



HM Inspectorate
of Probation

Youth justice inspection

Domain two

Case assessment rules and guidance (CARaG)

V 7.4 June 2024

Domain two standards, questions and prompts are supported by the domain two case assessment rules and guidance (CARaGs). 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.

The CARaGs provide guidance on the questions and prompts. They are regularly updated to ensure that they remain consistent with any changes that we make to standards, questions and prompts, and so that they remain linked to evidence. The CARaGs also contain links, where relevant, to more detailed guidance and HM Inspectorate of 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	An information 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.

Information about the child

Case information		
I 1.1	Has the child been care experienced at any time during the sentence being inspected?	<p>If the child is care experienced, we check whether the YJS being inspected is acting as 'home' or 'host' for the child.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the inspected YJS is the home YJS and the child has lived in the area covered by the inspected YJS for the whole of the sentence being inspected, we inspect the case as normal. • If the inspected YJS is the home YJS and the child has lived outside the area covered by that YJS for any part of the sentence being inspected, we check whether the inspected YJS has taken responsibility for assessment of the child. If yes, we inspect the case as normal, and would expect the YJS to ensure that sufficient services are delivered by the host YJS to meet the needs of the child and the sentence. • If the inspected YJS is not the home YJS for the child, and has not been responsible for assessment, we exclude the case from the inspection sample.
I 1.4	Gender	The options to answer this question are recommended as best practice by the Office for National Statistics. We expect to see evidence of the YJS having an age-appropriate conversation with the child to establish how they view their gender identity, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.5	Race and ethnic category	The options to answer this question are recommended as best practice by the Office for National Statistics. We expect to see evidence of the YJS having a conversation with the child to establish how they identify their race and ethnic category, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.6	Preferred language	We expect to see evidence of the YJS discussing with the child what is their preferred language, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.7	Religion/faith	The options to answer this question are recommended as best practice by the Office for National Statistics. We expect to see evidence of the YJS having a conversation with the child to establish how they identify their religion, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.

I 1.8	Sexual identity	The options to answer this question are recommended as best practice by the Office for National Statistics. On balance, we believe that these questions can be used appropriately to capture any disadvantage experienced by children that is related to their sexual orientation. We expect to see evidence of the YJS having an age-appropriate conversation with the child to establish how they view their sexual identity. We expect the YJS to recognise that some children may not want to, or will feel unable to, describe their sexual identity, or may be unsure about it, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.9	Does the child have a disability?	Our definition of disability is 'a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on a child's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities'. The key words are 'substantial' and 'long-term'. In many cases, there will be a formal diagnosis of a specific condition. In cases where there is no specific diagnosis, we expect the YJS to recognise any symptoms experienced by the child and the impact on their life, which may be sufficient to be included under the definition of disability. We expect to see evidence of the YJS having a conversation with the child (and, if relevant, their parents or carers) about the nature of any disability, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.10	What is the impact of the child's disability?	We expect the YJS to understand the extent of the impact of the disability on the child, and to take that into consideration as part of assessment, planning and delivery of services. We expect to see evidence of the YJS having a conversation with the child (and, if relevant, their parents or carers) about the impact of any disability, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.

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 YJS to meet all our standards for assessment during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>		
	Inspection question	CARaG
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, that explains 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 explore 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 attitude to, or motivation for, the offence. The views of parents or carers are also important.</p>
	Does assessment sufficiently analyse diversity issues?	<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. Factors such as speech and language needs, and learning difficulties or disabilities, including attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and autism spectrum disorders, may count as disabilities, depending on the degree of impact on the child's life. Having identified relevant diversity factors, inspectors expect to see an account of the impact these have specifically on the requirements of the disposal and the child's ability to engage and comply.</p>

	<p>Does assessment consider personal circumstances, including the wider familial and social context of the child?</p>	<p>Assessment should consider 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 the child’s 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 autism spectrum disorders. YJS staff should consider whether the child has experienced trauma, and what impact this may have on their ability to engage in an intervention.</p> <p>For care experienced children, we expect assessment to take account of 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 evidence that YJS staff have considered any identified issues that the parents or carers may have, such as mental health or drug or alcohol problems, and what impact these may have on the child.</p>
	<p>Does assessment utilise information held by other agencies?</p>	<p>We expect to see a check with children’s social care and any education provider. The YJS should seek additional information from other partner or voluntary organisations that know the child, such as youth workers or support workers. If the child is care experienced, the YJS should obtain information from the child’s social worker.</p> <p>Past assessments, where available, should be taken into account.</p> <p>For children in custody, assessment should seek relevant information from the institution, including any specialist services such as psychology or intervention teams.</p>
<p>A 1.3</p>	<p>Does assessment focus on the child’s strengths and protective factors?</p>	<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, parents or carers, or education provider, and could be identified from the interview process and any self-assessment.</p>

		<p>Protective factors can include those that relate to the child, such as positive use of leisure time or engagement in education, and factors that relate to wider family and community networks. Inspectors will look for evidence that the YJS has identified any actual strengths and protective factors, and any factors that have the potential to be enhanced. Inspectors will also look for evidence that the YJS has identified periods when there was no offending, and explored 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 gaining 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>A custodial sentence can be considered a structural barrier, and assessment should consider the impact of this. For resettlement cases, assessment should consider critical structural barriers such as accommodation for release.</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 enough 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 the YJS has considered 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 the YJS to carry out some analysis of the child's ability to engage in the sentence. It should consider the impact of any cognitive or emotional issues such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, autistic spectrum disorders, learning difficulties, 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 sentence, and how well they have understood the implications of the outcome. If relevant, the YJS should consider the impact of custody on the child, particularly if this is their first custodial sentence. It should refer to any information from previous periods of custody, including police custody or remand.</p>

