



Her Majesty's
Inspectorate of
Probation

Youth offending inspection

Domain three

Case assessment rules and guidance (CARaG)

v 3.2 May 2021

Effective from July 2021

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

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

Key:

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

Information about the child

	Inspection question	CARaG
I 1.1	Has the child been a Looked After Child at any time during the disposal being inspected?	<p>If the child is a Looked After Child, we check whether the youth offending team (YOT) being inspected is acting as 'home' or 'host' for the child.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the inspected YOT is the home YOT and the child has lived in the area covered by the inspected YOT for the whole of the disposal being inspected, we inspect the case as normal. • If the inspected YOT is the home YOT and the child has lived outside the area covered by that YOT for any part of the disposal being inspected, we check whether the inspected YOT has taken responsibility for assessment of the child. If yes, we inspect the case as normal, and would expect the YOT to ensure that sufficient services are delivered by the host YOT to meet the needs of the child and the disposal. • If the inspected YOT is not the home YOT for the child, and has not been responsible for assessment, we exclude the case from the inspection sample.
I 1.4	Gender	The options to answer this question are recommended as best practice by the Office for National Statistics. We expect to see evidence of the YOT having an age-appropriate conversation with the child to establish how they view their gender identity, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.5	Race and ethnic category	The options to answer this question are recommended as best practice by the Office for National Statistics. We expect to see evidence of the YOT having a conversation with the child to establish how they identify their race and ethnic category, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.6	Preferred language	We expect to see evidence of the YOT discussing with the child what is their preferred language, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.7	Religion/faith	The options to answer this question are recommended as best practice by the Office for National Statistics. We expect to see evidence of the YOT having a conversation with the child to establish how they identify their religion, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.8	Sexual identity	The options to answer this question are recommended as best practice by the Office for National Statistics. On balance, we believe that these questions can be used appropriately

		to capture any disadvantage experienced my children that is related to their sexual orientation. We expect to see evidence of the YOT having an age-appropriate conversation with the child to establish how they view their sexual identity. We expect the YOT to recognise that some children may not want to, or will feel unable to, describe their sexual identity and all may be unsure about it, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.9	Does the child have a disability?	Our definition of disability is 'a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on a child's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities'. The keywords are 'substantial and 'long-term'. In many cases, there will be a formal diagnosis of a specific condition. In cases where there is no specific diagnosis, we expect the YOT to recognise any symptoms experienced by the child and the impact on their life, which may be sufficient to be included under the definition of disability. We expect to see evidence of the YOT having a conversation with the child (and, if relevant, their parents or carers) about the nature of any disability, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.
I 1.11	What is the impact of the child's disability?	We expect the YOT to understand the extent of the impact of the disability on the child, and to take that into consideration as part of assessment, planning and delivery of services. We expect to see evidence of the YOT having a conversation with the child (and, if relevant, their parents or carers) about the impact of any disability, and for that to be accurately recorded on case records.

Assessment

A 1	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	
	<p>'Assessment' includes all assessment activity, not just the preparation of a written assessment. We expect to see assessment that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for assessment to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in a post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific assessment tool or document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.</p>	
	Inspection question	CARaG
A 1.1	<p>Is there sufficient analysis of offending behaviour, including the child's acknowledgement of responsibility for, attitudes towards and motivation for their offending?</p>	<p>Inspectors are looking for an analysis of the offending behaviour, which explains why the child committed the offence, not just how. Information from police documents should be used, and any discrepancies between the police account and the account given by the child should be explained.</p> <p>We expect analysis to explore what happened and what the child thought about it, at the time and afterwards. It should also include an assessment of the child's acceptance of responsibility, and their attitude to, or motivation for, the offence. The views of parents or carers are also important.</p>
A 1.2a	<p>Does assessment sufficiently analyse diversity issues?</p>	<p>Inspectors expect to see a meaningful exploration of any diversity factors relevant to the child. We recognise the nine protected characteristics (sex, age, race, religion or belief, disability, pregnancy or maternity, sexual orientation, gender reassignment and marriage or civil partnership). We expect the case manager to go beyond simply listing any factors relevant to the individual child, and to analyse the impact on the child. Factors such as speech and language needs, and learning difficulties or disabilities, including attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) or autism spectrum disorders, may count as disabilities, depending on the degree of impact on the child's life. Having identified relevant diversity factors and personal circumstances, inspectors expect to see an account of the impact these have specifically on the requirements of the disposal and the child's ability to engage and comply.</p>
A 1.2b	<p>Does assessment consider personal circumstances, including the wider familial and social context of the child?</p>	<p>Assessment should give consider the child's lived experience and how this may affect their ability to engage in an intervention. This can include practical issues, such as living in a rural area or the child's ability to attend appointments, as well as personal concerns, such as problems with attachment, speech and language needs, and learning difficulties</p>

