



Her Majesty's  
Inspectorate of  
Probation

# **Consultation on probation inspection standards**

July 2022

# Contents

---

<b>Foreword</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Background</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Our guiding principles</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>3. What is changing</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Summary of consultation questions</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>5. How to respond</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Regional standards- Option (a)</b> .....	<b>15</b>
1.1 Leadership.....	15
1.2 Staff .....	16
1.3 Services- Promoting Desistance .....	17
1.4 Services- Protecting the Public .....	18
1.5 Services- Delivering the Sentence of the Court.....	19
<b>Regional standards- Option (b)</b> .....	<b>20</b>
1.1 Leadership.....	20
1.2 Staff .....	21
1.3 Services- Promoting Desistance .....	22
1.4 Services- Protecting the Public .....	23
1.5 Services- Delivering the Sentence of the Court.....	24
<b>PDU standards- Domain one</b> .....	<b>25</b>
1.1 Leadership.....	25
1.2 Staff .....	26
1.3 Services .....	27
<b>PDU standards- Domain two</b> .....	<b>28</b>
2.1 Court work .....	28
2.2 Assessment .....	28
2.3 Planning .....	29
2.4 Implementation and delivery.....	30
2.5 Reviewing.....	31
2.6 Outcomes.....	32
2.7 Statutory victim work .....	32

## Foreword

---

In 2021 we began our revised inspections of the way that probation services are delivered following the unification of provision into one national probation service. We focus on the things that make a difference to the quality of probation services and we target recommendations to drive improvement where it is needed. To achieve this, we focus our core inspections on the quality of work being done with individual people on probation including assessment and planning by probation practitioners and whether these plans are then delivered in practice, including the range and quality of services and interventions delivered. We do this through our inspection of local probation delivery areas (PDUs).

Our first year of inspection has demonstrated the breadth and complexity of provision involved in delivering local services through a national and regional infrastructure. We have reported on the delivery of services provided by PDUs, but we want to better capture the arrangements and activity at a regional level alongside our local PDU inspections. This will give a fuller picture of provision and what drives the delivery that we see at PDU level, enabling better accountability and targeting of recommendations.

In order to achieve this, we need to inspect probation regions alongside our PDU inspections in that region. In this consultation we are asking for views on proposed standards for the leadership, staffing and services organised and managed at regional level (what we call our domain one standards), and our streamlined PDU standards and how we make our judgements.

The proposed changes will enable our inspection regime to better fit the unified delivery model for probation. In making the changes we will continue to provide a proportionate approach to inspection and allow ourselves and those who provide probation services to drive improvement and identify effective practice.

This consultation focusses on our standards and closes at midnight on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2022. 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 The probation service is split into 12 regions across England and Wales. Each region is overseen by a Regional Probation Director who has responsibility for the commissioning and delivery of probation services in their region. Operational delivery in each region is organised around 108 Probation Delivery Units (PDUs), led by a manager. We currently inspect the quality of sentence management work at this PDU level, by inspecting the cases of individuals on probation as well as the way probation is led, managed and staffed locally.
- 1.2 Our judgements and ratings are at PDU level, though we recognise that contextual, national, regional, local or systemic issues can impact on a PDU's ability to deliver and comment on this in our reports and recommendations. For example, a national strategy, a regional directive or the engagement of partner agencies in the delivery of services. We pay attention to these issues and set out the reasons for shortfalls in our inspection report and tailor recommendations accordingly. But our judgements and ratings will always reflect the quality of delivery at the level at which we inspect, irrespective of the underlying reasons and rationale. This is not changing.
- 1.3 There are many benefits to this approach in our PDU inspections, most notably that we can comment and rate in real time at a meaningful, local level to drive improvement. What we do not do currently is rate regions against domain one standards (as we do not inspect against standards in the regions) or comment in detail on individual areas of service delivery. It is this that we now want to address.

## 2. Our guiding principles

---

- 2.1 Our proposed approach is guided by the following principles.
- **Efficiency-** We will make use of information that we already have. We will not duplicate activity, either our own or that of others. Where data and information reliably and meaningfully transfer between PDUs and a region, we should use that data and information rather than looking for more.
  - **Reasonable alignment-** We will ensure read across our PDU and regional inspections.
  - **Clarity-** If we are rating standards twice, at PDU and at regional level, we will be clear what the difference is.
  - **Accountability-** We will continue to judge and rate what we find at the level at which we find it, describing accountability in the report narrative and recommendations.

## 3. What is changing

---

- 3.1 This consultation covers our proposed changes to the standards framework.
- 3.2 Our PDU standards are split into two domains. Domain one focuses on organisational delivery and domain two focuses on the inspection of cases. We rate PDUs and recommendations in the PDU reports can be aimed at PDU, regional and/or national levels. We report on probation performance at probation delivery unit (PDU) level.
- 3.3 We undertake regional reviews to support our PDU inspections. The purpose of the regional review is to analyse the functions of the region and to identify the regional enablers and barriers to a PDU meeting our inspection standards.
- 3.4 We undertake a national review to support our regional reviews and PDU inspections. The purpose of the national review is to analyse the national enablers and barriers for regional and PDU delivery and to set the context for what we see in our regional reviews and PDU inspections.
- 3.5 We do not currently make judgements about sufficiency against standards at a regional level through the regional and national reviews, nor do we rate at this level. Instead, we ask a set of questions on areas linked to the PDU standards and the wider regional and national functions. This allows us to analyse and understand what we see at a PDU level and the broader context for that.
- 3.6 From April 2023 we propose to introduce regional inspections alongside PDU inspections. These regional inspections will replace the current regional review activity and will be delivered against a set of standards covering regional arrangements and activity.

