



HM Inspectorate
of Probation

An inspection of probation services in:

Derby City PDU

The Probation Service – East Midlands region

HM Inspectorate of Probation, February 2023

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Foreword | 3 |
| Ratings | 4 |
| Recommendations | 5 |
| Background | 6 |
| 1. Organisational delivery | 7 |
| 2. Court work and case supervision | 14 |
| Annexe one – Web links | 20 |

Acknowledgements

This inspection was led by HM Inspector Leon Bonas, supported by a team of inspectors and colleagues from across the Inspectorate. We would like to thank all those who participated in any way in this inspection. Without their help and cooperation, the inspection would not have been possible.

The role of HM Inspectorate of Probation

HM Inspectorate of Probation is the independent inspector of youth offending and probation services in England and Wales. We report on the effectiveness of probation and youth offending service work with adults and children.

We inspect these services and publish inspection reports. We highlight good and poor practice, and use our data and information to encourage high-quality services. We are independent of government, and speak independently.

Please note that throughout the report the names in the practice examples have been changed to protect the individual's identity.

© Crown copyright 2023

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available for download at: www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation

ISBN 978-1-915468-31-4

Published by:

HM Inspectorate of Probation
1st Floor Civil Justice Centre
1 Bridge Street West
Manchester
M3 3FX

Follow us on Twitter
[@hmiprobation](https://twitter.com/hmiprobation)

Foreword

In Derby City Probation Delivery Unit (PDU) we saw some promising practice undertaken by frontline practitioners which focused on engaging people on probation and addressing factors likely to contribute to their offending. But it was disappointing to find that this was often undermined by the work required for keeping others safe, meaning that actual or potential victims are potentially being left at risk. Despite there being a procedure for obtaining information from key partners such as the police and children's services, this was not used as often as it should have been.

The overall quality of work delivered by Derby City PDU was rated as 'Requires improvement' across four out of our five standards for casework, with assessment rated as 'Inadequate'. This PDU has been given an overall rating of 'Requires improvement'.

My inspectors give credit to the relatively new senior leadership team of this PDU for the passion and enthusiasm they have instilled in their team. Staffing and workloads were a critical concern at the time of inspection, with staffing levels which were not enough to deliver services to a sufficient quality. The PDU has a considerable number of new staff going through the probation qualification programme, and a recent successful recruitment campaign has improved staffing levels across the Probation Services Officer (PSO) grade. However, it will take time for these new members of staff to be fully trained and to be able to ease current pressures.

The PDU had access to a broad range of partnership services in the city and to appropriate facilities too. The Regional Outcomes and Innovation Fund (ROIF) had been used to commission specialist accommodation provision for people assessed as posing high risk of serious harm, and we saw examples of effective partnership working with this service.

We have concerns relating to the quality of sentence management work in cases where a standalone unpaid work requirement had been imposed. These cases were managed regionally, although the individuals reside within the Derby City PDU locality. The assessments completed by the unpaid work team were not sufficient and risk of harm was not appropriately analysed. Because of this, there were significant gaps in demonstrating whether safe allocations to unpaid work projects were being undertaken.

It was concerning that the work we saw with people being released from prison was undertaken less well than that with people subject to community sentences. The reasons for this will need to be explored and addressed by the PDU.

The PDU will be disappointed by the outcome of this inspection, but their capacity to develop practice is strong. The positive leadership and team culture, with investment in a number of new staff, should lay the foundations for progress to be made before the next inspection.



