



Youth offending inspection

Domain two

Case assessment rules and guidance (CARaG)

HMI Probation, v6.0 June 2019

Domain two and domain three standards, questions and prompts are supported by the domain two and three case assessment rules and guidance (CARaGs) respectively. These are a comprehensive set of published rules and guidance to be followed by inspectors and local assessors in their assessment of cases. The CARaGs promote transparency and consistency in our inspection of cases. Inspection staff and local assessors should use the appropriate CARaG as a reference document when assessing a case.

Guidance is provided in the CARaGs for questions and prompts. The CARaGs are regularly updated to ensure that they remain consistent with any changes that we make at standard, question and prompt level and so that they remain linked to evidence. The CARaGs also contain links where relevant to more detailed guidance and HMI Probation position statements in specialist areas.

Key:

Example	Question Format	Represents:
Is there sufficient analysis of offending behaviour, including the child or young person's attitudes towards and motivations for their offending?	Dark grey background	A question directly linked to a prompt in the inspection standards. The answers to these questions directly influence the summary judgement at key question level.
Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of the child or young person's desistance?	Light grey background	A supplementary question, asked to provide additional background information about the case, but less strongly linked to summary judgement questions.
Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child or young person's desistance?	Bold text on a dark grey background	A summary judgement question, answering a key question from the inspection standards.

Assessment

A 1 Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child or young person's desistance?		
	Inspection Question	CARaG Case Assessment Rules and Guidance
A 1.1	Is there sufficient analysis of offending behaviour, including the child or young person's attitudes towards and motivation for their offending?	<p>There should be an analysis of the offending behaviour, which gives context as to why the child or young person committed the offence, not just how, and it must also include an assessment of the child or young person attitudes or motivation for the offence, this can be based on the interview with the young person, which identifies the reasons for the offence, and it can also be from information from the self-assessment tool. Information from the CPS documentation should be used and any discrepancies in the information about the offence should be highlighted and explored.</p> <p>If the assessment is simply a clone of a previous assessment, there should be a clear update on the relevant offence the young person has been sentenced for.</p>
A 1.2	Does assessment consider the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child or young person, utilising information held by other agencies?	<p>The inspector should make a judgement on whether the assessment includes a meaningful exploration of the diversity and wider familial context of the child or young person's offending. There should be a clear consideration of the social context in which the child or young person is being raised. It should give an understanding of the child or young person lived experience and how this may affect their ability to engage in an intervention. This can include practical issues such as rurality and their ability to attend appointments, as well as internal issues, such as issues with attachment, speech and language needs, ADHD or Autism.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to whether the child or young person has experienced trauma, and what impact this may have on their ability to engage in an intervention.</p> <p>The assessment must include information from a parent/carer and if appropriate, other extended family that has caring responsibilities for the child or young person. Consideration must be given to any identified issues that the parent/carer may have, such as mental health or drug or alcohol problems, and what impact this may have on the child or young person. If the child is Looked After information must be gained from the child or young person's social worker.</p> <p>Consideration must be given to the child or young person's diversity factors, this goes beyond a recognition of their protected characteristics,</p> <p>Information must be gained from a variety of sources, as a minimum there should be a check with children's social care and education provider, but additional information can be gained from other partner or voluntary organisations that know the child or young person, such as youth workers or</p>

		<p>support workers.</p> <p>Past assessments, where available, should be used, and if there is a significant difference in these assessments, this should be explored and explained.</p>
A 1.3	Does assessment focus on the child or young person's strengths and protective factors?	<p>There should be a clear identification of the child or young person's strengths, this should include personal characteristics such as resilience, a sense of self efficacy or motivation to change. This should also identify periods where there has been no offending and what the child or young person felt was going well for them at that time. Strengths can be identified from the young person, parent/carer or education provider, and can be drawn from the interview process and the self-assessment. Protective factors can include those in relation to the young person, such as positive use of leisure time, engagement in education, and also the wider family and community networks. Potential as well as actual strengths and protective factors should be identified. Strengths could be things that are internal characteristics such as intelligence, resilience, hopes and ambition or a sense of self efficacy, protective factors could be support from a key person, family member or professional, hobbies or interests that are positive such as football, fashion, or good attachment to education.</p>
A 1.4	Does assessment analyse the key structural barriers facing the child or young person?	<p>The assessment should include an analysis of the impact that any structural barriers may have on the child or young person. If the child or young person is not excessive universal services such as education or healthcare, sufficient to meet their needs, consideration must be given to this.</p>
A 1.5	Is sufficient attention given to understanding the child or young person's levels of maturity, ability and motivation to change, and their likelihood of engaging with the court disposal?	<p>Consideration must be given to the maturity of the child/young person. This should include any episodes that may have delayed maturity, such as periods in custody, or experiences of neglect. The assessment should also include an analysis of the child/young person's ability to engage in the court outcome, this should include consideration of any cognitive or emotional issues such as ADHD, autism, learning difficulty, speech and language needs or acquired brain injury. The assessment should include an analysis of the child or young person's motivation to engage in the court order, this should include an assessment of any past engagement, including any episodes of good or poor compliance, their attitude to the offence and the court process.</p>
A 1.6	Does assessment give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of the victim/s, and opportunities for restorative justice?	<p>Where there are identified victims, the assessment should give consideration to the needs or wishes of the victim, these can be gained either from the police statements, or from the victim worker. The assessment should not be delayed if the only information that is outstanding is information from the victim.</p> <p>The assessment should include the victim's views, if known, on the court outcome, and any views the victim may have on reparation or any restorative activity, such as a letter of apology. Any requests from the victim must be balanced with the requirements of the court order and an awareness of the timescales and status of the disposal.</p>