A 1.6	Does assessment give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of victims, and opportunities for restorative justice?	<p>Inspectors will look for an assessment of the victim’s needs and wishes, if known, and of 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, the YJS should consider 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 child’s capacity and capability to comply with any restorative activity.</p> <p>Note: Issues about the victim’s safety are addressed later, in the section about keeping other people safe.</p>
A 1.7	Are the child and their parents or 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 that the interview has taken the child’s needs into account. This should include finding a suitable venue, and using 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. The YJS should make a reasonable effort to include the views of the child’s parents or carers in the assessment. It should also consider the needs of the parents or carers when interviewing them.</p> <p>We expect to see use of interpreters where the child and/or parents or carers do not speak English as a first language. For a care experienced child, the social worker’s views 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 allows others to access key information if required. HM Inspectorate of Probation does not require YJSs to use 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 look at a range of sources of evidence, this question is about a single assessment document. We think this is important, as it forms a reference for other staff who need 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 a limited offending history may be less detailed than assessment for a child with more convictions. 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 decide 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 that 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 YJS to meet all our standards for assessment during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>		
	Inspection question	CARaG
A 2.2	Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child?	<p>Risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child may come from external sources or may relate to their behaviour. 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> <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, substance misuse, risk-taking behaviour or a low sense of self-worth.</p>

		<p>The YJS should also consider the impact of the child’s own behaviour on their safety and wellbeing. This should include identifying any physical or mental health concerns, missing from home episodes, substance misuse or risk-taking behaviour that may place them at risk.</p> <p>There should be an explicit assessment of the impact a custodial sentence will have on the child. Assessment should consider the impact of the child being away from their home and peer group, and the potential safeguarding risks of being placed in a custodial setting. The impact of custody on the child’s physical, emotional and mental health should be assessed. This might include risks from others in the secure setting, and risk of self-harm and suicide.</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 the context in which 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 the YJS has asked for information from other agencies regarding the child’s safety and wellbeing. 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>For this 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 required. This should include any additional assessment that has 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 was involved 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. 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 that are in place to promote the child's safety and wellbeing. 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 or carers, and more formal controls, such as bail conditions or child protection requirements.</p> <p>The YJS should also consider any interventions already in place that promote the child's safety and wellbeing; these could include counselling, educational support, or services provided by external agencies to address mental or physical ill-health or substance misuse.</p> <p>Where children are in custody, there should be evidence of continuity of care from the community to custodial health teams and then back into the community. Any custody-related safety and wellbeing issues should be considered, such as increased risks of self-harm and the potential use of restraint.</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 they are 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.
	Is the case manager's classification of the level of safety and wellbeing reasonable?	<p>In cases close to a boundary between classification levels, inspectors will consider whether the case manager's classification was reasonable, in the context of all the information available to them at the time. We recognise that the precise level of safety and wellbeing is a point on a continuum, and that for cases close to the boundary between two levels, it is a fine judgement about the actual level to be assigned. We expect to see a clear explanation of the reasons that the particular level of safety and wellbeing has been set, based on AssetPlus definitions.</p>

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 allows others to access key information if required to keep the child safe. HM Inspectorate of Probation does not require YJSs to use 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 look at a range of sources of evidence, this question is about a single assessment document. We think this is important, as it forms a reference for other staff who need 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>
A 2 S	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child 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 safety and wellbeing may be less detailed than assessment for a child 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 decide 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>

A 3	Does assessment analyse how to keep other people 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>	

HM Inspectorate of Probation expects all factors relevant to risk of harm to be identified and analysed (not just factors related to risk of serious harm).

In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YJS to meet all our standards for assessment during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.

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?

Principles for inspection:

In any assessment of risk of harm to others, we expect any and all factors related to the risk of harm (not just factors related to risk of serious harm) to be set out, described and analysed. 'Harm' includes physical harm, sexual harm and psychological harm.

Identification of factors related to risk of harm

Our judgements are based on the overall assessment process, and inspectors will consider evidence from:

- AssetPlus
- any other specific or specialist assessment completed
- YJS case records
- notes of any internal risk management meeting
- interview with the case manager.

Risk of harm assessment should consider:

- static risk factors, including age, gender and nature, number and circumstances of previous convictions
- dynamic risk factors (which may be acute or stable):
 - acute dynamic risk factors are those that have the potential to change quickly, such as substance misuse
 - stable dynamic risk factors are those that may change over a longer period, such as problem-solving capability or response to trauma

- strengths of the child, including internal protective factors (such as resilience or a feeling of self-efficacy)
- resources available to the child or external protective factors (including positive family relationships and access to appropriate services)
- capacity and motivation to change (including the extent to which the child is able and willing to engage with risk management).

Specialist assessments include:

- AIM (Assessment, Intervention, Moving on), which is used to assess children who have shown sexually harmful behaviour
- SAVRY (Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth), which is used in relevant cases.

Risk to others can be indicated by 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. Examples of unintended harm could include driving offences or violent behaviour due to poor management of emotions. We expect case managers to recognise the potential for long-term psychological harm arising from offences where there has been no physical violence, such as some domestic abuse or harassment offences.