		<p>or disabilities, including ADHD or autism spectrum disorders. YOT staff should consider whether the child has experienced trauma, and what impact this may have on their ability to engage in an intervention.</p> <p>For Looked After Children, we expect assessment to take account of the potential lack of trust children might have in professionals, or difficulties they might have in engagement, arising from their experiences of feeling unsupported or not cared for.</p> <p>Assessment should explain and analyse the wider familial context of the child's offending, and the social context within which the child is living. Information from parents and any other carers should be included. Inspectors will look for evidence that YOT staff have considered any identified issues that the parents or carers may have, such as mental health or drug or alcohol problems, and what impact these may have on the child.</p>
A 1.2c	Does assessment utilise information held by other agencies?	<p>We expect to see a check with children's social care and any education provider. The YOT should seek additional information from other partner or voluntary organisations that know the child, such as youth workers or support workers. If the child is looked after, the YOT should obtain from their social worker.</p> <p>Past assessments, where available, should be taken into account.</p>
A 1.3	Does assessment focus on the child's strengths and protective factors?	<p>Inspectors will look for a clear identification of the child's strengths or potential strengths. This should include personal characteristics such as resilience, a sense of self-efficacy or motivation to change. Strengths can be identified from the child, parents or carers, or education provider, and could be identified from the interview process and any self-assessment.</p> <p>Protective factors can include those that relate to the child, such as positive use of leisure time or engagement in education, and factors that relate to wider family and community networks. Inspectors will look for evidence that the YOT has identified any actual strengths and protective factors present, and any factors that have the potential to be enhanced.</p>
A 1.4	Does assessment analyse the key structural barriers facing the child?	<p>Structural barriers are those that prevent the child from gaining sufficient access to universal services such as education or healthcare. School exclusion is a particularly significant structural barrier, as it can make a child vulnerable to involvement in county lines and criminal exploitation.</p>

		Inspectors will look for an analysis of the impact that any structural barriers may have on the child. Assessment should also include consideration of how to overcome any structural barriers.
A 1.5	Is sufficient attention given to understanding the child's levels of maturity, ability and motivation to change?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the YOT has considered the maturity of the child. This should include anything that may have delayed maturity, such as experiences of neglect, or a diagnosis of developmental delay or learning difficulty.</p> <p>We expect the YOT to carry out some analysis of the child's ability to engage in the disposal. It should consider the impact of any cognitive or emotional issues, such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, autism spectrum disorders, learning difficulties, speech and language needs or acquired brain injury.</p> <p>Assessment should be based on all the information identified and should also include an assessment of any past engagement, including any episodes of good or poor compliance.</p> <p>Assessment should reflect the child's motivation to engage in the disposal, and how well they have understood the implications of the outcome.</p>
A 1.6	Does assessment give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of the victims, and opportunities for restorative justice?	<p>Inspectors will look for an assessment of the victim's needs and wishes, if known, and of the viability of a restorative justice intervention. This should include any views the victim may have on reparation or any restorative activity, such as a letter of apology, shuttle mediation or direct reparation. It may also include any victim impact statement, which could later be incorporated into victim awareness work.</p> <p>If a victim does wish to be involved in a restorative activity, the YOT should consider their suitability to participate in this. Any requests from the victim should be balanced with the requirements of the disposal and an awareness of its timescales and status. We recognise that, in some cases, indirect restorative activity may be more appropriate.</p> <p>Assessment should also consider the child's capacity and capability to comply with any restorative activity.</p> <p>Note: Any issues about the victims' safety are addressed later, in the section about keeping other people safe.</p>
A 1.7	Are the child and their parents or carers meaningfully involved in their assessment, and are their views taken into account?	Inspectors will look for evidence that the child has been interviewed as part of the assessment process, and that the interview has taken the child's needs into account. This should include finding suitable venue, and using language or tools that the child is able

		<p>to understand. There should be evidence in the assessment of the child's perspective on their behaviour. The YOT should make a reasonable effort to include the views of the child's parents or carers in the assessment. It should also consider the needs of the parents or carers when interviewing them.</p> <p>We expect to see use of interpreters where the child and/or parents or carers do not speak English as a first language. For a Looked After Child, the social worker's views should be included.</p>
A 1.10	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of the child's desistance?	<p>A clear, written assessment guides the management of the case and allows others to access key information, if required. HM Inspectorate of Probation does not require YOT to use any specific assessment tool, but any document or process used should support the recording of factors that impact on the child's desistance.</p> <p>While in other questions about assessment we look at a range of sources of evidence, this question is about a single assessment document. We think this is important, as it forms a reference for other staff who need to understand the assessment.</p>
A 1 S	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient assessment for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than that for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child. Sufficient assessment will enable the right decision to be made about the disposal to be used, and the right interventions to be put in place.</p> <p>Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all the questions in this section, and decide whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the important factors for the nature of the case. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient. For example, assessment that failed to take into account a child's learning disability may be judged insufficient, even if it covered all other factors relevant to desistance.</p>