		The assessment should also consider the capacity and capability of the young person to comply with any restorative activity.
A 1.7	Is the child or young person and their parents/carers meaningfully involved in their assessment, and are their views taken into account?	<p>There must be evidence that the child or young person has been interviewed as part of the assessment protests and that the interview has taken into account the needs of the child/young person. This should include consideration of a suitable venue, the use of language or tools that the child or young person is able to understand. There should be evidence in the assessment of the child or young person's perspective of their behaviour.</p> <p>The views of the parent/carer of the young person must be included in the assessment, and every effort must be made to include these. If the child is estranged from their parents the views of their primary carer should be included. If every effort has been made to contact the parent or carer without success, this should be recorded and should form part of the overall assessment. The needs of the parent/carer must also be taken into consideration when completing an assessment. If an interpreter is needed, it is not acceptable that the child/young person acted in this role. If the child/young person lives with their parent, but other family members have significant caring responsibilities, their perspective should also be sought.</p> <p>For Looked after Children the views of the child's social worker should be included, or there should be evidence that their views have been sought.</p>
A 1.9	Is there sufficient assessment (of the child or young person's desistance) within an appropriate period following the start of sentence or release on licence?	The process of assessment should be completed in a timely manner, to allow the intervention to start. National standards for youth offending work outline the requirements of when an assessment is required, these are currently under review. Assessments may require additional time for a child or young person who has not previously been known to the YOT. However, in cases with previous contact, the assessment can be completed in a quicker time. The process of assessment involves seeking and analysing information from a range of sources. Case managers should be persistent in seeking information they need, and where there are structural barriers to accessing information from other agencies, the YOT should be addressing this. If a delay is due to factors associated with the young person and their family, for example holidays or bereavement, that needs to be taken into account in making a judgement. However, it is not acceptable for assessment to be delayed due to the circumstances of the YOT or case manager.
A 1.10	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of the child or young person's desistance?	A clear, written assessment is necessary to guide the management of the case, and to allow others to access key information if required. HMI Probation do not set a specific timescale for this to happen, but would not expect a written assessment to be delayed because of any specific information that has not been obtained.
A 1 S	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may

<p>child or young person's desistance?</p>	<p>be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>
---	---

<p>A 2 Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child or young person safe?</p>	
--	--

<p>A 2.2</p>	<p>Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person?</p>	<p>The assessment must consider any risks to the safety and well-being of the child/young person, from either external sources or the behaviour of the child/young person. The assessment should clearly state what the risk to safety and well-being is, why that risk is present, and the likelihood and imminence of the risk.</p> <p>Safety and well-being should consider whether the young person is being exploited, criminally or otherwise, by more sophisticated offenders, or being sexually exploited.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the impact on the safety and well-being of the child/young person from their own behaviour. This should include consideration of any physical or mental health concerns, substance misuse or risk-taking behaviour that may place them at risk.</p>
<p>A 2.3</p>	<p>Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including other assessments, and involve other agencies where appropriate?</p>	<p>There should be clear evidence that information from other agencies with reference to the safety and well-being of the child/young person has been sought. This should include any additional assessment been completed by other agencies, such as Child Sexual Exploitation screening, 'return from missing' interviews, or police intelligence. Information from past or present child protection plans should be included. If the child/young person has engaged with other agencies in relation to safety and well-being, information should be gained on how well they engage with agency and what facilitated or prevented this engagement.</p>
<p>A 2.4</p>	<p>Does assessment analyse controls and interventions to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person?</p>	<p>The assessment should include information about any controls/interventions that are in place to support the safety and well-being of the child/young person. This should include what the controls are, and an analysis of how well the child/young person is responding to those controls. This should include informal controls, such as those put in place by parents/carers; and more formal controls, such as bail conditions or child protection requirements.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to interventions that promote the safety and well-being of the child/young person; this could be previous interventions provided by the YOT, as well as counselling, support, medication or other services provided by external agencies.</p>
<p>A 2.5</p>	<p>What is the classification of safety and well-being of the child or young person, according to the case manager?</p>	<p>Every case should have a classification of safety and well-being; this should be recorded accurately and consistently.</p> <p>There are four classifications:</p> <p>Low - no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome</p>

