HM Inspectorate of Probation

o

Probation inspection

Case assessment rules and guidance (CARaG)

PDU and regional domain two standards

HM Inspectorate of Probation, December 2024

Contents

Introduction

During both probation delivery unit (PDU) and regional inspections, we inspect the quality of service delivery under the domain two standards. These standards have been updated to take account of the Inspectorate's approach to the implementation of Probation Reset. In addition to the core standards, we now apply a set of adjusted standards to licence cases where Probation Reset is applied eight weeks or less from the point of release. During PDU inspections, we gather evidence against the four PDU domain two standards (assessment, planning, implementation and delivery, and reviewing); this evidence is aggregated across all PDUs in the region to inform the regional ratings for desistance and public protection. Cases inspected as part of PDU domain two are also used to gather evidence for two of the regional domain two standards (court work and resettlement). During regional inspections, we gather case management evidence in connection with the final two regional domain two standards (unpaid work and victim work).

Domain two standards, questions and prompts are supported by the domain two case assessment rules and guidance (CARaG). This is a comprehensive set of published rules and guidance to be followed by inspectors and local assessors when they assess cases. The CARaG promotes transparency and consistency in our inspection of cases. It has been updated to reflect our approach to inspecting cases impacted by Probation Reset. For some questions, the CARaG sets out differing expectations depending on the impact of contact being suspended. In all other questions, the CARaG applies equally, irrespective of the timing or impact of Probation Reset. Inspection staff and local assessors should use the CARaG as a reference document when assessing a case.

Guidance is provided in the CARaG for all key questions and prompts in the standards framework, as well as for questions that we ask in order to gather additional data. The CARaG is updated regularly, to ensure that it remains consistent with any changes that we make at standard, question and prompt level and so that it remains linked to evidence.

Not all questions apply to all cases, and this is explained throughout the CARaG.

Key

Example	Question format	Represents:
Does assessment identify offending-related factors?	Plain text	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.

Was a report offered to the court when the case was sentenced?	*Italics*	An information question, asked to provide additional background information about the case, or to gather evidence for the inspection of domain one, but less strongly linked to summary judgement questions.
Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?	**Bold text**	A summary judgement question, answering a key question from the inspection standards, and directly influencing the rating for the relevant standard.

Inspection principles

Resettlement cases

For the assessment, planning, implementation and delivery, and reviewing standards, we inspect post-release work (where that has been the responsibility of the inspected region). There is a separate resettlement section to gather information about the pre-release phase of the sentences. In cases eligible for Offender Management in Custody (OMiC), we expect to see a handover from prison-based staff to a community offender manager around eight and a half months before the expected release date. This is to enable continuity of preparation for release, and effective handover to services in the community. We expect the community offender manager to be assessing and planning the work required, and overseeing delivery of required services, whether those services are delivered under prison-based or community-based arrangements. For cases with less than 10 months to serve at the point of sentence, we expect a community offender manager to be responsible for the case throughout. In cases serving very short periods in custody, we take a proportionate approach to what resettlement work would have been reasonable in the time available, although key issues regarding domestic abuse, child safeguarding and public protection should be prioritised.

Post-recall cases

We inspect cases that have been released post-recall as part of our PDU cohorts. As for other resettlement cases, evidence from earlier in the sentence may be taken into account, but we expect to see a community offender manager assessing, planning, and ensuring delivery of appropriate services during the recall period, to ensure preparation for re-release.

Cases transferred in or out of the PDU

We inspect cases transferred into or out of the PDU as part of our PDU cohorts. In cases transferred out, we expect the probation practitioner in the PDU to take full responsibility for assessment, planning, delivery of services and reviewing until the point that a formal transfer is agreed by the receiving area; this will include any work delivered by another area under temporary caretaking arrangements. In cases transferred in, we inspect the work of the receiving area from the point that formal transfer is agreed. We may take into account any assessment that has been completed by the transferring area, but the probation practitioner in the receiving area is responsible for ensuring that sufficient assessment and planning are in place to manage the case from the point of the formal transfer.

Cases that have terminated

We do not inspect cases that were terminated within seven days of the order or licence commencing. For cases that were terminated between eight and 28 days after sentence/release, we inspect those where there was continuity of supervision, such as where a community order was revoked and immediately replaced by a similar order, or where a licence case was recalled and subsequently re-released.

Cases impacted by Probation Reset

We include cases impacted by Probation Reset, where they appear in our PDU cohorts. In cases where contact has been suspended after eight weeks supervision or less, we apply an adjusted set of prompts. In cases where contact has been suspended after more than eight weeks supervision, we apply our core standards, and take a proportionate approach in making inspection judgements.

Cases with multiple sentences

In cases where the individual has been subject to additional community sentences or periods of post-release supervision since the date when the order/post-release supervision began, inspectors will take account of the whole period of continuous supervision since that date.

If a community order was revoked and replaced with another qualifying community order, the delivery and implementation under all orders will be inspected. If a community sentence was revoked and not immediately replaced with another community sentence, inspectors will only take account of work up to the point of revocation.

If a licence resulted in a recall, and the individual was subsequently re-released on a new licence or period of post-sentence supervision, the whole period of continuous supervision (including any time spent in custody on recall) will be taken into account.

Cases eligible for statutory victim contact

Where a resettlement case is eligible for statutory victim contact, and at least one victim appears to have lived in the region being inspected up to the point of the prisoner's release, we inspect the statutory victim contact in that case. If for any reason an eligible case has not been picked up by victim contact staff in the region, it will not be excluded from the inspection; instead, all summary judgements for that case will be negative.

Information about the case

	Inspection question	**CARaG**
2.0.02	*Is there evidence that the person on probation has been asked about their diversity characteristics at the start of the current period of supervision?*	It is important that each period of supervision starts with a discussion with the person on probation about their specific diversity characteristics. This will enable the probation practitioner to develop an understanding of the individual's lived experience, and the impact of diversity characteristics on their life. That provides a solid basis for establishing a positive working relationship for the period of supervision. While completion of a diversity monitoring form may be a part of that process, it is not sufficient on its own.
2.0.24	*Was a report offered to the court at the point of sentence?*	We believe a report should be offered to the court in all cases where: • there are significant risks to other people, including sexual and domestic offences and cases with current domestic abuse and/or child safeguarding concerns • the individual's circumstances are complex, for example they have a significant mental health issue or disability, have substance misuse issues, are pregnant or have recently given birth, are transgender, are a young adult (age 18 to 25) who has previously been known to the Youth Justice Service, or are the primary carer for children or dependant adults • the Probation Service has the opportunity to influence disproportionality in sentencing, for example in cases involving defendants from a Black, Asian or minority ethnic background, people from a minority cultural or faith community, or women • custody is being considered (and in these cases the report should explore other available sentencing options, not just the impact on the individual) • the case is currently managed under Integrated Offender Management (IOM) or Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) • there is a risk that the individual may have been the victim of domestic abuse, trafficking, modern slavery, or been subject to coercion, intimidation or exploitation. Inspectors will answer 'No, and should have been' to this question in any case where any of the above circumstances apply.

Court work

	Is the pre-sentence information and advice provided to court sufficiently analytical and personalised to the individual, supporting the court's decision-making?	
	We inspect court work where a pre-sentence report (PSR) (of any type) has been prepared within the previous 12 months, in the inspected Probation Service region. We normally inspect the report The report associated with the event being inspected, but may inspect another report if one does not exist for the specific event.	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
2.1.03	*Was the type of report prepared appropriate?*	We recognise that there are many groups who are disadvantaged through the court process, and we expect the type of report prepared to be appropriate to the individual's circumstances, as well as the nature and seriousness of the offence. In the following category of cases, we believe that a standard delivery report should be prepared, unless there are specific reasons that a shorter report would suffice: • cases where custody is being considered or may be likely (and in these cases the report should explore other available sentencing options, not just the impact on the individual) • sexual and domestic abuse offences • serious violent offences (section 47 and above) • cases with current domestic abuse and/or child safeguarding concerns • young adults who have previously been known to a Youth Justice Service • female defendants • transgender defendants • complex cases (such as defendants with a significant mental health issue or disability) • defendants from a Black, Asian and minority ethnic background • cases currently managed under IOM. A breach report should only be used for sentencing purposes when the case is being resentenced following breach. We expect the breach report to meet all our standards, including providing an appropriate proposal. Where an update from a current probation practitioner, written or oral, is used to provide information to court, that information should also meet all our standards.

		Inspectors will also consider the amount of time available to prepare the report. Where a same day report is ordered, but that does not allow time to make sufficient enquiries about issues that are apparent in the case, inspectors will answer this question 'No'. In cases that are already being supervised by the Probation Service at the point of sentence, we still expect sufficient information to be provided to support the courts decision-making. Where the current probation practitioner provides an update, whether in written format or orally, that information will be inspected against our standards provided the update has been specifically requested for, and delivered to, court.
2.1.04	*At the point the report was presented to court, were there any indicators that the person on probation might be a perpetrator of domestic abuse?*	We recognise the cross-government definition of domestic abuse as any incident of controlling, coercive or threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members, regardless of their gender or sexuality. Domestic abuse covers, but is not limited to, the following types of abuse: • psychological • physical • sexual • financial • emotional. Inspectors look at the evidence that would have been available to the report author. The index offence might constitute domestic abuse directly, due to the nature of the offence, such as an assault. Victim and witness statements and other prosecution documents may also indicate elements of domestic abuse in relation to other offences, such as theft and drugs offences. Lists of previous convictions do not indicate which individual offences constituted domestic abuse. We expect report authors to show an appropriate level of professional curiosity in circumstances where previous convictions include offences such as assault, criminal damage, threatening behaviour, harassment or breach of restraining orders. Probation Service records may indicate that the individual has been a perpetrator or victim of domestic abuse. Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments, nDelius case records and other available documents, including external reports, child protection conference notes and communication with other agencies, may provide useful sources of information.

		The individual might disclose in interview that they have been a perpetrator of domestic abuse, or might disclose other information about their relationships that could indicate the potential for domestic abuse to be present. We expect report authors to use suitable professional curiosity to explore these issues. This question is specifically about the individual being a perpetrator or potential perpetrator of domestic abuse, to allow a link to be made to assessment of the risk of serious harm they may pose. Where the person has been a victim of domestic abuse, we expect that to be covered as part of the personal circumstances of that individual.
2.1.05	*Was sufficient information about domestic abuse obtained before the report was prepared?*	We recognise that there are several different ways the Probation Service can obtain information about domestic abuse, including direct enquiries to the police, enquiries through a Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) and routine information-sharing by the police. Whatever the local arrangements, we expect the Probation Service to obtain sufficient information on domestic abuse from the police in all cases at the point when a PSR is ordered by the court. To be sufficient, information must cover a reasonable period of time, and must provide enough detail to allow the Probation Service to understand the behaviour of the individual that has come to police attention. A simple list of dates of police call-outs is unlikely to be sufficient. Any enquiries, and responses from the police, should be recorded clearly on nDelius. The only situation where fresh enquiries are not required is where sufficient up-to-date information is available from other sources, such as records of a current case or Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) information. We expect the Probation Service to be working with police forces to facilitate a clear, detailed and speedy response to all enquiries or to have in place other information-sharing arrangements. If information has not been obtained at the point of the PSR, we still expect the Probation Service to obtain sufficient information once the individual has been sentenced, but this does not absolve the Probation Service of our expectation to obtain information before sentencing.

2.1.06	*Was information about domestic abuse used in preparing the report?*	We expect any relevant information about domestic abuse to be used in preparing the report. It should therefore be discussed with the individual as part of the report preparation process. If the information obtained confirms there are no factors related to domestic abuse, this does not need to be specifically mentioned in the report. If there are factors related to domestic abuse, these should be referred to in the report, even if they are not relevant to the sentence being proposed. If the index offence is one of domestic abuse, information should be set out clearly in the report so that sentencers can understand any patterns of abusive behaviour that the individual has demonstrated, beyond those that have attracted convictions. If the report proposes a curfew, it is critical that any information about domestic abuse is fully set out as part of the report, to ensure the safety of partners or other family members who may be living at the proposed curfew address. It may not be appropriate to present this information verbally in court.
2.1.07	*At the point the report was presented to court, were there any indicators that there might be child protection or child safeguarding concerns in this case?*	Inspectors look at the information that would have been available to the report author. The index offence might have had a child co-defendant, a child victim or child witnesses. For most offences, the list of previous convictions does not identify which individual offences indicate risks to, or concerns for, children. We expect report authors to show an appropriate level of professional curiosity to explore the ages of any co-defendants, and of victims of sexual or violent offences. Existing Probation Service records may reveal current or previous child safeguarding or child protection concerns. OASys assessments, nDelius case records and other available documents, including external reports, child protection conference notes and communication with other agencies, may provide useful sources of information. The individual might disclose issues in interview that indicate child protection or child safeguarding concerns. We expect report authors to use suitable professional curiosity to explore these issues.
2.1.08	*Was sufficient information about child protection and child safeguarding obtained before the report was prepared?*	We expect to see clear evidence recorded that shows whether the individual has been asked if they have children or are in contact with children (so we know if information about child protection or child safeguarding is required). We expect the Probation Service to obtain information about child protection and child safeguarding in all cases where the individual: • has children, or • is in contact with children, or • presents a potential risk of harm to children.

		We recognise that there are several different ways the Probation Service can obtain information about child protection and child safeguarding, including direct enquiries to children's social care, and enquiries through a MASH. Whatever the local arrangements, we expect the Probation Service to obtain sufficient information about child protection and child safeguarding in all relevant cases at the point when a PSR is ordered by the court. To be sufficient, information must cover a reasonable period of time, and must provide enough detail to allow the Probation Service to understand the individual's behaviour and/or concerns about children they are in contact with that have come to the attention of children's services. Enquiries should be made in the individual's home local authority area, and in the local authority area where any relevant children live, if different. A simple list of dates of contact with children's social care is unlikely to be sufficient. Information should be sought at the point a PSR is ordered by the court. Any enquiries, and responses from children's services, should be clearly recorded on nDelius. The only situation where fresh enquiries are not required in these cases is where sufficient, up-to-date information is available from other sources, such as records of a current case. We expect the Probation Service to be working with local authorities to facilitate a clear, detailed and speedy response to all enquiries. If not done at the point of the report, we still expect the Probation Service to make these enquiries once a case has been allocated, but this does not absolve the Probation Service of our requirement to initiate enquiries before sentence and allocation.
2.1.09	*Was information about child protection and child safeguarding used, where relevant, in preparing the report?*	We expect any relevant information about child protection and child safeguarding to be used in preparing the report. It should therefore be discussed with the individual as part of the report preparation process. If the information obtained confirms there are no factors related to child protection and child safeguarding, this does not need to be specifically mentioned in the report. If there are factors related to child protection and child safeguarding, these should be referred to in the report, if they are relevant to the sentence being proposed. If the report proposes a curfew, it is critical that any information about child protection and child safeguarding is fully set out as part of the report, to ensure the safety of children who may be living at the proposed curfew address. It may not be appropriate to present this information verbally in court.

