the risk.</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 clear evidence that information has been sought from other agencies regarding the safety and wellbeing of the child. As a minimum this should include a check on the children's social care system. Further information should include education and health checks.</p> <p>To be sufficient the case manager should have taken into account the key relevant sources of information. It would not be sufficient to just list the issues; analysis is</p>

		<p>required. This should include any additional assessment been completed by other agencies, such as Child Sexual Exploitation screening, 'return home interviews', or police intelligence. Information from past or present child protection plans should be included. Historical information should be referenced and evaluated in the current circumstances. If the child has engaged with other agencies in relation to safety and wellbeing, information should be gained on how well they engage with those agencies and what facilitated or prevented this engagement. For children in custody, assessment should incorporate relevant information from the institution.</p>
A 2.4	Does assessment analyse controls and interventions to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child?	<p>Assessment should identify any existing controls and interventions which are in place to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child. This should include detail of what the controls are, and an explanation of how well the child is responding to those controls. We expect to see assessment of informal controls, such as those put in place by parents/carers; and more formal controls, such as bail conditions or child protection requirements.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to interventions already in place that promote the safety and wellbeing of the child; this could include counselling, educational support, or services provided by external agencies to address mental physical health or substance misuse.</p>
A 2.5	What is the classification of safety and wellbeing of the child, according to the case manager?	<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"> • Low – no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome • 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 • High – high risk that a potential negative safety and wellbeing outcome will occur and the impact could be serious • Very high – the negative safety and wellbeing concern could happen immediately and the impact will be serious.
A 2.9	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</p>

		<p>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> <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> <p>Even in cases where there are no factors related to safety and wellbeing, or the level of safety and wellbeing risk is correctly judged to be low, there should be a clear written explanation of this.</p>
<p>A 2 S</p>	<p>Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?</p>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the sentence. Sufficient assessment for a child where there are few or no concerns about safety and wellbeing, may be less detailed than for those believed to be at greater risk. Inspectors will consider the range of information gathered and the circumstances and characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all the questions in this section, and weigh up, whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the important factors related to keeping the child safe. 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>A 3</p>	<p>Does assessment analyse how to keep other people safe?</p>	
	<p>'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 offending, circumstances and the type of sentence. We look for evidence from a range of sources, including case records and the interview with the case manager. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for assessment during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>	

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 any/all harm, not just serious 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 past behaviour and convictions, and involve other agencies where appropriate?	<p>Inspectors will look for clear 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 convictions and other informal disposals should be used, and information about concerning behaviour that did not result in the criminal outcome should also be referenced, such as information from community safety teams. This might include information from school about bullying, or police investigations or intelligence. To be sufficient case managers should have taken account of the key relevant sources of information. It would not be sufficient to just list the issues, analysis is required.</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. For children in custody, assessment should incorporate relevant information from the institution.</p>

A 3.3	Does assessment analyse controls and interventions to manage and minimise the risk of harm presented by the child?	<p>Assessment should identify any existing controls and interventions which are in place to minimise the risk of harm to others presented by the child. This should include detail of what the controls are, and an explanation of how well the child is responding to those controls. We expect to see assessment of informal controls, such as those put in place by parents/carers; and more formal controls, such as bail conditions.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to interventions already in place that promote the safety of other people; this could include counselling, educational support, or services provided by external agencies to address mental physical health or substance misuse.</p>
A 3.4	What is the risk of serious harm classification of the child, according to the case manager?	<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"> • Low – no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome • 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 • 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 • Very high – the risk of serious harm concern could happen imminently and the impact would be serious. Case will need increased case supervision.
A 3.11	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 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>
A 3 S	Does assessment analyse how to keep other people safe?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the sentence. Sufficient assessment for a child where there are few or no concerns about risk of harm to others, may be less detailed than for those believed</p>

to present a higher level of risk. Inspectors will consider the range of information gathered, the nature of offending and other behaviour, and the circumstances and characteristics of the child.

Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all the questions in this section, and weigh up whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the important factors related to keeping the child safe. 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. For example, assessment might be judged insufficient if it identified risks to the general public, but overlooked risks to parents or siblings.

Planning

P 1	Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	
	<p>'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 offending, circumstances and the type of sentence. We look for evidence from a range of sources, including case records and the interview with the case manager. We judge the quality of the planning process in its entirety.</p> <p>In referral order cases, the contract with the panel sets out what should be achieved, but we expect to see more detailed planning from the YOT about how this will be done.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for planning during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</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 services and/or 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 supporting desistance.</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>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, or evidence of planning to meet housing 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>Planning should build on what has worked during any previous periods of desistance. For referral orders, we expect to see community volunteers involved in the development of the plan or contract.</p>

		Planned activity should deliver the requirements of the court order or licence, and should be achievable within the duration of the order/licence. For very short interventions there should be consideration of exit planning and utilising community resources for when the court order intervention is completed.
P 1 .2	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 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 level of family support and affordability, and any additional impact of living in a rural area. Planning should accommodate any educational and religious commitments of the child.</p>
P 1.3	Does planning take sufficient account of the child's strengths and protective factors, and seek to reinforce or develop these as necessary?	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 1.4	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 1.5	Does planning give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of the victim/s?	Where a victim has expressed wishes in relation to the 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 1.6	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/carer have not been successful, this does not necessarily result in a negative response.</p>
P 1.8	Is planning proportionate to the court outcome, with interventions capable of being delivered within an appropriate timescale?	<p>Inspectors will look for planning being proportionate to the type of disposal, and the circumstances of the child. 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.</p> <p>Any activities identified in the plan should be capable of being completed within the time period.</p> <p>The work identified during planning should reflect what is reasonable within the available timescale. If the child has ongoing needs that extend beyond the time period available to the YOT, planning should identify which community-based organisation is best placed to meet those needs.</p>
P 1 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	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 referral order,

		<p>may be less detailed than for a youth rehabilitation order or licence. 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 sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>
--	--	--

P 2	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	
	<p>'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 offending, circumstances and the type of sentence. We look for evidence from a range of sources, including case records and the interview with the case manager. We judge the quality of the planning process in its entirety.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for planning during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>	
P 2.1	Does planning promote the safety and wellbeing of the child, sufficiently addressing risks?	<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 referral order may be less detailed than for a youth rehabilitation order or licence.</p>

P 2.2	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>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	Does planning set out the necessary controls and interventions to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child?	<p>Planning should promote any existing controls and interventions in place to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child and should identify any new controls and/or interventions that are required.</p> <p>Planning should identify when external controls are needed to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child, and who is responsible for implementing these. This could include specific agreements with the child and parents/carers, safety planning with the police, implementation of Child Abduction Warning Notices, or placing restrictions on activities. Planning should make it clear how those controls will be monitored.</p> <p>Planning should also support constructive activities that address internal factors which enable the child to develop their own self efficacy or resilience in relation to safety and wellbeing. This could include referral to substance misuse interventions, developing appropriate leisure activities or self-esteem work.</p> <p>Inspectors will judge whether reasonable restrictive and constructive interventions have been identified, appropriate to the needs of the child. In some cases, very few or no safety and wellbeing interventions may be required.</p>
P 2.4	Does planning set out necessary and effective 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 safety and wellbeing of the child. Planning should set out actions to take if these factors change, and the risk to the child either 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.
P 2 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the safety and wellbeing needs of the case and the nature of the sentence. Sufficient planning for a first referral order, may be less detailed than either a those for a youth rehabilitation order or licence. Inspectors will consider the nature of 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 sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