		<p>Medium - some risk of safety and well-being concerns have been identified, but is unlikely to cause serious safety and well-being adverse outcomes unless circumstances change. Can be managed under normal case management.</p> <p>High - high risk that a potential negative safety and well-being outcome will occur and the impact could be serious. Case may need increased case supervision.</p> <p>Very high - the negative safety and well-being concern could happen immediately and the impact will be serious. Case will need increased case supervision.</p>
A 2.8	Is there sufficient assessment (of the child or young person's safety and well-being) within an appropriate period following the start of sentence or release on licence?	The process of assessment should be completed in a timely manner, to allow the intervention to start. National standards for youth offending work outline the requirements of when an assessment is required, these are currently under review. Assessments may require additional time for a child or young person who has not previously been known to the YOT. However, in cases with previous contact, the assessment can be completed in a quicker time. The process of assessment involves seeking and analysing information from a range of sources. Case managers should be persistent in seeking information they need, and where there are structural barriers to accessing information from other agencies, the YOT should be addressing this. If a delay is due to factors associated with the young person and their family, for example holidays or bereavement, that needs to be taken into account in making a judgement. However, it is not acceptable for assessment to be delayed due to the circumstances of the YOT or case manager.
A 2.9	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of the child or young person's safety and well-being?	A clear, written assessment is necessary to guide the management of the case, and to allow others to access key information if required. HMI Probation do not set a specific timescale for this to happen, but would not expect a written assessment to be delayed because of any specific information that has not been obtained.
A 2 S	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child or young person safe?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

A 3 Does assessment analyse how to keep other people safe?		
A 3.1	Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risk of harm to others posed by the child or young person, including identifying who is at risk and the nature of that risk?	<p>Assessment should consider who is at risk from the child/young person; the nature of that risk; and the impact on imminent of the risk. We expect an assessment of the risk of any/all harm, not just serious harm.</p> <p>If there is an identified person at risk (parent, sibling, peer, partner or ex-partner) this should be clearly identified, and the nature of that risk specified.</p> <p>Use of specialised risk assessment tools should be referenced, such as AIM.</p>
A 3.2	Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including past behaviour and convictions, and involve other agencies where appropriate?	<p>There should be clear evidence that information from other agencies with reference to risk of harm from the child/young person has been sought. This should include any additional assessments completed by other agencies. Information about previous convictions should be used, and information about concerning behaviour that did not result in the criminal outcome should also be referenced. This might include information from school about bullying, or police investigations or intelligence.</p> <p>If the child/young person has engaged with other agencies in relation to risk of harm, information should be gained on how well they engage with agency, and what facilitated or prevented that engagement.</p>
A 3.3	Does assessment analyse controls and interventions to manage and minimise the risk of harm presented by the child or young person?	<p>The assessment should include information about controls and interventions that are in place to manage the risk from the child/young person. This should include what the controls are, and how the child young person's responding to those controls. This should include informal controls such as those put in place by parents/carers, and more formal controls such as bail conditions. Consideration should also be given to interventions that reduce the risk of harm from the child/young person. This could be previous interventions provided by the YOT, as well as restrictions or other activity by external agencies.</p>
A 3.4	What is the risk of serious harm classification of the child/young person, according to the case manager ?	<p>Every case should have a classification for risk of serious harm, and this should be recorded accurately and consistently throughout the assessment.</p> <p>There are four classifications:</p> <p>Low - no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome</p> <p>Medium - some risk of harm concerns have been identified, but is unlikely to cause serious harm unless circumstances change. Can be managed under normal case management.</p> <p>High - high risk that a potential risk of serious harm outcome will occur, and the impact could be serious. Case may need increased case supervision.</p>

		Very high - the risk of serious harm concern could happen imminently and the impact would be serious. Case will need increased case supervision.
A 3.10	Is there sufficient assessment (to keep other people safe) within an appropriate period following the start of sentence or release on licence?	The process of assessment should be completed in a timely manner, to allow the intervention to start. National standards for youth offending work outline the requirements of when an assessment is required, these are currently under review. Assessments may require additional time for a child or young person who has not previously been known to the YOT. However, in cases with previous contact, the assessment can be completed in a quicker time. The process of assessment involves seeking and analysing information from a range of sources. Case managers should be persistent in seeking information they need, and where there are structural barriers to accessing information from other agencies, the YOT should be addressing this. If a delay is due to factors associated with the young person and their family, for example holidays or bereavement, that needs to be taken into account in making a judgement. However, it is not acceptable for assessment to be delayed due to the circumstances of the YOT or case manager. Even in cases where there are no factors related to risk of harm, or the level of risk of serious harm is correctly judged to be low, the assessment should be completed within a reasonable timescale.
A 3.11	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of to keep other people safe?	A clear, written assessment is necessary to guide the management of the case, and to allow others to access key information if required. HMI Probation do not set a specific timescale for this to happen, but would not expect a written assessment to be delayed because of any specific information that has not been obtained. Even in cases where there are no factors related to risk of harm, or the level of risk of serious harm is correctly judged to be low, there should be a clear written record of this.
A 3 S	Does assessment analyse how to keep other people safe?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