### **Our approach**

- 3.7 We think that inspecting end to end provision is the best way to capture the delivery and impact of probation services for those who experience them. We do this by focussing our standards on how inputs and activities deliver improved outputs and, in turn, better outcomes for service users 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). We think that our PDU inspection standards do this well. However, PDU provision is influenced by national policy and regional implementation arrangements and our current inspection of PDUs does not allow us to rate regions or comment on individual strands of regional service delivery. We propose to rate regions against domain one standards and that we should continue to rate PDUs against domain one and domain two standards. This is a new set of standards, replacing the regional questions and aligning as appropriate with domain one PDU standards that will enable us to rate regional arrangements and activity.
- 3.8 We will make judgements at a regional level against the regional standards based on the evidence that we find. Evidence for regional inspection will include management information where appropriate across the whole region and findings from our PDU inspections in that region. As with our PDU inspections, we will use the standard level regional ratings to generate an overall rating for each region

and will use the same four-point rating scale for each standard as for our PDU inspections, rating each standard as 'inadequate'; 'requires improvement'; 'good' and 'outstanding'.

### 1 Should we inspect and rate regional arrangements and activity against domain one standards?

3.9 Regional leadership and regionally managed functions and interventions support delivery at PDU level of high-quality services, and we believe that holding regions to account through rating them in this way is the best way to ensure that implementation at regional level effectively supports delivery at PDU level. We will use our findings about work in individual cases at a PDU level to triangulate what we see being delivered to people on probation with the arrangements and activity that we see at the regional level. We propose to use aggregated domain two data from our PDU inspections to make our judgements of regions, rather than collecting new case data.

3.10 Under each key question in the regional standards there will be *delivery* prompts to ensure the link between regional implementation and delivery at PDU level is captured. Evidence will include case data from domain two PDU inspections and other management information. This will ensure that findings from PDUs are included with judgements we make about the region. To cover these elements of delivery, each key question asks about the regional arrangements and activity *driving* rather than *enabling* effective delivery of high-quality services.

### 2 Is the proposed read across from regions to delivery at PDU level sufficient and clear?

### 3 How should PDU findings influence regional judgements?

3.11 We have also revised the PDU domain one standards in line with our guiding principles. These are now fewer in number and align where appropriate to regional standards. There is no proposed separate domain two inspection at regional level and domain two standards for PDU inspections remain unchanged. Instead, we will use the PDU domain two data to assess the impact of regional arrangements and activity at a practice level.

3.12 We want to be able to comment on separate areas of service delivery at a regional level. The areas of service delivery that we want to be able to comment on separately within the three *Services* standards are:

- Commissioned rehabilitative services
- Accredited programmes
- Structured interventions and toolkits
- Unpaid work
- Victims
- Risk management
- Safeguarding/Domestic abuse
- Resettlement
- Sentence delivery

3.13 We have organised the *Services* standards into groupings which map onto the functions of the regional teams- 1.3 Reducing reoffending; 1.4 Protecting the public and 1.5 Delivering the sentence of the court - plus two of the key enablers of all of these things – 1.1 Leadership and 1.2 Staff. In our PDU inspections we look at the work delivered at an individual case level where relevant for the areas under the services standards. For the regional inspection we want to look more at the arrangements and activity for that delivery. This will include case information from domain two PDU inspection but also evidence such as management information from that area of work, interviews and focus groups and could include observation and site visits for example at unpaid work sites.

**4 What evidence should we draw on to make judgements against the regional standards?**

3.14 We will continue to make judgements about statutory victim work at a regional level. In any inspection sample period, there are likely to be very low numbers of custodial sentences commencing and/or cases being released from custody, where a victim is eligible for statutory victim contact. This makes it difficult to rate this work at a PDU level, based on very small numbers of cases. In addition, we understand that in many areas, victim teams are organised across broader areas than a single PDU. Inspecting at a regional level would ensure numbers of cases were sufficient to form a basis for judgement and rating and would not be complicated by potentially different accountability arrangements for delivery of that service.

**Frequency of inspection**

3.15 As currently, we will inspect around a third of PDUs in a region at one time and will use the evidence from that third to inform our regional judgements, along with regional management information relating to all the region's PDUs.

**5 Can we reliably use inspection ratings for a third of PDUs in a region to inform overall regional judgements in that region? Are there any pitfalls to this and how can we avoid them?**

3.16 We expect our regional inspections, starting in April 2023, to draw on a range of evidence including a) regional management information provided in advance on key issues such as staffing, backlogs and performance of commissioned services b) The findings of PDU inspections from that region in the year of the regional inspection and c) onsite fieldwork during which we will interview regional leaders, managers and staff involved in the delivery of all regional functions, as well as with external partners.

3.17 We are committed to ensuring that our inspection activity is proportionate and for this reason we need to consider how frequently we inspect each region. Annual inspection of each region would be disproportionate alongside PDU inspections and would offer limited time for improvements to be made in between inspections. Inspecting each region every two years, at the rate of six regions per year, would offer a more balanced approach and provide sufficient time for improvements to be made. Alternatively, we could inspect each region every third year unless the region was rated as 'Inadequate' in which case we could re-inspect sooner.

