



Her Majesty's
Inspectorate of
Probation

Consultation on the future of adult inspections (part two)

May 2021

Contents

Foreword.....	3
1. Background	4
2. Our guiding principles.....	5
3. Decisions following our first consultation (summer 2020).....	6
4. Current consultation questions	10
5. How to respond	15
Annexe 1 – proposed inspection standards.....	16
Annexe 2 – experience of probation questionnaire	29

Foreword

The government is changing the way that probation services are delivered from June 2021. HM Inspectorate of Probation must bring its inspection regime in line with the new unified delivery model for probation so that we can continue to drive improvements in probation services. We have worked closely with the HMPPS probation transformation team, Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) and the National Probation Service (NPS) in England and Wales in developing our proposed approach. Thank you to all of those involved.

The new probation delivery model puts responsibility for probation provision into one public sector service supported by a dynamic framework of commissioned specialist services. We want to make sure that our proposed approach remains focused on the things that make a difference to the quality of probation services and we want to continue to uphold the key principles of inspection agreed by all the criminal justice inspectorates. These include a focus on improvement and outcomes, an inspection methodology and frequency that is proportionate to risk, a more explicit focus on diversity issues for both staff and people on probation, and a focus on the perspective of people on probation.

We undertook a consultation in summer 2020 outlining our standards and approach in broad terms. We tested out those plans through a pilot inspection of two local areas of Wales NPS in December 2020 and we have refined our approach in response. In this consultation we set out our decisions and invite comment on our remaining proposals on inspecting diversity, measuring outcomes and the involvement of people on probation.

The proposed changes will enable our inspection regime to best fit the new delivery model for probation. In making the changes we will continue to provide a proportionate approach to inspection, working with those who deliver services to drive improvement and identify effective practice.

This consultation closes on 01 June 2021 23:59. We would like to hear your views on our proposals and I hope you will take the opportunity to respond.



Justin Russell

Chief Inspector of Probation

1. Background

- 1.1 Under the new probation delivery model set out by the Ministry of Justice, responsibility for the provision of probation services will move to a new unified National Probation Service (NPS) from 26 June 2021. The service will be split into 12 regions across England and Wales. Each NPS region will be overseen by a Regional Probation Director (RPD) who will have responsibility for the delivery of probation services in their region. Operational delivery in each region will be reorganised around Probation Delivery Units (PDUs), led by a manager with between five and 18 of these PDUs in each region. With the ending of the split between current NPS divisions and CRC services, HM Inspectorate of Probation will cease to focus on different providers of services. Instead, we will inspect the new arrangements based on overall provision to people on probation.
- 1.2 Our consultation is in two parts. We consulted in summer 2020 on our proposed broad approach and tested out these proposals on a pilot inspection of Wales NPS in December 2020. The decisions that we made following both the first consultation and the pilot are described in section three. It includes the decisions that we have made on our inspection standards framework, how we will achieve local and regional coverage, how often we inspect, how we sample cases for inspection and how we inspect statutory work with victims.
- 1.3 We now want to hear views about some of the detail of our approach that we have not yet settled on. This is in section four and includes our revised approach to inspecting diversity, how we judge outcomes, and how we capture and use the views of people on probation.
- 1.4 We have included some consultation questions to guide respondents.

2. Our guiding principles

- 2.1 Our proposed approach is informed by the general principles of criminal justice inspection, to which HM Inspectorate of Probation is a signatory, which can be found at: www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/cjji/inspections/cjji-business-plan-2019-21.

It is also guided by the following principles:

- we will be robust, fair, transparent, proportionate, flexible and reliable
- our impact should be both to inform practice and influence national policy
- the quality of frontline service delivery is paramount but is not a standalone measure of an effective service. We will continue to assess how the service is set up, led and managed
- we deliver inspection rather than audit and this requires us to provide as full a picture of delivery as possible, triangulated across our domains. We should not duplicate the work of others.

3. Decisions following our first consultation (summer 2020)

Inspection standards

- 3.1 Our inspections draw on a wide range of evidence including interviews and focus groups with staff and managers at all levels from Probation Services Officers up to Chief Executives as well as undertaking detailed scrutiny of management data and individual case files. Our judgements on the ratings for the quality of offender management are quantitative ones driven by the aggregate results from our individual case inspections. Overall ratings on leadership and organisational delivery are qualitative ones made by our lead inspectors based on both the individual case assessments and evidence from interviews with staff, managers and external stakeholders. Full details of our methodology can be found at: www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/about-our-work/our-standards-and-ratings.
- 3.2 In our first consultation we outlined our plans for amendments to our standards framework. Our proposals met with broad assent albeit with some reservations about how well we would be able to inspect outcomes. We tested out our proposals during the pilot inspection in Wales and found that the proposed evaluation of outcomes standard did present us with some difficulties. We have, therefore, significantly reworked this element of the framework and it is outlined in section four. The remainder of our proposed amendments to the standards framework worked well on the pilot inspection and will be implemented.
- 3.3 This means that our standards will be ordered into two rather than three domains, with domain one relating to the way organisations are led and managed, and domain two relating to the quality of work produced by the organisation, which we inspect through a detailed analysis of individual cases. Figure 1 below lists the standards that will be included. They are provided in full in Annexe 1.