Justin Russell

Chief Inspector of Probation

Ratings

Derby City PDU

Fieldwork started November 2022

Score **11/27**

Overall rating

Requires improvement



1. Organisational delivery

1.1 Leadership

Requires improvement



1.2 Staff

Good



1.3 Services

Good



1.4 Information and facilities

Good



2. Court work and case supervision

2.1 Court work

Requires improvement



2.2 Assessment

Inadequate



2.3 Planning

Requires improvement



2.4 Implementation and delivery

Requires improvement



2.5 Reviewing

Requires improvement



Recommendations

As a result of our inspection findings we have made a number of recommendations that we believe, if implemented, will have a positive impact on the quality of probation services.¹

Derby City PDU should:

1. improve the quality of risk of harm assessments and analysis ensuring all available information is accessed and utilised
2. improve the quality assurance and management oversight arrangements of all casework, ensuring practitioners apply professional curiosity
3. ensure that interventions necessary to improve desistance and reduce reoffending and risk of harm are provided in all case
4. ensure appropriate management information is available to analyse and consider any potential disproportionality in the quality of service delivery to people on probation from black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds.

East Midlands region should:

5. ensure that standalone unpaid work cases have a thorough individual assessment and analysis of risk of harm that informs safe placement allocation
6. ensure that standalone unpaid work teams exchange risk-related information with Derbyshire Constabulary and children's services departments
7. ensure that Derby City PDU has sufficient staffing resources in place.

HM Prison and Probation Service should:

8. ensure the East Midlands region are sufficiently staffed to deliver necessary services and undertake public protection responsibilities.

¹ Progress against previous inspection recommendations for the relevant Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) or National Probation Service (NPS) division are included in annexe one.

Background

We conducted fieldwork in Derby City PDU week beginning 21 November 2022. We inspected 47 cases where sentences and licences had commenced between 25 April 2022 and 01 May 2022, and 09 May 2022 and 15 May 2022. We conducted 24 interviews with probation practitioners and held 16 group meetings with 68 probation and partnership staff. We gained feedback from a total of 94 people on probation.

On 26 June 2021, the PDU was formed from the CRC and NPS teams covering Derby City. The PDU is one of six in East Midlands region and delivers probation work across one probation office and one magistrates' court. The PDU offices host staff from a neighbouring PDU due to the closure of two offices. Derby has a Crown Court managed as part of Derbyshire PDU, and an approved premise which is managed regionally. Unpaid work and accredited programmes delivered to people on probation within the Derby City PDU are also managed regionally.

The city of Derby is a unitary local authority area with an estimated population of 256,814. It has 18 suburbs, with a wide variation in demographics, with some areas having high levels of deprivation. The proven reoffending rate across Derby between January 2020 to December 2020 is 28.3 per, with an average number of reoffences per reoffender of 3.65.² The population of Derby is ethnically diverse; 24 per cent of the population describing themselves as from a black, Asian or minority ethnic background.³

The PDU had a caseload of 1,667, which includes those in custody. East Midlands region has five commissioned rehabilitation services (CRS) including: NACRO to support people on probation with accommodation; Ingeus providing education, training and employment (ETE) services as well as finance benefit and debt; Ingeus Forward providing personal wellbeing services; and Women's Work provided services for women. Local services were in place for those requiring support for substance or alcohol misuse. Derby City PDU was involved in a mental health treatment requirement (MHTR) pilot with a neighbouring PDU.

Derby City PDU had staffing and workload challenges. The senior leadership team was fully staffed; however, there were vacancies across practitioner and administration grades, with an average Probation Officer (PO) working to 130 per cent of their capacity under the workload measurement tool. At the point of inspection, senior leaders were giving consideration to an 'amber' rating application on a nationally approved prioritisation framework, which can be approved by the Regional Probation Director. If granted, this would allow them to deprioritise certain activities across sentence management teams.

² Source: Ministry of Justice. (October 2022). Proven reoffending statistics: January 2020 to December 2020.

³ Census 2021.

1. Organisational delivery

1.1. Leadership



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

Requires improvement

As a result of the domain two ratings, which are impacted by the poor quality of work in standalone unpaid work cases, leadership is rated 'Requires improvement' after applying HM Inspectorate of Probation's decision rules.