**6 What is the optimum frequency for regional inspection?**



## Leadership

- 3.18 We have revised our leadership standard for regional and PDU inspections. This better reflects what we consider to be the key leadership functions and capabilities and clearly places accountability for implementation and delivery in the right places. As with our current inspections, this standard will include within its scope the leadership team not just an individual leader. The proposed standard covers three leadership competencies; strategic leadership, operational leadership, and engagement with staff. These key domains of leadership are drawn from research-based approaches including the *Primary Colours Model of Leadership* (Professor David Pendleton, 2012), see figure 1 below, and *Future-Engage-Deliver: The Essential Guide to your Leadership* (Steve Radcliffe, 2008). We have included a fourth standard to measure the extent to which the region or PDU is a learning organisation, continuing to look to improve its leadership against all three of the other domains.

*Figure 1- Primary Colours Model of Leadership* (Professor David Pendleton, 2012)



## 7 Does the proposed Leadership standard capture the important factors in effective leadership at the right levels?

### Staff

- 3.19 We have not changed our expectations around probation staff and what staff need in order to deliver a high-quality service. We will continue to look at staff and workload levels, the skills and profile of staff and the provision of learning and development to staff. We propose to consider all of these elements in both regional and PDU inspections. The engagement of staff will move to sit under our leadership standard in the judgements that we make about interpersonal elements of leadership.
- 3.20 Our PDU inspections against the staff standard will include all staff directly deployed to that PDU. Our regional inspection against the staff standard will include regional staff, the data and information that we gather from the PDUs that we inspect and the management information from across the region, for example on staff vacancies and attrition rates and workloads. Our definition of regional staff is unchanged and includes the Regional Probation Director and all staff and managers in the following teams: operations, interventions, performance and quality, community integration, regional equality and diversity leads, corporate services, business partner functions, learning and development staff allocated to the region and any other roles that are not directly managed by only one PDU.

## 8 In addition to evidence about PDU staffing what other evidence should we use in making judgements about staffing at a regional level?

### Services

- 3.21 We currently have one inspection standard for *Services* in our PDU inspections. The breadth of work that this covers at regional level is too big and variable in nature to be contained in one standard. Instead, we propose three standards relating to delivery of key probation functions: 1.3 promoting desistance, 1.4 protecting the public and 1.5 delivering the sentence of the court. These are largely aligned with the core functions of probation regions. Each key question under each of the three standards covers six basic areas as follows:
- Is there effective planning of services based on analysis of risks, need and strengths?
  - Is there effective partnership working arrangements impacting on delivery?
  - Does this drive effective delivery?
  - Is this supported by sufficient staffing?
  - Is this supported by sufficient access to the right services?
  - Is this underpinned by regular robust evidence-based monitoring, evaluation and review?
- 3.22 The key questions on *Commissioned Rehabilitative Services*, *Unpaid work*, *Structured Interventions* and *Accredited Programmes* focus strongly on the delivery element with individual prompts asking about services being provided at the right time, in the right locations, of the right type and in the right volume.

3.23 Regional standard *1.3 Services- Promoting Desistance* covers a lot of activity. We need to consider how we reach an overall judgement on this if some key questions are answered more favourably than others, for example if the quality of accredited programme delivery is poor but commissioned rehabilitative services are outstanding. We could take a quantitative scoring approach to this based on points for each key question which then generates a rating for the standard. This would enable us to comment on each area of delivery separately and in sufficient detail while avoiding the averaging out that can be the result of making judgements across a breadth of information.

9 [Is the balance between the standards right?](#)

10 [How can we create an overall rating for each of these standards given the breadth of evidence and diversity of delivery covered by each standard?](#)

### **Standards' structure**

3.24 Whilst it would be possible to include all of the different interventions managed at regional level within our promoting desistance standard (1.3) – this would create an unwieldy and disproportionately large standard compared to the other ones and would be difficult to assign an overall rating to. We are therefore suggesting that one of the larger interventions should sit under standard 1.5 – 'Delivery of the sentence of the court'.

3.25 Two options are proposed. The first option has the unpaid work key question under *1.3 Services- Promoting Desistance* and has the resettlement key question under *1.5 Services- Delivering the Sentence of the Court*. The structure recognises the rehabilitative function of unpaid work as a key factor in high-quality unpaid work delivery. As such it aligns with our *Thematic Inspection of the Delivery of Unpaid Work* (HMI Probation, 2016) and more recently *The Future of Unpaid Work- Payback with a Purpose* (Bennet, N and Bowen, P, 2022) delivery. This structure also aligns neatly with the probation service's own regional functions. It could be argued however that unpaid work is generally seen by the public and sentencers as a punishment rather than a desistance focused intervention and for this reason would fit better under standard *1.5 Services- Delivering the Sentence of the Court*.

3.26 The second option is to switch the two key questions around and have the unpaid work key question under *1.5 Services- Delivering the Sentence of the Court* and have the resettlement key question under *1.3 Services- Promoting Desistance*.

3.27 There are drawbacks and benefits to each approach, and we want to gather the views of consultees to help us finalise this important element of our approach.

11 [Are we looking at the right things through our regional prompts?](#)

12 [Under which standard should unpaid work and resettlement sit?](#)

### **ICT and Facilities**

3.28 Our current standard *1.4 ICT and Facilities* has been disbanded in the proposed regional and PDU standards. ICT and facilities issues are largely nationally controlled and as such will sit under the national review. Learning and evaluation will sit under *1.1 Leadership*. Where ICT facilities do have a role, in the effective delivery of programmes for example, they appear as prompts at regional level.