Figure 1: Standards in domains one and two

Domain one
Leadership
Staffing
Services
Information and facilities
Domain two
Court work
Assessment
Planning
Implementation and delivery
Reviewing
Outcomes for people on probation
Statutory victim work

- 3.4 The quality of court work, unpaid work delivery and resettlement services, currently inspected under domain three, will now be inspected in every local PDU as part of

our overall approach to inspecting individual cases supervised by the service. So, for each case we inspect we will include:

- the quality of the court reports produced by the relevant NPS court team before sentence and whether the case was allocated to an appropriately experienced and trained responsible officer
- for cases being supervised on licence, the work that was done in prison to prepare the person on probation for release and how the transition back into the community was managed
- the quality of assessment and sentence planning undertaken – both with respect to rehabilitative needs and management of potential risks to the public
- the quality of delivery of any sentence requirements – including unpaid work and any specified accredited programmes or treatment requirements – as well as other rehabilitative services or offending behaviour interventions identified at the assessment and planning stage
- the quality of reviewing undertaken to assess progress against sentence or release plans and whether appropriate changes were made to these plans to reflect changing circumstances or risks.

Regional and PDU level inspections

- 3.5 In our first consultation we outlined proposals for a programme of inspection whereby we would inspect and rate the provision of services at a PDU level as well as making judgements about how well a region is operating. The PDU level inspection approach received support as it will enable regional directors, stakeholders and the public to understand how services are performing in their local area.
- 3.6 We have reviewed our proposal to undertake separate regional inspections and have decided not to pursue this approach. Instead we will focus our efforts on PDU reporting, inspecting each PDU once every three years. Rather than undertaking separate regional inspections at the end of each group of PDUs, we will undertake a fact finding, contextual exercise within each region prior to starting the inspection of any of the PDUs in the region. This will provide crucial briefing information for the lead inspector of each PDU and will be shared with the RPD. Once the annual sample of PDUs in a given region have been inspected, the relevant regional director will receive feedback on any themes that have emerged during these local inspections and from the initial week of regional level fieldwork interviews and analysis. A commentary on each region will be included alongside PDU level findings in each of our annual reports.
- 3.7 In order to complete the regional contextual briefing and the PDU inspection we have split our qualitative standards on organisational leadership and delivery (domain one), so that some will inform the regional contextual review and others will be inspected at PDU level.

PDU inspections

- 3.8 Individual PDUs will be inspected once every three years. If we have concerns about the performance of a PDU, we may undertake follow up activity in between the three-year period. We will inspect, report and rate every PDU against the PDU domain one and domain two standards, other than statutory victim work. Statutory victim work will be inspected in relevant cases during PDU inspections but we will

report on this area of work annually and at a national level. Our proposed PDU standards are in Annexe 1.

- 3.9 We acknowledge that in rating PDUs against our domain one standards we are judging a local service on some issues which may be beyond their control. In all of our inspection programmes our approach is to report and rate on what we find at the level at which we find it. In our reports we will set our findings in context and describe the reasons for any shortfalls, targeting any relevant recommendations at the right level whether this is at a PDU, regional or national level.

Regional activity

- 3.10 We will undertake activity at a regional level to obtain contextual and policy information to inform the PDU inspections. This activity will be a combination of evidence in advance and some on-site activity such as interviews and focus groups with the RPD, their senior teams and other regional level stakeholders. This activity will be undertaken against the regional domain one standards but regions will not be rated and we will not publish separate regional reports. RPDs will be given feedback on findings and a commentary on any key themes identified in each region will be published in our annual reports. We will also introduce a process to update this information on an annual basis.
- 3.11 We recognise our regional inspections may identify issues that are outside the region's control and where accountability sits at a national level. For instance, a region may have limited control over staff recruitment and training or facilities management. Although RPDs may have more autonomy in the new structures, accountability for some services will sit elsewhere. We will also undertake a national review of relevant national structures or policy materials. This will enable us to report on the impact of national issues as we see them PDU level and to target our recommendations appropriately.

Frequency of inspection

- 3.12 Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, we aimed to inspect every provider, every year. This was necessary at a time of significant concern about the implementation of the *Transforming Rehabilitation* reforms but did not allow much time between inspections for recommendations to be acted on.
- 3.13 We want to take a proportionate approach to inspection and allow sufficient time between inspections for improvements to be made. Respondents to our first consultation recognised that there is a balance to be struck between leaving sufficient time in between inspections for changes to be made, while at the same time not waiting so long that our impact is reduced. Any approach also has to be consistent with our own resources. Taking all of these factors into account we believe that inspecting every PDU once every three years is the preferred approach, though we would expect to return to PDUs identified as 'Inadequate' in a shorter timeframe.
- 3.14 With this approach we will inspect around one third of all PDUs in every region each year. Each PDU inspection will last for one week.

Sampling of cases for inspection

- 3.15 Instead of our current sampling approach, we will inspect all eligible cases in each PDU which commenced over a given one to two-week period six months before our fieldwork starts. This negates any need for sampling and removes any concerns about sufficient confidence levels and margins of error. If a PDU advises that something particularly odd happened in one of those weeks (for example, a court had to close or IT system went down) then we can shift our requested date parameters by a week. The number of cases inspected under this approach in each PDU will reflect the volume of new cases coming into each team during a one or two-week period and is likely to range from 20 to 30 in smaller areas to more than 100 in the largest PDUs like Birmingham and Solihull.