Planning

P 1	Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child or young person's desistance?	
P 1 .1	<p>Does planning set out the services most likely to support desistance, paying sufficient attention to the available timescales and the need for sequencing?</p>	<p>Planning refers to the whole process, not just the preparation of a written plan. The written plan itself could be in Asset Plus, a Referral Order contract, or another document. Planning should set out what activities will be completed by the YOT and which will be completed by the child or young person. Planning should be understandable by the child or young person. It should be clear what the child/young person is expected to do, and when they will have achieved that outcome. There should be clear evidence that the plan has been discussed with, shared with, and understood by the child/young person and their parent/carer. Planning should be based on the current situation of the child or young person, in recognition of their attitude towards their offending. Planning should aim to build positive engagement in meaningful activities, with the aim of encouraging desistance. Services, interventions and activities identified should be based on the needs of the child or young person, and should be designed to encourage desistance. Planning should build on any previous periods of desistance. For referral orders, there should have been use of community volunteers.</p> <p>There should be evidence that the planning addresses how to overcome any key structural barriers that are preventing the young person to achieve their potential. It should be clearly identified what actions will be taken to address these barriers and who will undertake these actions. It should be clear when the outcome has been achieved. For example, how to achieve the young person's reintegration into education, or evidence of planning to meet accommodation needs.</p> <p>Where the assessment has failed to identify key factors, we still expect planning to address them.</p>
P 1 .2	<p>Does planning take sufficient account of the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child or young person?</p>	<p>Planning should take full account of all the diversity needs of the child or young person, not just protected characteristics. Planning should consider how those needs are facilitated by the delivery of the plan. There should be consideration of the social context of the child or young person, as well as their lived experience.</p> <p>Planning should also take into consideration the role of the wider family, both in the support they can offer, and also any caring role the child or young person may have. Planning should identify where activities and interventions will be delivered, and ensure this is achievable for the young person. This should include both consideration of rurality issues and affordability. Planning should take into consideration the education and religious commitments of the child or young person.</p>

P 1.3	Does planning take sufficient account of the child or young person's strengths and protective factors, and seek to reinforce or develop these as necessary?	Planning should build on the young person's strengths and protective factors, which should have been identified in the assessment. This includes planning to develop internal strengths as well as protective factors identified. Planning should actively facilitate the child or young person's attendance at positive activities, and build on the positive activities that have been identified.
P 1.4	Does planning take sufficient account of the child or young person's levels of maturity, ability and motivation to change, and seek to develop these as necessary?	Planning should take into consideration the maturity of the child or young person, and identify the services, activities and interventions that are best suited for their needs. There should be evidence this has been considered when developing the plan. Consideration should also be given to the level of motivation of the child/young person to address the issues that underlie their offending behaviour. Interventions should be identified that support and encourage the young person to increase their motivation to change.
P 1.5	Does planning give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of the victim/s?	Where a victim has expressed wishes in relation to the court disposal, these should be included in the planning. This may include direct or indirect reparation activities, a letter of apology, or other restorative activities. For Referral Order contracts (which constitute the plan) there must be an element of restorative activity. This can either be directed to the victim, or indirect to the community.
P 1.6	Are the child or young person and their parents/carers meaningfully involved in planning, and are their views taken into account?	There should be clear evidence that the child or young person, and their parents/carers have been involved in the planning and they have been able to contribute and participate in the planning. This should be more than simply signing the planning documents, and should include views from the child or young person and their parents/carer on what they consider has worked well in the past and what has not worked well, if that is applicable. There should be evidence that the plan has been shared with the child or young person and their parent/carer. If there is evidence that meaningful attempts have been made to engage the parents/carers but that has not occurred due to parents' non- engagement the YOT should not be marked down for this, but the attempts must be meaningful. If the child or young person is estranged from parents then a person with caring responsibilities should be engaged with the planning. This could be a professional person, such as a support worker or extended family. There should be evidence of what the child or young person and their parent carer believes will work for the young person, including information about preferred learning styles, suitability of timings for appointments and what will facilitate their engagement in the plan. If the case is a Referral Order has the young person and parents been engaged in the Referral Order contract meeting?