Once the factors related to risk of harm have been identified, each factor should be analysed in terms of its potential impact on the risk of harm presented by the child. Analysis should consider the relevance and potential impact of individual identified factors on predictions of future behaviour, and the possible consequences of future behaviour. For example, historical behaviour that has not been repeated may be given less weight in the overall analysis than more recent behaviour. The potential impact of factors such as criminal exploitation and previous trauma on future behaviour should be considered and clearly explained. Assessment should be specific about exactly what harm might be caused and the circumstances when future harm is most likely to occur.

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, why that risk is present, and the likelihood and imminence of the risk. Where specific actual or

		<p>potential victims cannot be identified, assessment should look for any patterns in previous behaviour, and explain any groups of potential victims, such as peers, partners or shop security staff.</p> <p>Where risk factors indicate that the child could cause multiple types of future harm (such as sexual harm, physical harm, emotional harm), assessment should clearly state which type of harm is likely to be caused to which potential victims.</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 that the YJS has asked other agencies for information about the risk of harm from the child.</p> <p>Inspectors look to YJS records for information about current and previous convictions, prosecution documents, and information about any out-of-court or informal disposals. We also expect to see information from the child and parents or carers. There may be additional information from the police, ViSOR (Violent & Sex Offender Register), and MAPPA. YJS staff should actively seek information from assessments completed by other agencies, including education, health and children’s social care. For children in custody, they should seek and use information from the institution.</p> <p>We expect to see that YJS staff have considered the impact of factors such as learning difficulties, experience of trauma, and neurodiversity on the future behaviour of the child. They should also refer to information about worrying behaviour that has not resulted in a criminal outcome, such as information from parents or carers, from community safety teams, from a school about bullying, or from police intelligence. Information from these sources should be analysed to indicate the likely impact on future behaviour; it is not sufficient to just list the issues.</p> <p>We expect YJS staff to have gathered as much relevant information as possible to inform assessment. However, assessment should not be delayed unnecessarily if some information is not available. The level of information available will vary depending on the nature of the case. We base our judgements on the sources of information it would have been reasonable for the case manager to access at the time of the assessment. Case managers should actively seek all relevant information; if escalation processes are needed, they should be used to obtain key sources of information that are held by other agencies.</p> <p>If the child has engaged with other agencies in relation to risk of harm, YJS staff should obtain information 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 that 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 or carers, and more formal controls, such as bail conditions.</p> <p>YJS staff should also consider any interventions already in place that promote the safety of other people; these could include counselling, educational support, or services provided by external agencies to address mental or physical ill-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>HM Inspectorate of Probation recognises the AssetPlus definitions of the levels of serious harm. 'Serious harm is defined as an event which is life-threatening and/or traumatic, and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, can be expected to be difficult or impossible.' While we do expect all factors relevant to risk of harm to be identified and analysed, when assessing the level of risk of harm, we are looking at the level of risk of serious harm.</p> <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. <p>The best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour. The level of serious harm is defined in terms of the likelihood of serious harmful behaviour happening.</p> <p>Assessment should be clear about the level and nature of the risk presented to any/all categories of actual or potential victim. Where relevant, assessment should reflect the nature of the circumstances in a custodial setting and consider the risk to others in custody, as well as those in the community.</p>

In assessing the likelihood of seriously harmful behaviour, we expect case managers to consider the following:

If there are no factors at all that indicate the potential for seriously harmful behaviour, or where there are factors that indicate the potential for some harmful behaviour, and there is good evidence that those factors are mitigated by a combination of internal and external factors, and the circumstances of the child are stable and likely to remain so, an assessment of low risk of serious harm (RoSH) may be appropriate.

Where there are current factors indicating the potential for seriously harmful behaviour, we expect case managers to consider the following, when judging the level of RoSH:

- What do the static factors in the case indicate?
- What is known about the stable dynamic risk factors? This may include issues such as problem-solving ability or emotional regulation. The presence of a range of stable, or improving, dynamic risk factors may reduce the assessed level of RoSH.
- What is known about the acute dynamic risk factors? This may include issues such as substance misuse, or likely responses to stressors. The presence of a number of acute dynamic risk factors may increase the assessed level of RoSH.
- What is known about the child's strengths? The presence of known strengths may reduce the assessed level of RoSH.
- What resources or services are available to the child, such as supportive family relationships or access to appropriate services?
- What is known about the child's capacity and motivation to change? To what extent have they demonstrated that they are able and willing to engage with risk management? Evidence of commitment to change and cooperation with risk management arrangements may reduce the assessed level of RoSH.
- What are the circumstances in which seriously harmful behaviour might arise, and how similar are the current circumstances?
- Is there evidence that the child is actively seeking opportunities to offend?
- Is there evidence that the child is engaging in other behaviour that directly or indirectly increases the likelihood of serious harm?

