



## **Draft standards for inspecting probation services (Sept 2017)**

### **2. Case supervision**

#### **2.1 Assessment**

*Assessment is well-informed, analytical, individualised and actively involves the service user.*

- Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?
  - Does the assessment analyse the service user's readiness to engage and comply with supervision?
  - Does the assessment describe the service user's diversity characteristics and the impact they have on their circumstances and their ability to comply and engage with the sentence?
  - Is the service user meaningfully involved in their assessment and are their views taken into account?
  
- Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?
  - Does the assessment identify and analyse offending related factors?
  - Does the assessment identify the service user's strengths and protective factors?
  - Does the assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including any other assessments that have been completed?
  
- Is there an accurate and thorough assessment of the risk of harm to others?
  - Does the assessment specify who is at risk, and the nature and level of that risk?
  - Does the assessment describe any specific concerns and risks related to identifiable actual and potential victims?
  - Does the assessment of risk of harm include details about past behaviour as well as convictions?

## 2.2 Planning

*Planning is driven by the assessment, holistic, individualised and actively involves the service user.*

- Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the service user?
  - Is the service user meaningfully involved in planning and are their views taken into account?
  - Does planning take sufficient account of the service user's diversity, readiness and motivation to change, personal characteristics and circumstances which may affect engagement and compliance?
  - Does the plan set out how all the requirements of the sentence or licence/post-sentence supervision will be delivered?
  - Does the plan set a level, pattern and type of contact sufficient to engage the service user and to support the effectiveness of specific interventions?
  
- Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting the service user's desistance?
  - Does planning build on the service user's strengths and protective factors?
  - Does the plan sufficiently reflect the assessment of offending related factors?
  - Does the plan set out the services, activities and interventions most likely to reduce reoffending and support desistance?
  
- Does planning address appropriately factors associated with the risk of harm to others?
  - Does the plan address factors identified in the risk of harm assessment?
  - Does the plan make appropriate links to the work of other agencies involved with the service user and any multi-agency plans (e.g. safeguarding, MAPPA, MARAC)?
  - Does the plan include necessary and effective contingency arrangements for those risks that have been identified?

## 2.3 Implementation

*High quality well-focused, individualised and co-ordinated services are delivered which engage the service user.*

- Is the sentence of the court and/or licence/post-sentence supervision period implemented appropriately with a focus on engaging the service user?
  - Do the requirements of the sentence start promptly, or at an appropriate time?
  - Is sufficient focus given to maintaining an effective working relationship with the service user?
  - Are sufficient efforts made to enable the service user to complete the sentence, including flexibility to take appropriate account of their personal circumstances?
  - *Licence/post-supervision supervision cases only:* Was there a proportionate level of contact with the prisoner before release?
  - Are professional judgements recorded in relation to decisions about missed appointments?
  - Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?
  - Are sufficient efforts made to re-engage the service user after enforcement action or recall?
  
- Does supervision focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting the service user's desistance?
  - Are services, activities and interventions delivered in line with the plan?
  - Is there effective co-ordination with other organisations in the delivery of services, activities and interventions?
  - Is the level and nature of contact sufficient to achieve planned objectives and to support desistance?
  - Wherever possible, do services, activities and interventions build upon the service user's strengths and protective factors?
  - Are local services engaged to support and sustain desistance during the sentence and beyond?
  
- Does supervision focus appropriately on managing and minimising the risk of harm to others?
  - Is the level and nature of contact offered sufficient to achieve planned objectives in connection with managing and reducing risk of harm?
  - Is service delivery sufficiently well co-ordinated with other agencies to support the management of risk of harm?
  - Are home visits undertaken where necessary to ensure full management of risk of harm?
  - Is sufficient attention given to the protection of victims and potential victims?

## 2.4 Reviewing

*Reviewing of progress is well-informed, analytical, individualised and actively involves the service user.*

- Does reviewing effectively support the service user's compliance and engagement?
  - Does reviewing consider the level of compliance and engagement, analyse any barriers and where appropriate amend planned work?
  - Are service users encouraged to contribute to reviewing their progress and engagement?
  - Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of actions to implement the sentence?
  
- Does reviewing effectively support progress towards desistance?
  - Does reviewing actively address changes in factors linked to offending, with the necessary adjustments being made to ongoing planned work to take account of these changes?
  - Does reviewing focus sufficiently on building upon the service user's strengths and protective factors?
  - Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies working with the service user?
  - Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of the progress towards desistance?
  
- Does reviewing focus sufficiently on the risk of harm to others?
  - Are reviews completed and recorded in response to changes in the risk of harm?
  - Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in managing the service user's risk of harm?
  - Are service users encouraged to contribute to reviewing their risk of harm?
  - Are written reviews completed as appropriate to update the assessment of risk of harm, with the necessary adjustments being made to the planned work to address the specified risks?