## **Regional standards**

### ***Standard 1.1 Leadership***

Key question 1.1.1 Vision and strategy

Key question 1.1.2 Delivery

Key question 1.1.3 Engagement

Key question 1.1.4 Analysis, evidence and learning

### ***Standard 1.2 Staffing***

Key question 1.2.1 Workload

Key question 1.2.2 Staff skills and profile

Key question 1.2.3 Learning and development

### ***Standard 1.3 Services- Promoting Desistance***

Key question 1.3.1 Commissioned Rehabilitative Services

Key question 1.3.2 Accredited Programmes

Key question 1.3.3 Structured Interventions

Key question 1.3.4 Unpaid work or Resettlement

### ***Standard 1.4 Services- Protecting the Public***

Key question 1.4.1 Victims

Key question 1.4.2 Risk Management

Key question 1.4.3 Safeguarding/Domestic Abuse

### ***Standard 1.5 Services- Delivering the Sentence of the Court***

Key question 1.5.1 Unpaid work or Resettlement

Key question 1.5.2 Sentence delivery

Summary of consultation questions

## 4. Summary of consultation questions

---

1. Should we inspect and rate regional arrangements and activity against domain one standards?
2. Is the proposed read across from regions to delivery at PDU level sufficient and clear?
3. How should PDU findings influence regional judgements?
4. What evidence should we draw on to make judgements against the regional standards?
5. Can we reliably use inspection ratings for a third of PDUs in a region to inform overall regional judgements in that region? Are there any pitfalls to this and how can we avoid them?
6. What is the optimum frequency for regional inspection?
7. Does the proposed Leadership standard capture the important factors in effective leadership at the right levels?
8. In addition to evidence about PDU staffing what other evidence should we use in making judgements about staffing at a regional level?
9. Is the balance between the standards right?
10. How can we create an overall rating for each of these standards given the breadth of evidence and diversity of delivery covered by each standard?
11. Are we looking at the right things through our regional prompts?
12. Under which standard should unpaid work and resettlement sit?

## 5. How to respond

---

The deadline for responses is **midnight on 21 August 2022**.

Please email responses to [consultations@hmiprobation.gov.uk](mailto:consultations@hmiprobation.gov.uk).

We recognise the breadth of the questions that we are asking and whilst keen to get a comprehensive response we do not require each respondent to answer every question.

As part of your response, please ensure that:

- You state clearly who the submission is from, for example, whether from yourself 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.

# Annex 1

## Regional standards- Option (a)

---

### 1.1 Leadership

Regional leadership drives the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for people on probation.

#### 1.1.1 Does the regional vision and strategy drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all people on probation?

- a) Does the regional vision and strategy set out a clear plan for how quality supervision and services for people on probation will be delivered?
- b) Are there effective governance arrangements and clear regional delivery plans that translate this vision and strategy into practice?
- c) Is the regional vision and strategy based on a comprehensive analysis of risk, needs and strengths?
- d) Does the regional vision and strategy take account of and set out how diverse needs will be met?

#### 1.1.2 Does regional leadership activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all people on probation?

- a) Are high quality services delivered to all people on probation in this region? *[Link to PDU data for 1.3.1 and 2.4 and to regional level MI on delivery]*
- b) Do regional leaders sufficiently understand performance across the region?
- c) Do regional leaders engage sufficiently with partners and stakeholders to ensure effective delivery of the vision and strategy?
- d) Does the regional leadership take a deliberate, strategic and informed approach to meeting diverse needs?
- e) Are risks to service delivery understood sufficiently, with appropriate mitigations and controls in place?

#### 1.1.3 Do regional leaders actively engage with staff to drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all people on probation?

- a) Are staff in this region bought into the regional vision and strategy. Are they well engaged, motivated and proud to work for the Probation Service? *(Underpinned by a staff engagement strategy and linked to PDU data on engagement and morale plus regional level Civil Service and HM Inspectorate of Probation staff survey data)*
- b) Does the region's culture promote openness, constructive challenge and ideas?
- c) Do regional leaders equitably provide promotion opportunities and recognise and reward exceptional work?
- d) Do regional leaders ensure reasonable adjustments are made for staff in accordance with statutory requirements and protected characteristics?
- e) Are there clear routes from complaints, with support for staff if they feel discriminated against or experience any form of discrimination?

#### **1.1.4 Do regional leaders use analysis, evidence and learning to drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all people on probation?**

- a) Are the views of people on probation and other key stakeholders sought, analysed and used to review and improve the effectiveness of services?
- b) Are services improved through evaluation and development of the underlying evidence base?
- c) Where necessary, is action taken promptly and appropriately in response to performance monitoring, audit or inspection?

### **1.2 Staff**

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?** *(Evidence will be drawn from the relevant prompts under 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 as well as from the PDU inspections\*, EIA and domain one fieldwork activity).*

- a) Are regional staffing levels sufficient?
- b) Are PDU staffing levels sufficient? \*
- c) Are regional staff workloads manageable?
- d) Are PDU staff workloads manageable? \*
- e) Are staffing levels across the region (regional and PDU staff) planned and reviewed, with changes made to meet the demands and profiles of people on probation?

#### **1.1.5 Do the skills, profile and management oversight of staff support the delivery of a high-quality service?**

- a) Do regional staffing structures and arrangements support effective service delivery?
- b) Are management oversight arrangements effective?
- c) Do the skills and diversity of regional staff meet the needs of people on probation?
- d) Do the skills and diversity of PDU staff meet the needs of people on probation? \*

#### **1.1.6 Are arrangements for learning and development comprehensive and responsive?**

- a) Is the potential of regional staff developed?
- b) Is the potential of PDU staff developed? \*
- c) Is sufficient access provided to training for regional staff?
- d) Is sufficient access provided to training for PDU staff? \*
- e) Is a culture of learning and continuous improvement actively promoted across the region?
- f) Is poor regional and PDU staff performance identified and addressed?