		<p>Nature of risk:</p> <p>Absence of immediate access to victims, whether by custody, school exclusion, child protection arrangements or the ending of a relationship, or other external constraints, is not in itself a reason to lower the assessed level of RoSH.</p> <p>Evidence that the child is genuinely complying with arrangements to protect victims or reduce access to victims may contribute towards lowering the assessed level of RoSH.</p>
	Is the case manager's classification of the level of risk of serious harm reasonable?	In cases close to a boundary between classification levels, inspectors will consider whether the case manager's classification was reasonable in the context of all the information available to them at the time. We recognise that the precise level of risk of serious harm is a point on a continuum, and that for cases close to the boundary between two levels, it is a fine judgement about the actual level to be assigned. We expect to see a clear explanation of the reasons that the particular level of RoSH has been set, based on AssetPlus definitions.
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. We do not set a specific model for this assessment tool, but the assessment 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 sources of evidence; this question is about a single assessment document. We think this is important, as it forms a reference for other staff who 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 assessment for a child believed to present a higher level of risk.</p> <p>Inspectors will consider the range of information gathered, the nature of offending and other behaviour, and the circumstances and characteristics of the child, including any risks they present to other people.</p>

Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all the questions in this section, and decide 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 YJS about how this will be done.</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YJS to meet all our standards for planning during the custodial and post-release phases of the sentence.</p>	
P 1.1	Does planning set out the services most likely to support desistance, paying sufficient attention to the available timescales and the need for sequencing?	<p>Inspectors look for planning that sets out services and/or activities that will support the child's desistance. Planning should build on the child's strengths 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 which activities will be completed by the YJS and which by the child, and should be understandable to the child. It should be clear what the child is expected to do, and when they have</p>

		<p>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. These might include how to reintegrate the child 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 about 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 developing the plan or contract.</p> <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, YJS staff should consider exit planning and using community resources when the court order intervention is completed.</p> <p>In custodial cases, planning for release should start at the initial sentence planning stage. We expect accommodation needs to be considered early, and continuity of planning to address educational needs, including linking with community provision. Where specific interventions are not available in custody, plans should be put in place to start these as soon as possible after release.</p>
	<p>Does planning sufficiently address diversity issues?</p>	<p>Inspectors will look for planning that takes sufficient account of the child’s diversity needs. Planning should set out how these needs can be accommodated. Where there are protected characteristics or other relevant factors, inspectors expect the YJS to have considered the impact of these on the child’s ability to engage and comply with the disposal. For example, planning should accommodate any religious commitments or child care responsibilities of the child. Where assessment has failed to identify diversity factors, inspectors still expect planning to address them.</p>

	Does planning take sufficient account of the child's personal circumstances, including the wider familial and social context of the child?	<p>We expect YJS staff to consider the child's social context and lived experience. 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 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 should ensure this is achievable for the child. This might include considering the level of family support and affordability, and any additional impact of living in a rural area. Planning should accommodate any educational 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?	<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. Planning should develop any positive activities that child is able to access while in custody. These may include the use of gym or religious facilities.</p>
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 child's maturity and identifies the interventions that are the best suited to their needs. There should be evidence that YJS staff considered these when developing the plan.</p> <p>YJS staff should also consider the child's level of motivation to address the issues that underlie the offending behaviour. They should identify interventions that support and encourage the child to increase their motivation to change.</p>
P 1.5	Does planning give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of the victims?	<p>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 justice 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. This question is specifically about the needs and wishes of victims, issues of victim safety are covered elsewhere.</p>

P 1.6	Are the child and their parents or carers meaningfully involved in planning, and are their views taken into account?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the child and their parents or carers have been able to contribute to 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 an extended family member. 'Involvement' should be more than simply signing the planning documents or completing a self-assessment tool.</p> <p>The views of the child and their parents or carers should be clear, including what they believe will work for 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 YJS or other services, if applicable. We expect the YJS to make reasonable efforts to share the plan with the child and their parents or carers. If reasonable efforts to contact the parents or carers have not been successful, this will not necessarily result in a negative response.</p> <p>In custodial cases, planning should actively involve the child and their parents or carers. We expect to see YJS workers advocating for the needs of the child as part of planning.</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 child's needs.</p> <p>Any activities identified in the plan should be capable of being completed within the time available.</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 YJS, planning should identify which community-based organisation is best placed to meet those needs.</p> <p>In custodial cases, inspectors will look for planning from the start of sentence that considers both the time the child is in custody and planning for their release. Planning should include but not be solely based on managing the child's behaviour in the establishment. Planning should be based on the needs of the child, and not be limited to services available in the establishment. This could require the YJS worker, or community specialist provision, to deliver interventions to the child while they are in custody. The purposeful use of release on temporary licence, home detention curfew, and suitability for early release should be included in planning from an early stage.</p>

P 1 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the child's desistance needs and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient planning for a first referral order 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 enough 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 YJS 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 or carers, and work to be done by the YJS, potentially on a multi-agency basis. The child and parents or 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>