Statutory work with victims

- 3.16 We will inspect victim contact scheme work at PDU level when we undertake our domain two inspection of cases. We will report on this work annually and at a national level.
- 3.17 This is because at a local PDU level, there are likely to be very low numbers of new cases where a victim becomes eligible for statutory victim contact in any given one or two week period, making it difficult to rate this work at a PDU level. In addition, we understand that in many areas, victim teams are organised across broader areas than a single PDU. Reporting victim work at a national level will ensure that case numbers are sufficient for us to reach valid conclusions.

4. Current consultation questions

Inspecting diversity

- 4.1 In March 2021 we published our thematic inspection report *Race equality in probation: the experiences of black, Asian and minority ethnic probation service users and staff*. We reported that the services provided for black, Asian and minority ethnic people on probation and the experiences of black, Asian and minority ethnic staff were not good enough. We found evidence of this at both an individual and an organisational level. Our local inspections have also shown that some people on probation with other protected characteristics (for example learning disabilities or mental health problems) may also be receiving poorer quality support and supervision.
- 4.2 Our standards emphasise the importance of a personalised approach. We define a personalised approach as one in which services are tailored to meet the needs of individuals, giving people as much choice and control as possible over the support they receive. This personalised approach must include, but by no means be limited to, an individual's protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, and sex). It should also include personal circumstances that could influence the individual's ability and capacity to engage in interventions, such as maturity, rurality, learning needs, language barriers, mental health concerns and cultural identity. There should be evidence that consideration has been given to how **that** individual will be able to respond to **that** intervention at **that** time.
- 4.3 For each standard in domain one we will set out clear diversity expectations with prompts based on learning from relevant thematics while ensuring that organisations are meeting their *Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act, 2010)* obligations. Our inspectors will ask the following prompts:
- Does the PDU leadership team take a deliberate, strategic and informed approach to meeting diverse needs?
 - Does the workforce adequately reflect the diversity of the local population?
 - Do the skills and diversity of the workforce meet caseload needs?
 - Is an effective induction programme delivered to new staff that addresses issues of diversity and is accessible to all?
 - Are reasonable adjustments made for PDU staff in accordance with statutory requirements and protected characteristics?
 - Are diversity factors and issues of disproportionality sufficiently addressed in the range of services provided?
 - Are diversity factors and issues of disproportionality sufficiently addressed in the way that services are delivered?
 - Are there effective arrangements with other agencies to support the personal circumstances and diversity needs service users?
 - Does the PDU collect and use diversity information to drive improvement?

- Do the ICT systems support the production of management information, including data on service user needs and diversity factors?
- 4.4 The inspection of diversity will form part of our domain two standards. Our inspectors will assess each case using the above prompts; they will collect evidence of how well services have responded to an individual's protected characteristics and their personal circumstances. This will enable us to report separately on each aspect as well as commenting on both as part of a wider picture on diversity.
- 4.5 Our judgements on the diversity prompts will be included under each standard in which they sit and will influence the ratings for all those standards. In addition, we will report on diversity as a separate standalone section in each PDU inspection report based on our findings across the entire standards framework. We will introduce a 'hurdle' in our decision making here; those PDUs judged as 'Inadequate' on their approach to diversity will not find it possible to gain an 'Outstanding' rating on our leadership standard.

QUESTION – Is the proposed way of inspecting diversity fair and proportionate?

QUESTION – Will the proposed way of inspecting diversity drive improvement?

Inspecting outcomes

- 4.6 Our standards framework focuses on how inputs and activities deliver improved outputs, which in turn should lead to better outcomes for people on probation and victims. Probation services are less likely to meet their aims without good quality inputs (such as professional staff and comprehensive services) and activities (such as case assessment and effective interventions). This will be as important as ever in the new unified service and we will continue with this approach. In addition, we want to say more about whether good quality inputs are leading to better outcomes for people on probation. Although reoffending rates remain a key strategic outcome measure for probation services, we have considered how we can include earlier outcomes in our inspection of cases, judging whether sufficient progress has been made by people on probation.
- 4.7 Under our proposed approach, our inspectors will make judgements about four key questions relating to the progress that a person on probation makes during the period of each case that we are inspecting (typically the first six months of supervision on a community sentence or after release from custody). These are:
- a) Have there been improvements in those factors most closely linked to offending both in developing strengths and addressing needs?
 - b) Has there been a reduction in factors most closely related to risk of harm to others?
 - c) Has there been a reduction in offending?
 - d) Has there been sufficient compliance?
- 4.8 We are working up detailed guidance for our inspectors on exactly which indicators of progress they should look for in individual case files and in interviews with the responsible probation practitioner, but the sorts of questions they are likely to ask are:

- a) what was the service user's accommodation and employment status at the start of the order or licence period and what was it at the point of inspection or have their family links and relationships improved or got worse?
- b) has there been a reduction or stabilisation of substance misuse where this was linked to risk of harm?
- c) have there been fewer incidents of or a reduction in the frequency of offending?
- d) has the service user been breached or recalled during the period under inspection?