2.1.10	Does the information and advice draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including child safeguarding and domestic abuse information?	Inspectors need to consider what sources of information were available to the report writer at the time the report was written. Were there gaps? If so, were attempts made to find this information from other sources? As a minimum, documents from the CPS, including about previous convictions, and any information on OASys or nDelius about current or recent supervision, should form the basis for information given to the court. The victim impact statement, if there is one, should also be taken into account. If the individual is a foreign national, court staff should ask CPS whether any information is available about offences committed abroad. In some circumstances, information from other agencies, such as substance misuse or mental health services, should be sought and used. Failure to obtain information on child safeguarding and/or domestic abuse may result in a negative response to this question, if that information might have had a bearing on the assessment of risk in the information and advice provided to court. It is not always appropriate to share detailed information from children's social care services or police domestic abuse units with the court, but the content of any report should refer to checks having been made, and should take any relevant information into account.
2.1.11	Is the individual involved meaningfully in the preparation of the report, and are their views considered?	We do not want to see a 'one size fits all' report or proposal. Is reference made in the report, or any other documents, to the individual's views and circumstances? Has a self-assessment questionnaire been completed, and/or is it clear that the report writer has explored the issues that the individual identifies for themselves? The report should include a sufficient description of the individual's personal circumstances, gathered through the interview with them, to reflect their engagement. Where a report is prepared before a plea or finding of guilt, we expect to see a full explanation of this, and of any constraint that it places on the report preparation process. Where a report is prepared by a remote interview with the individual, we expect the practitioner to have considered whether this might disadvantage the individual because of any specific needs they have.
2.1.12	Does the advice consider factors related to the likelihood of reoffending?	Inspectors will be looking to see whether the written record of the report makes clear the main factors related to likelihood of reoffending. The report should be used to address an individual's needs in the following areas: • accommodation • education, training and employment (ETE)

		• relationships • lifestyle and associates • alcohol misuse • drug misuse • emotional management and wellbeing • attitudes, thinking and behaviour • finance, benefits and debt. These are the needs that evidence shows either predict reoffending if they are not met, or, if they are addressed, will contribute to the stability that people need in order to be able to deal with other significant issues. In general, the more of these needs that the person has, the greater their likelihood of reoffending.
2.1.13	Does the advice consider factors related to risk of harm?	Inspectors will be looking to see whether the written record of the report makes clear whether there were any factors related to risk of harm, not just risk of serious harm (RoSH), and if so, what they were. This includes factors related to the offence for which the individual is appearing in court, and other known factors about risk of harm presented by the individual, including any domestic abuse or child safeguarding concerns. There is no requirement for the report to state the level of assessed risk of harm, as in many cases the full assessment of risk of harm is not completed until after the individual has been sentenced.
2.1.14	Does the advice consider the individual's motivation and readiness to change?	This does not have to be an extensive analysis, but there needs to be some explanation of the individual's motivation, and an assessment of their readiness to change or not. Inspectors will expect to find evidence that the individual has been informed about the proposal, and that their level of motivation and willingness to comply has been considered. Assessments for alcohol treatment, drug rehabilitation and mental health treatment requirements require the individual to consent to treatment.
2.1.15	Does the advice consider the individual's diversity and personal circumstances?	We expect to see evidence of discussion of diversity characteristics and other personal circumstances with the individual, which may be recorded on a diversity monitoring form. Where there are relevant factors, particularly where they might affect the individual's ability to comply with any sentence imposed, we would expect these to be drawn to the attention of the court. This includes consideration of whether the individual has been a victim of domestic abuse.

2.1.16	Does the advice consider the impact of the offence on known or identifiable victims?	We expect the report to comment on the impact of the offences on any identifiable victims, and the individual's attitude to that. This should be more than a duplicate of the victim impact statement or information in the CPS documents. The report should summarise the impact appropriately and analyse any empathy for the victims, or remorse, if shown.

<table>
<tr>
<td>2.1.17</td>
<td>Is an appropriate proposal made to court?</td>
<td>We expect the proposal to allow for assistance to be given with any factors related to offending and for management of any identified risk of harm.
Where a rehabilitation activity requirement (RAR) is proposed, we expect to see an explanation of the factors that might be covered by any such requirement, to assist sentencers. Court officers should specify the rehabilitative needs to be addressed and the number of days needed to do so. There is no maximum number of RAR days, but the 'offender group reconviction scale' (OGRS) score, based on age, gender and criminal history, should be the main guide to the number of days proposed. This is because there is a clear link between the OGRS score and the number of rehabilitative needs.
<table>
<tr><th>OGRS</th><th>Guideline RAR days</th></tr>
<tr><td>0–24%</td><td>Not recommended</td></tr>
<tr><td>25–49%</td><td>1–15 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>50–74%</td><td>15–25 days</td></tr>
<tr><td>75–100%</td><td>25–60 days</td></tr>
</table>
Where the individual is likely to be eligible and suitable for any accredited programmes, an accredited programme should normally be proposed to court. If a programme is not proposed or it is unclear whether suitability was assessed, inspectors will assess the suitability of the proposed requirements/sentence to address the offending-related factors.
Where the proposal has been for a requirement or set of requirements without any rehabilitative content (any combination of unpaid work, curfew and prohibition), the requirements should meet the needs of the case.
Even where the court has asked for a specific assessment, such as for unpaid work, the Probation Service should inform the court about whether this is likely to be an effective sentence, and should make a proposal for a more suitable sentence if that meets the needs of the case.
Where there are factors related to harm, for example domestic abuse, we expect the proposal to allow for these issues to be addressed and safely managed, even when the index offence is not related to these issues.
We expect the proposed sentence to be achievable by the individual, considering their personal circumstances and diversity factors.</td>
</tr>
</table>

		Where custody (immediate or suspended) has been proposed, we expect to see an explanation about why no other sentence is appropriate. Drug rehabilitation requirements (DRRs) can be given when the court is satisfied that the person on probation is dependent on or misuses drugs, and that treatment is likely to help and is available. Alcohol treatment requirements (ATRs) can be given when the court is satisfied that a person on probation is dependent on alcohol and that treatment is likely to help and is available. The assessment of suitability of treatment should be completed by the local substance misuse provider and this should be made available at the time of sentencing. The person on probation's dependency on alcohol does not have to have caused or contributed to the offence for which they have been convicted. Where their consent is required (e.g. for an ATR or DRR), this should be clearly recorded. Mental health treatment requirements (MHTRs) can be given where the court is satisfied that an offender has a mental health condition that is treatable either in a community setting or as an outpatient in a non-secure setting. The court must be satisfied that, on the evidence of a registered medical practitioner, the individual's mental health condition is such that it requires, and may be susceptible to, treatment but does not warrant making a hospital order. Arrangements should have been made for the treatment intended. MHTRs can be used for any mental health issue, including personality disorders, and the treatment offered can cover a wide range of interventions, from therapy for depression and anxiety through to secondary and psychiatric care. Where other measures are proposed, such as a curfew or prohibition, relevant checks should be carried out, including checks of child safeguarding (where necessary) and/or domestic abuse information, to ensure that proposals are safe and appropriate. In a breach report, we expect a realistic proposal about whether the sentence should continue, or be revoked and different sentence imposed. Inspectors will answer this question negatively where the proposal is not clearly stated, where there is insufficient information to explain the proposal or where the proposal does not allow for key offending or risk of harm factors to be addressed, based on information that was or should have been available to the person preparing the report.

2.1.18	Is there a sufficient record of the advice given, and the reasons for it?	The main source of evidence about the record of advice given to court, and the reasons for it, will be the written report. For standard delivery and short-format written reports, this will be the typed report itself. For oral reports, it will be the uploaded copy of the report. The written record of oral reports may be brief or even non-existent, but our judgement is still based on the available record. Under the current working arrangements with HM Courts & Tribunals Service, we cannot expect reports to be long documents in all circumstances. We do, however, expect them to make an appropriate proposal, based on sufficient information. We also expect them to be sufficiently personalised. The reason for this is that a probation practitioner will base their supervision on the written record of the report. The practitioner needs to understand what was proposed to the court and why, and the content of the report may form part of a breach case in the future.
2.1.19	**Is the pre-sentence information and advice provided to court sufficiently analytical and personalised to the individual, supporting the court's decision-making?**	To make a judgement, inspectors take into account the answers to all the questions in this section. We consider whether, during the report preparation process, the practitioner obtained and used properly all the relevant information that was, or could reasonably have been expected to be, available. We expect the report preparation process to be sufficiently personalised, depending on the individual's needs and circumstances. We expect to see an appropriate proposal put to the court, allowing relevant factors related to reoffending and risk of harm to be addressed. We focus on the proposal made, not the sentence actually imposed. We expect sufficient evidence to be entered on nDelius, so that any subsequent probation practitioner can understand the nature, content and purpose of advice provided to court. The absence of written evidence of court work is likely to lead to a negative judgement. Inspectors will answer this question negatively where there are indicators of domestic abuse and/or child safeguarding issues and information has not been received from the police and/or children's services to confirm those issues, because absence of that information could impact on the safety of the proposal.

Resettlement

	Is resettlement timely, personalised and coordinated, and does it address key resettlement needs and support the individual's integration into the community?	
2.2.02	Was there a clear handover from the prison offender manager to the community offender manager at an appropriate point before release?	This question only applies to cases in scope for OMiC where the custodial part of the sentence is 10 months or more. For shorter sentences, we expect the case to be allocated to, and managed by, a community offender manager throughout the sentence. In OMiC cases, we expect to see a clear handover from a prison offender manager to the community offender manager around eight and a half months before release. We recognise that an earlier handover may take place in a few specific cases, for example MAPPA level 3, critical public protection and Terrorism Act cases. We recognise that HMPPS guidance is for some cases to have an enhanced handover, including completion of an updated OASys, and a handover meeting attended by the prisoner, prison offender manager, other prison staff and the community offender manager. The HMPPS guidance expects enhanced handover to take place in cases where the individual is eligible for parole, assessed as high RoSH, eligible for MAPPA or serving an indeterminate sentence. In other cases, the HMPPS guidance states that a handover report completed by the prison offender manager is sufficient. Inspectors will be looking for a handover that meets the needs of the case, in terms of timing and content, and ensures a smooth transition from services that are delivered in custody to those that prepare the individual for release. A discussion between the prison offender manager and the community offender manager is good practice. We expect any handover report to include all relevant information from the prison, including security information and, particularly, information relating to risk of harm and managing the risk after release.
2.2.03	Was there sufficient information-sharing between prison-based staff and the community offender manager?	We expect the community offender manager to be proactive in seeking information from prison-based staff, including information about risk of harm, risk of suicide or self-harm, security issues, desistance and resettlement needs, and work being undertaken during the custodial element of the sentence.

		Inspectors bear in mind what is reasonable given the length of the custodial part of the sentence, and that the community offender manager normally only takes responsibility for the case during the final eight and a half months of longer custodial sentences. The community offender manager should keep up-to-date with any changes for the prisoner during the pre-release period, and to ensure that relevant pre-release services are delivered within the prison.
2.2.04	Did the community offender manager ensure a proportionate level of contact with the prisoner before release?	Prisoners should receive sufficient contact from the assigned community offender manager before they are released from prison, to support them with their resettlement needs. Where possible, this should include face-to-face contact, either by a visit or a videoconference. Inspectors bear in mind what is reasonable given the length of the custodial part of the sentence, and that the community offender manager normally only takes responsibility for the case during the final eight and a half months of longer custodial sentences.
2.2.05	Did the community offender manager identify and address the key resettlement or desistance needs before release?	The community offender manager should identify and plan to address key resettlement or desistance needs before release. This includes planning to ensure that suitable accommodation is available; making arrangements for services delivered in prison, such as substance misuse or ETE, to be handed over to community services; and maintaining or improving family relationships. Work planned to be delivered by prison staff can be counted as part of the evidence here.
2.2.06	Did the community offender manager identify and address key risk of harm issues before release?	We expect the community offender manager to identify and plan to address any factors related to risk of harm that might be present during the final months of the custodial sentence and after release. This includes obtaining sufficient information from the prison about behaviour that may indicate ongoing risks after release. It also includes ensuring that appropriate licence conditions are in place. It may also include checking and addressing the safety of victims, partners and children, and ensuring that suitable licence conditions are in place. Work planned to be delivered by staff working in custody could be counted as part of the evidence here, where the community offender manager has been taking a coordinating role. There should also be liaison and coordination with partner agencies regarding the management of risk of harm. This might include MAPPA, integrated offender management (IOM), the police, or children's services.
2.2.07	Are resettlement services delivered in line with person in prison's	In this question we look at the overall delivery of resettlement services that has taken place between the point the community offender manager took responsibility for the case, and the

	resettlement needs, prioritising those which are most critical?	release date. We expect the community offender manager to ensure services are delivered to address any resettlement needs that might be present during the final months of the custodial sentence and after release. This may include making arrangements for accommodation or benefit claims, or arranging access to a bank account and ID. It also includes any necessary work relating to the management of risk to individuals and/or the public. Work delivered by staff working in custody could be counted as part of the evidence here, where the community offender manager has been taking a coordinating role.
2.2.08	Is there effective coordination of resettlement activity with other services being delivered in prison?	We expect the community offender manager to be proactive in coordinating their work with the services being delivered in prison. This should include working jointly with prison pre-release staff to address practical issues such as accommodation, and to manage any issues relating to domestic abuse and/or child safeguarding. The community offender manager should ensure that any other organisation delivering services to the individual is fully aware of the individual's needs and risks. For example, accommodation referrals should be informed by any history of substance misuse, or domestic abuse.
2.2.09	Do resettlement services support effective handover for delivery in the community?	We expect the community offender manager to be proactive in ensuring a handover from services delivered in the prison to services delivered in the community. This might include referral for further work to address accommodation; ETE; finance, benefit and debt; substance misuse; or mental health issues. The community offender manager should be clear about the detail of any community appointments arranged, such as for substance misuse, so they can support the person on probation to attend after release. For people being released homeless, community offender managers need to be aware of the 'Duty to Refer (in England)/Application for Help (in Wales)' and the requirement to complete this referral as part of release planning. They may also need to coordinate community services or other parts of the Probation Service to ensure the effective management of risk.
2.2.11	**Is resettlement timely, personalised and coordinated, and does it address key resettlement needs and support the individual's integration into the community?**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall resettlement work meets the needs of the case. We expect to see coordination of resettlement services by the community offender manager. The actual work delivered could be provided in a range of ways: by prison-based staff, by other community-based staff, or by the community offender manager themselves. We expect to see sufficient attention paid to issues related to risk of harm, including domestic abuse and child safeguarding, to ensure a safe release.

		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 sufficient planning in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient planning for a single critical factor, such as failing to undertake domestic abuse checks before release from custody, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

Assessment

	Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?
	Assessment refers to the process of assessment, not just to the preparation of a single assessment document. This section refers to the overall assessment at the start of the community sentence or at the point a community offender manager should have been assigned to a custodial case being inspected. **Timescales** We do not specify the timescale within which assessment should be completed, but if there is a delay in completing significant elements of assessment, that can result in a negative judgement, even when any finalised assessment is good enough. If the person on probation has been subject to other sentences at the point this sentence began, previous assessments can be taken into account, but we would expect them to be updated for the sentence. In some cases, the person on probation will have received additional community sentences/post-release supervision starting after the date of the sentence that is subject to inspection. We would expect to see a reassessment in those circumstances, but that work will be inspected under the 'reviewing' standard. **Post-release cases** In post-release cases, we look at assessment from the point of release. Where there has been an assessment in the period immediately preceding the release, as part of preparation for release, that can be included as part of the evidence for this standard. Where there has been little or no attendance from the person on probation, we do not necessarily expect a written assessment to have been completed, but we expect to see some evidence of the probation practitioner thinking about how to engage the person on probation, beyond sending routine enforcement letters. **Assessment of risk of harm** 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. **Probation Reset Cases** Where prompts apply in core and adjusted cases, we expect our standards for assessment, as described in the CARaG, to be met to the same level in all cases where Probation Reset has been applied, irrespective of the length of active supervision. This

	is because sufficient assessment is the necessary foundation for delivery of services either by the Probation Service, or as part of exit planning and handover to other services at the point supervision is suspended.	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
2.3.01 Core cases only	Does assessment analyse the motivation and readiness of the person on probation to engage and comply with the sentence?	Inspectors are looking for more than a simple statement about the individual's motivation and readiness to engage and comply with the sentence. We expect to find a clear assessment of the individual's readiness to engage, recognising the different stages in the cycle of change. We expect practitioners to recognise the level of the individual's motivation to comply, and any supporting or contradictory factors. We look for evidence in formal assessment documents, the case record and the interview with the practitioner. This question only refers to motivation and readiness to engage and comply with the sentence. If a written self-assessment has been completed (such as the OASys self-assessment questionnaire), this may contain useful information. We expect the practitioner to consider information from previous periods of probation supervision and to identify any potential barriers to engagement, which may be indicated by information from previous breaches or non-compliance.
2.3.02 Core cases only	Does assessment analyse the protected characteristics of the individual and consider the impact of these on their ability to comply and engage with service delivery?	Inspectors expect to see a meaningful exploration of any diversity factors relevant to the individual. We recognise the nine protected characteristics (sex, age, race, religion and belief, disability, pregnancy and maternity, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, and marriage or civil partnership). As a starting point, inspectors expect to see a fully completed and up-to-date diversity monitoring form. We also expect to see evidence that this has been discussed with the individual, to gain a clear understanding of the impact of each factor on their life and on their ability to engage with the sentence. The potential impact of any factor and the degree to which it needs to be taken into account will vary according to the individual case. A number of factors can have an impact on the extent to which individuals are able to engage with services; experience of discrimination can contribute to this. Many users of adult probation services have had these experiences. We recognise that many individuals have multiple relevant protected characteristics, and inspectors will consider issues of intersectionality.