P 1.8	Is planning proportionate to the court outcome, with interventions capable of being delivered within an appropriate timescale?	The planning should be appropriate to the disposal. Any activities identified in the plan should be capable of being completed within the time period. A short Referral Order could be just three months long, and may have as few as six appointments. The work identified on the plan should reflect what is reasonable within that timescale. Conversely and ISS requirement is a longer and more intensive order, and therefore a higher level of intervention should be planned for. If the child or young person has ongoing needs that extend beyond the time period available to the YOT, planning should identify which community-based organisation is best placed to meet those needs.
P 1 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child or young person's desistance?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

P 2	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child or young person safe?	
P 2.1	Does planning promote the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person, sufficiently addressing risks?	Planning includes all planning activity, as well as any written plan. All relevant concerns (whether or not identified in the assessment) should feature in the planning. Planning should identify activities, services and interventions that promote the specific safety and well-being factors that are present in the case. Planning should make it clear who is to complete actions, and how the child or young person will know when the desired outcomes been achieved.
P 2.2	Does planning involve other agencies where appropriate, and is there sufficient alignment with other plans (e.g. child protection or care plans) concerning the child or young person?	Planning to promote the safety and well-being of the child/young person should be closely aligned with any other plans managed by other agencies. This can include: -Child Sexual Exploitation Plans -Missing from Home Plans -Criminal Exploitation Plans -Education Health and Care Plans and Health Care Plans The YOT plan can either reference other plans, or to draw directly on any activities that had been identified in the plans of other agencies. Where more than one agency is involved, it should be very clear which agency will lead on each activity, and how they will communicate with each other about the engagement of the child or young person.
P 2.3	Does planning set out the necessary controls and	Planning should identify which internal interventions are in place to promote safety and well-being, and who is responsible for delivering these. This could include substance misuse interventions, or

	interventions to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person?	self-esteem work. Planning should also identify when external controls are needed to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child/young person, and who is responsible for implementing these. This could include agreements with the young person and parents to ensure their mobile phone is always turned on and charged, safety planning with the police, implementation of Child Abduction Morning Notices, or restricted activities. Planning should make it clear what those controls and interventions consist of, and who is responsible for monitoring and delivering them.
P 2.4	Does planning set out necessary and effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that have been identified?	Planning should include clear contingency arrangements for if the safety and wellbeing risks go up or down. Planning should identify what actions by the young person, or by others may lead to a change in the safety and wellbeing and then what actions need to be taken as a consequence of that change. To maintain high levels of control where the risk has decreased may not be in the interests of the child or young person. Contingency planning should be more than stating the plan will be reviewed if the risk changes.
P 2 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child or young person safe?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

P 3	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping people safe?	
P 3.1	Does planning promote the safety of other people, sufficiently addressing risk of harm factors?	Inspectors should take into account all of the planning activity, not just any written plan has been produced. Planning should address all relevant risk of harm factors, whether or not they have been identified in the assessment. Planning should identify activities and interventions that minimise any identifiable risk of harm to others. Planning should specify who is to complete the actions, and how the child/young person will know when the outcome has been achieved.
P 3.2	Does planning involve other agencies where appropriate?	Inspectors will look for clear evidence that planning to keep other people safe has taken a multi-agency approach. Where there has been a multi-agency planning meeting used to formulate the planning, this must be referenced in the main plan. Where there are other agency plans in place it should be very clear on which agency will lead each activity and how they will keep each other informed of how the child/young person has engaged in the activities.

P 3.3	Does planning address any specific concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims?	<p>Planning should identify who may be at risk and in what circumstances; it should include actions to minimise that risk. Where there is an identifiable victim, planning must be clear as to how the risks to that victim will be managed. There should be clear communication with the victim worker, and there should be clear planning to keep that victims safe. This could be through formal requirements such as restricted activities, or restraining orders. There should be clear actions in place should those requirements be breached.</p> <p>Where there is no specific identifiable victim, planning should consider who is most at risk (peers, people in authority, children et cetera) and what plans need to be in place to minimise those risks. Planning should specify how an increased level of risk will be identified and what actions will be taken and by whom to address this.</p>
P 3.4	Does planning set out the necessary controls and interventions to promote the safety of other people?	<p>Planning should identify which internal interventions are in place to minimise the risk of harm to others, and who is responsible for delivering those. This could include interventions to help manage emotions, or knife crime awareness work.</p> <p>Planning should also identify when external controls are needed to minimise the risk of harm to others, and who is responsible for implementation. This could include agreements with parents or children's home staff to check bedrooms for weapons, or increased police intelligence. This could also include formal restrictions such as non-Association requirements or prohibited activities. It should be clear what those controls and interventions are, and who is responsible for delivering them.</p>
P 3.5	Does planning set out necessary and effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that have been identified?	<p>There should be clear contingency planning in place. This should include what actions to take if the risk of harm either increases or decreases. To maintain high levels of control where the risk of harm has decreased, may not be in the best interests of the child/young person. Contingency planning should consist of more than a simple statement that the plan will be reviewed if the level of risk of harm changes.</p>
P 3 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping people safe?	<p>The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