4.9 In our first consultation there was a general consensus that any measurement of outcomes must be in line with reasonable expectations for individual people on probation. We will judge whether sufficient progress, some progress or no progress has been made during the period being inspected.

4.10 For example for a) if substance misuse was an assessed need we will judge whether progress against this need has been made, the problem has got worse or there has been no change. In making judgments about each of these questions our inspectors will take into account evidence from the case file and from their interview with the relevant probation practitioner.

4.11 These judgements about sufficiency will take into account the needs of the individual person on probation and what is reasonable for them at that point in their sentence. Our inspectors will make an overall yes/no judgement on each of the four questions set out above as to whether early outcomes are positive, demonstrating reasonable progress for the individual person on probation. We recognise that progress within six months will be ambitious for some people on probation and that sufficiency may be about maintaining stability instead. We propose that where stability is deemed to be a reasonable and defensible expectation for an individual person on probation, we should give credit for this.

4.12 We recognise that inspecting outcomes is new to us, which means that we do not yet have an evidence base to tell us what adequate or inadequate performance looks like or where we should set the thresholds which distinguish between performance that is 'Inadequate', 'Requires improvement', 'Good' or 'Outstanding' performance.

4.13 Our current ratings for case inspection are based on consolidated results of all the cases inspected. We use these percentage boundaries to determine our ratings.

Lowest banding (key question level)	Rating (standard)
Minority of cases inspected were satisfactory: <50%	Inadequate
Too few: 50-64% satisfactory	Requires improvement
Reasonable majority satisfactory: 65-79%	Good
Large majority satisfactory: 80%+	Outstanding ☆

4.14 We do not yet have the same evidence on which to base our rating boundaries for the inspection of outcomes for people on probation and cannot assume that these same rating boundaries will be reasonable or fair. For the first PDU inspections we

will therefore report on the percentage of cases that we find to be satisfactory against each key outcome question, without assigning a rating category. Once we feel we have a sufficient evidence base we will consult further on where these ratings boundaries should lie.

QUESTION – Will the proposed approach to measuring personalised progress against outcomes help to drive improvement?

QUESTION – Will the proposed standard enable us to make reasonable and defensible judgements about sufficient progress?

QUESTION – Where maintaining stability is a reasonable and defensible expectation for an individual person on probation should we judge this to be sufficient or should we always expect that some progress will be made?

QUESTION – Should we rate outcomes when we introduce the standard or should we build up some baseline data first?

Feedback from people on probation

- 4.15 We want to give a stronger voice to people on probation and to hear about what has worked for them. We have tried a variety of ways of capturing these views but have not yet found a way that can reliably inform our judgements and ratings.
- 4.16 In the 2020 pilot inspection we contacted people on probation whose cases we inspected under domain two. Of those people on probation that we engaged with, many of them were overwhelmingly positive in their feedback. This presented us with difficulties in making judgements, as the feedback in many cases was significantly at odds with our inspectors' own views of the quality of support and supervision to the person on probation. There have also been issues with response rates which have severely restricted the sample of people our inspectors have been able to talk to.
- 4.17 Rather than restrict ourselves to views from a limited sample of domain two cases, we are now proposing to give everyone on probation in a local area the chance to give feedback. We will then use this to inform judgements about our domain one standards.
- 4.18 The first stage of the approach will be a short text survey containing a small number of questions to be sent out to all people on probation. This should increase the number of responses we obtain and so give us some quantitative data to work with. We will ask people on probation about their experience of probation, including the accessibility of services, appropriateness of interventions and relationships with probation practitioners. The text survey will be managed in house by the Inspectorate. We are still finalising the questions to be asked but they are likely to be drawn from the long list set out in Annexe 2.
- 4.19 Following on from the text survey, the second stage of our approach will be to offer people on probation the opportunity to provide further information by other methods such as interview by phone, in person or by electronic methods, should they want to give further comment.
- 4.20 To support both stages of the approach we will promote these opportunities for people on probation to have their say in the run up to and during fieldwork in each area, including, for example, posters in reception areas to encourage people on probation to engage with the inspection. We will also have interviewers on site during the fieldwork phase to talk to people on probation in reception areas, work

with probation councils, meet with unpaid work groups and with other groups where appropriate.

- 4.21 Findings from these survey responses and interviews with people on probation will be summarised in a dedicated section in the inspection report. The findings will inform the judgements and ratings that we make in domain one, for example on the range and quality of services offered or the accessibility of group meetings and appointments.
- 4.22 To help us deliver this proposed approach and gain the confidence of people on probation to share their true feelings about their supervision, we intend to commission an organisation, that has experience of employing people with lived experience of the criminal justice system to recruit, train and manage a small national network of field interviewers who have been subject to probation supervision themselves in the past.
- 4.23 This should help establish an environment where people on probation feel empowered to provide unreserved feedback about their experiences and will also provide opportunities for valuable work-related experience and skills.

QUESTION – Will our proposed approach to engaging people on probation provide a reliable basis to inform inspection judgements?

QUESTION – How can we maximise the engagement of people on probation with our proposed approach?