		Having analysed the diversity factors, we expect to see an account of the impact these have specifically on the individual's ability to engage and comply with the sentence.
2.3.03 Core cases only	Does assessment analyse the personal circumstances of the individual and consider the impact of these on their ability to comply and engage with service delivery?	Inspectors expect to see a clear analysis of any relevant personal circumstances, for example living in a rural area, employment patterns, issues around immigration status or understanding of English, caring responsibilities, educational difficulties, having grown up in local authority care, past trauma (for example, linked to refugee status or childhood abuse) or level of maturity. Any of these factors can make it difficult for individuals to access services and interventions or may mean that 'one size fits all' services are not appropriate. Analysis should include a description of any circumstances that are relevant to the individual's life, and of how these affect or have affected their life. The potential impact of any factor and the degree to which it needs to be taken into account will vary according to the individual case. A number of factors can affect how individuals are able to engage with services; for example, experience of having been in care, mental health problems, substance misuse or experience of domestic abuse can all contribute to this. Many users of adult probation services have had these experiences, which can affect their ability to develop appropriate supportive networks and form trusting relationships with professionals, and their self-perception. People with recent care experience may not have access to a range of support networks, which are important for desistance. If the person on probation is a foreign national, the probation practitioner should contact the Home Office to establish immigration status, so as to understand what services they are able to access in the community in terms of employment, education, healthcare, access to public funds and accommodation. Having analysed relevant personal circumstances, we expect to see an account of the impact these have specifically on the individual's ability to engage and comply with the sentence.
2.3.04 Adjusted cases only	Does assessment consider how to best engage the individual for contact ending?	We expect to see an early discussion with the person on probation about the impact of Probation Reset, so they are clear about the service they will receive. Assessment may be based on limited contact with the person on probation, sometimes a single appointment, but practitioners should still access all other available information, such as records from periods in custody and previous probation supervision. We expect to see analysis of any information about current or previous levels of engagement, as the starting point for being able to put in

		place appropriate, personalised arrangements for any direct delivery before suspension, and for post-supervision support. In cases where the person on probation is already engaged with other agencies, we would expect practitioners to recognise that in their assessments.
2.3.05 Adjusted cases only	Does assessment consider diversity factors and potential barriers to planning for contact ending and compliance during suspension?	Even where there is limited contact with the person on probation, we expect practitioners to fully consider diversity factors and any potential barriers to engagement, as the starting point for being able to put in place appropriate, personalised arrangements for any direct delivery before suspension, and for post-supervision support.
2.3.04 All cases	Is the person on probation involved meaningfully in their assessment, and are their views taken into account?	Inspectors will look for evidence that the individual has been interviewed as part of the assessment process, and that the practitioner has taken their views into account. There should be evidence in the assessment of the individual's perspective on their behaviour. We expect to see use of an interpreter where the individual does not speak English as a first language. Sources of evidence include any written self-assessment, or sections of assessment tools, recording the individual's attitudes. A detailed note on the case record of an interview where these issues were discussed and recorded could be sufficient. If the views of the person on probation are not recorded, we cannot judge whether they have been taken into account. Where the individual's views have been recorded, we look for evidence about how those views have been taken into account in the assessment process. Practitioners should balance the views of the person on probation with the overall management of the case.
2.3.05	**Summary judgement: Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment of engagement meets the needs of the case and the nature of the sentence. Sufficient assessment of an individual with a limited offending history may be less detailed than an assessment of someone with more convictions. Assessment should be sufficiently personalised, both engaging the individual in the assessment process and assessing the factors that are likely to have an impact on their willingness and ability to comply with supervision. 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 most important factors related to engagement. 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 an individual's ethnicity may be judged insufficient, even if it covered all other factors relevant to engagement. For adjusted cases, we recognise that there may be very little direct contact with the person on probation, but that contact should be used in conjunction with other evidence from case records to analyse the likelihood of engagement with residual licence conditions after suspension, and with any potential reinstatement of supervision.

	Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
2.3.10 Core cases only	Does assessment identify and analyse offending-related factors?	Inspectors are looking for an analysis of the offending behaviour that explains why the individual 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 that given by the individual should be explained. We expect analysis to explore what happened and what the individual thought about it, at the time and afterwards. It should also include an assessment of the individual's acceptance of responsibility, and their attitude to, or motivation for, the offence. Assessment should identify and analyse the specific factors that contributed to the index offence and other offending. Ideally, the evidence for this will be within a single assessment document, but inspectors will also look at self-assessments, notes of interviews, and other available documents. For more complex cases, additional specialist assessments may be needed.
2.3.11	Does assessment identify and analyse the critical factors	We expect practitioners to take steps to identify and analyse the critical factors related to offending, irrespective of whether they will be addressed through direct delivery by the

Adjusted cases only	requiring ongoing support/engagement from local services?	Probation Service, or through a referral to other agencies where the period of active contact with the Probation Service is short. Information from previous contact with the Probation Service or previous periods in custody can be considered, but we expect practitioners to show appropriate professional curiosity and to make sure historical information is checked and updated where there have been subsequent changes.
2.3.12 All cases	Does assessment identify the strengths and protective factors of the person on probation?	We expect assessment to identify the strengths of the individual under supervision, and also any protective factors. Strengths are those factors that support sustained desistance. They include external and social aspects of the person's life, as well as internal and psychological factors. All strengths support desistance. Protective factors are those strengths that mitigate against criminogenic factors, so not all strengths are protective factors. Examples of protective factors include stable accommodation, secure employment, engagement with substance misuse treatment, pro-social activities and pastimes, and stable, supportive relationships. We expect to see some analysis of the nature and relevance of identified protective factors to the individual. In some cases, inspectors might find that there are no strengths or protective factors.
2.3.15 All cases	Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information?	We expect assessment to be based on all available sources of information. This could include information from people on probation themselves; current and previous records of supervision, assessments by other agencies (including youth offending services and healthcare providers), specialist assessments, and information about the custodial part of sentences. We expect the probation practitioner to seek as much relevant information as possible to inform their assessment, and to incorporate and analyse evidence from multiple sources. The level of information available will vary, depending on the nature of the case. Inspectors will base their judgements on the sources of information that the probation practitioner would reasonably have been able to access at the time of the assessment. Probation practitioners should actively seek all relevant information; if needed, they should use escalation processes to obtain key sources of information that are held by other agencies.
2.3.16	**Summary judgement: Does assessment focus**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment of desistance meets the needs of the case and the nature of the sentence. Sufficient assessment of an individual

	sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?	with a limited offending history may be less detailed than assessment of someone with more convictions. Assessment should be sufficiently personalised, identifying the most important factors related to offending and desistance for the person on probation. 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 most important factors related to engagement. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances omission of a single critical factor, such as substance misuse, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

	Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
	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.	
2.3.20 *All cases*	*Was sufficient information about domestic abuse obtained?*	We expect the Probation Service to obtain sufficient information about whether the individual is a perpetrator or potential perpetrator of domestic abuse, in all cases at the point when a PSR is ordered by the court. If there was no court report, or information was not obtained at the court stage, we expect the Probation Service to obtain this information once the case has been allocated (or transferred to the community offender manager, in custodial cases). The only situation where fresh enquiries are not required is when sufficient, up-to-date information about known domestic abuse concerns is available from other sources, such as records of a currently supervised case or CPS information. We expect the Probation Service to be working with police forces to facilitate a clear, detailed and speedy response to all enquiries. We recognise that there are several different ways the Probation Service can obtain information about domestic abuse, including direct enquiries to the police, enquiries

		through a MASH, and routine information-sharing by the police. To be sufficient, information must cover a reasonable period of time, and must provide enough detail to allow the Probation Service to understand the behaviour that has come to police attention. A simple list of dates of police call-outs is unlikely to be sufficient. Checks should be refreshed before release where there has been a significant time lag since any checks at the court/allocation/transfer stage. Information about the individual being a victim of domestic abuse is considered under personal circumstances.
2.3.21 *All cases*	*Was information about domestic abuse used in assessing the case?*	We expect any relevant information about the individual being a perpetrator or potential perpetrator of domestic abuse to be used in assessing the case. It should therefore be discussed with the individual as part of the assessment process. If the information obtained confirms there are no factors related to domestic abuse, this should be clearly recorded. If there are factors related to domestic abuse, irrespective of whether the index offence is one of domestic abuse, this information should be clearly set out as part of the assessment, to identify and analyse any patterns of abusive behaviour that have been demonstrated by the individual, beyond those that have attracted convictions. If there is a curfew in the case, it is critical that any information about domestic abuse has been explicitly referenced, to ensure the safety of partners or other family members who may be living at the proposed curfew address.
2.3.22 *All cases*	*Was sufficient information about child protection and child safeguarding obtained where required?*	We expect to see clear evidence recorded that shows whether the individual has been asked if they have children or are in contact with children (so that we know if information about child protection or child safeguarding is required). We expect the Probation Service to obtain information about child protection and child safeguarding in all cases where the individual: • has children, or • is in contact with children, or • presents a potential risk of harm to children. We recognise that there are several different ways the Probation Service can obtain information about child protection and child safeguarding, including direct enquiries to children's social care, and enquiries through a MASH. Whatever the local arrangements, we

		expect the Probation Service to obtain sufficient information about child protection and child safeguarding in all relevant cases at the court report stage. If there was no court report, or information was not obtained at the court stage, we expect the Probation Service to obtain this information once the case has been allocated (or transferred to the community offender manager, in custodial cases). To be sufficient, information must cover a reasonable period of time, and must provide enough detail to allow the Probation Service to understand the behaviour of the individual and/or concerns about children they are in contact with that have come to the attention of children's services. Enquiries should be made in the individual's home local authority area, and in the local authority area where any relevant children live, if different. A simple list of dates of contact with children's social care is unlikely to be sufficient. We expect this information to be obtained, if required, as part of the court report process. Enquiries should identify whether any children in contact with the person on probation has ever previously: • received early help intervention, or • been identified as a child in need, or • been subject to a child protection plan. The only situation where fresh information is not required is where sufficient, up-to-date information about child safeguarding concerns is available from other sources, such as records of a currently supervised case or CPS information. Checks should be refreshed before release where there has been a significant time lag since any checks at the court/allocation/transfer stage. We expect the Probation Service to be working with local authorities to facilitate a clear, detailed and speedy response to all requests for information.
2.3.23 *All cases*	*Was information about child protection and child safeguarding used, where required, in assessing the case?*	We expect any relevant information about child protection and child safeguarding to be used in assessing the case. It should therefore be discussed with the individual as part of the assessment process. If the information obtained confirms there are no factors related to child protection and child safeguarding, this should be clearly recorded. If there are factors related to child protection or child safeguarding, this information should be clearly set out as part of the assessment, to identify and analyse any ongoing risks to children.

		If there is a curfew in the case, it is critical that any information about child protection has been explicitly referenced, to ensure the safety of children who may be living at the proposed curfew address.
2.3.24 All cases	Does assessment identify and analyse clearly any risk of harm to others?	**Principles for inspection** Our key principle is that we inspect the quality of assessment overall rather than the use of any specific document, tool or process. We do not require the use of any specific assessment tool, but instead judge the quality of assessment in the round. Our judgements are based on the overall assessment process, including evidence from: • OASys (RoSH screening, full analysis, and other sections) • any other specific assessments completed • ongoing case records • any interview with the responsible officer • information from external sources, including YOT records, where relevant. We inspect against our published standards, not against the adherence of the Probation Service to any specific policy on assessment. In any assessment of risk of harm to others, we expect **any and all** factors related to the risk of harm to be described and analysed, not just factors related to risk of serious harm. We expect to see a clear analysis of any risks to children (known to the individual or children in general), and of any risks of domestic abuse (to intimate partners and/or other family members). Harm includes physical harm, sexual harm and psychological harm. We expect responsible officers to identify the potential for long-term psychological harm arising from non-violent offences, such as child neglect or domestic abuse. A risk of harm assessment should consider: • **actuarial risk assessments** (including Risk of Serious Recidivism (RSR) and OASys predictors for sexual and violent offending (OVP, OSP/DC, OSP/IIC) • **static risk factors**, including age and gender, and the 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 service user, including internal protective factors (such as feeling part of the community or being hopeful about the future) • **resources** available to the service user, or external protective factors (including positive personal relationships and access to rehabilitative interventions) • **capacity and motivation to change** (including the extent to which the service user is able and willing to engage with risk management). We expect to see information verified where possible, and the credibility and relevance of information considered. We also consider the content of any specialist assessments completed in the case.
2.3.25 *All cases*	*In the opinion of the inspector, was current domestic abuse concern an important factor linked to risk of harm?*	'Current' includes situations where the person on probation has previously shown behaviour related to domestic abuse, that is neither so historical that it has become irrelevant, nor has been addressed by interventions to a point where future domestic abuse is unlikely. This includes any cases where the person on probation is assessed as presenting a risk of harm to current, previous or future partners (medium or higher), irrespective of whether they are currently in a relationship.
2.3.26 *All cases*	*In the opinion of the inspector, was current child safeguarding concern an important factor linked to risk of harm?*	'Current' includes situations where the person on probation has children or is in contact with children who are subject to multi-agency child safeguarding arrangements, or where the person on probation is assessed as presenting a risk of harm to children (medium or higher), irrespective of whether they are currently in contact with children.
2.3.27 All cases	Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including past behaviour and convictions, and involve other agencies where appropriate?	We expect assessment to be based on all available sources of information. This could include current and previous records of supervision, assessments by other agencies (including youth offending services, healthcare providers and adult social care services), specialist assessments, and information about the custodial part of sentences. Information from the person on probation (and their family members, if available) should also be taken into account. Assessment should consider previous convictions and other previous known or suspected behaviour, including information about offending abroad.

		We expect the probation practitioner to seek as much relevant information as possible, to inform the assessment. However, the 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. Our judgements are based on the sources of information that the probation practitioner would reasonably have been able to access at the time of the assessment. Probation practitioners should actively seek all relevant information; if needed, they should use escalation processes to obtain key sources of information that are held by other agencies. Information about current and previous convictions will come from prosecution documents, probation records and the person on probation. In some cases, there will be additional information from external sources, such as the youth offending team, prison records, the police, the Violent and Sex Offender Register (ViSOR) and MAPPA. Information about past (unconvicted) behaviour could come from a range of sources, including the person on probation, their family members and other professionals working with them. This may include responses to previous orders, juvenile behaviour and the views of previous practitioners. We expect practitioners to consider the impact of any trauma experienced by the individual on the risk to others. In some cases, there will be no previous convictions or information about past behaviour. Probation practitioners should be persistent in trying to obtain information from other organisations. They should analyse whether past behaviours remain relevant, and the circumstances in which the behaviour may manifest. An example would be a return to drinking following a period of abstinence. Where the person on probation is a foreign national,
2.3.28 All cases	Does assessment analyse any specific concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims?	Assessment should identify, where possible, any and all actual or potential victims, using the following categories: general public, known adults, children, staff, and prisoners. Within these broad headings, the assessment should clearly identify any sub-groups that are more likely to be at risk, such as 'general public – peers in pubs/clubs', 'known adults – grandparents', 'children – within family and friendship circles' or 'staff – police and security guards'. When assessing who might be potential future victims, we expect probation practitioners to look for patterns of behaviour that are repeated and therefore likely to reoccur. Attention should be paid to any specific diversity characteristics of the victim that

		may either make them more likely to be targeted, or make it harder for them to report offences. We expect assessment to be clear about whether or not there is ongoing risk to any victims of current or previous offences. Assessment should specify the nature and level of any ongoing risks to current or previous victims, and to any identifiable potential victims.
2.3.29 *All cases*	*What is the risk of serious harm classification of the person on probation (at the start of the order or the point of transfer to the community offender manager) according to the probation practitioner?*	We recognise the OASys 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. Assessment should be specific about exactly what harm might be caused and the circumstances in which future harm is most likely to occur. 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. Definitions of levels of RoSH are: **Very high:** There is an imminent RoSH. The potential event is more likely than not to happen imminently, and the impact would be serious. **High:** There are identifiable indicators of RoSH. The potential event could happen at any time and the impact would be serious. **Medium:** There are identifiable indicators of RoSH. The offender has the potential to cause serious harm but is unlikely to do so unless there is a change in the circumstances **Low:** Current evidence does not indicate the likelihood of causing serious harm. Assessment should be clear about the level and nature of the risk presented to any/all categories of actual or potential victim. In assessing the likelihood of seriously harmful behaviour, we expect probation practitioners to consider the following guidance. An assessment of low RoSH may be appropriate if: • there are **no** factors at all that indicate the potential for seriously harmful behaviour

		• there **are** factors indicating the potential for seriously harmful behaviour, but there is good evidence that those factors are mitigated by a combination of internal and external factors, and the circumstances of the person on probation are stable and likely to remain so. An assessment of medium RoSH should be made if there are factors that indicate the potential for serious harm to be caused but this is unlikely to happen unless circumstances change. Where there are current factors indicating the potential for seriously harmful behaviour, we expect probation practitioners to consider the following, when judging the level of RoSH: • What do the static factors in the case and statistical predictors indicate? Older people are less likely to reoffend. Higher scores on the Risk of Serious Recidivism tool and OASys Violence Predictor may indicate a higher likelihood of future seriously harmful behaviour. • 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 response to stressors. The presence of a number of acute dynamic risk factors may increase the assessed level of RoSH. • What is known about the strengths of the person on probation, including internal protective factors (such as feeling part of the community or being hopeful about the future)? The presence of known strengths may reduce the assessed level of RoSH. • What resources or services are available to the person on probation, including supportive family relationships or access to rehabilitative services? • What is known about the person on probation's capacity and motivation to change? To what extent has the person on probation 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 person on probation is actively seeking opportunities to offend? • Is there evidence that the person on probation is engaging in other behaviour that directly or indirectly increases the likelihood of serious harm? Absence of immediate access to victims, whether by imprisonment, 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. Evidence that the person on probation is genuinely complying with arrangements to protect victims or reduce access to victims may contribute towards lowering the assessed level of RoSH.
2.3.30 *All cases*	*Is the probation practitioner's classification of risk of serious harm reasonable?*	In this question we are looking both at the overall classification of risk of serious harm, and the individual levels assessed for each specific group of potential victims. In cases close to a boundary between classification levels, inspectors will consider whether the probation practitioner's classification was reasonable in the context of all the information available to them at the time. We recognise that the precise level of RoSH 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 OASys definitions.
2.3.35 *All cases*	*Was domestic abuse and child safeguarding information obtained and used as part of the assessment of suitability for curfew?*	In cases where an electronically monitored curfew is proposed, including home detention curfew and a curfew as a requirement of a community sentence, we expect the Probation Service to obtain and use information about domestic abuse and child safeguarding. Domestic abuse information should be requested in all cases. Information obtained should be sufficient to identify any known behaviour or risk of harm in connection with the proposed curfew address and any residents there, and also any behaviour related to other individuals or circumstances that might suggest an ongoing risk of domestic abuse. We believe a curfew should not be proposed if there is any evidence of ongoing risk of domestic abuse. We expect to see clear evidence recorded that shows whether the individual has been asked if they have children or are in contact with children (so we know if information about child protection or child safeguarding is required).