Strengths:

- Derby City PDU had a new senior leadership team when inspected. They engaged strategic partners at pace to maintain established relationships, with positive feedback to inspectors on their contribution to strategic forums. Relationships with multi-agency partners being particularly strong.
- The PDU plan aligned with the regional delivery model and referenced key priorities. Managers and staff were involved in the delivery of these strategies, such as progressing staff secondments into local authority housing teams and children's services' Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH).
- The PDU had a comprehensive risk register and business continuity plan. Plans mitigated key business risks. Inspectors saw instances where these plans were enacted and were effective.
- The PDU head held all staff briefings to ensure messages and staff priorities were communicated across the PDU. There were mechanisms to gain staff feedback. The PDU commissioned a 'climate assessment' to understand the needs of staff. Six out of nine respondents to our survey indicated the culture promoted openness, constructive challenge and ideas. Practitioners indicated open and positive relationships with their Senior Probation Officers (SPOs).
- A performance monitoring meeting chaired by the deputy head of the PDU had led to improved performance against key performance indicators. Where there was evidence that performance had not increased, systems were changed in order to support improvements.
- The PDU adopted a local equality and diversity strategy to operationalise the regional strategy. This contained a number of equality and diversity pledges. The PDU has a diversity champion that covers two PDUs.

Areas for improvement:

- The focus of the diversity, equality and inclusion strategy should be developed to ensure that information is used to inform the commissioning of services, and to understand diverse needs of people on probation.
- Derby City PDU had access to support from the regional Engaging People on Probation team, further work is required to use feedback from people on probation to influence strategy and improve services.
- Senior leaders had limited information on the management and delivery of standalone unpaid work across the city of Derby. The quality of assessment in relation to keeping people safe across all cases inspected was insufficient.

1.2. Staff



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

Good

Strengths:

- Vacancies and workloads were actively reviewed by senior leaders. Local recruitment campaigns are underway to fill gaps.
- The culture of the office was positive and supportive, with motivated staff wanting to make a difference. New staff had a positive experience.
- Despite a high level of staff attrition, leaders had regular discussions with staff, not only on case supervision, but also safety and wellbeing. Practitioners were able to feedback views and concerns to their managers.
- In response to the high vacancies in administration teams, leaders reviewed case administrator roles and implemented successful changes to processes, providing continuity of support whilst still operating with a staffing deficit.
- Five practitioners were promoted to SPO grades, maintaining a commitment to developing staff potential and career progression opportunities.
- Staff reported open and excellent relationships with their SPOs, with frequent and meaningful supervision. PDU leaders monitored the nature and quality of supervision through internal audits.
- We found innovative approaches to support newly qualified POs and new PSO staff, with access to Professional Qualification in Probation learner teams to develop their knowledge, skills and experience in the role. New staff benefitted from this support, including CRS providers contributing to staff inductions.
- Applications were open for staff to apply for the PRISM (Promoting Inclusion Staff Mentoring) scheme, a mentoring scheme for black, Asian and minority ethnic staff.

Areas for improvement:

- Derby City PDU retained 184 cases on behalf of Derbyshire PDU, although overall 'green' rated under the prioritisation framework, Derby City PDU are experiencing staffing and workload pressures and this arrangement is adding to the pressures.
- The deputy head covered two PDUs; this meant they were thinly stretched and unable to proactively plan for and consistently support two PDUs.
- Whilst practitioners were positive regarding supervision with managers, our inspectors found that management oversight was insufficient in 55 per cent of inspected cases.

1.3. Services



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

Good

Strengths:

- A range of services were available via the CRS and local provision for drugs and alcohol support.
- PDU leaders recognised the limitations of CRS accommodation support and in response developed additional services through the ROIF funding, which included specialist accommodation to support high risk people on probation. A PSO had also been seconded into the local authority housing department to support information sharing.
- SPOs were allocated as single point of contacts for each CRS service. Those management oversight arrangements enhanced relationships, notably relating to the ROIF-funded Star Project, which involved tasking and coordinating activity.
- Sentencers were positive about the input provided by PDU staff within sentencer liaison meetings and were kept up to date with available services across the PDU.
- Where there was an accredited programme requirement, we saw timely referrals and programme commencements.
- Women's services delivered under CRS provision were impressive. The service is based a short distance from the PDU office and delivered trauma-informed services, alongside programmes to address criminogenic need and promote engagement. The implementation and delivery of services for women was more effective than for the overall cohort.