		For children in custody, planning should consider how the custodial setting will keep the child safe and should include staff from the custodial institution. If necessary, the YJS should advocate for the safety and wellbeing of the child, including escalation of any concerns about gaps in planning for safety.
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>This question is specifically about planning to keep the child safe, which may involve some actions carried out by other agencies. Where this is the case, it should be clear in the planning. Where the child is subject to plans managed by other agencies, for example, child protection planning, the YJS's plan should be coordinated with, and make reference to, them. 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 agencies will communicate with each other about work with the child.</p> <p>Planning should link to, but not repeat, other custodial plans, such as behaviour management, ACCT (Assessment Care in Custody and Teamwork), anti-bullying and Secure Stairs planning.</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 to promote the child's safety and wellbeing and identify any new controls and/or interventions that are required.</p> <p>Planning should identify when external controls are needed to promote the child's safety and wellbeing and who is responsible for implementing these. This could include specific agreements with the child and parents or 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>For children in custody, planning should consider any controls provided by the custodial setting to keep the child safe. These could include ACCT, room location, monitoring of telephone calls and management of association. We also expect planning to manage a safe transition back into the community after release.</p>
P 2.4	<p>Does planning set out necessary and effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that have been identified?</p>	<p>We expect to see clear contingency planning that recognises the factors which may lead to a change in the child’s level of safety and wellbeing. Planning should set out actions to take if these factors change and the risk to the child either 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> <p>Contingency planning for children in custody should include all resettlement planning, including arrangements for accommodation, education and other critical factors. If specialist placement is likely to be needed, planning for this should start early. Contingency plans should be shared between the YJS and the institution.</p>
P 2 S	<p>Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?</p>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the child’s safety and wellbeing needs and the nature of the sentence. Sufficient planning for a first referral order may be less detailed than planning 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 enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Where there are no factors related to keeping the child safe, inspectors will answer ‘Yes’.</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 offending, 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>HM Inspectorate of Probation expects all factors relevant to risk of harm to be planned for (not just factors related to risk of serious harm).</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YJS 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 address all factors relevant to keeping other people safe. Planning should include both work to be done directly with the child and parents or carers, and work to be done by the YJS, potentially on a multi-agency basis. The child and parents or 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 child's circumstances, so planning for a first referral order may be less detailed than for a youth rehabilitation order or licence. For children in custody, planning should include staff from the custodial institution. Planning should consider how the custodial setting will keep others safe. YJS staff should consider actual and potential victims within the custodial environment and in the community.</p>
P 3.2	Does planning involve other agencies where appropriate?	This question is specifically about planning to keep other people safe, which may involve some actions carried out by other agencies. Where this is the case, it should be clear. Where the child is subject to plans managed by other agencies, for example MAPPA, the YJS plan should be coordinated with, and make reference to, them. We expect to see clear information-sharing arrangements.

		<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>The content and rationale of other agencies' plans should be known to the case manager. Copies of the plans should be available on the case record. Plans should be integrated, and they should support each other.</p> <p>Where a case is assessed as high or very high risk of harm, and significant multi-agency risk management is needed, it is essential that plans contained within MAPPA or MALRAP (Multi Agency Lifer Risk Assessment Panel) notes, child safeguarding records, ARMS and AssetPlus are aligned and make clear reference to each other, to facilitate joint working and ensure emergency action can be taken safely if required.</p> <p>For children in custody, planning should link to, but not repeat, other custodial plans, such as behaviour management, anti-bullying or Secure Stairs planning. Where there are specific risks linked to the child's placement in custody, such as gang retaliation, these must be planned for with the custodial establishment. Specialist agencies may need to be involved at the earliest stage to manage unusual or extreme risks.</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, YJS and custodial staff, 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. 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</p>

child and parents or 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.

Planning for controls may include:

- measures such as informal curfews or identification of suitable accommodation that aim to restrict the child's ability to cause harm
- monitoring of activities by the case manager, police or others, to ensure compliance and identify changes in risk factors; where there are controls, planning should indicate how compliance with the requirements will be monitored
- planning to keep actual and potential victims safe, including specific licence conditions and information-sharing.

Planning for interventions may include:

- constructive activities that address internal factors which enable the child to develop their own self-efficacy and self-control
- interventions to address specific factors, such as anger management or substance misuse interventions, or knife-crime programmes
- planning should be trauma-informed, where necessary.

Inspectors will judge whether reasonable restrictive and constructive interventions have been identified, appropriate to the risk of harm presented by the child. All cases where there are active factors related to risk of harm should have at least some constructive interventions. In some cases, very few or no interventions may be required to promote the safety of other people.

For children in custody, planning should consider any controls to keep other people safe provided by the custodial setting. These could include room location, monitoring of telephone calls and managing who the child associates with. Planning should consider how the child can be helped to develop internal controls to reduce their risk to others. If the necessary services are not available in the custodial setting, planning should consider how these will be delivered.

We also expect planning to manage a safe transition back into the community when the child is released.

P 3.5	Does planning set out necessary and effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that have been identified?	<p>In cases where there are factors related to risk of harm to others, we expect to see clear contingency planning that recognises and anticipates the factors which may lead to a change in the child’s level of risk to others. Planning should set out actions to take if these factors change and the risk to others increases or decreases. Planning should be proportionate to the level and nature of the risk of harm in the case, and more detailed contingency planning should be in place for those presenting a high or very high risk of serious harm. Contingency planning should be specific to known risk factors. It could include additional steps required to protect known victims, 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 for children in custody should include all resettlement planning, including arrangements for accommodation, education and other critical factors. If the child is likely to need a specialist placement, planning for this should start early. Contingency plans should be shared between the YJS and the institution.</p> <p>Contingency planning should be specific and identify who should complete the actions and by when. Examples of contingency action could include requesting a change of accommodation placement, sharing information about increasing risks with an education provider or increasing the level of MAPPA management. Generalised phrases such as ‘consult manager’, ‘review planning’ or ‘consider enforcement’ are unlikely to be sufficient.</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 planning 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> <p>Where there are no factors related to risk of harm, inspectors will answer ‘Yes’.</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 YJS to take all reasonable steps to ensure appropriate services are delivered to the child during the custodial part of the sentence.	
D 1.1	<p>Are the delivered services those most likely to support desistance, with sufficient attention given to sequencing and the available timescales?</p>	<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 for delivering specific interventions that explains how they meet the needs of the child.</p> <p>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 planned, 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 for 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 child's needs. The interventions should start in a timely manner and it should be clear whether the child has engaged with them.</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 the interventions.</p>