5. How to respond

The deadline for responses is 01 June 2021 23.59.

Please email responses to consultations@hmiprobation.gov.uk.

As part of your response, please ensure that:

- you state clearly who the submission is from, for example, from an individual in a personal capacity or sent on behalf of an organisation
- you include a brief description of yourself/your organisation
- you state clearly if you wish your submission to be confidential and/or you do not want to be contacted with follow-up enquiries (see confidentiality statement below).

Confidentiality statement

The information you send HM Inspectorate of Probation may be published in full or in a summary of responses. All information in responses, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the *Freedom of Information Act (2000)*, the *Data Protection Act (1998)* and the *Environmental Information Regulations (2004)*).

If you want your response to remain confidential, you should explain why confidentiality is necessary and your request will be acceded to only if it is appropriate in the circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding.

Annexe 1 – proposed inspection standards

1. Domain one

Regional standards to inform the regional contextual briefing

1.1 Leadership

The leadership of the organisation supports and promotes the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all people on probation.

1.1.1 Does the vision and strategy effectively drive the delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?

- a) Does the vision and strategy prioritise the quality of service and adherence to the evidence base?
- b) Does the vision and strategy address diversity considerations and set out equality objectives?
- c) Are the views of people on probation incorporated into the vision and strategy?
- d) Are there effective governance arrangements and clear delivery plans that translate the vision and strategy into practice?
- e) Does the organisation's culture promote openness, constructive challenge and ideas?
- f) Does the regional leadership team take a deliberate, strategic and informed approach to meeting diverse needs?
- g) Is the impact of the strategy on delivery monitored and regularly reviewed?
- h) Does the regional leadership team effectively influence partners, suppliers, the courts and other stakeholders to support the delivery of the vision and strategy?

1.1.2 Are potential risks to service delivery anticipated and planned for in advance?

- a) Are risks to the service sufficiently understood, with appropriate mitigations and controls in place?
- b) Are appropriate arrangements in place to ensure business continuity across the region in the event of major incidents?
- c) When carrying out changes to systems, processes or staffing is the impact on delivery assessed, including any diversity considerations, and appropriate action taken?
- d) Are risks to provision understood, with appropriate contingency plans in place?

1.1.3 Does the operating model support effective service delivery, meeting the needs of all people on probation?

- a) Does the operating model facilitate meaningful contact and continuity of contact with people on probation?
- b) Does the operating model encourage personalised approaches with people on probation, taking account of diversity factors?

- c) Where there are significant planned changes to the operating model, are these communicated and implemented effectively?

1.2 Staffing

Staff within the organisation are empowered to deliver a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all people on probation.

1.2.1 Do staffing and workload levels support the delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?

- a) Are regional staffing levels sufficient?
- b) Are regional staff workloads manageable?

1.2.2 Do the skills and profile of staff support the delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?

- a) Are roles for all staff clearly defined to support the delivery of a high-quality service?
- b) Is there a strategy in place to ensure that the workforce adequately reflects the diversity of the local population?
- c) Is there an effective strategy in place to ensure that the skills and diversity of the workforce meet the caseload needs?
- d) Is there an effective strategy in place to recruit and select mentors and volunteers?

1.2.3 Are arrangements for learning and development comprehensive and responsive?

- a) Is there an effective strategy in place to identify and develop the potential of individual staff?
- b) Is sufficient access provided to pre-qualifying training routes to support the delivery of a quality service?
- c) Is sufficient access provided to in-service training to support the delivery of a quality service?
- d) Do staff from all backgrounds have equitable access to promotion opportunities and reward and recognition?

1.2.4 Do managers pay sufficient attention to staff engagement?

- a) Are regional staff motivated to contribute to the delivery of a quality service?
- b) Is appropriate attention paid to monitoring and improving engagement levels of regional staff and of Heads of PDUs with the region?
- c) Do regional managers recognise and reward exceptional work?
- d) Is appropriate attention paid to staff safety and wellbeing, and building staff resilience? (as it applies to regional staff and Heads of PDUs)
- e) Are reasonable adjustments made for staff in accordance with statutory requirements and protected characteristics? (as it applies to regional staff and Heads of PDUs)

1.3 Services

A comprehensive range of high-quality services is in place, supporting a tailored and responsive service for all people on probation.

1.3.1 Is a sufficiently comprehensive and up-to-date analysis of the profile of people on probation, used by the organisation to deliver well-targeted services?

- a) Does the analysis capture sufficiently the desistance and offending-related factors presented by people on probation?
- b) Does the analysis capture sufficiently the risk of harm profile of people on probation?
- c) Does the analysis pay sufficient attention to diversity factors and to issues of disproportionality?
- d) Is there sufficient analysis of local patterns of sentencing and offence types?
- e) Is the analysis used effectively to target services?
- f) Does the analysis incorporate the views of people on probation?

1.4 Information and facilities

Timely and relevant information is available and appropriate facilities are in place to support a high-quality, personalised and responsive approach for all people on probation.

1.4.1 Do the policies and guidance in place enable staff to deliver a quality service, meeting the needs of all people on probation?