Implementation and Delivery

D 1	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the child or young person's desistance?	
D 1.1	<p>Are the delivered services those most likely to support desistance, with sufficient attention given to sequencing and the available timescales?</p>	<p>The services, activities and interventions that are delivered should be the ones that are most likely to reduce offending and support desistance. There must be a clear link with the interventions provided and the known likelihood of those reducing offending and increasing desistance. The case manager should be able to explain why specific interventions have been delivered and how they meet the needs of the child/young person.</p> <p>The interventions should start in a timely manner and it should be clear whether the child or young person has engaged in the interventions. Where interventions have not been delivered as required, there must be clear reasons recorded for this, such as a crisis in a primary need.</p>
D 1.2	<p>Does service delivery reflect the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child or young person, involving parents/carers or significant others?</p>	<p>The interventions delivered must take into account the diversity needs of the child or young person. This includes a range of needs associated with learning needs, rurality, identity, culture, race and gender. The interventions should suit the needs of the child or young person and there should be clear evidence that the child or young person is able to understand and respond to the interventions being offered. Where it is clear the young person is struggling to engage reasonable adaptations should be made to meet the needs of the young person.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the wider familial circumstances of the child or young person, which not only includes recognition of their lived experience, but also their role in the family.</p> <p>If it has been recognised that the child or young person has experienced trauma this should be recognised and responded to appropriately.</p> <p>Feedback should be given to the young person on how they have engaged in the intervention, and the child or young person views should be gained on their experience of the intervention. This could be done after each intervention session, or as part of a review process.</p> <p>Feedback should be given to parents/carers as to how the child or young person has engaged and consideration should also be given to how the parent/carer can reinforce and support the interventions, for example encouraging parent/carer to support desistance based activities.</p>
D 1.3	<p>Does service delivery build upon the child or young person's strengths and enhance protective factors?</p>	<p>Service delivery should build upon the strengths of the child and young person. Service delivery should aim to enhance strengths, and should be achievable for the child/young person. There should be a clear and recognisable link with service delivery and the outcome of increasing the child/young person's strengths.</p>

D 1.4	Is sufficient focus given to developing and maintaining an effective working relationship with the child or young person and their parents/carers?	<p>Service delivery should aim to maintain a positive working relationship with the child/young person and parent/carer. There should be evidence that the child/young person has been engaged with using their preferred method of communication, and that this has been followed up. Appointments should be made at times and places that are suitable for the child/young person and facilitate their attendance.</p> <p>If the relationship with the YOT worker is not working, there should be evidence of efforts to explore the reasons for this, and consideration of possible resolutions.</p> <p>There should be evidence of positive feedback to the child/young person, where applicable.</p> <p>There should be evidence that the child/young person and their parents/carer are aware of how to respond if they are unhappy with the service they receive.</p>
D 1.5	Does service delivery promote opportunities for community integration including access to services post-supervision?	<p>Service delivery should promote opportunities for community integration and access to mainstream services. This can be achieved by using community venues for meetings, and these should be used for Referral Order panel meetings. Referrals should be considered to mainstream services. There should be evidence of how the YOT will support access to mainstream services, which could include supporting the young person at the first appointment.</p> <p>There should be evidence to show the YOT has supported any existing community-linked interventions, and that work planned by the YOT does not detract from this.</p> <p>Every effort should be undertaken to ensure the child/young person accesses universal services, such as education or healthcare.</p>
D 1.6	Is sufficient attention given to encouraging and enabling the child or young person's compliance with the work of the YOT?	<p>There should be evidence of effective engagement with the child/young person, and their parent/carer. Simply attending appointments does not necessarily indicate engagement and compliance.</p> <p>For meaningful engagement in the delivery of the sentence, the inspector will need to be satisfied that parents/carers are involved as appropriate throughout the delivery of the sentence, particularly to support the work of the YOT. Evidence of this could be found through case diary entries, particularly with reference to home visits and any specific parenting or family work which could possibly involve other agencies, such as children's services. Other examples of engagement with a family could include use of family meetings or family group conferencing, liaison with extended family network or use of interpreters or members of the community for additional support where necessary.</p> <p>The inspector should be satisfied that any workers involved with the child/young person have sought to maintain a positive working relationship, to motivate them and reinforce positive behaviour. This can include the use of motivational interviewing techniques, pro-social modelling or other communication and support methods.</p> <p>Critically the inspector will need to be satisfied that the worker has not adopted a 'one size fits all' approach to their work with the child/young person, but has assessed their individual needs and the</p>