A 2	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?	
	<p>'Assessment' includes all assessment activity, not just the preparation of a written assessment. We expect to see assessment that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for assessment to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in a post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific assessment tool or document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.</p>	
A 2.2	<p>Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child?</p>	<p>Risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child may come from external sources or may relate to their behaviour. Assessment should clearly identify the nature of risk, why that risk is present, and the likelihood and imminence of the risk to the child.</p> <p>Examples of external sources of safety and wellbeing concerns include familial abuse or neglect, exploitation by older or more sophisticated offenders, sexual exploitation or bullying.</p> <p>Internal sources of safety and wellbeing concerns could include mental or physical health, substance misuse, risk-taking behaviour or a low sense of self-worth.</p> <p>Having identified the safety and wellbeing concerns, assessment should analyse the potential impact of these on the child. The safety and wellbeing assessment should consider the circumstances of the case and the context in which any safety and wellbeing concern is likely to occur.</p>
A 2.3	<p>Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including other assessments, and involve other agencies where appropriate?</p>	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the YOT has asked for information from other agencies regarding the child safety and wellbeing. That information should be referred to in the overall assessment of the safety and wellbeing of the child. This should include any assessments relevant to safety and wellbeing that have been completed by other agencies, such as child protection/child safeguarding, child sexual exploitation screening, interviews after a return from missing episode or police intelligence. If the child was involved with other agencies in relation to their safety and wellbeing, information should be gained on how well they engaged with that agency and what facilitated or hindered this engagement.</p>
A 2.4	<p>What is the classification of safety and wellbeing of the child, according to the case manager?</p>	<p>Every case should have a classification of safety and wellbeing; this should be recorded accurately and consistently.</p> <p>There are four classifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low – no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium – some risk of safety and wellbeing concerns have been identified, but is unlikely to cause serious safety and wellbeing adverse outcomes unless circumstances change • High – high risk that a potential negative safety and wellbeing outcome will occur, and the impact could be serious • Very high – the negative safety and wellbeing concern could happen immediately, and the impact will be serious.
A 2.6	Is the case manager’s classification of safety and wellbeing reasonable?	In cases close to a boundary between classification levels, inspectors will consider whether the case manager’s classification was reasonable, in the context of all the information available to them at the time. We recognise that the precise level of safety and wellbeing is a point on a continuum, and that for cases close to the boundary between two levels it is a fine judgement about the actual level to be assigned. We expect to see a clear explanation of the reasons for the particular level of safety and wellbeing that has been set, based on AssetPlus definitions.
A 2.8	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment of the child's safety and wellbeing?	<p>A clear, written assessment guides the management of the case, and allows others to access key information if required to keep the child safe. HM Inspectorate of Probation does not require YOTs to use any specific assessment tool, but any document or process used should support recording of the factors that impact on the child’s safety and wellbeing.</p> <p>While in other questions about assessment we look at a range of sources of evidence, this question is about a single assessment document. We think this is important, as it forms a reference for other staff who need to understand the assessment.</p> <p>Even in cases where there are no factors related to safety and wellbeing, or the level of safety and wellbeing risk is correctly judged to be low, there should be a clear written explanation of this.</p>
A 2 S	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the sentence. Sufficient assessment for a child where there are few or no concerns about safety and wellbeing may be less detailed than assessment for a child believed to be at greater risk. Inspectors will consider the range of information gathered and the circumstances and characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Inspectors need to take into account their answers to all the questions in this section, and decide whether the strengths outweigh any deficiencies. We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the important factors related to keeping the child safe.</p>

Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

A 3 Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?

'Assessment' includes all assessment activity, not just the preparation of a written assessment. We expect to see assessment that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for assessment to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in a post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific assessment tool or document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the assessment process in its entirety.

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

A 3.1 Does assessment clearly identify and analyse any risk of harm to others posed by the child, including identifying who is at risk and the nature of that risk?

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

Identification of factors related to risk of harm

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

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

Risk of harm assessment should consider:

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

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

Specialist assessments include:

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

Risk to others can be indicated by behaviour that is or was intended to cause harm, such as a planned assault, or behaviour that either through recklessness or an unintended consequence could cause harm to another person. Examples of potential intended harm could include possession of a weapon, involvement in gang activities or sexual offending. Examples of unintended harm could include driving offences or violent behaviour due to poor management of emotions. We expect case managers to recognise the potential for long-term psychological harm arising from non-violent offences, such as domestic abuse or harassment.

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

If there is an identified person at risk (parent, sibling, peer, partner or ex-partner) this should be clearly identified, and the nature of that risk specified. Assessment should clearly state the nature of any risk to others, why that risk is present, and the likelihood and imminence of the risk. Where specific actual or potential victims cannot be identified,

		<p>assessment should look for any patterns in previous behaviour, and indicate any groups of potential victims, such as peers, partners or shop security staff.</p> <p>Where risk factors indicate that the child could cause multiple types of future harm (such as sexual, physical or emotional harm), assessment should clearly state which type of harm is likely to be caused to which potential victims.</p>
A 3.2	<p>Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including any other assessments that have been completed, and other evidence of behaviour by the child?</p>	<p>Inspectors will look for clear evidence that the YOT has asked other agencies for information about the risk of harm from the child.</p> <p>Inspectors look to YOT records for information about current and previous convictions, prosecution documents, and any out-of-court or informal disposals. We also expect to see information from the child and parents or carers. There may be additional information from the police, ViSOR (Violent & Sex Offender Register) and Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA). YOT staff should actively seek information from assessments completed by other agencies, including education, health and children's social care.</p> <p>We expect to see that YOT staff have considered the impact of factors such as learning difficulties, experience of trauma and neurodiversity on the future behaviour of the child. They should also refer to information about worrying behaviour that has not resulted in a criminal outcome, such as information from parents or carers, from community safety teams, from a school about bullying, or from police intelligence. Information from these sources should be analysed to indicate the likely impact on future behaviour; it is not sufficient to just list the issues.</p> <p>We expect YOT staff to have gathered as much relevant information as possible to inform assessment, but assessment should not be delayed unnecessarily if some is not available. The level of information will vary depending on the nature of the case. We base our judgements on the sources of information it would have been reasonable for the case manager to access at the time of the assessment. Case managers should actively seek all relevant information; if escalation processes are needed, they should be used to obtain key information that is held by other agencies.</p> <p>If the child has engaged with other agencies in relation to risk of harm, YOT staff should obtain information on how well they engaged with those agencies, and what facilitated or prevented that engagement.</p>

A 3.3

What is the risk of serious harm classification of the child, **according to the case manager?**

HM Inspectorate of Probation recognises the AssetPlus definitions of the levels of serious harm. 'Serious harm is defined as an event which is life-threatening and/or traumatic, and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, can be expected to be difficult or impossible.' While we expect all factors relevant to risk of harm to be identified and analysed, when assessing the level of risk of harm, we are looking at this in relation to the risk of *serious* harm.