Areas for improvement:

- CRS providers from personal wellbeing and ETE services described low referral numbers. Whilst some had a presence within the PDU office, there was a lack of coordination and communication to staff of these arrangements. Referral numbers were inconsistent across teams, however, we noted an increased number of referrals coming from more experienced and established members of staff which suggests a training issue for newer staff.
- A mentoring scheme which would seek to provide services for black, Asian and minority ethnic young adults was locally commissioned in the city of Derby. This was underused, with little analysis by the PDU as to why.

Resettlement work

Strengths:

- Planning sufficiently addressed risk of harm factors and prioritised those that were most critical. This led to practitioners being able to set out the necessary constructive or restrictive interventions to manage risk of harm in 76 per cent of resettlement cases, with some effective use of licence conditions.
- Where people on probation were subject to post-release supervision, we saw requirements starting promptly, or at an appropriate time, in 88 per cent of relevant inspected cases. Many of the delays in the start of community sentences were as a result in delays to unpaid work requirements commencing.

Areas for improvement:

- Derby City PDU had yet to implement specialist resettlement teams to work with prisoners preparing for release, and after release into the community. Probation work across assessment, implementation and delivery and reviewing was comparatively worse in resettlement cases than for community sentences.
- Pre-release contact was inconsistent. In 41 per cent of relevant cases, there was an insufficient level of contact with the prisoner pre-release. This was a missed opportunity to understand the individual's needs and set a good foundation for further work.
- Assessments were not sufficiently focused on how to engage individuals and did not identify the relevant factors linked to their offending and desistance in nearly half of all relevant cases.
- Once released, we found the level and nature of contact to manage and minimise the risk of harm was sufficient in only just over half of relevant inspected cases, with staff prioritising other areas once the person on probation had been released.

1.4. Information and facilities



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

Good

Strengths:

- The PDU had one office in Derby city centre. It was accessible and had a positive environment, with one-to-one and group space.
- The premises for women's CRS services were impressive and designed to deliver personalised trauma-informed services for women.
- Service level agreements were in place, covering children's social care MASH team and the local authority housing department arrangements. These made clear arrangements for information sharing between services.
- The PDU use the EQuIP system to store and access necessary policy and a 'OneNote' system was accessible for all practitioners. This was well regarded, with a range of materials including toolkits, practice and policy information.
- Managers had access to a variety of dashboards including service level agreements, human resources and the use of systems to review the profile and needs of people on probation to drive improvements.
- Shortly following unification, the PDU undertook an equality analysis to understand the impact of moving legacy CRC staff, this included a range of protected characteristics and circumstances of staff.
- Data was routinely used within monthly performance meetings chaired by the deputy head, with changes to systems and processes to drive improvement.
- The PDU introduced a new system for making, tracking and reviewing work orders to resolve key building issues, leading to telephony and Wi-Fi access in parts of the building being escalated for a suitable resolution.
- Feedback was sought from practitioners by regional contract managers on the quality of CRS services. Issues with the implementation of services under the accommodation contract was raised and local resolutions implemented.
- The Self-Assessment Quality Assurance Framework was being used to inform practice improvements with SPOs and probation practitioners.

Areas for improvement:

- The deputy head collated learning from the Serious Further Offences team. The planned initiative for tracking and coordinating relevant recommendations and learning from Serious Case Reviews and Domestic Homicide Reviews to inform team meetings and future PDU training was positive.
- While staff benefitted from understanding the services available from CRS and non-CRS providers, they were not fully aware of referral criteria which resulted in a mismatch between supply and demand. Communication as to when services were based in the PDU office was not always understood.