### 1.3 Services- Promoting Desistance

Regional arrangements and activity enable the delivery of high-quality services to promote desistance.

#### **1.3.1 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive Commissioned Rehabilitative Services (CRS)?**

- a) Is there a comprehensive analysis of risk, needs and strengths underpinning regional CRS commissioning? (Define comprehensive- and include breakdown by PDU level, risk and diversity)
- b) Are effective arrangements in place that enable partnership working between CRS providers and probation practitioners including well understood referral routes?
- c) Are CRS delivered in a timely manner and in the right locations?
- d) Are there sufficient CRS start and completion rates?
- e) Is there sufficient CRS capacity and range of provision consistently available to meet demand?
- f) Are CRS staff appropriately skilled and trained?

#### **1.3.2 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive Accredited Programmes?**

- a) Is there a comprehensive analysis of risk, needs and strengths underpinning the type and availability of accredited programmes? (Define comprehensive- include breakdown by PDU level, risk and diversity)
- b) Are effective arrangements in place that enable partnership working between interventions teams and probation practitioners including well understood referral routes?
- c) Are accredited programmes delivered in a timely manner and in the right locations?
- d) Are there sufficient accredited programmes start and completion rates?
- e) Is there sufficient volume of accredited programmes and range of provision consistently available to meet demand?
- f) Are accredited programme delivery staff appropriately skilled and trained?

#### **1.3.3 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive Structured Interventions and toolkits?**

- a) Is there a comprehensive analysis of risk, needs and strengths underpinning the type and availability of structured interventions and toolkits? (Define comprehensive- include breakdown by PDU level, risk and diversity)
- b) Are effective arrangements in place that enable partnership working between interventions teams and probation practitioners including well understood referral routes?
- c) Are structured interventions and toolkits delivered in a timely manner and in the right locations?
- d) Is work on structured interventions and toolkits started and completed?

- e) Is there sufficient volume and range of evidence based structured interventions and toolkits consistently available to meet demand?
- f) Are interventions delivery staff appropriately skilled and trained?

#### **1.3.4 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high quality, personalised and responsive unpaid work (UPW)?**

- a) Is there effective planning of UPW provision based on analysis of risk, needs and strengths?
- b) Are arrangements in place that enable effective partnership working between UPW teams and probation practitioners including well understood referral routes?
- c) Is UPW delivered in a timely manner and in the right locations?
- d) Are there sufficient UPW start and completion rates?
- e) Is there sufficient UPW capacity and range of provision consistently available to meet demand?
- f) Is staffing sufficient to ensure to ensure that UPW is delivered in line with rehabilitative requirements?

### **1.4 Services- Protecting the Public**

Regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality services to protect the public.

#### **1.4.1 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high quality, personalised and responsive services to victims?**

- a) Is there effective planning for victims' services based on analysis of risk, needs and strengths?
- b) Do the regional strategic arrangements drive high quality work with victims?
- c) Are effective regional strategic arrangements in place to enable partnership working where appropriate?
- d) Is there a sufficient volume and range of services available for victims?
- e) Is staffing sufficient to ensure to ensure high quality services to victims?

#### **1.4.2 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive management of risk of harm?**

- a) Do the regional risk management arrangements drive effective multi agency risk management practice?
- b) Are there sufficient services in place to ensure that risk is effectively managed and rehabilitative activities are provided?
- c) Is staffing sufficient to ensure to ensure that risk is effectively managed and rehabilitative activities are provided?
- d) Are risk management arrangements informed by regular robust evidence-based monitoring, evaluation and review?

### **1.4.3 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive safeguarding and domestic abuse practice?**

- a) Are there robust information sharing agreements enabling effective local information sharing and partnership arrangements for each PDU?
- b) Does the region ensure that effective risk management arrangements for safeguarding and domestic abuse are in place?
- c) Do the regional safeguarding and domestic abuse arrangements drive effective multi-agency practice?
- d) Is robust multi-agency monitoring, evaluation and review regularly undertaken including from SCRs and SFOs where there are safeguarding or domestic abuse issues? (*cross ref learning and evaluation key question from 1.1.4*)

## **1.5 Services- Delivering the Sentence of the Court**

Regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of the Sentence of the Court.

### **1.5.1 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive resettlement provision? (Resettlement provision includes OMiC implementation and delivery)**

- a) Is there effective planning for resettlement services based on analysis of risk, needs and strengths?
- b) Are effective arrangements in place to enable partnership working including effective handovers and assessments?
- c) Does the region ensure that there is sufficient volume and quality of services in place to ensure that resettlement is effectively managed and rehabilitative activities are provided?
- d) Is staffing sufficient to ensure that resettlement is effectively managed and rehabilitative activities are provided?
- e) Do procured services ensure continuity of service after release?

### **1.5.2 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive breach and recall practice?**

- a) Is regional data and information analysed to determine and enable high quality, relevant delivery?
- b) Are sentence requirements being delivered?
- c) Do partnership arrangements enable a personalised, responsive service to be provided to enable the delivery of sentence requirements, prevent breach and manage those released from prison?
- d) Is breach practice delivered appropriately?
- e) Is recall practice delivered appropriately?
- f) Is staffing sufficient to effectively manage breach and recall?

## Regional standards- Option (b)

---

### 1.1 Leadership

Regional leadership drives the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for people on probation.

#### 1.1.1 Does the regional vision and strategy drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all people on probation?