Every case should have a classification for risk of serious harm, and this should be recorded accurately and consistently. There are four classifications:

- Low – no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome
- Medium – some risk of harm concerns have been identified, but is unlikely to cause serious harm unless circumstances change. Can be managed under normal case management
- High – high risk that a potential risk of serious harm outcome will occur, and the impact could be serious. Case may need increased case supervision
- Very high – the risk of serious harm concern could happen imminently, and the impact would be serious. Case will need increased case supervision.

HM Inspectorate of Probation recognises the AssetPlus definitions of the levels of serious harm. 'Serious harm is defined as an event which is life-threatening and/or traumatic, and from which recovery, whether physical or psychological, can be expected to be difficult or impossible.' While we do expect all factors relevant to risk of harm to be identified and analysed, when assessing the level of risk of harm, we are looking at the level of risk of serious harm.

Every case should have a classification for risk of serious harm, and this should be recorded accurately and consistently. There are four classifications:

- Low – no specific behaviours, events or people likely to cause an adverse outcome
- Medium – some risk of harm concerns have been identified, but is unlikely to cause serious harm unless circumstances change. Can be managed under normal case management
- High – high risk that a potential risk of serious harm outcome will occur, and the impact could be serious. Case may need increased case supervision
- Very high – the risk of serious harm concern could happen imminently, and the impact would be serious. Case will need increased case supervision.

The best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour. The level of serious harm is defined in terms of the likelihood of serious harmful behaviour happening.

Assessment should be clear about the level and nature of the risk presented to any/all categories of actual or potential victim. Where relevant, assessment should reflect the nature of the circumstances in a custodial setting and consider the risk to others in custody, as well as those in the community.

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

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

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

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there evidence that the child is engaging in other behaviour that directly or indirectly increases the likelihood of serious harm? <p>Nature of risk:</p> <p>Absence of immediate access to victims, whether by custody, school exclusion, child protection arrangements or the ending of a relationship, or other external constraints, is not in itself a reason to lower the assessed level of RoSH.</p> <p>Evidence that the child is genuinely complying with arrangements to protect victims or reduce access to victims may contribute towards lowering the assessed level of RoSH.</p>
A 3.5	Is the case manager's classification of risk of serious harm reasonable?	In cases close to a boundary between classification levels, inspectors will consider whether the case manager's classification was reasonable in the context of all the information available to them at the time. We recognise that the precise level of risk of serious harm is a point on a continuum, and that for cases close to the boundary between two levels it is a fine judgement about the actual level to be assigned. We expect to see a clear explanation of the reasons that the particular level of risk of serious harm has been set, based on AssetPlus.
A 3.8	Is there a clear, written record of the assessment to keep other people safe?	<p>A clear, written assessment is necessary to guide the management of the case, and to allow others to access key information if required. We do not set a specific model for this assessment tool, but the assessment should identify the factors that impact on the child's risk of harm to others, and there should be a clear categorisation and a rationale for that decision. Even in cases where there are no factors related to risk of harm, or the level of risk of serious harm is correctly judged to be low, there should be a clear written record of this.</p> <p>For the other assessment questions, we look at a range of sources of evidence; this question is about a single assessment document. We think this is important, as it forms a reference for other staff who need to understand the assessment.</p>
A 3 S	Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of assessment meets the needs of the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient assessment for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than those for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence.</p> <p>Inspectors will consider the range of information gathered, the nature of offending and other behaviour and the circumstances and characteristics of the child, including any risks they present to other people. Sufficient assessment will enable the right decision to be</p>

made about the disposal to be used, and the right interventions to be put in place, paying due attention to the safety of others.

We are not looking for perfection, but for a sufficient assessment of the most important factors. Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact on the safety of others. So, in some circumstances, a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.

Planning

P 1 Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?		
	'Planning' includes all planning activity, not just the preparation of a written plan. We expect to see planning that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for planning to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in a post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific planning document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the planning process in its entirety.	
P 1.1	Does planning set out the services most likely to support desistance, paying sufficient attention to the available timescales and the need for sequencing?	<p>Inspectors look for planning that sets out activities that will support the child's desistance. Planning should build upon the child's strengths and increase protective factors. Planning should recognise the child's attitude towards their offending and aim to build positive engagement in meaningful activities, with the aim of reducing offending.</p> <p>Planning should set out which activities will be completed by the YOT and which by the child, and should be understandable to the child. It should be clear what the child is expected to do, and when they should have achieved that outcome. Where the assessment has failed to identify desistance factors, inspectors still expect planning to address them.</p> <p>We expect to see evidence that the plan has been shared with, and understood by, the child, and their parent or carer.</p> <p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the planning addresses any key structural barriers that are preventing the child from achieving their potential. These might include how to reintegrate the child into education; facilitate or improve access to mainstream services such as mental health or substance misuse; or meet accommodation needs.</p>