Feedback from people on probation

User Voice, working with HM Inspectorate of Probation, had contact with 94 people on probation as part of this inspection. Of these, 54 per cent reported that they were being supervised having been released from a prison sentence and 44 per cent were subject to a community sentence. Females surveyed were representative of the wider caseload of the PDU. Only 21 per cent of people on probation identified as from a black, Asian and minority ethnic heritage, which was an under-representation of the overall caseload.

Strengths:

- Over two-thirds of people on probation were happy with the overall support they received, with 85 per cent of respondents indicating that they were able to contact their probation practitioner when they needed to.

“Good, really pleasant staff and seen on time, issues sorted quickly. Referred to women’s work and employment support.”

- People on probation generally felt safe accessing probation services (91 per cent) and were able to have private conversations with their probation practitioner (81 per cent).
- Despite seeing evidence that referral rates may differ across teams and CRS providers, 34 out of 46 respondents to the User Voice survey believed that they had access to the services they needed.

“Yes, they helped me get my benefits. I also got a bit of counselling. Both were pretty quick, but I certainly couldn’t have done it without my probation officer.”

Areas for improvement:

- The loss of some staff and recruitment of new starters has impacted on the experiences of people on probation who believed that this meant that they had to start their supervision experience over again.

“I have changed probation officer many times, feels like we start all over again each time. They should be doing a handover.”

- None of the people interviewed felt that their views about how services were run, are taken into account.
- We heard from staff that coordination of duty arrangements, and communication between practitioner and administration teams as to when partner agencies were present in the office could be improved. One respondent to the survey noted:

“I think they could work on their time keeping a bit better, never on time.”

Diversity and inclusion

Strengths:

- Diversity was led at a regional level. Derby City PDU shared a local equality, diversity and inclusion strategy with Derbyshire PDU. The PDU had two diversity champions who were committed to raising the profile of diversity, equality and inclusion across the PDU. The role also provided a link between staff support networks.
- In 98 per cent of cases inspected practitioners recognised and recorded appropriately where the person on probation had a disability.
- Staff are aware of the regional PRISM mentoring scheme. This was intended to provide mentoring opportunities for black, Asian and minority ethnic staff and is due to launch in April 2023.
- Evidence from cases we inspected indicated that staff gave sufficient focus to maintaining an effective working relationship with the person on probation, taking into account their diversity needs in 77 per cent of all cases inspected.

Areas for improvement:

- We found deficits in the work to manage risk of harm across assessment and planning where the person on probation identified as from a black, Asian and minority ethnic background⁴. Further work was required to understand and address the specific needs of this cohort across probation practice.
- Whilst we saw positive services in place for females on probation, consideration needs to be given to the experiences of women on probation. The PDU did not have women-only reporting times, or dedicated probation practitioner staff. We heard instances where females were uncomfortable in reporting to the PDU office in mixed waiting areas.
- Whilst the PDU was able to access translation services, these were not used consistently. This was to the detriment of the engagement of the person on probation.
- Services have previously been commissioned to address the needs of black, Asian and minority ethnic people on probation, however these were underused. Further work was required to understand why, whilst there was clearly a need for these services in Derby, they were unsuccessful. This would better inform any future commissioning intentions.

⁴ The findings relating to ethnicity have not been subject to a relative rate index analysis, which is test used to compare rates of incidence, we report on our findings with that caveat.

2. Court work and case supervision

2.1. Court work



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

Requires improvement

Our rating⁵ for court work is based on the percentage of cases we inspected being judged satisfactory against the key question:

| Key question | Percentage 'Yes' |
|--|------------------|
| Is the pre-sentence information and advice provided to court sufficiently analytical and personalised to the individual, supporting the court's decision-making? | 50% |

Strengths:

- Meaningful engagement between individuals and staff preparing court reports was undertaken in all cases. This meant people on probation were positively involved in the process.
- In a large majority of reports inspected, the advice to court sufficiently considered factors related to the individual's likelihood of reoffending.
- Mechanisms to obtain child safeguarding and domestic abuse worked effectively at court in the large majority of cases where requests were made. In all cases inspected, relevant children's services checks had been made where they were needed. This ensured appropriate information was available when making sentencing proposals.