- a) Are national policies and guidance implemented and communicated effectively by the region to enable the delivery of a quality service?
- b) Are there policies and clear guidance in place about the full range of locally commissioned services, their suitability for individual people on probation and referral processes?
- c) Are local policies and guidance reviewed regularly, paying due regard to diversity issues?

1.4.2 Is analysis, evidence and learning used effectively to drive improvement?

- a) Do assurance systems and performance measures drive improvement?
- b) Is there a sufficient understanding of performance across the organisation?
- c) Does the region systematically learn from things that go wrong including SFOs?
- d) Where necessary, is action taken promptly and appropriately in response to performance monitoring, audit or inspection?

PDU standards

1.1 Leadership

The leadership of the organisation enables the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all people on probation.

1.1.1 Does the vision and strategy of the PDU leadership team effectively drive the delivery of high-quality service for all people on probation?

- a) Are staff, partners, suppliers and other stakeholders sufficiently engaged in delivering the vision and strategy?
- b) Does the PDU's culture promote openness, constructive challenge and ideas?
- c) Are there effective arrangements and clear local delivery plans that translate the vision and strategy into frontline practice?
- d) Does the PDU leadership team effectively influence partners, suppliers, the courts and other stakeholders to support the delivery of the vision and strategy?
- e) Does the PDU leadership team take a deliberate, strategic and informed approach to meeting diverse needs?

1.1.2 Are potential risks to service delivery anticipated and planned for in advance?

- a) Are risks to local service delivery sufficiently understood, with appropriate mitigations and controls in place?
- b) Are appropriate arrangements in place to ensure continued provision of local services in the event of major incidents?
- c) When carrying out changes to systems, processes or staffing is the impact on local service delivery, including equality impact, assessed and appropriate action taken?
- d) Are risks to local delivery sufficiently understood, with appropriate mitigations and controls in place?

1.1.3 Does the PDU deliver the operating model effectively to meet the needs of all people on probation?

- a) Is there alignment between the operating model and local plans?
- b) Do staff understand the local plans, how the service should be delivered and what they are accountable for?
- c) Are appropriate arrangements in place to ensure local business continuity in the event of major incidents?

1.2 Staffing

Staff are enabled to deliver a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all people on probation.

1.2.1 Do staffing and workload levels support the delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?

- a) Are PDU staffing levels sufficient?
- b) Are staffing levels planned and reviewed with changes made to meet the changing demands and profiles of people on probation?
- c) Do practitioners have manageable workloads, given the profile of the cases and the range of work undertaken?
- d) Do administrative staff have manageable workloads?
- e) Do Heads of PDUs and middle managers have manageable workloads?
- f) Are workloads actively managed, with resources being redeployed when reasonable and necessary, in response to local pressures?

1.2.2 Do the skills and profile of staff support the delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?

- a) Does the workforce adequately reflect the diversity of the local population?
- b) Do the skills and diversity of the workforce meet caseload needs?
- c) Are cases allocated to staff who are appropriately qualified and/or experienced?
- d) Is the potential of staff identified and developed?
- e) Where volunteers and mentors are used, are they supported to fulfil clearly defined roles?

1.2.3 Does the oversight of work support high-quality delivery and professional development?

- a) Do staff receive effective case-focussed supervision that enhances and sustains the quality of work with people on probation?
- b) Is an effective induction programme delivered to new staff that addresses issues of diversity and is accessible to all?
- c) Is the appraisal process used effectively to ensure that staff are delivering a quality service?
- d) Is a culture of learning and continuous improvement actively promoted?
- e) Are the learning needs of staff identified and met?
- f) Is poor staff performance identified and addressed?

1.2.4 Do managers pay sufficient attention to staff engagement?

- a) Are staff motivated to contribute to the delivery of a quality service?
- b) Is appropriate attention paid to monitoring and improving staff engagement levels?
- c) Do managers recognise and reward exceptional work?
- d) Is appropriate attention paid to staff safety and wellbeing, and building staff resilience?

- e) Are reasonable adjustments made for staff in accordance with statutory requirements and protected characteristics?

1.3 Services

A comprehensive range of high-quality services is in place, supporting a tailored and responsive service for all people on probation.

1.3.1 Does the organisation provide the right volume, range and quality of services to meet the needs of people on probation?

- a) Are appropriate services provided, either in-house or through other agencies, to meet the identified needs and risks?
- b) Is building strengths and enhancing protective factors central to the delivery of services?
- c) Are diversity factors and issues of disproportionality sufficiently addressed in the range of services provided?
- d) Are diversity factors and issues of disproportionality sufficiently addressed in the way that services are delivered?
- e) Are services delivered in appropriate and accessible locations?
- f) Is the quality of services reviewed and evaluated, including review of impact on diverse groups, with remedial action taken where required?

1.3.2 Are relationships with providers and other agencies established, maintained and used effectively to deliver high-quality services to people on probation?

- a) Are there effective relationships with other agencies that support desistance through access to mainstream services both during and after the sentence?
- b) Are there effective relationships with other agencies that manage the risk of harm to others?
- c) Are there effective arrangements with other agencies to support the personal circumstances and diversity needs of people on probation?
- d) Are courts kept up to date with the services available to support sentencing options?

1.4 Information and facilities

Timely and relevant information is available and appropriate facilities are in place to support a high-quality, personalised and responsive approach for all people on probation.