		<p>Planned activities should normally be sequenced in order of priority. When this is not the case, there should be a clear explanation about why, such as where initial work is needed to enhance engagement or increase motivation.</p> <p>Planned activities should be achievable within the timescales of the disposal. For very short interventions, there should be consideration of exit planning and utilising community resources on completion of the disposal. In some cases, a disposal can be as short as one session, or up to three months' intervention.</p>
P 1.2a	Does planning sufficiently address diversity issues?	Inspectors will look for planning that takes sufficient account of the child's diversity needs. Planning should set out how these needs can be accommodated. Where there are protected characteristics or other relevant factors, inspectors expect the YOT to have considered the impact of these on the child's ability to engage and comply with the disposal. For example, planning should accommodate any religious commitments or child care responsibilities of the child. Where assessment has failed to identify diversity factors, inspectors still expect planning to address them.
P 1.2b	Does planning take sufficient account of the child's personal circumstances including the wider familial and social context of the child?	<p>We expect YOT staff to consider the child's social context and lived experience. Planning should take into consideration the role of the wider family, both in the support they can offer and also any caring role the child may have. Where the assessment has failed to identify familial or social context factors, inspectors still expect planning to address them.</p> <p>Planning should identify where activities and interventions will be delivered, and should ensure this is achievable for the child. This might include considering the level of family support and affordability, and any additional impact of living in a rural area. Planning should accommodate any educational commitments of the child.</p>
P 1.3	Does planning take sufficient account of the child's strengths and protective factors, and seek to reinforce or develop these as necessary?	Planning should build on the child's strengths and protective factors, whether or not they have been identified through assessment. This includes planning to develop internal strengths as well as external protective factors. Planning should actively facilitate the child's attendance at positive activities, and build on any existing positive activities that have been identified.
P 1.4	Does planning take sufficient account of the child's levels of maturity, ability and motivation to change, and seek to develop these as necessary?	<p>Inspectors will look for planning that takes into consideration the child's maturity and identifies the interventions that are the best suited to their needs. There should be evidence that YOT staff considered these when developing the plan.</p> <p>YOT staff should also consider the child's level of motivation to address the issues that underlie the offending behaviour. They should identify interventions that support and encourage the child to increase their motivation to change.</p>

		Planning should reflect whether the nature of the intervention is entirely voluntary, and should set out any potential implications if the child does not engage.
P 1.5	Does planning take sufficient account of opportunities for community integration, including access to mainstream services following completion of out-of-court disposal work?	Planning should recognise that the duration of out-of-court disposals is often relatively brief, and should make appropriate links to services that could offer ongoing support to the child and their parents or carers.
P 1.6	Does planning give sufficient attention to the needs and wishes of the victims?	Where a victim has expressed wishes in relation to the out-of-court disposal, these should be included in the planning. Planned activity may include direct or indirect reparation activities, a letter of explanation or victim impact statement, which can be used in victim awareness work, or other restorative activities. If a victim has not chosen to participate in a restorative disposal, their potential wishes, for example writing a letter of apology, could be included in planning to remain on file.
P 1.7	Are the child and their parents or carers meaningfully involved in planning, and are their views taken into account?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence that the child and their parents or carers have been able to contribute to and participate in the planning. If the child is estranged from parents then another person with caring responsibilities should be engaged with the planning. This could be a professional person, such as a support worker, or an extended family member. 'Involvement' should be more than simply signing the planning documents or completing a self-assessment tool.</p> <p>The views of the child and their parents or carers should be clear, including what they believe will work for them, such as information about preferred learning styles, suitability of timings for appointments and what will facilitate their engagement in the plan. This may include reference to their experience of previous contact with the YOT or other services, if applicable. We expect the YOT to make reasonable efforts to share the plan with the child and their parents or carers. If reasonable efforts to contact the parents or carers have not been successful, this will not necessarily result in a negative response.</p>
P 1.9	Is planning proportionate to the disposal type, with interventions capable of being completed within appropriate timescales?	Inspectors will look for the planning to be appropriate to the disposal and to the circumstances of the child. The minimum length of an out-of-court disposal is a single session and the maximum is three months. Any activities identified in the plan should be capable of being finished within the time period. The level, pattern and type of contact planned should be appropriate within the expectations of the disposal, proportionate to the case, and set at a level that meets the needs of the child. In some cases, the needs of the case could be met with a single session, while in others, a high level of intervention would be expected. If the

		child has needs that are likely to extend beyond the time available, the YOT should identify a community-based organisation to meet those needs.
P 1 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the child's desistance needs and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than that for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Sufficient planning will enable the right interventions to be put in place. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning to address the important factors for the nature of the case.</p> <p>Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

P 2	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	
	'Planning' includes all planning activity, not just the preparation of a written plan. We expect to see planning that is proportionate to the nature of the child's circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for planning to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in a post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific planning document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the planning process in its entirety.	
P 2.1	Does planning promote the safety and wellbeing of the child, sufficiently addressing risks?	<p>Planning should include both work to be done directly with the child and parents or carers, and work to be done by the YOT, potentially on a multi-agency basis. The child and parents or carers should be involved in the planning to address safety and wellbeing. Where the assessment has failed to identify safety and wellbeing needs, inspectors still expect planning to address them.</p> <p>Planning should identify activities, services and interventions that address any safety and wellbeing concerns. Planning should also strengthen existing protective factors in the case. Planning should make it clear who is to complete actions, and how the child will know when the desired outcomes have been achieved.</p>