- a) Does the regional vision and strategy set out a clear plan for how quality supervision and services for people on probation will be delivered?
- b) Are there effective governance arrangements and clear regional delivery plans that translate this vision and strategy into practice?
- c) Is the regional vision and strategy based on a comprehensive analysis of risk, needs and strengths?
- d) Does the regional vision and strategy take account of and set out how diverse needs will be met?

#### 1.1.2 Does regional leadership activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all people on probation?

- a) Are high quality services delivered to all people on probation in this region? *[Link to PDU data for 1.3.1 and 2.4 and to regional level MI on delivery]*
- b) Do regional leaders sufficiently understand performance across the region?
- c) Do regional leaders engage sufficiently with partners and stakeholders to ensure effective delivery of the vision and strategy?
- d) Does the regional leadership take a deliberate, strategic and informed approach to meeting diverse needs?
- e) Are risks to service delivery understood sufficiently, with appropriate mitigations and controls in place?

#### 1.1.3 Do regional leaders actively engage with staff to drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all people on probation?

- a) Are staff in this region bought into the regional vision and strategy. Are they well engaged, motivated and proud to work for the Probation Service? *(Underpinned by a staff engagement strategy and linked to PDU data on engagement and morale plus regional level Civil Service and HM Inspectorate of Probation staff survey data)*
- b) Does the region's culture promote openness, constructive challenge and ideas?
- c) Do regional leaders equitably provide promotion opportunities and recognise and reward exceptional work?
- d) Do regional leaders ensure reasonable adjustments are made for staff in accordance with statutory requirements and protected characteristics?
- e) Are there clear routes from complaints, with support for staff if they feel discriminated against or experience any form of discrimination?

#### **1.1.4 Do regional leaders use analysis, evidence and learning to drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all people on probation?**

- a) Are the views of people on probation and other key stakeholders sought, analysed and used to review and improve the effectiveness of services?
- b) Are services improved through evaluation and development of the underlying evidence base?
- c) Where necessary, is action taken promptly and appropriately in response to performance monitoring, audit or inspection?

### **1.2 Staff**

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?** *(Evidence will be drawn from the relevant prompts under 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 as well as from the PDU inspections\*, EIA and domain one fieldwork activity).*

- a) Are regional staffing levels sufficient?
- b) Are PDU staffing levels sufficient? \*
- c) Are regional staff workloads manageable?
- d) Are PDU staff workloads manageable? \*
- e) Are staffing levels across the region (regional and PDU staff) planned and reviewed, with changes made to meet the demands and profiles of people on probation?

#### **1.2.2 Do the skills, profile and management oversight of staff support the delivery of a high-quality service?**

- a) Do regional staffing structures and arrangements support effective service delivery?
- b) Are management oversight arrangements effective?
- c) Do the skills and diversity of regional staff meet the needs of people on probation?
- d) Do the skills and diversity of PDU staff meet the needs of people on probation? \*

#### **1.2.3 Are arrangements for learning and development comprehensive and responsive?**

- a) Is the potential of regional staff developed?
- b) Is the potential of PDU staff developed?\*
- c) Is sufficient access provided to training for regional staff?
- d) Is sufficient access provided to training for PDU staff? \*
- e) Is a culture of learning and continuous improvement actively promoted across the region?
- f) Is poor regional and PDU staff performance identified and addressed?

### 1.3 Services- Promoting Desistance

Regional arrangements and activity enable the delivery of high-quality services to promote desistance.

#### **1.3.1 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive Commissioned Rehabilitative Services (CRS)?**

- a) Is there a comprehensive analysis of risk, needs and strengths underpinning regional CRS commissioning? (Define comprehensive- and include breakdown by PDU level, risk and diversity)
- b) Are effective arrangements in place that enable partnership working between CRS providers and probation practitioners including well understood referral routes?
- c) Are CRS delivered in a timely manner and in the right locations?
- d) Are there sufficient CRS start and completion rates?
- e) Is there sufficient CRS capacity and range of provision consistently available to meet demand?
- f) Are CRS staff appropriately skilled and trained?

#### **1.3.2 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive Accredited Programmes?**

- a) Is there a comprehensive analysis of risk, needs and strengths underpinning the type and availability of accredited programmes? (Define comprehensive- include breakdown by PDU level, risk and diversity)
- b) Are effective arrangements in place that enable partnership working between interventions teams and probation practitioners including well understood referral routes?
- c) Are accredited programmes delivered in a timely manner and in the right locations?
- d) Are there sufficient accredited programmes start and completion rates?
- e) Is there sufficient volume of accredited programmes and range of provision consistently available to meet demand?
- f) Are accredited programme delivery staff appropriately skilled and trained?

#### **1.3.3 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive Structured Interventions and toolkits?**

- a) Is there a comprehensive analysis of risk, needs and strengths underpinning the type and availability of structured interventions and toolkits? (Define comprehensive- include breakdown by PDU level, risk and diversity)
- b) Are effective arrangements in place that enable partnership working between interventions teams and probation practitioners including well understood referral routes?
- c) Are structured interventions and toolkits delivered in a timely manner and in the right locations?
- d) Is work on structured interventions and toolkits started and completed?

- e) Is there sufficient volume and range of evidence based structured interventions and toolkits consistently available to meet demand?
- f) Are interventions delivery staff appropriately skilled and trained?

**1.3.4 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive resettlement provision? (Resettlement provision includes OMiC implementation and delivery)**

- a) Is there effective planning for resettlement services based on analysis of risk, needs and strengths?
- b) Are effective arrangements in place to enable partnership working including effective handovers and assessments?
- c) Does the region ensure that there is sufficient volume and quality of services in place to ensure that resettlement is effectively managed and rehabilitative activities are provided?
- d) Is staffing sufficient to ensure that resettlement is effectively managed and rehabilitative activities are provided?
- e) Do procured services ensure continuity of service after release?