		<p>best way to work to maximise the potential for a successful outcome to the sentence. For Looked after Children the local authority social worker should be involved in delivery of interventions, particularly where they are cross-cutting with welfare needs and where additional motivational support may be required when the child/young person is away from the YOT. This could also include joint work with the YOT case manager on family reintegration, or otherwise to promote safeguarding and address vulnerability needs. Pre-intervention and motivational work is often critical, and this can support engagement and compliance.</p>
D 1.10	Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?	<p>There should be clear evidence that every effort has been made to engage with the child/young person before formal enforcement action is taken. This should include using a variety of ways to engage with the child/young person. Where there is no option other than formal enforcement action, consideration should be given to a pre-breach meeting, such as an enforcement panel. Effort should be made to contact the parent/carer to facilitate engagement before formal enforcement action is taken.</p> <p>Where enforcement is part of the safety planning, this should be done in line with the planning processes.</p> <p>When formal enforcement action is required, this should be done promptly.</p>
D 1 S	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the child or young person's desistance?	<p>The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

D 2	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child or young person?	
D 2.1	Does service delivery promote the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person?	<p>Service delivery should take into account all the factors necessary to keep the child/young person safe. This should include interventions and controls that will promote the safety of the child/young person. It could also include interventions that develop internal strategies for staying safe, and external controls where available.</p>
D 2.2	Is the involvement of other organisations in keeping the child or young person safe sufficiently well-coordinated?	<p>There should be evidence of how the child/young person has engaged with other agencies in the work to promote their safety and well-being. The child/young person should be supported in engaging with other agencies as required. There should be feedback available as to how the</p>

		child/young person has engaged with other agencies. The work of other agencies should link and support the work of the YOT to promote the safety and well-being of the child/young person.
D 2 S	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child or young person?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

D 3	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?	
D 3.1	Are the delivered services sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?	The appropriate services, activities and interventions are delivered in line with the factors indicating risk of harm to others, irrespective of whether all the correct factors were identified in the plan. All interventions should have the explicit aim of minimising the risk of harm to others. Interventions and services can include activities that increase the capacity of the child/young person to minimise their risk to others, such as managing emotions; or external controls, such as restricted activities or non-association requirements.
D 3.2	Is sufficient attention given to the protection of actual and potential victims?	Where a specific potential victim has been identified, interventions should be delivered to contribute to keeping that victims safe. If victim safety will be increased by restorative work, or victim awareness intervention, this should be considered. Reasonable wishes of victims in relation to sentence or licence requirements should be responded to. There should be regular liaison with the victim worker if required.
D 3.3	Is the involvement of other agencies in managing the risk of harm sufficiently well-coordinated?	There should be evidence of how the child/young person has engaged with other agencies in the work to minimise risk of harm to others. There should be sufficient information sharing to ensure that all other agencies involved are fully aware of the level and nature of risk of harm.
D 3 S	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

Reviewing

R 1	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child or young person's desistance?	
R 1.1	Does reviewing identify and respond to changes in factors linked to desistance?	<p>We expect YOT workers to take account of any changes in the life or situation of the child or young person, and adjust their work appropriately. This should include responding to any new offending or otherwise worrying behaviour; changes to relationships with family, partners or peers; changes in accommodation; changes in education or training. As a minimum, these changes should be recorded and discussed with the child or young person on an ongoing basis. The plan of work to be delivered should be adjusted to take account of any changes.</p> <p>A full written review is required by HMI Probation whenever there has been a 'significant change'. More examples?</p> <p>The definition of the significant change depends on the individual features of the case. For example, if the child or young person has had many changes of accommodation a new placement might not be significant; whereas for another young person a change in accommodation might be highly significant.</p> <p>Are written review must not simply be a clone of any previous assessment, but must fully detail changes that have taken place since the previous assessment. Irrelevant, historical information should be removed, so the most recent assessment should always give a clear picture of the current circumstances that young person.</p> <p>For Referral Order cases, reviews may take place using community volunteers, with changes being identified in the contract and plan.</p>
R 1.2	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on building upon the child or young person's strengths and enhancing protective factors?	<p>Reviewing should identify how successful, or otherwise, work has been to build the young person's strengths and protective factors. Reviewing should identify which interventions and services have been delivered, and the impact they have had on the young person. Information should be sought and incorporated in the reviewing from any other organisations working with the child/young person.</p>
R 1.4	Is the child or young person and their parents/carers meaningfully involved in reviewing their progress and engagement, and are their views taken into account?	<p>The child or young person and their parent/carer should be involved in the reviewing process. Some reviewing will be iterative, as the sentence goes forward. More formal reviewing could take place at a meeting, such as a Referral Order review.</p> <p>The view of the child or young person should be gained as to what they think went well and what areas of intervention did not go as well for them. Reviewing should identify what methods of intervention has worked well for the young person and whether adjustments to the planning need to be considered.</p>