		<p>In custodial cases, interventions should be delivered to support the child's needs; if there are gaps in the range of interventions available in the establishment, interventions should be delivered by YJS staff or community organisations.</p> <p>Interventions to prepare for release should be considered in the later part of a custodial sentence, including liaising with education providers, linking with community health provision, online learning, and setting up ID and bank accounts. Identifying suitable accommodation for release should be a priority, so that the child knows where they will be living. If possible, there should be visits to any new accommodation provider, so that the child is familiar with the arrangements and has met staff in advance of their release.</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 the interventions.</p>
	<p>Does service delivery account for the diversity issues of the child?</p>	<p>Inspectors expect interventions to be delivered in a way that takes into account the child's protected characteristics. For example, the content of interventions should be personalised to take into account the gender, age and disability of children. The timing and location of interventions should also be personalised.</p>
	<p>Does service delivery reflect the wider familial and social context of the child, involving parents or carers or significant others?</p>	<p>We expect interventions to be delivered in a way that takes into account relevant factors for the child, such as self-identity or living in a rural area. 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 child's needs. YJS staff should consider wider familial circumstances, including the child's lived experience and their role in the family. If the child has experienced trauma, this should be responded to appropriately. For children in custody, there should be evidence that use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) has been considered to meet the child's needs.</p> <p>For care experienced children, we expect the local authority social worker to be involved in delivering interventions.</p>

		<p>Feedback should be given to the child about how they have engaged in the intervention, YJS staff should obtain the child's views 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 or carers about how the child has engaged. YJS staff should also consider how the parents or carers can reinforce and support the interventions, for example by supporting desistance-based activities.</p>
D 1.3	Does service delivery build upon the child's strengths and enhance protective factors?	<p>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. In custody, we expect this work to be undertaken irrespective of any difficulties with the regime.</p>
D 1.4	Is sufficient focus given to developing and maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents or carers?	<p>Service delivery should aim to maintain a positive working relationship with the child and parents or carers. 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 to consider 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 the best way to maximise the potential for a successful outcome.</p> <p>In custodial cases, inspectors will look for evidence that the YJS worker has maintained contact with the child, parents and carers, and custodial staff. We expect to see appropriate communication with the child on a regular basis, beyond any sentence planning arrangements. As a minimum, we expect to see telephone contact with the parents or carers of the child. Best practice might include facilitating visits or helping the family attend sentence planning meetings. Parents and carers should be included in pre-release planning. We expect to see evidence of timely information-sharing with custodial staff, including appropriate challenge if necessary.</p>

D 1.5	Does service delivery promote opportunities for community integration including access to services post-supervision?	<p>There should be evidence of how the YJS 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 YJS has supported any existing engagement with community services, and that it has ensured its own interventions do not distract from this. Every effort should be made to ensure the child accesses universal services, such as education or healthcare. If the child is likely to need further intervention after completing their sentence, the YJS should actively support this transition.</p> <p>In custodial cases, inspectors expect to see evidence that there has been continuity between the custodial and community elements of the sentence. There should be evidence that information is shared between the secure sector and the community to prepare for the child's release. If the child has completed any training or courses while in custody, these should be built upon following release. We will look for evidence that ROTL has been considered as part of the preparations for release. The custodial establishment should work with the YJS to make any practical arrangements required for release, such as securing suitable identification documents.</p>
D 1.6	Is sufficient attention given to encouraging and enabling the child's compliance with the work of the YJS?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence of effective engagement with the child, and their parents or carers, going beyond simply attending appointments. We expect to see reasonable attempts to engage parents or carers and other professionals in supporting the work of the YJS. Inspectors will make a judgement based on the YJS worker's approach, not solely on the child's response.</p> <p>We expect to see evidence that 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 considering a change in the venue for appointments, or the timings of the appointments. YJS workers should try to understand why the child has not engaged with the interventions.</p> <p>In custodial cases, we expect YJS workers to identify where any non-engagement may be due to restrictions in the regime, and to discuss this with the institution. We expect to see evidence that the child has been prepared for release and has a good understanding of what will be expected of them when they are back in the community, including information about the reasons for any additional licence conditions.</p>

D 1.10	Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?	<p>We expect to see that the YJS has made efforts to engage with the child before taking formal enforcement action. Where formal enforcement action appears to be the only option, YJS workers should consider holding a pre-breach meeting, such as an enforcement panel. They should try to involve the parents or carers and any other professionals working with the child, to help the child to engage before formal enforcement action is taken.</p> <p>In some circumstances, enforcement is required as part of contingency planning to manage the safety of the child or 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 meets the needs of the case. They will consider whether strengths 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, a particular omission may be important enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>If the child has not engaged, this does not necessarily result in a negative judgement. Inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort, skills and tenacity the YJS has shown in engaging with 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 YJS to take all reasonable steps to ensure appropriate work is done to keep the child safe during the custodial part of the sentence, as well as when the child is in the community.	
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 failed to identify safety and wellbeing factors, inspectors still expect service