		We expect the Probation Service to obtain information about child protection and child safeguarding in all cases where a curfew is being considered, where the individual: • has children, or • is in contact with children, or • presents a potential risk of harm to children. Information obtained should be sufficient to identify whether the individual poses any ongoing risk of harm to children who might be resident at, or visiting, the proposed curfew address. We believe a curfew should not be proposed if there is any evidence of ongoing risk to children at the proposed curfew address.
2.3.36	**Summary judgement: Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment of risk of harm meets the needs of the case, taking into account the nature and level of risk of harm in the case, and will look for a proportionate approach to assessment. 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 most important factors related to risk of harm. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, omission of a single critical factor, such as domestic abuse, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. Where there were no factors related to risk of harm, inspectors answer 'yes'.

Planning

	Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?	
	'Planning' includes all planning activity, not just the preparation of a written plan. Evidence for this standard may come from the interview with the probation practitioner and ongoing case records, as well as from OASys. Planning should be proportionate to the individual's risk and needs, and to the nature of the sentence and its requirements. The plan must be understandable to the person on probation and other agencies. The person on probation should understand their role in planning, and the actions that are expected of them. Where people on probation are subject to a range of plans (sentence, MAPPA, child protection etc.), these should be coordinated, including agreement on the sequencing of actions. Planning should cover actions to support engagement; address offending behaviour; reduce and manage risk of harm; and support desistance. **Post-release cases** In post-release cases, we look at planning from the point of release. Where there has been planning in the period immediately preceding the release, as part of preparation for release, that can also be included as part of the evidence for this standard. Where there has been little or no attendance from the person on probation, we do not necessarily expect a written plan to have been completed, but we expect to see some evidence of the probation practitioner thinking about how to engage the person on probation, and planning any actions necessary to protect others. **Probation Reset cases** We expect planning in cases where Probation Reset has been applied to cover both activity that will be delivered during active supervision, **and** services that can be offered after supervision has been suspended, as part of exit planning. In cases where we apply adjusted standards, where there is a very short, or no, period of supervision, planning should be proportionate to address what, if anything, can be delivered during the period of active supervision, and what will be offered as part of exit planning. We will look for evidence in formal planning documents and contacts with the person on probation. **Risk of harm** HM Inspectorate of Probation expects all factors relevant to risk of harm to be planned for, not just factors related to RoSH.	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**

2.4.01 Core cases	Is the person on probation involved meaningfully in planning and are their views taken into account?	Inspectors will look for evidence that the individual has been able to contribute to, and participate in, the planning. 'Involvement' should be more than simply completing a self-assessment tool or signing a sentence planning document. We expect evidence of specific discussion with the individual about the plan for their sentence, and we expect completed planning documents to be shared with them. Planning should identify set goals relevant to both the person on probation and the purpose of the sentence. Any enabling factors should be identified and built into the sentence plan. Where possible, there should be evidence that the probation practitioner sought to identify and address any potential barriers to achieving the planned outcomes. Inspectors need to be satisfied that engagement with the person on probation was appropriate to the individual, relevant, and responsive to the needs of the case. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect planning for the active period of supervision and for exit planning.
2.4.02 Adjusted cases only	Is the person on probation involved meaningfully in planning for contact ending, and are their views taken into account?	We expect the person on probation to be involved meaningfully in planning, even where the Probation Service plan to offer a single appointment to cover assessment, planning and handover, That planning should cover any delivery that will happen before supervision is suspended, and for arrangements for ongoing support from other agencies after suspension. Their views should be taken into account, in terms of what is likely to be most effective to meet their needs. We expect to see personalised planning; not simply provision of a list of available local agencies and contact details. Planning should include for any check-in required for people on probation with no fixed address.
2.4.03 Core cases only	Does planning take sufficient account of the protected characteristics of the individual which may affect engagement and compliance?	Inspectors will look for planning that takes sufficient account of the individual'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 practitioner to have considered the impact of these on the individual's ability to engage and comply with the sentence. Where assessment has not identified all relevant factors, we still expect planning to be based on all relevant factors, not just those that have been identified. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect planning for the active period of supervision and handover or exit planning to take sufficient

		account of protected characteristics; to ensure that services directly delivered or referrals made for post-supervision contact are sufficiently personalised.
2.4.04 Core cases only	Does planning take sufficient account of the personal circumstances of the individual which may affect engagement and compliance?	We expect probation practitioners to consider the individual's social context and lived experience, as well as their specific personal circumstances; all such factors should be planned for. This might include planning to overcome transport difficulties or caring responsibilities, or to accommodate the needs of people who have care experience or who pose a risk of self-harm or suicide. We expect practitioners to plan for a trauma-informed approach with individuals who require this. Where assessment has not identified all relevant factors, we still expect planning to be based on all relevant factors, not just those that have been identified. Where the person on probation has specific learning or neurodiversity needs or a personality disorder, bespoke approaches may be required. Where there is joint working with other agencies, such as the police in cases convicted of sexual offences, an appropriate approach to planning should be agreed with the other staff involved. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect planning for the active period of supervision and handover or exit planning to take sufficient account of the personal circumstances of the individual; to ensure that services directly delivered or referrals made for post-supervision contact are appropriate and accessible.
2.4.05 Core cases only	Does planning take sufficient account of the readiness and motivation of the person on probation to change which may affect engagement and compliance?	Planning should follow on from the assessment of readiness and motivation to change and should be clear about how any identified barriers to engagement and compliance will be addressed. Planning should be appropriate to the stage the individual is at in the cycle of change. Planning should address how the probation practitioner will work with the person on probation to increase their motivation to take active responsibility for their offending and for changing future behaviour.

		In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect planning for the active period of supervision and handover or exit planning to be tailored to the level of motivation and readiness to change of the person on probation.
2.4.06 Core cases only	Does planning set out how all the requirements of the sentence or licence/post-sentence supervision will be delivered within the available timescales?	Planning should take account of all requirements of the sentence or licence. For post-release cases, we expect planning to cover work delivered before and after release from custody. We expect a record of discussion of all legal requirements, to ensure that the person on probation understands what is expected of them. Planning should also be commensurate with the nature of the order/licence. So, for example, we would expect to see much less planning in a community order with a single requirement of 10 RAR days, than in a licence in the case of a person who has committed sexual offences. For cases with RAR requirements, we expect planning to specify exactly what is required and how the RAR days will be delivered. We expect planning to be sufficient to ensure that all requirements of the order/licence can be delivered before the expected termination date or suspension. Where requirements (such as unpaid work or an accredited programme) continue beyond the point of suspension, we expect to see clear planning for how those requirements will be delivered once supervision has been suspended. If there is no suitable service to address specific needs after suspension, this should be clearly recorded.
2.4.07 Core cases only	Does planning set a level, pattern and type of contact sufficient to engage the individual and to support the effectiveness of specific interventions?	The level, pattern and type of contact planned should be appropriate within the requirements of the sentence, proportionate to the case, and set at a level that meets the individual's needs. There should be an explicit record of what/when/where contact will take place. In post-release cases, this question only refers to planning for work that needs to be delivered during the post-release phases of the sentence. Contact should occur in a suitable and safe place that allows for privacy and effective case management. We recognise that the Probation Service sets minimum standards for the frequency of contact; inspectors are aware of these but will still make judgements based on whether or not the set level of contact meets the needs of the case, rather than whether it complies with operational arrangements. Where contact is likely to be suspended, we expect planning to prioritise work to be done by the Probation Service before suspension, and also to reflect services that may be needed beyond the point of suspension. Where there are arrangements for flexible types of contact, inspectors will use their judgement about the appropriateness of such arrangements.

		We recognise that a RAR 'day' does not mean continuous activity throughout a whole day, but all activities delivered under RAR requirements need to be enforceable. The activities that count as one 'day' could include: • individual face-to-face planned and structured sessions designed to address identified need • a planned activity with a third-party provider • two or more separate planned activities or sessions in the same day.
2.4.08 Adjusted cases only	Does planning consider diversity factors and plan for contact ending?	We expect to see planning that considers diversity factors, both in the delivery of any work directly by the Probation Service before suspension, and in onward referral for services after the point of suspension. This might include referral to services appropriate for specific diversity factors, and consideration should be given to accessibility of appropriate support by the person on probation after supervision has been suspended.
2.4.09 Adjusted cases only	Does planning consider motivation to engage with identified services after contact has ended?	We expect to see planning that considers the level of motivation of the person on probation, both in the delivery of any work directly by the Probation Service before suspension, and in onward referral for services after the point of suspension. Planning should be personalised, to maximise opportunities for access to support by the person on probation after supervision has been suspended.
2.4.10 **All cases**	**Summary judgement: Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning for engagement meets the needs of the case. Planning in post-release cases should start around seven months before release, or from the point of sentence for shorter sentences (with inspectors taking a proportionate approach to what is reasonable, bearing in mind the actual time spent in custody). 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 sufficient planning in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient planning for a single critical factor, such as failing to accommodate disabilities, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

		In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect to see sufficient planning both for the active period of supervision and handover or exit planning for the period after supervision has been suspended.

	Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting desistance?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
2.4.11 All cases	Does planning reflect sufficiently offending-related factors and prioritise those which are most critical?	Planning should reflect the relevant factors in the case, and should be proportionate to the nature of the sentence. Planning should be appropriate to the stage the individual is at in the cycle of change. Where the assessment has failed to identify desistance factors, inspectors still expect planning to address them. We expect to see some evidence of sequencing, and prioritisation of work to be undertaken. Where this has not happened, there should be a clear explanation, such as initial work being needed to enhance engagement or increase motivation. For example, homelessness should be addressed before any specific work on other offending-related factors. In post-release cases, initial planning while the individual is still in custody should prioritise critical resettlement factors, but should also set out longer-term planning to support desistance after release. Planning should be integrated with any other plans involving the individual, such as joint working with the police in cases where individuals have been convicted of sexual offences. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect planning for the active period of supervision and handover or exit planning to frontload delivery of interventions during the active period of supervision. We also expect to see realistic planning for services that can be accessed after supervision has been suspended.
2.4.12	Does planning build on the individual's strengths and	Planning should build on the individual'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. Examples could include supporting employment or

All cases	protective factors, utilising potential sources of support?	improving family relationships, where that is safe. Planning should actively facilitate attendance at positive activities, and build on any existing positive activities that have been identified. In post-release cases, planning should develop any positive activities that can be accessed while in custody. It is good practice to identify external sources of support. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect to see consideration of the individual's strengths and protective factors, both in planning for the active period of supervision and handover or exit planning.
2.4.13 All cases	Does planning set out the services most likely to reduce reoffending and support desistance?	Inspectors look for planning that sets out services and/or activities that will support the individual's desistance. It should set out which activities will be completed by the Probation Service and which by the person on probation, and should be understandable. It should be clear what the person on probation is expected to do, and when they have achieved the desired outcome. Planning should be appropriate to the stage the individual is at in the cycle of change. Planning should set out clearly the range of services, activities and approaches to be used in the case. These should be in line with desistance literature, and appropriate for the individual. Inspectors will expect to see a personalised approach when selecting interventions to address the needs of the case, whether as part of a RAR or otherwise. Examples of activities could include: • allocation to a specific unpaid work project to improve employability skills • programmes designed to address specific issues such as emotional management • enforceable appointments with a specialist organisation to help achieve specific outcomes relating to housing or financial needs • working with a mentor – for example, to attend college, go to the library or help prepare a CV • structured sessions with the probation practitioner, third-sector provider or in-house specialist, to help improve an individual's ability to solve problems or access and maintain engagement with other services. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect planning to be clear about the services that will be provided, both for the active period of

		supervision and handover or exit planning to continue to address the critical needs of the person on probation, related to desistance, after supervision has ended.
2.4.14 **All cases**	**Summary judgement: Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting desistance?**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning for desistance meets the needs of the case. Planning in post-release cases should start around seven months before release, or from the point of sentence for shorter sentences (with inspectors taking a proportionate approach to what is reasonable, bearing in mind the actual time spent in custody). 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 sufficient planning in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient planning for a single critical factor, such as failing to accommodate disabilities, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect to see sufficient planning for the active period of supervision and for handover or exit planning at the point supervision is suspended.

	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
	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. Some cases assessed as low risk of serious harm will therefore require planning to address factors related to harm.	
2.4.20 All cases	Does planning address sufficiently risk of harm factors and prioritise those which are most critical?	Planning should identify activities and interventions that minimise any identifiable risk of harm to others (not just RoSH), and address all factors relevant to keeping other people safe. Planning should include both work to be done directly with the person on probation, and work to be done by the Probation Service, potentially on a multi-agency basis. The person on probation should be involved in the planning to address the safety of others.