		<p>Planning should be proportionate to the nature of the disposal and to the circumstances of the child, so planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution, may be less detailed than that of a youth conditional caution or post-court disposal.</p>
P 2.2	<p>Does planning involve other agencies where appropriate, and is there sufficient alignment with other plans (e.g. child protection or care plans) concerning the child?</p>	<p>Planning may involve actions carried out by other agencies. Where this is the case, it should be clear in the planning. Where the child is subject plans managed by other agencies, for example, child protection planning, the YOT's plan should be coordinated with, and make reference to them. We expect to see clear information-sharing arrangements.</p> <p>Planning should recognise and build on any internal and/or external controls and interventions necessary to keep the child safe.</p> <p>Where more than one agency is involved, it should be very clear which agency will lead on each activity, and how they will communicate with each other about work with the child.</p>
P 2.3	<p>Does planning include necessary contingency arrangements for those risks that have been identified?</p>	<p>We expect to see clear contingency planning, that recognises the factors that may lead to a change in the child's level of safety and wellbeing. Planning should set out the actions to take if these factors change, and if the risk to the child increases or decreases.</p> <p>Contingency planning should be specific and identify who should complete the actions and by when. It is not sufficient simply to state that planning will be reviewed if the perceived risk changes.</p>
P 2 S	<p>Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?</p>	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the child's safety and wellbeing needs and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than that for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Sufficient planning will enable the right measures to be put in place to keep the child safe. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning to address the important factors for the nature of the case.</p> <p>Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Where there are no factors related to keeping the child safe, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.</p>

P 3	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	
	<p>'Planning' includes all planning activity, not just the preparation of a written plan. We expect to see planning that is proportionate to the nature of the child's offending, circumstances and the type of out-of-court disposal used. It is reasonable for planning to be less detailed in a first disposal, such as a community resolution, than in a post-court sentence. We do not require the use of any specific planning document in out-of-court disposal cases. We judge the quality of the planning process in its entirety.</p> <p>HM Inspectorate of Probation expects all factors relevant to risk of harm to be planned for (not just factors related to risk of serious harm).</p>	
P 3.1	Does planning promote the safety of other people, sufficiently addressing risk of harm factors?	<p>Planning should identify activities and interventions that minimise any identifiable risk of harm to others, and address all factors relevant to keeping other people safe. Planning should include both work to be done directly with the child and parents or carers, and work to be done by the YOT, potentially on a multi-agency basis. The child and parents or carers should be involved in the planning to address the safety of others.</p> <p>Planning should specify who is to complete the activities, and how the child will know when 3 outcome has been achieved. Planning should address all factors relevant to keeping other people safe, irrespective of whether they had been identified at the assessment stage.</p> <p>Planning should be proportionate to the nature of the disposal and to the child's circumstances, so planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution, may be less detailed than that for a youth conditional caution or post-court disposal.</p>
P 3.2	Does planning involve other agencies where appropriate?	<p>Planning may involve some actions carried out by other agencies. Where this is the case, it should be clear in the planning. Where the child is subject to plans managed by other agencies, for example, MAPPA, the YOT's plan should be coordinated with, and make reference to them. We expect to see clear information-sharing arrangements.</p> <p>Planning should recognise and build on any internal and/or external controls and interventions necessary to keep other people safe.</p> <p>Where more than one agency is involved, it should be very clear which one will lead on each activity, and how they will communicate with each other about work with the child.</p> <p>The content and rationale of other agencies' plans should be known to the responsible officer. Copies of the plans should be available on the case record. Plans should be integrated, and they should support each other.</p>

P 3.3	Does planning address any specific concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims?	<p>Inspectors will look for planning that minimises any risk to identifiable or potential victims. There should be clear communication with the victim worker, and clear planning to keep actual victims safe.</p> <p>Planning should identify actions and interventions to address risks to others, including peers, people in authority, family members and other children.</p>
P 3.4	Does planning include necessary contingency arrangements for those risks that have been identified?	<p>In cases where there are factors related to risk of harm to others, we expect to see clear contingency planning, that recognises and anticipates the factors that may lead to a change in the child's level of risk to others. Planning should be proportionate to the level and nature of the risk of harm in the case, and more detailed contingency planning should be in place for those presenting a high or very high risk of serious harm. Contingency planning should be specific to known risk factors. It should set out actions to take if these factors change, and if the risk to others increases or decreases.</p> <p>Contingency planning should be specific and identify who should complete the actions and by when. It is not sufficient simply to state that planning will be reviewed if the perceived risk changes.</p>
P 3 S	Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of planning meets the risk of harm issues in the case and the nature of the disposal. Sufficient planning for a first disposal, such as a community resolution or a youth restorative disposal, may be less detailed than that for a youth conditional caution or a post-court sentence. Inspectors will consider the nature of the offence and the characteristics of the child.</p> <p>Sufficient planning will enable the right measures to be put in place to keep other people safe. We are not looking for perfection, but for sufficient planning to address the important factors for the nature of the case.</p> <p>Where there are deficits, inspectors will consider their impact in the context of the case. So, in some circumstances, a particular omission may be so important as to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Where there are no factors related to keeping other people safe, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.</p>