P 3	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping people safe?	
	<p>'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 sentence 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.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for planning during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>	
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 referral order, may be less detailed than for a youth rehabilitation order or licence.</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. 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. This could be through formal requirements such as restricted activities, or restraining orders. There should be clear actions in place should those requirements be breached.</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 the necessary controls and interventions to promote the safety of other people?	<p>Planning should promote any existing controls and interventions in place to protect others who may be at risk of harm from the child, and should identify any new controls and/or interventions that are required.</p> <p>Planning should identify when external controls are needed to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child, and who is responsible for implementing these. This could include specific agreements with the child and parents/carers, safety planning with children's home staff and/or police, or placing restrictions on activities. Planning should make it clear how those controls will be monitored.</p>

		<p>Planning should also support constructive activities that address internal factors which enable the child to develop their own self-efficacy or resilience in relation to safety and wellbeing. This could include anger management or substance misuse interventions, or knife-crime programmes.</p> <p>Inspectors will judge whether reasonable restrictive and constructive interventions have been identified, appropriate to the risk of harm presented by the child. In some cases, very few or no interventions may be required to promote the safety of other people.</p>
P 3.5	Does planning set out necessary and effective 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. More detailed contingency planning is needed for children presenting higher levels of risk of harm to others. Contingency planning should be specific to known risk factors. It could include additional steps required to protect known victims, or changes in supervision arrangements if risk of harm is increasing; or reduction or removal of restrictions if risk of harm is reducing.</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>
P 3 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping people safe?	<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 referral order, may be less detailed than either a those for a youth rehabilitation order or licence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and level and nature of risk of harm to others presented by 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> <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>

Implementation and Delivery

D 1	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the child's desistance?	
	In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to take all reasonable steps to ensure appropriate services are delivered to the child during the custodial part of the sentence.	
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 expect to see services delivered in line with available evidence about desistance. 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 interventions, based on the circumstances of the case. 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. Where the assessment has failed to identify desistance factors, inspectors still expect planning to address them.</p> <p>The case manager should be able to explain why specific interventions have been delivered and how they meet the needs of the child. The interventions should start in a timely manner and it should be clear whether the child has engaged in the interventions.</p> <p>If non-compliance of the child was a barrier to delivering planned services, this will not necessarily result in a negative answer, the inspector will make a judgement on the level of effort, skills and tenacity used to try to engage the child in delivery of interventions.</p>
D 1.2	Does service delivery reflect the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child, involving parents/carers or significant others?	Inspectors expect interventions to be delivered in a way which takes into account the needs of the child. This includes recognising protected characteristics, and other factors, such as 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

		<p>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>
D 1.3	Does service delivery build upon the child's strengths and enhance protective factors?	Services delivered should build on the child's strengths and protective factors, whether or not they have been identified in assessment. This includes interventions to develop internal strengths, such as motivation to change, and external protective factors, such as membership of pro-social friendship groups or involvement in positive activities. Service delivery should actively facilitate the child's attendance at positive activities, and build on any existing positive activities that have been identified.
D 1.4	Is sufficient focus given to developing and maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents/carers?	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.
D 1.5	Does service delivery promote opportunities for community integration including access to services post-supervision?	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 sentence, the YOT should actively support this transition.
D 1.6	Is sufficient attention given to encouraging and enabling the child's compliance with the work of the YOT?	<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 and other professionals in supporting the work of the YOT. Inspectors will make a judgement on the basis of the approach by the YOT worker, not solely the response of the child.</p> <p>We expect to see evidence the case manager has responded to incidents of non-engagement using a clear, measured and motivating approach to encourage compliance. This should include using a variety of ways to engage with the child, including consideration of a change in the venue for appointments, or the timings of the appointments. YOT workers should try to understand why the child has not engaged with the interventions.</p>
D 1.10	Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?	<p>We expect to see effort has been made to engage with the child before formal enforcement action is taken. Where formal enforcement action appears to be the only option, consideration should be given to a pre-breach meeting, such as an enforcement panel. Effort should be made to involve the parent/carer and any other professionals working with the child, to facilitate engagement before formal enforcement action is taken. In some circumstances, enforcement is required as part of contingency planning to manage the safety of the child, or the safety of other people. When formal enforcement action is required, this should be done promptly.</p>
D 1 S	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the child's desistance?	<p>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.</p> <p>If the child has not engaged, 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.</p>