		Planning should specify who is to complete the activities, and how the person on probation knows when the outcome has been achieved. It should address all factors relevant to keeping other people safe, irrespective of whether they were identified at the assessment stage. Planning should prioritise the most critical factors, which are those with the strongest link to the likelihood of harm being caused. Planning should be proportionate to the nature of the sentence, and the level and nature of risk of harm. In post-release cases, initial planning should involve staff from the prison, and should consider risks within the prison environment and in the community. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect to see clear planning for the active period of supervision and also clear arrangements for how risk of harm factors will be followed up by other agencies after supervision is suspended.
2.4.21 All cases	Does planning set out the necessary constructive and/or restrictive interventions to manage the risk of harm?	Depending on the level and nature of the risk in the individual case, not all of these elements are necessary in every case. Planning for constructive interventions may include: • supervision as part of the order or licence, and supervision that may be offered by other organisations working with the person on probation • specific, focused interventions, including accredited programmes, RAR activities or one-to-one interventions designed to address factors linked to risk of harm • trauma-informed planning, where necessary. Planning for restrictive interventions may include: • control measures such as curfews or accommodation at approved premises, which aim to restrict the ability of the person on probation to cause harm • identifying an appropriate unpaid work placement to avoid contact with potential victims • monitoring of activities by the probation practitioner, police or others, to ensure compliance and identify changes in risk factors

		• planning to keep actual and potential victims safe, including specific licence conditions and information-sharing. Inspectors will judge whether all reasonable constructive and restrictive interventions have been used, depending on the needs of the case. In some cases, very few or no restrictive interventions may be required. All cases where there are factors related to risk of harm should have at least some constructive interventions. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect planning for the active period of supervision and planning for clear information sharing at the point supervision is suspended, where the Probation Service will no longer be delivering interventions.
2.4.22 All cases	Does planning make appropriate links to the work of other agencies involved with the person on probation and any multi-agency plans?	The content and rationale of other agencies' plans should be known to the probation practitioner. Copies of the plans should be available on the case record. There should be integration between different plans, and they should support each other. Where a case is assessed as high/very high risk of harm, and significant multi-agency risk management is needed, it is essential that plans contained in MAPPA notes, child safeguarding records, active risk management system (ARMS) and OASys are aligned, and make clear reference to each other, to facilitate joint working and ensure that emergency action can be taken safely if required. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect planning for the active period of supervision and planning for clear information sharing at the point supervision is suspended, where the Probation Service will no longer be delivering interventions.
2.4.23 All cases	Does planning set out necessary and effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that have been identified?	Contingency planning should be in place where an increase in the level of risk of harm could be anticipated. In medium RoSH cases, contingency plans may be brief. More detailed contingency planning is needed for those presenting a high or very high RoSH. Contingency planning should be specific and address known potential threats. This could include steps needed to protect known victims, or changes in supervision arrangements, including curfew variation or recall, to address other behaviour linked to risk of harm. Generalised phrases such as 'consult manager' or 'consider enforcement' are unlikely to be sufficient. Examples of contingency action could include referring the case to children's social care services if a

		domestic abuse perpetrator forms a relationship with a person with children; moving a person on probation to approved premises; sharing information about risk of harm with organisations in contact with the person on probation; or increasing the level of MAPPA management. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect to see clear contingency planning for the active period of supervision and handover to other agencies at the point supervision is suspended. Contingency planning should also set out required responses to any information that might be received by the Probation Service after contact has been suspended, and the action that should be taken. For example, if information is received about a change of address, we expect clear planning for how that information should be shared with other agencies to ensure the safety of children or partners.
2.4.24	**Summary judgement: Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning to keep other people safe meets the needs of the case. Planning in post-release cases should start around seven months before release, or from the point of sentence for shorter sentences (with inspectors taking a proportionate approach to what is reasonable, bearing in mind the actual time spent in custody), and should involve prison-based staff. 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 sufficient planning in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient planning for a single critical factor, such as failing to undertake domestic abuse checks before release from custody, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. In cases where there have been no factors related to risk of harm, inspectors will answer 'yes'. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect to see sufficient planning for the active period of supervision and planning for a clear handover to other agencies at the point that supervision is suspended.

Implementation and delivery

	Is the sentence or post-custody period implemented effectively, with a focus on engaging the person on probation?	
Post-release cases In post-release cases, this question refers only to work delivered after release. **Risk of harm** HM Inspectorate of Probation expects work to be delivered to address all factors relevant to risk of harm, not just factors related to risk of serious harm. **Probation Reset cases** We recognise that under Probation Reset arrangements, the Probation Service is currently working to national guidance allowing contact with people on probation to be suspended before the end of orders or licences. In licence or PSS cases where supervision is suspended up to eight weeks after release, we apply adjusted standards. In adjusted cases where suspension is not immediate, we expect to see some delivery by the Probation Service during the active period of supervision; in all cases we expect evidence of delivery through onward referral and building exit plans for people on probation. We do not inspect delivery by other agencies beyond the point where supervision is suspended. In all community sentences, and in licence cases where supervision lasts more than eight weeks, we expect to see front-loaded delivery to meet the needs of the person on probation during the period of supervision before suspension.		
	Inspection question	CARaG Case assessment rules and guidance
2.5.01 Core cases only	Do the requirements of the sentence start promptly, or at an appropriate time?	We expect the requirements of an order or licence to begin promptly, unless there is a specific and defensible reason not to. In orders or licences with multiple requirements, we expect the different requirements to be sequenced in a sensible fashion. This sequencing needs to be known by the person on probation and by any partner agencies that are delivering requirements. Individuals should be able to access any specific requirements in good time, so that the completion timescale allows for consolidation work if needed. Inspectors will look at the case record and speak to the probation practitioner about the

		rationale for sequencing. They will make their judgements based on the work and interventions actually delivered, rather than those that are planned. In post-release cases, this question refers specifically to post-release requirements, not to pre-release resettlement work. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect delivery of requirements to be front-loaded during the active period of supervision, while certain requirements (unpaid work and accredited programmes) may continue beyond the point where supervision is suspended.
2.5.02 Core cases only	Is sufficient focus given to maintaining an effective working relationship with the person on probation, taking into account their diversity needs?	Inspectors will assess the effectiveness of the working relationship between the person on probation and the probation practitioner, as evidence shows that this relationship will facilitate and support desistance from offending. Discussions with the probation practitioner and the case record give an understanding of the nature of the relationship between person on probation and probation practitioner. We expect to see the probation practitioner tailoring their approach to fit individual needs, including diversity needs. We expect probation practitioners to understand the concept of procedural justice; evidence shows that people are most likely to respond to punishment when they feel they have been treated fairly. Research found that people on probation were most likely to credit their probation officer with helping them desist from offending when the officer was seen as being committed, fair and encouraging, and the relationship was seen as active and participatory. In cases where there is a high level of non-compliance, inspectors will judge whether the probation practitioner has taken reasonable steps to understand the reasons for non-compliance, and has used a bespoke approach to attempt to improve this. In cases involving a risk of sexual harm, a delivery style that avoids shaming, labelling and stigmatisation is particularly important.
2.5.03 Core cases only	Are sufficient efforts made to enable the individual to complete their sentence, including flexibility to take appropriate account of their personal circumstances?	We expect probation practitioners to make reasonable efforts to enable the person on probation to overcome any barriers to compliance. This may include adapting services to meet the individual's diversity needs and personal circumstances. Inspectors will look for evidence of efforts made by the probation practitioner, and staff in partner agencies, to mitigate any barriers to engagement, including in the pre-release phase for people in custody. Where an accredited programme is a requirement, we expect attention to be paid to preparing the person on probation for attendance on the programme. We expect probation

		practitioners to exercise professional judgement about the balance between flexibility and the need to deliver the requirements of the sentence. Discussion with the probation practitioner (and person on probation, if they consent) and reference to case records may give an indication of how individual needs are met. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect delivery to focus on completion of sentence requirements during the active period of supervision, with flexibility within that to take account of personal circumstances.
2.5.04 Core cases only	Are risks of non-compliance identified and addressed in a timely fashion to reduce the need for enforcement actions?	In some situations, where RoSH is high, we expect enforcement action to be swift following any non-compliance. In most other circumstances, we expect reasonable efforts to be made to engage with the person on probation at the earliest stage of any non-compliance, before any formal enforcement action (breach or recall) is taken. In custodial cases with a history of non-compliance, we expect the practitioner to consider, before the individual is released, how to improve their compliance once they are released. Inspectors will look for use of a variety of ways to engage – for example, telephone calls or a home visit. This is a balanced judgement, and it must be clear that when professional judgement is used, this is appropriate, and that people on probation do not inappropriately dictate the management of the case. In cases where suspension of contact under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect any issues of non-compliance to be dealt with swiftly during the active period of supervision, to maximise opportunities for services to be delivered.
2.5.05 Core cases only	Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?	This question refers to early enforcement action, including the issue of warning letters or applications to vary licence conditions, as well as formal action such as breach or recall. Prompt formal enforcement action should be taken when needed and appropriate. If there have been several incidents of non-compliance, we would expect to see formal enforcement unless a clear rationale has been set out for not doing this. For all decisions about formal enforcement, we expect probation practitioners to bear in mind the overall level of compliance, any factors related to risk of harm or likelihood of reoffending, and the 'public interest' in enforcement. We expect to see clear decisions about how enforcement issues will be followed up after supervision has been suspended.

2.5.06 Core cases only	Are sufficient efforts made to re-engage the individual after enforcement actions or recall?	The probation practitioner should work proactively with people on probation who have been subject to warnings, breach proceedings or recall. Where an individual has been recalled to prison, work should start immediately to prepare for custody-based sentence planning, or release where appropriate. For those breached on community orders, we will look for evidence of actions taken to re-engage the individual, including discussion about the reasons for enforcement, and how to avoid future non-compliance. Working through challenges such as this can strengthen the working relationship between the individual and the probation practitioner, and can be a critical part of the individual's desistance journey.
2.5.07 Adjusted cases only	Is the person on probation sufficiently informed of the requirements of the suspension period?	As part of delivery, we expect to see clear information given to the person on probation about their obligations beyond the point that supervision is suspended. This would include a discussion of any continued compliance with ongoing licence conditions, and information that needs to be reported to the Probation Service, and notifications of any changes of address or relationships, if relevant.
2.5.08 Adjusted cases only	Is sufficient focus given to diversity factors and engagement in order to identify appropriate support during the suspension period?	As part of any direct delivery of services by the Probation Service before suspension, we expect consideration to be given to factors related to diversity and engagement, to encourage compliance. That would include personalised delivery of services, appropriate to the individual, before suspension; and an understanding of the relevant factors so that handover can take place to appropriate agencies for ongoing support after supervision is suspended.
2.5.09 Adjusted cases only	Have sufficient services been identified to provide appropriate support for contact ending?	If the case has had any active period of supervision, we are looking for evidence of delivery during the active period of supervision, **and** the identification of services that can be accessed after suspension. In cases suspended immediately following release, we expect to see sufficient services identified for contact, albeit on a voluntary basis, following suspension of contact. There should be a personalised approach to identifying services, and consideration of direct referrals; a generic leaflet or letter would not be sufficient. We do not inspect work delivered by other agencies after suspension. We expect to see regular check-in contact with people on probation who have no fixed address.
2.5.10	**Summary judgement: Is the sentence or post-**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall implementation of the sentence meets the needs of the case. In post-release cases, this question refers only to work delivered after release.

	custody period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the person on probation?	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 sufficient planning in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient planning for a single critical factor, such as failing to communicate sufficiently with a prisoner before release from custody, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. While the majority of the prompts ask about the engagement of the person on probation, we are equally interested in whether the requirements of the order or licence have actually been implemented. In a situation where few or none of the requirements of the court order or licence have started, or where they have started so slowly that it is unlikely they can be completed during the effective period of the sentence, we would expect inspectors to answer the summary judgement question negatively. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect to see delivery during any active period of supervision **and** handover or exit planning to support the person on probation to engage both with direct delivery by the Probation Service, and to receive services from other agencies after supervision has been suspended.

	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support desistance?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
2.5.11 Core cases only	Are the delivered services those most likely to reduce reoffending and support desistance, with sufficient attention given to sequencing and the available timescales?	We expect to see services delivered in line with available evidence about desistance. Delivery should be appropriate to the stage the individual is at in the cycle of change. Inspectors will look at the specific interventions and services delivered, and the reasons for choosing them. We will judge the appropriateness of interventions, which should be consistent with the nature, requirements and length of the order/licence. There should be a clear rationale for delivering specific interventions, in line with the needs of the person on probation.

		Service delivery should address the desistance factors in the case, and should be sequenced to address the most critical factors first, unless there is a specific reason for doing otherwise. Even where assessment has failed to identify desistance factors in the case, inspectors still expect service delivery to address all factors that should have been identified. When interventions have not been delivered as required, the practitioner should record a clear explanation, and adjust the planning. We will look for evidence that interventions have been delivered. That may include work delivered individually or in a group, by the probation practitioner, commissioned rehabilitative services, partner agencies or external mainstream services. Services delivered to support desistance need to address both external factors and internal inhibitors relevant to the person on probation. For people on probation under 25 years of age, services should be appropriate to the individual's level of maturity. If non-compliance was a barrier to delivering planned services, this will not necessarily result in a negative answer. Inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort, skills and tenacity used to try to engage the person on probation in the interventions. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect delivery during any active period of supervision **and** handover or exit planning to support engagement with direct delivery by the Probation Service, and by other services after supervision is suspended.
2.5.12 Core cases only	Wherever possible, does the delivery of services build upon the individual's strengths and enhance protective factors?	Services delivered should build on the individual'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 involvement in pro-social activities. Strengthening bonds with non-offending partners and family also supports desistance, as does time spent with non-offending friends, and the individual's own children, where it is in the child's best interests to do so. Family and intimate attachments can provide a sense of purpose, meaning and direction. In some cases, individuals who devote themselves to raising their children or caring for elderly parents may find that offending is incompatible with such roles. However, that does not apply in cases where there has been exploitation, coercive control, child sexual abuse or internet-based offending. Reduction in abuse of alcohol and substances is often associated with desistance. People on probation who find steady

		employment – particularly if it offers a sense of achievement, satisfaction or proficiency – are more likely to stop offending. Generating and maintaining hope and motivation are powerful influences towards desistance, and the role of the probation practitioner can be crucial here. Individuals who find ways to participate in and/or contribute to society, their community or their families appear to be more successful at giving up crime. People with criminal records who do not define themselves purely as 'offenders' but see themselves as basically good people who made a mistake may find it easier to desist. Being believed in has a strong and encouraging influence on many individuals, and supports them to develop hope. People on probation are strongly encouraged by someone else believing that they can and will change, that they are good people and that they have something to offer society or other people. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect delivery during any active period of supervision and handover or exit planning to consider the individual's strengths, and put in place arrangements to build on them.
2.5.13 Core cases only	Is the involvement of other organisations in the delivery of services sufficiently well coordinated?	Where other agencies or organisations are delivering services to the person on probation, we expect to see the probation practitioner coordinating that activity. If the delivery of services has been well coordinated, we are likely to find a clear rationale and sequencing, and services that complement and reinforce progress made. In some cases, there will be no other organisations involved, so no need to coordinate work. RAR activities can be delivered by a commissioned rehabilitative service, an in-house specialist or the probation practitioner. When the probation practitioner is delivering RAR interventions, this should be recorded as such, as it is distinct from their offender management activity. The probation practitioner should ensure that the person on probation is engaging with the process and making progress. All appointments instructed by the probation practitioner, whether delivered by the probation practitioner or another RAR provider, are enforceable. Probation practitioners should ensure regular communication with the provider of the RAR activity regarding attendance, progress and suggested next steps. Where other agencies are involved in delivering services such as drug, alcohol or mental health treatment, probation practitioners should also ensure regular communication about attendance and progress.

		In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect coordination of delivery during any active period of supervision and clear exit planning and handover to any other agencies working in the case at the point that supervision is suspended.
2.5.27 *All cases with an accredited programme*	*Did programme delivery, including pre-programme work, start at an appropriate time?*	This question only applies to cases with an accredited programme requirement. We expect to see planning from the start of the order or licence, to ensure that programme delivery can be completed in the time available. In some cases, additional preparation work may be planned before the specified pre-programme work. Normally, we would expect to see programme delivery start promptly after the start of the order or licence, but inspectors will answer positively if other planned work has been necessary and has delayed the start of the programme. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect to see clear arrangements for continued delivery of the accredited programme.
2.5.28 *All cases with an accredited programme*	*Did programme delivery take place at appropriate times and in appropriate locations?*	We expect to see the personal circumstances of people on probation taken into account. Times of programmes should accommodate individual needs in respect of employment, religious adherence, and caring responsibilities. We recognise that some travel is likely to be required to programme locations, but will look to see if that time is reasonable given the other circumstances of the person on probation. In our domain one rules and guidance we say: All probation services should be reasonably accessible to people on probation; where they are geographically distant, as in sparsely populated rural areas, consideration should be given to how to support the compliance of these individuals without entailing excessive travel time (defined as more than one hour each way). There should be travel policies in place which specify reasonable expectations of people on probation and how compliance will be supported. Where probation staff are based in a centralised hub at a considerable distance from where people on probation live, opportunities must be available for the latter to receive face-to-face services at locations nearer to where they reside. Locations can include shared premises, community centres where other services may be available, or outreach services, as well as designated probation offices. Each location should have been assessed for its suitability for delivering services to those under supervision. Particular care should be taken when considering locations for women-only services, which

		should promote a women-friendly environment. Opportunities for evening reporting and the availability of … accredited programmes, out of normal working hours should be considered.
2.5.29 *All cases with an accredited programme*	*Is there evidence of effective partnership working with the interventions team in this case?*	We expect to see two-way communication between the probation practitioner and interventions team. The probation practitioner should keep the interventions team informed of any changes in the individual's circumstances or level of motivation. The interventions team should be proactive in keeping the probation practitioner informed about likely start dates for group work, and updates on engagement and progress during the group work sessions.
2.5.32 Core cases only	Are key individuals in the life of the person on probation engaged where appropriate to support their desistance?	We expect probation practitioners to engage with key individuals in the life of the person on probation, where appropriate, to support desistance. Given the evidence of the central role played in supporting desistance by parents and partners, probation staff should consider how to support and maintain these crucial relationships, where that can be done safely. The probation practitioner should be able to identify who key individuals are, and describe how they have engaged to support the individual's desistance. In some circumstances, there may be other professional workers with a key role in the life of the person on probation.
2.5.33 Core cases only	Are the level and nature of contact sufficient to reduce reoffending and support desistance?	The sufficiency of the nature and level of contact will vary, depending on the level of offending-related need in the case. Inspectors will consider the nature, length and requirements of the order or post-release supervision. Where contact has been insufficient, inspectors will identify whether that was because insufficient contact was offered, or whether it was due to non-compliance. In addition to ensuring that specific interventions are delivered, the probation practitioner has additional offender management activities, including encouraging motivation, promoting and sustaining hope, and overseeing the overall direction and sequencing of activities in the order. Supervision appointments do not count as RAR days, and the practitioner can offer as many of these as they feel are necessary during the order. There may also be other unstructured discussions between the practitioner or others and the person on probation, to support them in addressing their identified needs.