1.4.1 Do the policies and guidance in place enable staff to deliver a quality service, meeting the needs of all people on probation?

- a) Are policies and guidance communicated to and understood by relevant staff?
- b) Is learning communicated effectively?
- c) Are the views of people on probation and other key stakeholders sought, analysed and used to review and improve the effectiveness of services?

- d) Are service improvement plans supported through evaluation and development of the underlying evidence base?

1.4.2 Is analysis, evidence and learning used effectively to drive improvement?

- a) Are policies and guidance communicated to and understood by relevant staff?
- b) Is learning communicated effectively?
- c) Does the PDU collect and use diversity information to drive improvement?
- d) Are the views of people on probation and other key stakeholders sought, analysed and used to review and improve the effectiveness of services?
- e) Are service improvement plans supported through evaluation and development of the underlying evidence base?

1.4.3 Do the premises and offices enable staff to deliver a quality service, meeting the needs of all people on probation?

- a) Are the premises and offices sufficiently accessible to staff and people on probation?
- b) Do the premises and offices support the delivery of appropriate personalised work and the effective engagement of people on probation?
- c) Do the premises and offices provide a safe environment for working with people on probation?

1.4.4 Do the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) systems enable staff to deliver a quality service, meeting the needs of all people on probation?

- a) Are ICT systems regularly reviewed and updated to most effectively support and enhance service delivery?
- b) Is information exchanged with partners and other key stakeholders as necessary?
- c) Do the ICT systems support remote working where required?
- d) Do the ICT systems support the production of management information, including data on the probation needs and diversity factors of people on probation?

2. Domain two

2.1 Court work

The pre-sentence information and advice provided to court supports its decision-making.

2.1.1 Is the pre-sentence information and advice provided to court sufficiently analytical and personalised to the person on probation, supporting the court's decision-making?

- a) Does the information and advice draw sufficiently on available sources of information including child safeguarding and domestic abuse information?
- b) Is the person on probation meaningfully involved in the preparation of the report, and are their views considered?

- c) Does the advice consider factors related to the likelihood of reoffending?
- d) Does the advice consider factors related to risk of harm?
- e) Does the advice consider the person on probation's motivation and readiness to change?
- f) Does the advice consider the person on probation's diversity and personal circumstances?
- g) Does the advice consider the impact of the offence on known/identifiable victims?
- h) Is an appropriate proposal made to court?
- i) Is there a sufficient record of the advice given, and the reasons for it?

2.2 Assessment

Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, and actively involves the person on probation.

2.2.1 Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?

- a) Does assessment analyse the person on probation's motivation and readiness to engage and comply with the sentence?
- b) Does assessment analyse the person on probation's diversity and personal circumstances, and consider the impact these have on their ability to comply and engage with service delivery?
- c) Is the person on probation meaningfully involved in their assessment, and are their views taken into account?

2.2.2 Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?

- a) Does assessment identify and analyse offending-related factors?
- b) Does assessment identify the person on probation's strengths and protective factors?
- c) Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information?

2.2.3 Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risk of harm to others, including identifying who is at risk and the nature of that risk?
- b) Does assessment analyse any specific concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims?
- c) Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including past behaviour and convictions, and involve other agencies where appropriate?

2.3 Planning

Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, and actively involves the person on probation.

2.3.1 Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?

- a) Is the person on probation meaningfully involved in planning, and are their views taken into account?
- b) Does planning take sufficient account of the person on probation's diversity and personal circumstances which may affect engagement and compliance?
- c) Does planning take sufficient account of the person on probation's readiness and motivation to change which may affect engagement and compliance?
- d) Does planning set out how all the requirements of the sentence or licence/post-sentence supervision will be delivered within the available timescales?
- e) Does planning set a level, pattern and type of contact sufficient to engage the person on probation and to support the effectiveness of specific interventions?

2.3.2 Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting the person on probation's desistance?

- a) Does planning sufficiently reflect offending-related factors and prioritise those which are most critical?
- b) Does planning build on the person on probation's strengths and protective factors, utilising potential sources of support?
- c) Does planning set out the services most likely to reduce reoffending and support desistance?

2.3.3 Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) Does planning sufficiently address risk of harm factors and prioritise those which are most critical?
- b) Does planning set out the necessary constructive and/or restrictive interventions to manage the risk of harm?
- c) Does planning make appropriate links to the work of other agencies involved with the person on probation and any multi-agency plans?
- d) Does planning set out necessary and effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that have been identified?

2.4 Implementation and delivery

High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, and actively involve the person on probation.

2.4.1 Is the sentence/post-custody period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the person on probation?

- a) Do the requirements of the sentence start promptly, or at an appropriate time?
- b) Is sufficient focus given to maintaining an effective working relationship with the person on probation, taking into account their diversity needs?
- c) Are sufficient efforts made to enable the person on probation to complete the sentence, including flexibility to take appropriate account of their personal circumstances?
- d) Post-custody cases only: Was there a proportionate level of contact with the prisoner before release?
- e) Are risks of non-compliance identified and addressed in a timely fashion to reduce the need for enforcement actions?
- f) Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?
- g) Are sufficient efforts made to re-engage the person on probation after enforcement actions or recall?