D 2	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child?	
	In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to take all reasonable steps to ensure appropriate services are delivered to the child during the custodial part of the sentence.	
D 2.1	Does service delivery promote the safety and wellbeing of the child?	<p>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 failed to identify safety and wellbeing factors, inspectors still expect service delivery to address them. Inspectors will consider what could be reasonably expected 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-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>

D 2 S	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child?	<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>
--------------	--	---

D 3 Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?		
In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to take all reasonable steps to ensure appropriate services are delivered to the child during the custodial part of the sentence.		
D 3.1	Are the delivered services sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?	<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>
D 3.2	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</p>

		<p>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 delivering appropriate services.</p> <p>Effective delivery would also include active monitoring of any licence conditions or other restricted activities, through engagement with the YOT police officer.</p>
D 3.3	Is the involvement of other agencies in managing the risk of harm sufficiently well-coordinated?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence of how the YOT has worked with other agencies to manage the risk of harm to others presented by the child. If other agencies are involved with delivering work to support the safety of others, that work should be well coordinated with a clear record of the role of each agency, and clear information-sharing arrangements. 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 of other people.</p>
D 3 S	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?	<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>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 is minimised.</p>

Reviewing

R 1	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	
	<p>Reviewing is an ongoing process, recognising and responding to any changes in the child's circumstances. Written reviews may form part of the reviewing process.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for reviewing during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>	
R 1.1	Does reviewing identify and respond to changes in factors linked to desistance?	<p>Reviewing should be used to take stock of the child's progress to date and to give positive messages about the potential for desistance. Reviewing should take into account any changes in the circumstances of the child. This should include considering any new or worrying behaviour; changes in relationships with family, partners or peers; changes in education or training; changes in accommodation. All such changes should be discussed with the child as they happen, whether circumstances have improved or deteriorated.</p> <p>Ongoing reviewing should be used to check that the delivery of services is having the intended impact, whether those services are delivered by the YOT or other agencies. Reviewing 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. Any problems with delivery of planned services should be resolved immediately, and should not wait for a formal, written review. The completion of any requirement of an order/licence should lead at least to an informal review with the child. Being investigated for 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 child about any new allegations.</p> <p>We expect to see a full written review whenever there has been a significant change in the case. What constitutes a significant change depends on the individual features of the case. For example, a child moving out of the family home for the first time might be seen as a significant change, whereas the move of a child who has had many placements may not be judged to be significant. Reviews should take into consideration both improvements and deterioration in desistance factors.</p>

R 1.2	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on building upon the child's strengths and enhancing protective factors?	<p>Delivered services should build on the child's strengths and protective factors, whether or not they have been identified in assessment. This includes interventions to develop internal strengths, such as motivation to change, and external protective factors, such as membership of pro-social friendship groups or involvement in positive activities. Planning should actively facilitate the child's attendance at positive activities, and build on any existing positive activities that have been identified.</p> <p>Inspectors will look for reviewing which identifies the degree of success in enhancing child's strengths and protective factors. Reviewing should identify any changes in relevant factors. It should also consider the impact of delivered services on the child. Reviewing should be informed by information any other organisations working with the child.</p>
R 1.3	Does reviewing consider motivation and engagement levels and any relevant barriers?	<p>Reviewing should investigate any changes to levels of motivation and/or engagement of the child, and should investigate the reasons for any improvement or deterioration in engagement, including any barriers that are preventing planned work from being delivered. The perspective of the child and their parent carer is important.</p>
R 1.4	Is the child and their parents/carers meaningfully involved in reviewing their progress and engagement, and are their views taken into account?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the child and their parent/carers are involved in the reviewing process. Much of the reviewing will be iterative, as the sentence goes forward. More formal reviewing could take place at a meeting, such as a Referral Order review.</p> <p>The view of the child should be gained as to what they think went well and what areas of intervention did not go as well for them. Reviewing should identify what methods of intervention has worked well for the child and whether adjustments to the planning need to be considered. The views of the parent/carers should also be gained, this should include their views about the interventions and any changes in the needs of the child.</p> <p>We expect case records to evidence how the views of the child and their parent/carers have been sought. A completion of a review self-assessment questionnaire alone is not sufficient; that information should be incorporated in the reviewing process and should influence any changes to planning.</p> <p>If the child has not engaged, or if parents/carers are reluctant to engage, 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 and parents/carers. In some circumstances it might be appropriate for another professional working with the child to be involved in reviewing.</p>