**1.4 Services- Protecting the Public**

Regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality services to protect the public.

**1.4.1 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high quality, personalised and responsive services to victims?**

- a) Is there effective planning for victims' services based on analysis of risk, needs and strengths?
- b) Do the regional strategic arrangements drive high quality work with victims?
- c) Are effective regional strategic arrangements in place to enable partnership working where appropriate?
- d) Is there a sufficient volume and range of services available for victims?
- e) Is staffing sufficient to ensure to ensure high quality services to victims?

**1.4.2 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive management of risk of harm?**

- a) Do the regional risk management arrangements drive effective multi agency risk management practice?
- b) Are there sufficient services in place to ensure that risk is effectively managed and rehabilitative activities are provided?
- c) Is staffing sufficient to ensure to ensure that risk is effectively managed and rehabilitative activities are provided?
- d) Are risk management arrangements informed by regular robust evidence-based monitoring, evaluation and review?

### **1.4.3 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive safeguarding and domestic abuse practice?**

- a) Are there robust information sharing agreements enabling effective local information sharing and partnership arrangements for each PDU?
- b) Does the region ensure that effective risk management arrangements for safeguarding and domestic abuse are in place?
- c) Do the regional safeguarding and domestic abuse arrangements drive effective multi-agency practice?
- d) Is robust multi-agency monitoring, evaluation and review regularly undertaken including from SCRs and SFOs where there are safeguarding or domestic abuse issues? (*cross ref learning and evaluation key question from 1.1.4*)

## **1.5 Services- Delivering the Sentence of the Court**

Regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of the Sentence of the Court.

### **1.5.1 Do regional arrangements and activity drive the effective delivery of high-quality, personalised and responsive unpaid work (UPW)?**

- a) Is there effective planning of UPW provision based on analysis of risk, needs and strengths?
- b) Are arrangements in place that enable effective partnership working between UPW teams and probation practitioners including well understood referral routes?
- c) Is UPW delivered in a timely manner and in the right locations?
- d) Are there sufficient UPW start and completion rates?
- e) Is there sufficient UPW capacity and range of provision consistently available to meet demand?
- f) Is staffing sufficient to ensure that UPW is delivered in line with rehabilitative requirements?

### **1.5.2 Do regional arrangements and activity drive high-quality, personalised and responsive delivery of sentence requirements??**

- a) Is regional data and information analysed to determine and enable high quality, relevant delivery?
- b) Are sentence requirements being delivered?
- c) Do partnership arrangements enable a personalised, responsive service to be provided to enable the delivery of sentence requirements, prevent breach and manage those released from prison?
- d) Is breach practice delivered appropriately?
- e) Is recall practice delivered appropriately?
- f) Is staffing sufficient to effectively manage breach and recall?



## PDU standards- Domain one

---

### 1.1 Leadership

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

#### **1.1.1 Do the PDU vision and strategy drive the delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?**

- a) Are there effective governance arrangements and clear local delivery arrangements that translate the vision and strategy into frontline practice?
- b) Does the PDU leadership team engage sufficiently with partners and stakeholders to ensure effective delivery of the vision and strategy?
- c) Do PDU staff understand the PDU delivery arrangements, how the service should be delivered and what they are accountable for?
- d) Are risks to PDU service delivery understood sufficiently, with appropriate mitigations and controls in place?

#### **1.1.2 Does the PDU leadership team drive provision of a high-quality service for all people on probation?**

- a) Does the PDU leadership take a deliberate, strategic and informed approach to meeting diverse needs?
- b) Are 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 policies and guidance communicated to and understood by relevant staff?
- d) When carrying out changes to systems, processes or staffing, is the impact on service delivery, including equality impact assessed and appropriate action taken?

#### **1.1.3 Do PDU leaders actively engage with staff to achieve the effective delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?**

- a) Does the PDU's culture promote openness, constructive challenge and ideas?
- b) Are staff well engaged and motivated?
- c) Is appropriate attention paid to staff safety and wellbeing, and building staff resilience?
- d) Do PDU leaders ensure reasonable adjustments are made for staff in accordance with statutory requirements and protected characteristics?
- e) Are there clear routes from complaints, with support for staff if they feel discriminated against or experience any form of discrimination?

#### **1.1.4 Do PDU leaders use analysis, evidence and learning to drive the effective delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?**

- a) Do PDU leaders understand and use performance information to drive improvement?
- b) Does PDU delivery take sufficient account of the views of people on probation?

- c) Where necessary, is action taken promptly and appropriately in relation to performance monitoring, audit and inspection?
- d) Does the PDU learn systematically from things that go wrong, including SFOs?
- e) Is learning communicated effectively?

## 1.2 Staff

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

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

- a) Are PDU staffing levels sufficient?
- b) Do practitioners have manageable workloads, given the profile of the cases and the range of work undertaken?
- c) Do administrative staff have manageable workloads?
- d) Do heads of service for the PDU and middle managers have manageable workloads?
- e) Are workloads managed actively, with resources being redeployed, when this is 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 reflect adequately 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) Is an effective induction programme delivered to new staff that addresses issues of diversity and is accessible to all?
- b) Do staff receive effective case-focused supervision that enhances and sustains the quality of work with people on probation?
- c) Is the appraisal process used effectively to ensure that staff are delivering a high-quality service?
- d) Are the learning needs of staff identified and met?
- e) Is poor staff performance identified and addressed?
- f) Is a culture of learning and continuous improvement promoted actively?