		<p>The views of the parent/carer should also be gained, this should include their views about the interventions and any changes in the needs of the child or young person.</p> <p>A review self-assessment can be used for this process, if this is not used the YOT must be able to demonstrate how they have captured the views of the child or young person and their parent/carer. Were the children and parents engaged in the Referral order review meeting with community volunteers?</p> <p>If there is evidence that meaningful attempts have been made to engage the parents/carers but that has not occurred due to parents non-engagement the YOT should not be marked down for this, but the attempts must be meaningful. If the child or young person is estranged from parents then a person with caring responsibilities should be engaged with the review. This could be a professional person, such as a support worker or extended family.</p>
R 1.5	Does reviewing lead to the necessary adjustments in the ongoing plan of work to support desistance?	Ongoing reviewing should be used to check that other people working with the child/young person are delivering what has been expected. Any issues should be resolved on an ongoing basis, and should not wait for a formal review. Reviewing should identify what work has been successfully in supporting desistance and how the child or young person has responded to this. It should identify any changes that need to be made to the planning to support the desistance of the young person, and if there have been periods of desistance from offending, what has helped the young person achieve this.
R 1 S	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child or young person's desistance?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

R 2	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child or young person safe?	
R 2.1	Does reviewing identify and respond to changes in factors related to safety and wellbeing?	Reviewing should identify any changes relating to safety and wellbeing. Reviewing should identify how well the child or young person has responded to interventions designed to develop internal controls and whether these have had any impact on their safety and wellbeing. The reviewing should also comment on how well any external controls have acting in promoting the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person. If there has been a change in the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person, this should be identified and an explanation as to what these changes have been. A full written review should be completed when there are significant changes.

R 2.2	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in promoting the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person?	Reviewing should identify what other agencies have been involved and what activities and interventions they have completed with the child or young person. The potential impact of these interventions should be reviewed based on feedback from the partner agency, feedback from the young person and professional assessment from the case manager.
R 2.3	Does reviewing lead to the necessary adjustments in the ongoing plan of work to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person?	Planning should respond to any changes, with the removal of unnecessary external controls if the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person has improved. However, consideration should also be given to how well sustained these changes may be and what ongoing interventions will assist in maintaining these changes. Where there has been no change in the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person this should also be explored, with consideration as to why there has been no change. If it is because the child or young person has not engaged in the intervention, despite appropriate intervention being available, consideration should be given to how to improve the engagement of the child or young person.
R 2 S	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child or young person safe?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

R 3	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	
R 3.1	Does reviewing identify and respond to changes in factors related to risk of harm?	Reviewing should identify and changes relating to the risk of harm to others. This should include a consideration of any new examples of concerning behaviour. Reviewing should identify how well the child or young person has responded to interventions designed to develop internal controls and whether these have had any impact on their risk of harm to others. The reviewing should also comment on how well any external controls have been acting in minimising the risk of harm to others from the child or young person. If there has been a change in the risk of harm from others of the child or young person, this should be identified and an explanation as to what these changes have been.
R 3.2	Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in managing the risk of harm?	Reviewing should identify what other agencies have been involved and what activities and interventions they have completed with the child or young person. The potential impact of these interventions should be reviewed based on feedback from the partner agency, feedback from the young person and professional assessment from the case manager.

R 3.3	Is the child or young person and their parents/carers meaningfully involved in reviewing their risk of harm, and are their views taken into account?	The child or young person and their parent/carer should be involved in the reviewing process. This can be done at a formal reviewing meeting, such as a Referral Order review, or as a more informal process. The view of the child or young person should be gained as to what they think went well and what areas of intervention did not go as well for them. Reviewing should identify what methods of intervention has worked well for the young person and whether adjustments to the planning need to be considered. The views of the parent/carer should also be gained, this should include their views about the interventions and any changes in the needs of the child or young person. The review self-assessment can be used for this process, if this is not used the YOT must be able to demonstrate how they have captured the views of the child or young person and their parent/carer
R 3.4	Does reviewing lead to the necessary adjustments in the ongoing plan of work to manage and minimise the risk of harm?	The child or young person and their parent/carer should be involved in the reviewing process. This can be done at a formal reviewing meeting, such as a Referral Order review, or at a more informal process. The view of the child or young person should be gained as to what they think went well and what areas of intervention did not go as well for them. Reviewing should identify what methods of intervention has worked well for the young person and whether adjustments to the planning need to be considered. The views of the parent/carer should also be gained, this should include their views about the interventions and any changes in the needs of the child or young person. The review self-assessment can be used for this process, if this is not used the YOT must be able to demonstrate how they have captured the views of the child or young person and their parent/carer.
R 3 S	Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	The inspectors should judge whether the overall quality of the assessment undertaken meets the needs of the case. Does sufficiency in the assessment outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall this assessment is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while an assessment may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be sufficient to lead to a judgement of insufficient.