Implementation and delivery

D 1	Does service delivery support the child's desistance?	
D 1.1	Are the delivered services those most likely to support desistance, with sufficient attention given to sequencing and the available timescales?	<p>We recognise that there is little published evidence of the effectiveness of specific interventions in the work delivered to children as part of out-of-court disposals. We believe that a strengths-based approach, tailored to the needs of a child, is likely to have a positive impact on desistance.</p> <p>Inspectors will look at the specific interventions and services actually delivered to the child, and the reasons for choosing them. They will judge the appropriateness of the amount and nature of interventions delivered, based on the circumstances of the case. Interventions should build upon the strengths of the child, and enhance any protective factors. There should be a clear rationale for why specific interventions have been delivered, and how they meet the needs of the child.</p> <p>Interventions should start in a timely manner. Where a child has not engaged in interventions, we expect to see adjustments made to planned work to increase their engagement. Where interventions have not been delivered as planned, there should be a clear explanation recorded, and planning should be adjusted.</p> <p>Where several interventions to support desistance are planned, they should be sequenced and delivered in order of priority. We expect to see an explanation for any changes to sequencing, for example, to enhance engagement or increase motivation.</p> <p>Interventions to support desistance can be very brief for some out-of-court disposals. In some cases, a single session can be sufficient, but in more complex cases interventions can last up to three months.</p> <p>If the intervention is voluntary, such as for a community resolution, and the child has not engaged, inspectors will make a judgement about the level of effort, skills and tenacity used to try to engage the child in delivery of interventions.</p>
D 1.2a	Does service delivery account for the diversity issues of the child?	Inspectors expect interventions to be delivered in a way that takes into account the child's protected characteristics. For example, the content of interventions should be personalised to take into account the gender, age and disability of children. The timing and location of interventions should also be personalised.
D 1.2b	Does service delivery reflect the wider familial and social context of	We expect interventions to be delivered in a way that takes into account relevant factors for the child, such as self-identity or living in a rural area. Appointments should be made at times and places that are suitable for the child. There should be evidence that the child is able to understand

	<p>the child, involving parents or carers, or significant others?</p>	<p>and respond to the interventions being offered. Reasonable adaptations should be made to meet the child's needs. YOT staff should consider wider familial circumstances, including the child's lived experience, and their role in the family. If the child has experienced trauma, this should be responded to appropriately.</p> <p>For Looked After Children, we expect the local authority social worker to be involved in delivering interventions.</p> <p>Feedback should be given to the child about how they have engaged in the intervention, and YOT staff should obtain the child's views on their experience of the process. This could be done after each intervention session, or as part of the closure process. Feedback should be given to parents or carers about how the child has engaged. YOT staff should also consider how the parents or carers can reinforce and support the interventions, for example, by supporting desistance-based activities.</p>
D 1.3	<p>Is sufficient focus given to developing and maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents or carers?</p>	<p>Service delivery should aim to maintain a positive working relationship with the child and parent or carer. There should be evidence that the child's preferred method of communication has been used. If there are difficulties in the working relationship, we expect to see efforts made to explore the reasons for this and consideration of possible resolutions. We expect workers involved with the child to motivate them and reinforce positive behaviour. This may include the use of motivational interviewing techniques, pro-social modelling or other communication and support methods. Inspectors will need to be satisfied that the worker has not adopted a standardised approach to their work with the child, but has judged the best way to maximise the potential for a successful outcome.</p>
D 1.4	<p>Is sufficient attention given to encouraging and enabling the child's compliance with the work of the YOT?</p>	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence of effective engagement with the child and their parent or carer, going beyond simply attending appointments. We expect to see reasonable attempts to engage parents or carers to support the work of the YOT.</p> <p>In youth conditional caution cases, if the child does not comply with the conditions, the case should be referred back to the police to consider prosecution. In youth caution cases, the interventions are entirely voluntary, and there are no consequences for non-compliance. In community resolution and other lower-level disposals, the local operating model will set out whether or not to refer the case back to the police if the child does not comply. We expect the case manager to have a clear understanding of the legal position in their YOT, and this should be understood by the child and their parent or carer. For statutory disposals, there should be evidence that the case manager has responded to incidents of non-engagement using a clear measured and motivating approach to encourage compliance.</p>

D 1.5	Does service delivery promote opportunities for community integration, including access to mainstream services?	Most out-of-court disposals are short, so the need to refer to mainstream services should be considered as early as possible from the start of the disposal. There should be evidence of how the YOT will support access to mainstream services, which could include evidence of supporting the child at the first appointment or session with other agencies. We expect to see that the YOT has supported any existing engagement with community services, and that it has ensured its own interventions do not distract from this. Every effort should be made to ensure that the child accesses universal services, such as education or healthcare. If the child is likely to need further intervention after completing the out-of-court disposal, the YOT should actively support this transition.
D 1.6	Is the delivery of services proportionate to the type of out-of-court disposal, and completed within the required timescales?	The delivery of services should be in line with the nature of the disposal; as a maximum, this should be designed to be completed within a three-month period. In many cases, the intervention could be completed much sooner; sometimes a one-off session can be appropriate. Delivery of services should start promptly, and a disposal should not extend beyond the three-month period simply because there was a delay in planning and delivering services. The only exception to this may be when there have been delays in setting up a restorative process.
D 1 S	Does service delivery support the child's desistance?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of the service delivery meets the needs of the case. They will consider whether strengths in the service delivery outweigh any insufficiency. While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall, the service delivery is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the service delivery may have many strengths, a particular omission may be important enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Interventions to support desistance can be very brief for an out-of-court disposal; in some cases, as little as one session can be sufficient. But in more complex cases, interventions can be longer, to the maximum of three months.</p> <p>If the child has not engaged, whether the disposal is voluntary or statutory, this does not necessarily result in a negative judgement. Inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort, skills and tenacity the YOT has shown in engaging with the child.</p>