R 1.5	Does reviewing lead to the necessary adjustments in the ongoing plan of work to support desistance?	Having identified anything that is not working to support the child's desistance, planning should be adjusted to ensure it fits the current situation. New interventions may be identified, or adjustments may be made to the way current interventions are being delivered.
R 1.6	Was a written review of desistance completed?	We expect to see a written review when there are significant changes to assessment and/or planning for factors related to desistance. While the focus of inspection is on the overall activity of reviewing, in some situations where there have been significant changes we expect to see a clear written review. Inspectors recognise that for some children living chaotic lives, the rate of change can be fast, and will use their professional judgement to decide when a written review is required.
R 1 S	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of reviewing meets the needs of the case. In a case where circumstances are stable and the child is engaging with services, little reviewing may be required, and we do not necessarily expect to see a formal written review. In cases where there is less stability, poorer compliance and/or a higher level of desistance needs, we expect to see more iterative reviewing, and written reviews for any significant changes. Does sufficiency in the reviewing outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the reviewing is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the reviewing may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

R 2	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?
	<p>Reviewing is an ongoing process, recognising and responding to any changes in the child's safety and wellbeing. Written reviews may form part of the reviewing process.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for reviewing during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>

R 2.1	Does reviewing identify and respond to changes in factors related to safety and wellbeing?	<p>Reviewing should consider whether work to keep the child safe is having the desired impact. How well has the child responded to interventions designed to develop internal controls? How well have external controls protected the child? Have any new factors related to the child safety/wellbeing emerged? Have any previously identified factors reduced in significance? The voices of the child and their parents/carers are important, and their views about changes in safety and wellbeing should be recognised.</p> <p>In cases where there are concerns about the safety and wellbeing of the child, and there has not been any improvement, this should also be explored, with consideration as to why there has been no change. If it is because the child has not engaged in interventions, consideration should be given to how to improve the engagement of the child.</p> <p>Ongoing contact should actively monitor and review ongoing factors related to safety of the child; we expect case managers to be proactive and curious.</p> <p>We expect to see a full written review when there are significant changes to factors related to safety and wellbeing, not solely to changes in the level of concern.</p>
R 2.2	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in promoting the safety and wellbeing of the child?	<p>We expect case managers to be active in seeking information from other agencies as part of the ongoing reviewing process, not just in connection with full written reviews.</p> <p>Information should be shared about the behaviour of the child. Reviewing should identify what activities and interventions have been completed with the child, how well they have responded, and whether interventions have had the desired impact.</p>
R 2.3	Does reviewing lead to the necessary adjustments in the ongoing plan of work to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child?	<p>Where reviewing identifies changes in factors related to the safety and wellbeing of the child, we expect to see a reconsideration of planned activity. Are any additional interventions required? Are any current interventions no longer required? Consideration should be given to how sustained any changes may be, and whether ongoing support would assist in maintaining these changes.</p>
R 2.4	Was a written review of safety and wellbeing completed?	<p>We expect to see a written review when there are significant changes to assessment and/or planning for factors related to safety and wellbeing. While the focus of inspection is on the overall activity of reviewing, in some situations where there have been significant changes we expect to see a clear written review. Inspectors recognise that for some children living chaotic lives, the rate of change can be fast, and will use their professional judgement to decide when a written review is required.</p>