		Where an individual is attending an accredited programme or other structured intervention, effective delivery should include regular appointments with the probation practitioner while the programme or other work is being undertaken. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect delivery to be front-loaded during the active period of supervision.
2.5.35 Core cases only	Are local services engaged to support and sustain desistance during the sentence and beyond?	We expect there to be some exit planning, so that individuals are able to continue to access services locally, to support them once their supervision has ended. There should be evidence of referrals and advice given to individuals about local services. In some cases, signposting will be sufficient. In others, the probation practitioner may need to arrange visits and meetings to support relationship-building. The person on probation cannot be instructed to attend more RAR days than the total given in their sentence. The RAR days do not necessarily need to be spaced out for the duration of the sentence; they can be completed whenever is most appropriate. After completing the RAR activities to address the risk of reoffending, the probation practitioner can signpost the person on probation to further support if needed. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect to see active engagement with, and handover to, local services before the suspension takes place.
2.5.37 Adjusted cases only	Are the intended services most likely to reduce offending and support desistance?	We recognise that intended services post-suspension can only be offered and provided on a voluntary basis. In that context, we expect to see the individual referred or signposted to a bespoke and personalised set of services, that have the potential to support their desistance.
2.5.38 Adjusted cases only	Do the intended services build upon the individual's strengths and enhance protective factors?	We recognise that intended services post-suspension can only be offered and provided on a voluntary basis. In that context, we expect to see the individual referred or signposted to a bespoke and personalised set of services, that would build on their strengths and enhance protective factors.
2.5.39	Are services engaged to provide support and sustain desistance during the suspension period?	Once the appropriate services have been identified, we are looking for active engagement to encourage and support the individual to access the services they need to support and sustain desistance. Signposting alone may not be sufficient; depending on individual circumstances,

Adjusted cases only		active referral, arranging introductions and support to attend may be needed before supervision is suspended.
2.5.40	**Summary judgement: Does the implementation and delivery of services support desistance effectively?**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall implementation of the sentence meets the desistance needs of the case. In post-release cases, this question refers to work delivered after release only. 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 sufficient planning in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, if planning for a single critical factor does not sufficiently address the needs of the case, this may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect to see delivery during the active period of supervision and also in terms of making appropriate arrangements for ongoing support after supervision has been suspended.

	Does the implementation and delivery of services support the safety of other people?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
	HM Inspectorate of Probation expects work to be delivered to address **all** factors relevant to risk of harm, not just factors related to risk of **serious** harm. Some cases assessed as low risk of serious harm will therefore require work to be done to address factors related to harm.	
2.5.41 Core cases only	Are the level and nature of contact offered sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?	Contact with people on probation should be sufficient to deliver constructive interventions, monitor RoSH and provide the probation practitioner with opportunities to make an ongoing assessment. For cases assessed as presenting a high or very high RoSH, weekly contact should be maintained, other than in exceptional circumstances. The nature of contact should reflect the level and nature of the risk of harm. Where appropriate, it should include planned and unplanned home visits, face-to-face meetings, and meetings at different times of the day.

		In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect to see direct delivery of this work during any active period of supervision. Exit planning should put in place any possible arrangements to continue to manage and minimise risk of harm after supervision is suspended, including information sharing.
2.5.42 All cases	Is sufficient attention given to protecting actual and potential victims?	In all cases, regardless of whether the statutory victim contact scheme applies, we expect probation practitioners to identify whether there is a previous victim or other identifiable potential victims who could be at risk of harm. This is often the situation in domestic abuse or child protection cases. Inspectors will look for active management of the case that gives priority to victim safety. Evidence could include ensuring that the individual's place of residence or employment does not increase the risk to any victims or potential victims; active liaison with police, children's services or other agencies; discussion with employers or employment agencies about restrictions on employment; use of MAPPA and ViSOR to access and share information; and minimising contact through appropriate consideration of unpaid work placements, reporting times, programme allocation, etc. Most of the restrictive requirements and conditions available in orders and licences are intended to protect known or potential victims. These conditions can be varied, if necessary, after the start of the order or licence. Effective delivery would include active monitoring of any licence conditions or other orders (such as restraining orders, sexual harm prevention orders and domestic violence prevention orders).In cases where there is a victim who is eligible for statutory victim contact, inspectors will look in more detail at the work done to maintain contact with eligible victims under our specific standards for this work. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect direct work during the active period of supervision. Prior to suspension of contact, we expect to see clear handover or exit planning to ensure other agencies have been made aware of impact of suspension and cessation of active monitoring by the Probation Service.
2*.5.43* *Core cases only*	*Was there effective multi-agency working, including information-sharing, in respect of safeguarding children?*	In cases where there are current, active concerns about safeguarding children, we expect to see probation practitioners working in partnership with other agencies involved in the case. This applies in cases where concerns for the children arise from the individual on probation, and when children in contact with the person on probation are at risk from others. We expect

		to see information-sharing, both in terms of formal reports for multi-agency meetings, and informal updates to other agencies, such as children's social care, about changes in the case. Where an individual is assessed as medium risk of harm to children or higher, but there are no active concerns (they have no children of their own and are not known to be in contact with any children) then it may be that no further multi-agency liaison is required, beyond initial enquiries to verify this, or additional enquiries to confirm there are no changes. In this situation, inspectors will answer this question positively. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset is anticipated, we expect direct work during the active period of supervision. Prior to suspension of contact, we expect to see clear handover or exit planning to ensure other agencies have been made aware of impact of suspension and cessation of active monitoring. The Probation Service should actively monitor any information received in respect of safeguarding children after supervision has been suspended; new information received should be investigated and shared with other relevant agencies as necessary, to ensure continued safeguarding of children during the suspension period.
2.5.44 *Core cases only*	*Was there effective multi-agency working, including information-sharing, in respect of domestic abuse?*	In cases where there are current concerns about domestic abuse, whether the person on probation is the perpetrator, victim, or both, we expect to see probation practitioners working in partnership with other agencies involved in the case. This includes information-sharing in terms of formal reports for multi-agency meetings, such as MARAC, and informal updates to other agencies, such as police and domestic abuse workers, about changes in the case. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect direct work during the active period of supervision. Prior to suspension of contact, we expect to see clear handover or exit planning to ensure other agencies have been made aware of impact of suspension and cessation of active monitoring. The Probation Service should actively monitor any information received in respect of domestic abuse, including information about new addresses or new partners, after supervision has been suspended; new information received should be investigated and shared with other relevant agencies as necessary, to ensure a continued response to potential domestic abuse during the suspension period.

2.5.45 Adjusted cases only	Was there effective multi-agency coordination in relation to child safeguarding?	Cases where there is an active child protection plan are excluded from Probation Reset. In other adjusted cases where there are current, active concerns about safeguarding children, we expect to see probation practitioners working in partnership with other agencies involved in the case up to the point where supervision is suspended. This applies in cases where concerns for the children arise from the individual on probation, and when children in contact with the person on probation are at risk from others. We expect to see information-sharing, both in terms of formal reports for multi-agency meetings, and informal updates to other agencies, such as children's social care, about changes in the case. Where an individual is assessed as medium risk of harm to children or higher, but there are no active concerns (they have no children of their own and are not known to be in contact with any children) then it may be that no further multi-agency liaison is required, beyond initial enquiries to verify this, or additional enquiries to confirm there are no changes. In this situation, inspectors will answer this question positively. Prior to suspension of contact, we expect to see clear handover or exit planning to ensure other agencies have been made aware of impact of suspension and cessation of active monitoring. The Probation Service should actively monitor any information received in respect of safeguarding children after supervision has been suspended; new information received should be investigated and shared with other relevant agencies as necessary, to ensure continued safeguarding of children during the suspension period.
2.5.46 Adjusted cases only	Was there effective multi-agency coordination in relation to domestic abuse?	In cases where there are current concerns about domestic abuse, whether the person on probation is the perpetrator, victim, or both, we expect to see probation practitioners working in partnership with other agencies involved in the case up to the point where supervision is suspended. This includes information-sharing in terms of formal reports for multi-agency meetings, such as MARAC, and informal updates to other agencies, such as police and domestic abuse workers, about changes in the case. Prior to suspension of contact, we expect to see clear handover or exit planning to ensure other agencies have been made aware of impact of suspension and cessation of active monitoring. The Probation Service should actively monitor any information received in respect of domestic abuse, including information about new addresses or new partners, after supervision has

		been suspended; new information received should be investigated and shared with other relevant agencies as necessary, to ensure a continued response to potential domestic abuse during the suspension period. This might include making referrals to specific domestic abuse services. The Probation Service should also respond to any information sharing requests from other agencies that may be received after contact has been suspended. That should include continued attendance at MARAC in relevant cases.
2.5.47 *All MAPPA cases*	*In MAPPA cases, is there evidence of coordinated multi-agency oversight, including joint working with the police?*	In all MAPPA cases, irrespective of the category and level, we expect to see a coordinated multi-agency approach. We expect to see joint working with the police, particularly in cases where the person on probation has committed sexual offences. In all MAPPA cases, we expect to see clear management oversight of the work of the probation practitioner.
2.5.48 All cases	Is the involvement of other agencies in managing and minimising the risk of harm sufficiently well-coordinated?	We expect to see evidence of regular and effective communication between all agencies involved in the case, to manage and reduce risk of harm. Multi-agency forums, such as MAPPA and multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARAC), must be effective and include the right people to allow effective actions to be taken. We expect to see evidence of effective challenge and escalation, including by senior managers, if difficulties cannot be resolved. In some cases, there will be no need to undertake multi-agency work. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect to see clear co-ordination of activity during the active period of supervision. Prior to suspension of contact, we expect to see clear handover or exit planning to ensure other agencies have been made aware of impact of suspension and cessation of active monitoring. The Probation Service should actively monitor any information received in respect of risk of harm to others, after supervision has been suspended; new information received should be investigated and shared with other relevant agencies as necessary, to ensure a continued response to managing and minimising risk of harm during the suspension period.
2.5.49	Are key individuals in the life of the person on probation engaged where appropriate to support the	We expect probation practitioners to engage with key individuals in the life of the person on probation, to support desistance. In custodial cases, it is good practice to start this before the person is released. Given the evidence that parents and partners play a central role in

Core cases only	effective management of risk of harm?	supporting desistance, probation staff should consider all ways possible to support and maintain these crucial relationships. The probation practitioner should be able to identify who key individuals are, and describe how they have engaged them to support risk management. Examples might include support to the partner and family of the person on probation, to reinforce child safeguarding arrangements. In some circumstances, there may be other professional workers with a key role in the life of the person on probation and, with appropriate information-sharing, they may also be engaged to support risk management. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect to see clear communication with those individuals to ensure they have been made aware of the impact of suspension.
2.5.50 Core cases only	Are home visits undertaken where necessary to support the effective management of risk of harm?	We expect to see home visits used in all cases where there are child safeguarding or domestic abuse issues, unless there is a specific reason for not doing this (for example, the person on probation is resident in approved premises). In other cases, it is good practice to conduct home visits, to understand the circumstances in which the person on probation lives, and to meet partners and other family members.
2.5.62	**Summary judgement: Does the implementation and delivery of services support the safety of other people effectively?**	We expect probation practitioners to take reasonable steps to keep other people safe, including ensuring that constructive and restrictive interventions are delivered. Inspectors will judge whether the overall implementation of work to address risk of harm meets the needs of the case. In post-release cases, this question refers to work completed after release. 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 sufficient planning in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient delivery for a single critical factor, such as failing to check the suitability of a proposed release address, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. In cases where there have been no factors related to risk of harm, inspectors will answer 'yes'. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect sufficient delivery during the active period of supervision; sufficient handover at the point supervision is

		suspended; and ongoing active monitoring of new information received, to support the safety of other people.

Reviewing

	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the compliance and engagement of the person on probation?	
	Reviewing is an ongoing process; it should recognise and respond to any changes in individual circumstances. Written reviews may form part of the reviewing process; the timing of written reviews should depend on the needs of the case, and, except for reviewing immediately after release, we do not set any specific timescale for this. In cases where there have been multiple community sentences and/or release from custody, any reassessment undertaken as part of these new periods of supervision will be inspected under the 'reviewing' section. For post-recall cases, we expect to see a full written review at the point when the individual is re-released from custody.	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
2.6.01 Core cases only	Does reviewing consider compliance and engagement levels and any relevant barriers, with the necessary adjustments being made to the ongoing plan of work?	We expect to see active monitoring of the level of compliance and/or engagement, and any difficulties with either should be actively discussed with the person on probation. Probation practitioners should be constantly reviewing whether the approach they are taking is having the desired impact. The purpose should always be to check whether the initial planning is still adequate for the case. Reasonable adjustments should be made to planning, to support the person on probation to comply with the order. Practitioners may make small changes during the review, such as in the time or location of appointments, which need to be based on a good understanding of the individual's behaviour and needs. Where there have been any difficulties with compliance and/or engagement, this should be actively discussed, and attempts made to find ways to overcome any barriers. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect reviewing before suspension to update the position with regard to compliance and engagement.

2.6.02 Core cases only	Is the person on probation involved meaningfully in reviewing their progress and engagement?	Inspectors will look for evidence that the views of the person on probation have been taken into account in any reviewing. Much of the review will be iterative, as the sentence goes forward; evidence of this may include details of discussions about progress recorded on the case record, changes to any plans or assessments, or a new self-assessment questionnaire. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect clear reviewing of progress before suspension, involving the person on probation.
2.6.03 Core cases only	Are written reviews completed when appropriate as a formal record of actions to implement the sentence?	As the cases being inspected will be approximately six to seven months old, we do not always expect to see a formal written review of compliance and engagement at the time of inspection, unless there has been a significant change. That could be formal breach action or recall, or a significant improvement or deterioration in the level of motivation or engagement. In cases where supervision has been transferred out of the PDU, suspended or terminated, we expect to see a written review of progress made.
2.6.04 Adjusted cases only	Are sufficient efforts made to re-engage with the person on probation following changes in circumstances?	We expect to see supervision re-instigated in the limited circumstances set out under Probation Reset guidance: • There has been an increase in risk level to Very High RoSH • There has been a new MAPPA registration • There has been a new child protection registration • The case has been allocated to the National Security Division Where there is such a change of circumstances, or information is received that suggests that one of the above criteria may apply, we expect to see full and prompt efforts made to investigate the new circumstances, re-establish contact, and to gather and analyse new information.
2.6.05 Adjusted cases only	Is the person on probation sufficiently informed of any changes in relation to their supervision or contact arrangements?	Where supervision is re-instigated, we expect to see a clear explanation given to the person on probation about the reasons for that, and a review of the licence conditions so they are fully aware of the requirements on them.
2.6.06	Is contact re-instigated when necessary?	Where circumstances arise that meet the HMPPS guidance for reinstating supervision, we expect to see prompt action taken to reinstate supervision. Consideration should be given as to

Adjusted cases only		how to locate and communicate with the individual, to ensure contact is established as soon as possible.
2.6.07 **All core cases, and any adjusted cases where supervision should have been reinstated**	**Summary judgement: Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the compliance and engagement of the person on probation?**	We expect probation practitioners to be alert to any changes in the level of compliance and engagement. In cases where compliance is generally good, little or no reviewing will be required. In post-release cases, inspectors judge reviewing from the point of release. 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 sufficient reviewing in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient reviewing of a single critical factor, such as a sudden change in compliance with one element of supervision, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. In cases where no reviewing of compliance and engagement was required, inspectors will answer 'yes'. In core cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect reviewing before suspension to consider and update the response during any period of supervision, however brief.