		<p>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 child’s safety. 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 a record of the intended impact of the interventions and how the child has responded to them.</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 that YJS workers made to deliver appropriate services to the child. For children in custody, appropriate delivery may include internal safety planning meetings, reviews of location and feedback from custodial staff.</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 YJS has worked with other agencies to manage and promote the child’s safety and wellbeing. We expect the YJS 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 each agency’s role and clear information-sharing arrangements.</p> <p>The YJS should support the child to engage with other agencies as required, and should seek feedback on how well the child has engaged with those agencies.</p> <p>The work of the other agencies should link to, and support, the work of the YJS to assist in promoting the child’s safety and wellbeing. 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 YJS 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 child’s safety and wellbeing meets the needs of the case. They will consider whether strengths 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</p>

	<p>case. Conversely, while the service delivery may have many strengths, a particular omission may be important enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Whether the child has engaged or not, inspectors will expect the YJS to recognise its overarching responsibility for child safeguarding, and to ensure multi-agency safeguarding arrangements are used where necessary.</p> <p>Where there are no factors related to keeping the child safe, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.</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 YJS to take all reasonable steps to ensure appropriate work is done to manage the safety of others during the custodial part of the sentence, as well as when the child is in the community.	
D 3.1	<p>Are the delivered services sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?</p>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of the work is sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm to other people. We expect to see sufficient contact with the child to allow delivery of constructive interventions and to allow the case manager to monitor factors related to risk of harm to others. We would expect to see a higher level of contact in cases assessed as high or very high risk of serious harm. We expect case managers to engage with parents, carers and other key individuals in the child's life.</p> <p>In addition to services delivered specifically to the child, we expect to see clear joint working with any other agencies involved in work with the child, with a view to minimising the risk of harm.</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. There should be evidence of the intended impact of the interventions and how the child has responded.</p>

		Whether the child has engaged or not, inspectors will expect the YJS to recognise its overarching responsibility for public protection.
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 the victim will be made safer 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 that the YJS has considered the protection of any actual or potential victim, irrespective of whether the 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 the YJS has made to deliver appropriate services.</p> <p>Effective delivery would also include active monitoring (or, where relevant, enforcement) of any licence conditions or other restricted activities through engagement with the YJS police officer.</p> <p>In custody cases, where there is a victim eligible for statutory victim contact, inspectors will expect a referral to be made to the National Probation Service.</p>
D 3.3	Is the involvement of other agencies in managing the risk of harm sufficiently well-coordinated?	<p>Inspectors will look at how the YJS has worked with other agencies to manage the risk of harm to others presented by the child. We expect to see regular and effective communication between all other agencies involved in delivering work to support the safety of others. Joint work should be well-coordinated, with a clear record of each agency's role. There should be evidence of effective challenge and escalation, including by senior managers, if any difficulties cannot be resolved.</p> <p>The YJS 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 YJS to assist in promoting the safety of other people. In some cases, there may be no need for other agencies to be involved.</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. They will consider whether strengths 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, a particular omission may be important enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Whether the child has engaged or not, inspectors will expect the YJS to recognise their overarching responsibility for public protection, and to ensure risk of harm to other people is minimised.</p> <p>Where there are no factors related to risk of harm, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.</p>
--------------	---	---

Reviewing

R 1	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	
<p>Reviewing is an ongoing process. It recognises and responds 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 YJS 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. It should take into account any changes in the child's circumstances. This should include considering any new or worrying behaviour; changes in relationships with family, partners or peers; changes in education or training; and 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 YJS or other agencies. Reviewing should identify what has been effective and what has been achieved, as well as</p>

		<p>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>Reviewing 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>The 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. 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 that 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 take account of information provided by any other organisations working with the child.</p>
	Does reviewing include analysis of and respond to diversity factors?	Reviewing should consider both the extent to which work to address diversity factors has been successful, and whether there have been any changes to factors or protected characteristics.
	Does reviewing consider the personal circumstances including the wider familial and social context of the child?	We expect to see active, ongoing reviewing of any changes in the child's personal circumstances and wider familial and social context. Reviewing should consider both the extent to which work to accommodate these factors has been successful, and whether there have been any changes to those factors.
R 1.3	Does reviewing consider motivation and engagement levels and any relevant barriers?	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 parents or carers is important. Reviewing should consider how the child managed in custody and their views on any additional licence conditions.
R 1.4	Are the child and their parents or 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 parents or 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 YJS should ask the child what they think went well and what areas of intervention did not go as well for them. Reviewing should identify what methods of intervention have worked well for the child and whether adjustments to the planning need to be considered. The parents or carers should also be asked for their views. This should include their views about the interventions and any changes in the child's needs.</p> <p>We expect case records to evidence how the views of the child and their parents or carers have been sought. It is not sufficient to complete a review self-assessment questionnaire; this 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 or carers are reluctant to engage, this does not necessarily result in a negative judgement. Inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort, skills and tenacity the YJS has shown in trying to engage the child and parents or 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?	If the YJS identifies anything that is not working to support the child's desistance, it should adjust planning 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 full written review whenever there has been a significant change in the assessment and/or planning of factors related to desistance 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. 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?	<p>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.</p> <p>Inspectors will consider whether strengths 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, a particular omission may be important enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Where no reviewing of desistance was required, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.</p>