R 2 S	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of reviewing meets the needs of the case. In a case where the child is stable and engaging with services, little reviewing may be required, and we do not necessarily expect to see a formal written review. In cases where there is less stability, poorer compliance and/or a higher level of safety and wellbeing needs, we expect to see more iterative reviewing, and written reviews for any significant changes.</p> <p>Does sufficiency in the reviewing outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the reviewing is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the reviewing may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>
--------------	---	--

R 3 Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?		
<p>Reviewing is an ongoing process, recognising and responding to any changes in the risk of harm presented by the child to other people. Written reviews may form part of the reviewing process.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YOT to meet all our standards for reviewing during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>		
R 3.1	Does reviewing identify and respond to changes in factors related to risk of harm?	<p>Reviewing should consider whether work to keep other people safe is having the desired impact. How well has the child responded to interventions designed to develop internal controls? How well have external controls protected victims and potential victims? Have any new behaviours related to risk of harm to others been identified? Have any previously identified factors reduced in significance?</p> <p>In cases where there are concerns about risk of harm presented by the child, and there has not been any improvement, this should also be explored, with consideration as to why there has been no change. If it is because the child has not engaged in interventions, consideration should be given to how to improve the engagement of the child.</p> <p>Ongoing contact should actively monitor and review ongoing factors related to safety of other people; we expect case managers to be proactive and curious.</p>

		We expect to see a full written review when there are significant changes to factors related to safety of other people, not solely to changes in the level of concern.
R 3.2	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in managing the risk of harm?	We expect case managers to be active in seeking information from other agencies as part of the ongoing reviewing process, not just in connection with full written reviews. Information should be shared about the behaviour of the child. Reviewing should identify what activities and interventions have been completed with the child, how well they have responded, and whether interventions have had the desired impact.
R 3.3	Is the child and their parents/carers meaningfully involved in reviewing their risk of harm, and are their views taken into account?	Inspectors will look for evidence that the child and their parent/carer are involved in the reviewing process. Much of the reviewing will be iterative, as the sentence goes forward. More formal reviewing could take place at a meeting, such as a Referral Order review. The view of the child should be gained as to what they think went well and what areas of intervention did not go as well for them. Reviewing should identify what methods of intervention has worked well for the child and whether adjustments to the planning need to be considered. The views of the parent/carer should also be gained, this should include their views about the interventions and any changes in the needs of the child. We expect case records to evidence how the views of the child and their parent/carer have been sought. If the child has not engaged, or if parents/carers are reluctant to engage, 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 and parents/carers. In some circumstances it might be appropriate for another professional working with the child to be involved in reviewing.
R 3.4	Does reviewing lead to the necessary adjustments in the ongoing plan of work to manage and minimise the risk of harm?	Where reviewing identifies changes in factors related to the safety of other people, we expect to see a reconsideration of planned activity. Are any additional interventions required? Are any current interventions no longer required? Consideration should be given to how sustained any changes may be, and whether ongoing support would assist in maintaining these changes.
R 3.5	Was a written review of risk of harm completed?	We expect to see a written review when there are significant changes to assessment and/or planning for factors related to risk of harm. While the focus of inspection is on the overall activity of reviewing, in some situations where there have been significant changes we expect to see a clear written review. Inspectors recognise that for some

		<p>children living chaotic lives, the rate of change can be fast, and will use their professional judgement to decide when a written review is required.</p>
<p>R 3 S</p>	<p>Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?</p>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of reviewing meets the needs of the case. In a case where the child is stable and engaging with services, little reviewing may be required, and we do not necessarily expect to see a formal written review. In cases where there is less stability, poorer compliance and/or a higher level of concern for the safety of others, we expect to see more iterative reviewing, and written reviews for any significant changes.</p> <p>Does sufficiency in the reviewing outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall the reviewing is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the reviewing may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>