	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting desistance?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
2.6.10	Does reviewing identify and address changes in factors linked to offending behaviour, with the	Reviewing should be used to take stock of the progress to date and to give positive messages about the potential for desistance. It should take into account any changes in the individual's circumstances. Reviewing should cover relevant improvements and deterioration in behaviour

All cases	necessary adjustments being made to the ongoing plan of work?	linked to desistance. It should identify what work has been effective and what has been achieved, as well as work that is still outstanding, or needs to be reconsidered or redesigned. The completion of any requirement of an order/licence should lead at least to an informal review with the individual. Being charged with a new offence will also be considered a change in the factors linked to desistance and offending, and we would expect to see some discussion with the individual about any new allegations. Necessary adjustments might involve changing the way that a particular issue is to be addressed; referrals to outside agencies; identifying additional work necessary because of a new offence; or ending work that has succeeded. Reviewing should always involve the person on probation, and take their views into account. In cases where supervision has been suspended immediately or very early under Probation Reset, inspectors may record that there is no available information to review. In cases where there is an active period of supervision before suspension, we expect to see reviewing before suspension to evaluate work on factors related to offending that has been undertaken during any supervision period, and identify issues that may need further attention.
2.6.11 All cases	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on building on the strengths and enhancing the protective factors of the person on probation?	Inspectors will look for reviewing that identifies the degree of success in enhancing strengths and protective factors. Much work with people on probation focuses on identifying and targeting factors that increase the likelihood of reoffending. Often, less attention is paid to identifying and building personal strengths, and individuals can find this bias to be demotivating. Reviewing should identify any changes in relevant factors, and should consider the impact of delivered services. It is important that reviewing is used to mark achievements along the journey towards desistance. It can provide feedback on the distance travelled, and recognise the effort made to make changes. Reviewing should be used to take stock of the progress to date and to give positive messages about the potential for desistance. It should take into account any changes in the individual's circumstances. Reviewing should cover relevant improvements and deterioration in behaviour linked to desistance. It should identify what work has been effective and what has been achieved, as well as work that is still outstanding, or needs to be reconsidered or redesigned. The completion of any requirement of an order/licence should lead at least to an informal review with the individual. Being charged with a new offence will also be considered a change in

		the factors linked to desistance and offending, and we would expect to see some discussion with the individual about any new allegations. Necessary adjustments might involve changing the way that a particular issue is to be addressed; referrals to outside agencies; identifying additional work necessary because of a new offence; or ending work that has succeeded. Reviewing should always involve the person on probation, and take their views into account. In cases where supervision has been suspended immediately or very early under Probation Reset, inspectors may record that there is no available information to review. In cases where there is an active period of supervision before suspension, we expect to see reviewing before suspension to evaluate work to build strengths and enhance protective factors that has been undertaken during any supervision period, and identify issues that may need further attention.
2.6.12 All cases	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies working with the person on probation?	Where other agencies are working with the individual, the practitioner should seek information from them routinely as part of informal or formal reviewing. This can provide additional feedback or challenge to the person on probation. In cases where supervision has been suspended immediately or very early under Probation Reset, inspectors may record that there is no available information to review. In cases where there is an active period of supervision before suspension, we expect reviewing before suspension to gather this information from all other agencies working with the person on probation.
2.6.13 Core cases only	Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of the progress towards desistance?	As the cases being inspected will be approximately six to seven months old, we do not always expect to see a formal written review of desistance at the time of inspection, unless there has been a significant change. That could be a positive or negative change to the key factors related to offending and desistance, including completion of a substantial piece of work or commission of a new offence. The outcome of any RAR intervention or other specific work needs to be recorded, including a statement of whether the desired outcomes that were agreed as part of the initial sentence plan have been achieved. In the case of RAR requirements, the probation practitioner needs to confirm to the person on probation that this counts as the completion of the RAR. If fewer days have been completed than were ordered by the court, the officer needs to record the rationale for taking this decision, a description of the progress that has been made

		and the outcome achieved. Similar principles apply to pieces of work being delivered by other organisations, or on a one-to-one-basis by the probation practitioner. In cases where supervision has been transferred out of the PDU or terminated, we expect to see a written review of progress. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect to see a written review of progress before suspension.
2.6.14 **All core cases, and any adjusted cases where supervision should have been reinstated**	**Summary judgement: Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the person on probation's desistance?**	We expect probation practitioners to be alert to any changes in the factors related to desistance, including improvements and deterioration. We expect to see positive feedback about any successes, as well as challenge where there have not been improvements. In post-release cases, inspectors only judge reviewing from the point of release. 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 sufficient reviewing in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient reviewing of a single critical factor, such as failure to identify successes, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. In cases where supervision has been suspended immediately or very early under Probation Reset, inspectors may record that there is no available information to review. In cases where there is an active period of supervision before suspension, we expect reviewing before suspension to capture progress and identify outstanding work. Where supervision is re-instigated, we expect to see a full review of the new circumstances.

	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**

	HM Inspectorate of Probation expects **all** factors relevant to risk of harm to be reviewed, not just factors related to risk of **serious** harm.	
2.6.20 All cases	Does reviewing identify and address changes in factors related to risk of harm, with the necessary adjustments being made to the ongoing plan of work?	We expect to see ongoing reviewing of risk of harm, even in cases where the assessed level of risk of harm is low. Informal reviewing would be evidenced by continuing enquiries about relationships, contact with children, level of substance misuse, behaviour and any reoffending. It may also consist of information from relatives or other professionals, including police intelligence. We expect probation practitioners to have an enquiring mind. Any new behaviour that might be linked to risk of harm should be identified, analysed and taken into account in any reviewing of planned activity. In some cases, there may be no new information that necessitates formal reviewing of risk of harm, but probation practitioners should take sufficient steps to ensure that existing information remains correct. In cases assessed as high or very high risk of harm, reviewing activity should be ongoing, to ensure that the risk management plan is working. Evidence of reviewing could include multi-agency meetings or discussions, or consultation with a manager, and does not always need to be completed in OASys. In cases where the person on probation has been convicted of a sexually motivated offence, we would expect relevant specialist assessments to be reviewed in any circumstances where there are changes in any of the factors. Changes should be made to the ongoing plan of work in response to changes in the nature of any risk of harm, not just to the assessed level, in order to manage and reduce risks. Based on their knowledge of the case, inspectors will decide if the correct changes have been identified. This might include making checks about new partners or considering the impact of a pregnancy or the ending of a relationship (both of which can increase the level of risk of harm); increasing the level of contact or home visits; or referrals to other agencies. For significant changes in risk of harm factors, it may be necessary to reassess the level of risk of harm. Where the assessed level of risk is increased or decreased, we expect there to be a clear rationale for that as part of a written review. Reduction of the assessed level of risk of harm should be based on verified evidence of behaviour change, not just on circumstantial change, such as the ending of a relationship, or on superficial compliance with restrictions. In some circumstances, it would be reasonable for probation practitioners to seek advice from their manager before completing a full review of risk of harm.

		Where the original assessment of risk of harm was insufficient, but there have been no subsequent changes in factors related to risk of harm, inspectors will not necessarily score negatively for the absence of reviewing; that judgement will be made on the basis of the level of ongoing alertness to change. In cases where supervision has been suspended immediately or very early under Probation Reset, inspectors may record that there is no available information to review. In cases where there is an active period of supervision before suspension, we expect reviewing before suspension to analyse any changes in factors related to risk of harm, and identify outstanding areas of work. During the period of suspension, we expect practitioners to monitor any information received about changes of circumstances related to risk of harm, and consider whether any action is required.
2.6.21 All cases	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in managing risk of harm?	Information from other agencies is critical in reviewing risk of harm. In domestic abuse cases, we expect to see regular information-sharing with police domestic abuse staff about any new reported behaviour. In cases where children's services are working with a child in contact with the person on probation, we expect to see regular communication with social workers. Probation practitioners should always attend multi-agency meetings, including MARAC, MAPPA and child protection meetings. If additional information comes to light, this must be shared with relevant agencies, so that they are appraised of key information in the case. This question will be answered negatively if inspectors find a lack of professional curiosity; if the risk is seen in isolation from other agencies; or if reviewing does not lead to necessary action. When reviewing cases with known domestic abuse issues, practitioners should be alert for points when risk is likely to be increased, including entering a new relationship, failure to cooperate with children's services, an increase in substance misuse, or deteriorating mental health. Reviewing must include any other agencies involved in the case. Probation practitioners must be alert to the potential for safeguarding and child protection issues, throughout the span of the order/licence. Where there are known concerns, these should be managed proactively, monitored and reviewed. Where new concerns are identified, action to protect children and vulnerable adults should be the priority. In all cases, information-sharing will be critical; probation practitioners should not assume that other agencies know about situations and

		circumstances. Reviewing could involve a fresh referral of the child to children's services, or participation in multi-agency reviewing. Planning by the probation practitioner should be adapted in light of the outcome of any external reviews. Probation staff can make a significant contribution to child safeguarding, but to do this they need to understand their role and responsibilities and know how to represent the views of their organisation. Records should evidence an effective contribution to multi-agency reviews. In cases where supervision has been suspended immediately or very early under Probation Reset, inspectors may record that there is no available information to review. In cases where there is an active period of supervision before suspension, we expect practitioners to obtain updated information from other agencies working with the person on probation, to underpin reviewing of factors related to risk of harm before suspension. During the period of suspension, we expect practitioners to monitor any information received from other agencies, related to risk of harm, and consider whether any action is required.
2.6.22 Core cases only	Is the person on probation (and, where appropriate, are key individuals in their life) involved meaningfully in reviewing their risk of harm?	The nature and level of involvement of the person on probation should depend on the nature and extent of the risk of harm. The probation practitioner should be able to relate how they have considered the views of the person on probation and, where appropriate, any key individuals in their life. People on probation should know what is expected of them to reduce risk of harm, and reviewing should involve them and consider progress towards this. In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect reviewing before suspension to involve the person on probation, and key individuals in their life (where appropriate), in reviewing risk of harm.
2.6.23 Core cases only	Are written reviews completed as appropriate, as a formal record of the management of risk of harm?	As the cases being inspected will be approximately six to seven months old, we do not always expect to see a formal written review of risk of harm at the time of the inspection, unless there has been a significant change. We do not set any specific period where we expect to see written reviews. We expect to see a written review where there has been a significant change in the case. That could be a positive or negative change to the key factors related to risk of harm, including completion of an accredited programme or other requirement of the order or licence; the start or end of a relationship in cases where domestic abuse is a feature; termination of the order or licence; repeat or escalation of previous risk-related behaviour; emergence of new risk-related behaviour; or allegations of a new (harmful) offence.

		In cases where supervision has been suspended under Probation Reset, we expect a written review of risk of harm before suspension to confirm the level and nature of risk of harm at the point of suspension, including any necessary contingency arrangements, to support any decisions that may be needed about information received following suspension.
2.6.25 Adjusted cases only	Has appropriate recall action been taken where the risks can no longer be managed in the community?	Where there is a change in circumstances that indicates that risk can no longer be safely managed in the community, we expect to see full and prompt investigation to ascertain whether recall is necessary to protect the public. If that threshold is passed we expect to see prompt recall action.
2.6.26 Adjusted cases only	Has a sufficient review of assessment and planning taken place?	The circumstances that would give rise to reinstatement of supervision would almost certainly be linked to changes in factors related to risk of harm. We therefore expect to see a full review of assessment and planning at the point supervision is re-instigated, to inform future work.
2.6.27 Adjusted cases only	Has sufficient management oversight been provided?	Where circumstances have arisen that trigger re-instigation of supervision, we expect to see management oversight to review steps that need to be taken to protect the public.
2.6.28 **All core cases, and any adjusted cases where**	**Summary judgement: Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?**	We expect probation practitioners to be alert to any changes in the factors related to risk of harm, including improvements and deterioration. We expect to see positive feedback about any progress, as well as challenge where there have not been improvements. We expect probation practitioners to be proactive in seeking and verifying information that may have an impact on keeping other people safe, throughout the whole period of supervision. In post-release cases, inspectors only judge reviewing from the point of release. 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

supervision should have been reinstated		sufficient reviewing in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient reviewing of a single critical factor, such as failure to investigate a new relationship, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. In cases where there have been no factors related to risk of harm, inspectors will answer 'yes'. In cases where supervision has been suspended immediately or very early under Probation Reset, inspectors may record that there is no available information to review. In cases where there is an active period of supervision before suspension, we expect reviewing before suspension to fully update the current situation with respect to risk of harm.

Case summary

	Management oversight	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
2.9.06	How would you describe management oversight in the case?	HM Inspectorate of Probation position statement on management oversight is published on our website[1]. Effective management oversight is much more than countersigning. It includes elements of quality assurance, staff supervision, dealing with developing areas of concern in individual cases and facilitating improvements in practice. It should be particular focus on ensuring that actual or potential victims and people on probation themselves are sufficiently protected from harm. Management oversight should focus mainly on cases that have been assessed as high or very high risk of harm to others, or those with active domestic abuse or child safeguarding issues. Oversight is particularly important at the point where any such cases may have contact suspended under Probation Reset, to ensure effective information sharing and contingency planning for changes that may take place after suspension. We also expect managers to be aware of, and actively monitoring, cases that are not currently assessed at these levels of risk of harm, but have the potential to increase.

[1] https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2022/03/Management-oversight.pdf

Unpaid work

	Is the assessment and planning of unpaid work personalised?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
3.2.20	Does assessment and planning consider the individual's diversity, protected characteristics and personal circumstances, and the impact these have on their ability to comply and engage with unpaid work?	Inspectors expect to see a meaningful exploration of any diversity factors relevant to the individual. We recognise the nine protected characteristics (sex, age, race, religion and belief, disability, pregnancy and maternity, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, and marriage or civil partnership). Inspectors expect to see a fully completed and up-to-date diversity monitoring form, and evidence that this has been discussed with the individual, to gain a clear understanding of the impact of each factor on their ability to engage with the unpaid work requirement. The potential impact of any factor and the degree to which it needs to be taken into account will vary according to the individual case. We recognise that many individuals have multiple relevant protected characteristics, and inspectors will consider issues of intersectionality. We also expect to see a clear analysis of any relevant personal circumstances, for example living in a rural area, employment patterns, issues around immigration status or understanding of English, caring responsibilities, educational difficulties, having grown up in local authority care, past trauma (for example, linked to refugee status or childhood abuse) or level of maturity. Any of these factors can make it difficult for individuals to comply or engage with the unpaid work requirement, or may mean that 'one size fits all' services are not appropriate. We expect to see an account of the impact any relevant personal circumstances have specifically on the individual's ability to engage and comply with the unpaid work requirement. Arrangements for unpaid work should mitigate the impact of these factors.
3.2.21	Does assessment and planning for unpaid work identify and build on the individual's strengths and enhance their protective factors?	We expect assessment to identify the strengths of the individual under supervision, and also any protective factors. Strengths that could be built upon as part of unpaid work might include employment skills, engagement with the community and motivation to change.