R 2	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	
	<p>Reviewing is an ongoing process. Recognises and responds 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 YJS 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's safety and wellbeing emerged? Have any previously identified factors reduced in significance? The voices of the child and their parents or 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 child’s safety and wellbeing, and there has been no improvement, the YJS should explore this, and consider why there has been no change. If it is because the child has not engaged in interventions, the YJS should consider how to improve the child’s engagement.</p> <p>In custodial cases, reviewing should include any safeguarding incidents that have occurred while the child is in custody. Reviewing should analyse how the institution and the YJS have responded to this. It should focus on any anticipated changes to safety issues as the child moves from custody to the community.</p> <p>Ongoing contact should actively monitor and review factors related to the child’s safety; 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. Information from the custodial institution should be sought and considered.</p> <p>Information should be shared about the child’s behaviour. 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 child’s safety and wellbeing, we expect to see that the YJS has reconsidered planned activity. Are any additional interventions required? Are any current interventions no longer required? The YJS should consider 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</p>

		chaotic lives, the rate of change can be fast, and will use their professional judgement to decide when a written review is required.
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>Inspectors will consider whether the strengths in 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, a particular omission may be important enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>In cases where no reviewing of safety and wellbeing was required, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.</p>

R 3	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	
	<p>Reviewing is an ongoing process. It recognises and responds 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>HM Inspectorate of Probation expects all factors relevant to risk of harm to be reviewed (not just factors related to risk of serious harm).</p> <p>In cases where the child has received a custodial sentence, we expect the YJS 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>We expect to see ongoing reviewing of risk of harm even in cases where the assessed level of risk of harm is low. Informal reviewing would be evidenced by continuing enquiries about the child's relationships, level of substance misuse, behaviour and any reoffending. It may also include information from parents, carers or other professionals, and police intelligence. We expect case managers to have an enquiring mind. Any new behaviour that might be</p>

		<p>linked to risk of harm should be spotted, analysed, and taken into account in any reviewing of planned activity to keep other people safe. In some cases, there may be no new information that necessitates formal reviewing of risk of harm, but case managers should take sufficient steps to ensure existing information remains correct.</p> <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 custodial cases, reviewing should reflect any incidents related to the safety of others that have taken place in the secure establishment and consider how both the secure estate and the YJS have responded to this. Reviewing should focus on any anticipated changes to risk of harm to others as the child moves from custody to the community. In cases where there are concerns about the risk of harm presented by the child, and there has not been any improvement, the YJS should also explore this, and consider why there has been no change. If it is because the child has not engaged in interventions, the YJS should consider how to improve the child's engagement. Evidence of reviewing could include internal or multi-agency meetings or discussions, or consultation with a manager. Reviews do not always need to be completed on AssetPlus.</p> <p>We expect to see a full written review when there are significant changes to factors related to the safety of other people, not solely to changes in the level of concern.</p> <p>Where the assessed level of risk is increased or decreased, we expect to see a clear rationale for that as part of a written review.</p>
R 3.2	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in managing the risk of harm?	Information from other agencies is critical in reviewing 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. Case managers should always attend multi-agency meetings, including MARAC, MAPPA and child protection meetings. If additional information comes to light during any reviewing, this must be shared with relevant agencies, so that they are appraised of key information in the case. This

		<p>question will be answered 'No' if there is a lack of professional curiosity, if the risk presented by the child is seen in isolation from other agencies and or if reviewing does not lead to necessary action. It is critical to obtain the views of parents or carers at the point children are about to be released from custody.</p> <p>Reviewing should identify what activities and interventions have been completed with the child, how well the child has responded, and whether interventions have had the desired impact.</p>
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 that the YJS has reconsidered the planned activity. Are any additional interventions required? Are any current interventions no longer required? The YJS should consider 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 do not set any specific period where we expect to see written reviews. We do expect a written review to be completed when there are significant changes to assessment and/or planning for factors related to risk of harm. Examples might be a positive or negative change to any of the key factors related to risk of harm; repeat or escalation of previous risk-related behaviour; emergence of new risk-related behaviour; or allegations of a new (harmful) offence. 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 3 S	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people 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 concern for the safety of others, we expect to see more iterative reviewing, and written reviews for any significant changes.</p> <p>Inspectors will consider whether the strengths in reviewing outweigh any insufficiency. While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that, overall, the reviewing is</p>

sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the reviewing may have many strengths, a particular omission may be important enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

In cases where no reviewing of risk of harm was required, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.

Case manager interview

O 2	Is there access to appropriate services to support desistance, safety and wellbeing and risk of harm?	
	We expect the YJS to have in place a comprehensive range of high-quality services, to enable personalised and responsive provision for all children. Services should cover the desistance needs of children, as well as ensuring effective arrangements to support the safety and wellbeing of children and manage the risk of harm to others.	
O 2.1	Does the case manager have access to the services needed in this case to support desistance?	We expect the YJS partnership to ensure that sufficient services are in place to support desistance. The services may be provided internally by the YJS, by partner agencies, or by other organisations (on a commissioned or non-commissioned basis).
O 2.2	Does the case manager have access to the services needed in this case to support the safety and wellbeing of the child?	We expect the YJS partnership to ensure that sufficient services are in place to support the safety and wellbeing of the child. The services may be provided internally by the YJS, by partner agencies, or by other organisations (on a commissioned or non-commissioned basis).
O 2.3	Does the case manager have access to the services needed in this case to support the safety of other people?	We expect the YJS partnership to ensure that sufficient services are in place to support management of risk of harm. The services may be provided internally by the YJS, by partner agencies, or by other organisations (on a commissioned or non-commissioned basis).