D 2	Does service delivery effectively support the safety of the child?	
D 2.1	Does service delivery promote the safety and wellbeing of the child?	<p>Inspectors will assess whether the services, activities and interventions that are delivered directly to the child are those most likely to promote safety and wellbeing. Where assessment has failed to identify safety and wellbeing factors, inspectors still expect service delivery to address them. Inspectors will consider what it is reasonable to expect to be delivered, given the nature and type of intervention.</p> <p>Service delivery could include interventions and controls that will promote the child's safety. It could also include interventions that develop internal strategies for staying safe, such as self-esteem work, or work with parents or carers to monitor potential and manage behaviour. There should be a record of the intended impact of the interventions and how the child has responded to them.</p> <p>If no services were delivered due to the non-engagement of the child, inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort that YOT workers made to deliver appropriate services to the child.</p>
D 2.2	Is the involvement of other organisations in keeping the child safe sufficiently well-utilised and coordinated?	<p>Inspectors will look for evidence of how the YOT has worked with other agencies to manage and promote the child's safety and wellbeing. We expect the YOT to be active in referring children to other agencies, including child safeguarding arrangements. If other agencies are involved with delivering work to support the safety and wellbeing of the child, that work should be well-coordinated with a clear record of each agency's role, and clear information-sharing arrangements.</p> <p>The YOT should support the child to engage with other agencies as required, and should seek feedback on how well they have engaged with those agencies.</p> <p>The work of the other agencies should link to, and support, the work of the YOT to assist in promoting the child's safety and wellbeing. In some cases, it is possible for all the relevant work in connection with safety and wellbeing to be delivered by other organisations, but the YOT should still seek feedback.</p>
D 2 S	Does service delivery effectively support the safety of the child?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of the work to promote the child's safety and wellbeing meets the needs of the case. They will consider whether strengths in the service delivery outweigh any insufficiency? While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall, the service delivery is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the service delivery may have many strengths, the importance of a particular omission may be enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p>

Whether the child has engaged or not, inspectors will expect the YOT to recognise its overarching responsibility for child safeguarding, and to ensure multi-agency safeguarding arrangements are used where necessary.

Where there are no factors related to keeping the child safe, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.

D 3 Does service delivery effectively support the safety of other people?

D 3.1	Are the delivered services sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?	<p>Inspectors will judge the overall quality of the work is sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm to other people. We expect to see sufficient contact with the child to allow delivery of constructive interventions and to allow the case manager to monitor factors related to risk of harm to others. We would expect to see a higher level of contact in cases assessed as high or very high risk of serious harm. We expect case managers to engage with parents or carers and other key individuals in the child's life.</p> <p>In addition to services delivered specifically to the child, we expect to see clear joint working with any other agencies involved in work with the child, with a view to minimising the risk of harm.</p> <p>Whether the child has engaged or not, inspectors will expect the YOT to recognise its overarching responsibility for public protection.</p> <p>Service delivery could include interventions that develop internal strategies for managing and reducing risky behaviour, such as managing emotions or knife-crime work, or external controls, such as curfew, which may be available on a youth conditional caution. There should be evidence of the intended impact of the interventions and how the child has responded.</p> <p>We also expect to see joint work with other agencies, when required. Inspectors will consider what it would have been reasonable to expect the case manager and others to deliver, given the nature and type of intervention.</p> <p>Whether the child has engaged or not, inspectors will expect the YOT to recognise its overarching responsibility for public protection.</p>
D 3.2	Is sufficient attention given to the protection of actual and potential victims?	<p>Where a specific victim has been identified, interventions delivered should contribute to keeping that victim safe. If the victim will be made safer by restorative work, or victim awareness intervention, this should be considered.</p> <p>We expect to see a response to any reasonable wishes from victims in connection with youth conditional caution requirements. There should be regular liaison with the victim worker if</p>

		involved. There should be evidence that the YOT has considered the protection of any actual or potential victim, irrespective of whether the victim has engaged in a restorative intervention. If no services were delivered due to the non-engagement of the child, inspectors will make a judgement on the level of effort the YOT has made to deliver appropriate services.
D 3 S	Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?	<p>Inspectors will judge whether the overall quality of work to support the safety of other people meets the needs of the case. They will consider whether strengths in the service delivery outweigh any insufficiency. While there may be deficits, the inspector may be able to conclude that overall, this service delivery is sufficient within the context of the case. Conversely, while the service delivery may have many strengths, a particular omission may be important enough to lead to a judgement of insufficient.</p> <p>Where there are no factors related to keeping other people safe, inspectors will answer 'Yes'.</p>

Case manager interview

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