		This Strengths are the factors that support sustained desistance. They include external and social aspects of the person's life, as well as internal and psychological factors. All strengths support desistance. Protective factors are those strengths that mitigate against criminogenic factors, so not all strengths are protective factors. Examples of protective factors include stable accommodation, secure employment, engagement with substance misuse treatment, pro-social activities and pastimes, and stable, supportive relationships. We expect to see some analysis of the nature and relevance of identified protective factors to the individual. In some cases, inspectors might find that there are no strengths or protective factors.
3.2.22	Does assessment and planning for unpaid work identify and address factors related to risk of harm?	We expect assessment of risk of harm to be completed for all unpaid work requirements. Assessment should include information from all relevant sources; offending history and other information about behaviour; information from other agencies that have been working with the person on probation; and an interview with the individual. Where any risk of harm is identified, we expect to see planning to address that risk. Planning should include the steps necessary to ensure the safety of staff, other workers, and the general public as part of delivery of the unpaid work requirement. Planning should also include steps to protect others who may be at risk from the individual, including risks from domestic abuse, and child protection or child safeguarding issues.
3.2.23	**Is the assessment and planning of unpaid work personalised?**	We expect to see personalised planning for the delivery of the unpaid work requirement. In cases with multiple requirements, planning should be integrated with the planning for other requirements, and should clearly reference factors related to unpaid work. 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 sufficient assessment and planning in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, insufficient assessment of a single critical factor, such as domestic abuse, may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

	Do arrangements for unpaid work maximise rehabilitative elements and support desistance?	
3.2.30	Is the allocated work suitable, taking account of the individual's diversity and personal circumstances?	We expect individuals to be allocated to projects that are suitable in terms of their skills, interests, preferences and availability. Timing and location of work should recognise the impact of transport requirements, employment and caring responsibilities. The nature of the work should be meaningful to individuals. We look for a range of projects being available, including group work and single placements. We expect women who are subject to an unpaid work requirement to be offered the opportunity to work in a female-only environment.
3.2.31	Does unpaid work offer opportunities to develop employment-related skills?	Where the individual subject to an unpaid work requirement has ETE needs, we expect them to be provided with opportunities for relevant learning, to improve their employment or employability skills. For some individuals, provision through the virtual campus will be appropriate, and we would expect to see evidence of how ETE delivered through that route meets individual needs. We would look for bespoke provision in circumstances where the ETE available through the virtual campus did not meet the individual needs of the case. We will also look at the nature of individual work projects to look for evidence that placements are allocated to help individuals develop employment-related skills. Not everyone subject to an unpaid work requirement will have ETE needs, and we do not expect to see delivery of ETE work where it is not required.
3.2.32	Is clear information given to the person on probation and is there consistent application of the rules?	We expect to see clear information given to the person on probation at the start of the unpaid work requirement, including an explanation of the rules, covering compliance and enforcement. We then expect to see those rules being followed consistently to support the individual to complete the unpaid work requirement.
3.2.33	**Do arrangements for unpaid work maximise rehabilitative elements and support desistance?**	We believe that people on probation are more likely to comply with, and benefit from, unpaid work where it is delivered in a way that supports desistance. We expect to see the hours used meaningfully and productively, and the requirement managed fairly in line with the rules. 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 sufficient attention to be paid to rehabilitation in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case.

	Is unpaid work delivered safely?	
3.2.40	Does the delivery of unpaid work take account of risk of harm to other people on probation, staff or the public?	We expect allocation of projects to take into account any identified factors related to risk of harm; these may include risks to staff, other workers, or beneficiaries. For example, if a person on probation presents a risk of harm to children, they should be allocated to a project where contact with children is not expected. Supervising staff should be made aware of any specific risks posed by the individual to any people they may come into contact with through completing unpaid work, such as hostility to specific groups or behaviour related to substance misuse. We also expect the probation practitioner to take account of any risks to others outside unpaid work; such as ongoing risks of domestic abuse or child safeguarding issues. While a practitioner managing a stand-alone unpaid work requirement has limited capacity to work directly with the person on probation, they should still be alert to any relevant issues, such as relationships, and share information with partner agencies if there is any new information or if there are any changes to risk of harm. They should play a full role in any multiagency arrangements, such as child protection or MARAC.
3.2.41	Does unpaid work consider issues relating to the health and safety or potential vulnerability of the person on probation?	We expect attention to be paid to the vulnerability of people subject to unpaid work requirements, and for them to be placed on a project that keeps them safe. For example, we expect women subject to an unpaid work requirement to be offered a female-only placement as an option. People with disabilities should not be excluded from unpaid work, but reasonable adjustments should be made to work to allow full participation.
3.2.42	**Is unpaid work delivered safely?**	We expect unpaid work to be delivered safely, to the individual, other workers, staff, beneficiaries and the general public. Inspectors need to take into account their answers to the questions in this section, and decide whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. We are not looking for perfection,

		but sufficient consideration of safety in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case.

	Is the sentence of the court implemented appropriately?	
3.2.50	Does unpaid work commence promptly and happen regularly?	We expect the unpaid work requirement to start reasonably promptly after the requirement has been ordered, unless there are specific reasons to delay the start in an individual case. That might include sequencing with other work where there are multiple requirements on the order. We then expect unpaid work to be offered regularly, so that the individual can complete the hours within a reasonable period of time, and certainly within the normal 12-month period.
3.2.51	Do arrangements for unpaid work encourage the individual's engagement and compliance with the order?	We expect probation practitioners to make reasonable efforts to enable the person on probation to overcome any barriers to compliance. This includes offering regular work sessions at times and in locations that are reasonable for the person on probation. Inspectors will look for evidence of efforts made by the probation practitioner to mitigate any barriers to engagement.
3.2.52	Are appropriate professional judgements made in relation to decisions about missed appointments?	We expect to see professional judgements made in a way that is fair, consistent and clearly recorded in connection with all missed appointments.
3.2.53	Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?	This question refers to early enforcement action, including the issue of warning letters, as well as formal breach action. Prompt formal enforcement action should be taken when needed and appropriate. If there have been several incidents of non-compliance, we would expect to see formal enforcement unless a clear rationale is set out for not doing this. For all decisions about formal enforcement, we expect probation practitioners to bear in mind the overall level of compliance, any factors related to risk of harm or likelihood of reoffending, and the 'public interest' in enforcement. Where there are multiple requirements, we expect to see collaboration between unpaid work staff and the probation practitioner.

3.2.54	*Is there evidence of effective partnership working between all staff involved in the case?*	We expect to see good communication between the practitioner responsible for the unpaid work requirement and unpaid work supervisors. Information about any risks presented by the person on probation and any concerns about their behaviour should be shared. Where the overall order is managed outside the unpaid work team, we also expect to see effective joint working between the responsible practitioner and the unpaid work team. This would include discussions about suitable placements, potential ETE activity, compliance and enforcement.
3.2.56	**Is the sentence of the court implemented appropriately?**	Inspectors will judge whether the overall implementation of the sentence meets the needs of the case. 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 sufficient delivery in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. We look to see if the unpaid work requirement has actually been implemented. If the requirement has not started, or has started so slowly that it is unlikely it can be completed during the effective period of the sentence, we would expect inspectors to answer this question negatively.

Statutory victim work

	Does initial contact with victims encourage engagement with the victim contact scheme and provide information about sources of support?	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
4.2.03	*Is the victim recorded on the Victim Case Management System (VCMS) database?*	We look for evidence of contact with victims in any case where there appears to be an eligible victim who is resident within the inspected region during the pre-release period of the perpetrator's custodial sentence. If there is an eligible victim who cannot be traced on VCMS, the deputy lead inspector will raise this with the link manager for victim work. The case is still inspected if the Probation Service has not identified it as an eligible case for victim contact, and will be judged negatively as a result. If an inspector finds a case where victim contact should have been offered, and has not been, the lead inspector will require the Probation Service to offer contact immediately.
4.2.05	*Is there a clear record of the protected characteristics of the victims?*	We expect to see a clear record of the protected characteristics of all victims, so that appropriate account can be taken of these when contact is made.
4.3.01	Is appropriate initial contact made with the victim soon after sentence, with consideration given to the timing of such contact?	We expect contact to be made as soon as reasonably possible, being sensitive to issues such as the date of the offence, the victim's date of birth, holiday and festival periods and any other factors that may have an unnecessarily adverse impact on the victim. We recognise that the Probation Service Instruction requires contact to be made within 40 working days from the date of notification of the case by the witness care unit. There is an expectation that initial contact will be made in writing by conventional mail, unless there are reasons that this is not appropriate.

4.3.02	Is the initial letter to the victim appropriately personalised, considering the nature of the experience of the victim and any diversity issues?	As a minimum, we would expect letters to be professionally constructed and to use accurate spelling for the names and addresses of victims. In cases where the person being contacted is not the direct victim (for example, they are the next of kin of a deceased victim or the parent of a child victim), the letters should recognise the relationship. The letters should also recognise any pre-existing relationship between the perpetrator and any victims. The language of the letter, while not naming the offence that the victim has experienced, should be sensitive to the nature of the offence.
4.3.03	Is clear information given to the victim about what they can expect at different points in a sentence?	Any letters should be clear about what the victim contact scheme can and cannot offer the victim. Language must be straightforward and understandable. The tone of the letter should make it clear that the victim is free to choose whether or not to participate. It should also make it clear that an initial choice not to participate can be changed at any point that the victim wishes. It should explain what the victim should do in those circumstances.
4.3.04	Does the initial letter to the victim contain sufficient information to enable them to make an informed choice about whether to participate in the scheme?	We expect letters to include details of the victim contact scheme, and the roles of the Probation Service and the victim liaison officer. They should include an explanation of the victim's right to decline contact and/or opt into the victim contact scheme at any point in the offender's sentence. The letter should also include the victim liaison officer's contact details; a suggested date and time when the victim liaison officer could meet the victim at their home (or an alternative location); details of how to confirm this appointment; and how to arrange an alternative location, time or date. The letter should give reassurance that the victim liaison officer will not proceed with this meeting without the victim's permission, and should encourage the victim to contact the victim liaison officer to confirm a meeting. Victims should be assured that the victim contact scheme is a flexible service, and that the meeting will, if possible, be arranged to fit around the victim's commitments (for example, employment or childcare commitments). They should be told that a friend, colleague or member of a charity such as Victim Support can be present at the meeting if the victim wishes. Victims should be provided with contact details for Victim Support and/or any other appropriate local support organisations, including details of the Victim Support line, along with supporting literature and leaflets, if available. Letters and appointments should make reasonable adjustments to accommodate any special requirements that have been highlighted by the witness care unit. This might include providing information in a different

		language or an easier-to-read format. If the victim is a child or vulnerable adult, the letter should request the view of an appropriate adult about whether the victim should be involved actively from the outset. The letters need to be clear about what the victim contact scheme can and cannot offer the victim. Language must be straightforward and understandable. The tone of the letters should make it clear that the victim is free to choose whether or not to participate. They should also make it clear that an initial choice not to participate can be changed at any point that the victim may choose so to do. It should explain what the victim should do in those circumstances.
4.3.05	Is the victim informed about the action they can take if the prisoner attempts to make unwanted contact with them?	This may be covered in leaflets, letters to victims or in meetings with victim liaison officers. Victims should be made aware of the Victim Helpline, including the telephone number and the email address, where they can express any concerns about unwanted contact, as well as concerns about release arrangements. They should also be informed that if a perpetrator makes unwanted contact, including electronically, whether during the custodial part of the sentence or licence, the VLO will report that to the prison or the offender manager for action to be taken to prevent further contact.
4.3.06	Is the victim referred to other agencies or services, or given information about available sources of help or support?	General information should be provided in initial letters sent to victims. Following the first meeting with the victim liaison officer, consideration should be given to providing information or arranging a referral to generic and specific support services, where appropriate. This could include agencies such as Women's Aid, Rape Crisis, Victim Support or specific localised provision. In some cases, provision of general information will be sufficient. In cases with a greater level of need, we expect victim liaison officers to make relevant referrals.

4.3.07	**Does the initial contact with victims encourage engagement with the victim contact scheme and provide information about sources of support?**	We expect victim liaison staff to make reasonable and sufficient efforts to encourage victims to engage with the scheme, considering the nature of the offence that has been committed and their personal circumstances. The fact that a victim chooses not to accept the offer of victim contact is not a reason for answering the summary judgement question negatively. 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 sufficient attempts at contact in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. For example, sending an initial letter close to the date of a key anniversary in the case may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.
	Is there effective information and communication exchange to support the safety of victims?	
	These questions are only answered if the victim opted into the victim contact scheme.	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
4.3.23	Are victim liaison staff involved in Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements where appropriate?	MAPPA arrangements begin six to nine months before the perpetrator is due to be released from custody. Inspectors expect to see victim liaison staff involved in MAPPA arrangements, at all levels. This could include professionals' meetings and other multi-agency meetings for MAPPA level 1 cases, as well as formal meetings in cases that are managed at levels 2 and 3.

4.3.24	Do victim liaison staff share relevant information with the probation practitioner?	We expect to see sharing of information from the victim liaison officer to the perpetrator's probation practitioner, to ensure that the wishes of victims are incorporated into relevant documents and licences. Following initial contact with the victim, victim liaison officers should inform the probation practitioner whether or not the victim has opted into the victim contact scheme at that point. If known, they should also share initial thoughts of the victim about potential licence conditions. At key points of the sentence, the victim liaison officer should be proactive in seeking information from victims and informing the probation practitioner of the victim's views. Depending on the stage of sentence, and the prison location of the perpetrator, the probation practitioner may be based in the community, or may be working in a prison under OMiC arrangements.
4.3.25	Are the concerns of the victim addressed and is attention paid to their safety when planning for release?	We expect the location of the victim to be considered when planning for release. Timely communication with the victim about release arrangements is critical. We also expect to see liaison with police staff if additional safety measures are required. We expect victims' views to be considered, but recognise that it is not always reasonable or possible to meet all of their needs, or put in place everything that a victim requests. The Probation Service is likely to be the first point of contact when victims are dissatisfied with the service they have received from the Parole Board, as contact with the Parole Board will occur when victim contact has been established for some time. At the stage when victims are first notified about the beginning of the parole process, they should be provided with information about the Parole Board's single point of contact for dealing with complaints. If a victim is dissatisfied with the service they have been provided with by the Probation Service, they should complain under the normal process, and then, if appropriate, to the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman.

4.3.26	Are victim liaison staff provided with appropriate and timely information about the management of the offender?	Probation practitioners must notify the relevant victim liaison officer as soon as they become aware that one of the key stages in the offender's sentence is approaching, or when there are any other key developments in a case that might have an impact on the victim. This includes consideration of a move to category D conditions, and applications for release on temporary licence and parole. Effective systems must be in place to ensure that probation practitioners and victim liaison officers exchange information quickly and allow sufficient time for victims' views to be sought and fed into the decision-making process. The probation practitioner should pass any victim information provided by the victim liaison officer to the relevant decision-maker (internal prison board/Parole Board). Where the victim has a right to make representations about a particular stage, the probation practitioner must take account of this in informing the victim liaison officer in good time. When a parole application is being considered, the probation practitioner should pass on victim representations about licence conditions, and must include any victim personal statement and/or victim contact report in the Parole Board dossier.
4.3.27	**Is there effective information and communication exchange to support the safety of victims?**	We look for a proportionate response, taking into account the length and nature of the sentence, and the range and type of situations that should generate information-sharing with the victim. 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 sufficient communication in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. For example, failure to notify a victim about a key change in the case may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

	Does pre-release contact with victims allow them to make appropriate contributions to the conditions of release?	
	These questions are only answered if the victim opted into the victim contact scheme.	
	Inspection question	**CARaG** **Case assessment rules and guidance**
4.3.30	Is the victim given the opportunity to contribute their views to inform decisions about the offender's release in a timely way and supported in doing so?	The victim needs to be consulted as soon as a request for permanent release approaches. Victims need sufficient time to reflect on the contribution they wish to make, without additional pressure. We recognise that the role of the victim liaison officer is to support the victim in preparing their contributions, but the victim liaison officer is not a counsellor or advocate and there is a need to maintain appropriate professional boundaries.
4.3.31	Are views expressed by the victim treated appropriately and in accordance with the victim contact scheme?	We expect victim liaison officers to respect the views and wishes expressed by victims. Where the views or wishes of the victim are not compatible with the constraints of the statutory victim contact scheme, victim liaison officers should explain that to the victim. Victim liaison managers must ensure that victim information is held securely, but that there is sufficient access to information to allow for provision of a continuous service, including when victim liaison officers are on leave, out of the office and, if appropriate, out of hours. Victim liaison unit staff should record information clearly and comprehensively, in such a way that a colleague with no prior knowledge of the case could read and understand the record if necessary. This provides an important basis for effective contact, particularly in cases where there are long periods of non-contact or where the case is transferred between victim liaison officers.
4.3.32	Is the victim supported in making a victim personal statement in parole applications?	Victim liaison officers should take all reasonable steps to offer the victim the opportunity to make a victim personal statement for consideration by the Parole Board, where the perpetrator's release or move to open conditions is being considered by the Parole Board.

4.3.33	*Were no-contact licence conditions used in this case?*	The Probation Service is expected to inform victims about any specific no-contact conditions in licence cases. Such conditions should name individual people; phrases such as 'family members' are not enforceable so should not be used. Normally, no-contact conditions would be requested via the victim liaison officer and would only be used where the victim had requested them and had been informed. Exceptionally, if such conditions are requested by the probation practitioner and imposed without the knowledge of the victim, we would expect to see a full explanation of the reasons for that.
4.3.34	**Does pre-release contact with victims allow them to make appropriate contributions to the conditions of release?**	Inspectors recognise that the conditions of release may not always be able to accommodate all the views and wishes of victims. Legal and policy guidance needs to be followed, and a balance needs to be made between the wishes of victims and the need to develop a safe release plan. 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 sufficient communication in the circumstances of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. For example, failure to notify a victim about the conditions of release may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.