### 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 Are high-quality services provided to meet the needs of people on probation?

- a) Is there a diverse and flexible range of services that meet identified risk and needs and build strengths?
- b) Is building strengths and enhancing protective factors central to the delivery of services?
- c) Are diversity factors and issues of disproportionality addressed sufficiently in the way that services are delivered?
- d) Is staffing sufficient to ensure that delivery of high-quality services?
- e) Are services delivered in appropriate and accessible locations?
- f) Is the delivery of services informed by regular robust evidence-based monitoring, evaluation and review?

#### 1.3.2 Is the right range and volume of services provided to meet the needs of people on probation?

- a) Does the volume of services available consistently meet demand?
- b) Are there clear and well understood access and referral routes for services?
- c) Are services available in a timely manner for people on probation?
- d) Is there effective collaborative working between service providers and probation practitioners?
- e) Are courts kept up to date with the services available, to support sentencing options?

## PDU standards- Domain two

---

*As currently and in order to remain proportionate in our inspection prompts marked \* do not apply in unpaid work only cases.*

### 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 individual, 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 individual involved meaningfully 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 individual's motivation and readiness to change?
- f) Does the advice consider the individual's diversity and personal circumstances?
- g) Does the advice consider the impact of the offence on known or 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, actively involving the person on probation.

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

- a) Does assessment analyse the motivation and readiness of the person on probation to engage and comply with the sentence?
- b) Does assessment analyse the protected characteristics of the individual and consider the impact of these on their ability to comply and engage with service delivery?
- c) Does assessment analyse the personal circumstances of the individual and consider the impact of these on their ability to comply and engage with service delivery?
- d) Is the person on probation involved meaningfully 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 strengths and protective factors of the person on probation?
- 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 identify and clearly analyse any risk of harm to others?
- b) Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information, including past behaviour and convictions, and involve other agencies where appropriate?
- c) Does assessment analyse any specific concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims?

## 2.3 Planning

Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, actively involving 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 diversity factors of the individual which may affect engagement and compliance?
- c) Does planning take sufficient account of the personal circumstances of the individual which may affect engagement and compliance?
- d) Does planning take sufficient account of the readiness and motivation of the person on probation to change which may affect engagement and compliance?
- e) Does planning set out how all the requirements of the sentence or licence/post-sentence supervision will be delivered within the available timescales?
- f) Does planning set a level, pattern and type of contact sufficient to engage the individual and to support the effectiveness of specific interventions?

### 2.3.2 Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting desistance?

- a) Does planning sufficiently reflect offending-related factors and prioritise those which are most critical? \*
- b) Does planning build on the individual'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, engaging the person on probation.

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

- a) Post-custody cases only: Did the community offender manager ensure a proportionate level of contact with the prisoner before release?
- b) Do the requirements of the sentence start promptly, or at an appropriate time?
- c) Is sufficient focus given to maintaining an effective working relationship with the person on probation, taking into account their diversity needs?
- d) Are sufficient efforts made to enable the individual to complete their sentence, including flexibility to take appropriate account of their personal circumstances?
- 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 individual after enforcement actions or recall?

### 2.4.2 Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support desistance?

- a) Post-custody cases only: Did the community offender manager address the key resettlement or desistance needs before release?
- b) Are the delivered services those most likely to reduce reoffending and support desistance, with sufficient attention given to sequencing and the available timescales?
- c) Wherever possible, does the delivery of services build upon the individual's strengths and enhance protective factors?
- d) Is the involvement of other organisations in the delivery of services sufficiently well-coordinated?\*
- e) Are key individuals in the life of the person on probation engaged where appropriate to support their desistance?\*
- f) Are the level and nature of contact sufficient to reduce reoffending and support desistance?
- g) Are local services engaged to support and sustain desistance during the sentence and beyond?\*

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

- a) Post-custody cases only: Did the community offender manager address key risk of harm needs before release?
- b) Are the level and nature of contact offered sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm?\*
- c) Is sufficient attention given to protecting actual and potential victims?

- d) Is the involvement of other agencies in managing and minimising the risk of harm sufficiently well-coordinated?
- e) Are key individuals in the life of the person on probation engaged where appropriate to support the effective management of risk of harm?\*
- f) 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, actively involving the person on probation.

### 2.5.1 Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the compliance and engagement of the person on probation?

- 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 involved meaningfully 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 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 on the strengths and enhancing the protective factors of the person on probation?
- 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 risk of harm?
- c) Is the person on probation (and, where appropriate, are key individuals in their life) involved meaningfully in reviewing the risk of harm?\*
- g) Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of the management of the risk of harm?

## 2.6 Outcomes

Early outcomes are positive, demonstrating reasonable progress for the 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 victims 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 victims 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 personalised appropriately, considering the nature of the experience of victims and any diversity issues?
- c) Is clear information given to victims about what they can expect at different points in a sentence?
- d) Do the initial letters include sufficient information to enable victims to make an informed choice as to whether to participate in the scheme?
- e) Are victims informed about the action they can take if the offender attempts to make unwanted contact with them?
- f) Are victims 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 Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements where appropriate?
- b) Do victim liaison staff share relevant information with the probation practitioner?
- c) Are the concerns of the victims 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 offender?



**2.7.3 Does pre-release contact with victims allow them to make appropriate contributions to the conditions of release?**

- a) Are victims given the opportunity to contribute their views to inform decisions about the release of the offender in a timely way, and supported in doing so?
- b) Are views expressed by victims treated appropriately and in accordance with the victim contact scheme?
- c) Are victims supported in making a victim personal statement in parole applications?