2.4.2 Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the person on probation's desistance?

- a) Are the delivered services those most likely to reduce reoffending and support desistance, with sufficient attention given to sequencing and the available timescales?
- b) Wherever possible, does the delivery of services build upon the person on probation's strengths and enhance protective factors?
- c) Is the involvement of other organisations in the delivery of services sufficiently well-coordinated?
- d) Are key individuals in the person on probation's life engaged where appropriate to support their desistance?
- e) Is the level and nature of contact sufficient to reduce reoffending and support desistance?
- f) Are local services engaged to support and sustain desistance during the sentence and beyond?

2.4.3 Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?

- a) Is the level and nature of contact offered sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?
- b) Is sufficient attention given to protecting actual and potential victims?
- c) Is the involvement of other agencies in managing and minimising the risk of harm sufficiently well-coordinated?
- d) Are key individuals in the person on probation's life engaged where appropriate to support the effective management of risk of harm?

- e) Are home visits undertaken where necessary to support the effective management of risk of harm?

2.5 Reviewing

Reviewing of progress is well-informed, analytical and personalised, and actively involves the person on probation.

2.5.1 Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the person on probation's compliance and engagement?

- a) Does reviewing consider compliance and engagement levels and any relevant barriers, with the necessary adjustments being made to the ongoing plan of work?
- b) Is the person on probation meaningfully involved in reviewing their progress and engagement?
- c) Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of actions to implement the sentence?

2.5.2 Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the person on probation's desistance?

- a) Does reviewing identify and address changes in factors linked to offending behaviour, with the necessary adjustments being made to the ongoing plan of work?
- b) Does reviewing focus sufficiently on building upon the person on probation's strengths and enhancing protective factors?
- c) Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies working with the person on probation?
- d) Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of the progress towards desistance?

2.5.3 Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) 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?
- b) Is reviewing informed by the necessary input from other agencies involved in managing the person on probation's risk of harm?
- c) Is the person on probation (and, where appropriate, key individuals in the person on probation's life) meaningfully involved in reviewing their risk of harm?
- d) Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of the management of the person on probation's risk of harm?

2.6 Person on probation outcomes

Early outcomes are positive, demonstrating reasonable progress for the individual person on probation.

2.6.1 Do early outcomes demonstrate that reasonable progress has been made in line with the personalised needs of the person on probation?

- a) Have there been improvements in those factors most closely linked to offending both in developing strengths and addressing needs?
- b) Has there been a reduction in factors most closely related to risk of harm to others?
- c) Has there been a reduction in offending?
- d) Has there been sufficient compliance?

2.7 Statutory victim work

Relevant and timely information is provided to the victim/s of a serious offence, and they are given the opportunity to contribute their views at key points in the sentence.

2.7.1 Does initial contact with the victim/s encourage engagement with the victim contact scheme and provide information about sources of support?

- a) Is appropriate initial contact made soon after sentence, with consideration given to the timing of such contact?
- b) Are the initial letters appropriately personalised, considering the nature of the experience of the victim/s and any diversity issues?
- c) Is clear information given to victim/s about what they can expect at different points in a sentence?
- d) Do the initial letters include sufficient information to enable the victim/s to make an informed choice as to whether to participate in the scheme?
- e) Are victim/s informed about the action they can take if the prisoner attempts to make unwanted contact with them?
- f) Are victim/s referred to other agencies or services, or given information about available sources of help and support?

2.7.2 Is there effective information and communication exchange to support the safety of victims?

- a) Are victim liaison staff involved in MAPPAs where appropriate?
- b) Do victim liaison staff share relevant information with the probation practitioner?
- c) Are the concerns of the victim/s addressed and is attention paid to their safety in planning for release?
- d) Are victim liaison staff provided with appropriate and timely information about the management of the person on probation?

2.7.3 Does pre-release contact with the victim/s allow them to make appropriate contributions to the conditions of release?

- a) Are the victim/s given the opportunity to contribute their views to inform decisions about the person on probation's release in a timely way and supported in doing so?
- b) Are views expressed by victim/s treated appropriately and in accordance with the victim contact scheme?
- c) Are victim/s supported in making a Victim Personal Statement in parole applications?



Annexe 2 – experience of probation questionnaire

Please think about your recent experience of being on probation.

For each item, please tick the box that best describes what you think or feel.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Inspector use
I have been able to access the services I need to make positive changes to my life	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.3.2a				
I have been able to access these services in a reasonable time (I did not have to wait too long)	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.3.2a				
I am able to access services appropriate to my personal characteristics (for example, age, gender, ethnicity, sexuality etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.3.2c/d				
I have been able to access these services in my local area	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.3.2e				
I travelled a reasonable distance for my probation appointments	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.4.2a				
I have been able to contact probation services when required (for example, to change appointments)	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.4.2a				
I have been able to see my probation officer at a convenient time (for example, taking into account work or caring responsibilities)	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.4.2a				
When required, I have been able to have conversations in private with my probation officer	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.4.2b				
I feel safe accessing probation services	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.4.2c				
I have been asked for my views on how my probation services should run	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.4.4d				
Overall, I am happy with the support I have received from probation	<input type="checkbox"/>					

PLEASE TURN OVER...