Areas for improvement:

- Staff were not routinely requesting police domestic abuse information. These were absent in 40 per cent of case inspected. Where information was received from the police or children's services, the information was not always sufficiently analysed or considered in advice to court.
- Only half of reports inspected sufficiently considered the individuals diversity and personal circumstances. Whilst we did not inspect any reports that had considered a Mental Health Treatment Requirement, we did see examples where the impact of an individual's mental health or wellbeing had not been sufficiently explored.

⁵ The rating for the standard is driven by the score for the key question, which is placed in a rating band. Full data and further information about inspection methodology is available [in the data workbook](#) for this inspection.

2.2. Assessment



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

Inadequate

Our rating⁶ for assessment is based on the percentage of cases we inspected being judged satisfactory against three key questions:

| Key question | Percentage 'Yes' |
|---|------------------|
| Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation? | 70% |
| Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance? | 70% |
| Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe? | 40% |

Derby City PDU was rated as 'Inadequate' for assessment due to the score of 40 per cent for keeping other people safe.

Strengths:

- There were strengths in how staff were assessing the engagement needs of people on probation. In 77 per cent of cases, assessments analysed the readiness of the person on probation to engage and comply with the sentence.
- Positive engagement was further demonstrated in the User Voice survey, confirming that 76 out of 87 people on probation considered that they had appointment times that suited their circumstances.

Areas for improvement:

- None of the 12 standalone unpaid work cases inspected had sufficient focus on the assessment of the safety of others. In only 17 per cent of these assessments were domestic abuse enquiries undertaken, which significantly questions the accuracy if all relevant information was not obtained.
- Across wider sentence management teams, assessments to keep others safe was slightly better; however, 45 per cent of cases were not based on the necessary police domestic abuse information. It was concerning that in over half of all relevant cases inspected, the safety of actual or potential victims was not sufficiently understood or analysed.

⁶ The rating for the standard is driven by the score for the key question, which is placed in a rating band. [Full data and further information about inspection methodology is available in the data workbook for this inspection.](#)

2.3. Planning



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

Requires improvement

Our rating⁷ for planning is based on the percentage of cases we inspected being judged satisfactory against three key questions:

| Key question | Percentage 'Yes' |
|---|------------------|
| Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation? | 72% |
| Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting desistance? | 68% |
| Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe? | 51% |

Derby City PDU is rated as 'Requires improvement' for planning due to the score of 51 per cent for the work in keeping other people safe.

Strengths:

- Staff generally engaged people on probation in planning the frequency and nature of appointments, taking into account any barriers to attendance. Of the 87 people surveyed, 76 indicated that their PO offered them an appointment time that suited them.
- For cases excluding UPW only order, over two-thirds of plans reflected the most relevant factors related to offending behaviour and promoting desistance and in 80 per cent of cases, relevant services were identified that would most likely reduce offending and promote desistance, which meant individuals could access services needed.

Areas for improvement:

- The most critical risk of harm factors were not prioritised in 4 out of 10 cases, with many being a result of insufficient contact with the prisoner pre-release. Only 60 per cent of cases included an appropriate contingency plan which identified necessary actions to manage risk.
- Where individuals were subject to standalone unpaid work, only half of cases took into account diversity factors. While unpaid work is considered a punitive element, we still expect relevant links to other agencies to manage harm, but this was not seen in any of the nine relevant cases.

⁷ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. [Full data and further information about inspection methodology is available in the data workbook for this inspection.](#)

2.4. Implementation and delivery



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

Requires improvement

Our rating⁸ for implementation and delivery is based on the percentage of cases we inspected being judged satisfactory against three key questions:

| Key question | Percentage 'Yes' |
|---|------------------|
| Is the sentence or post-custody period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the person on probation? | 66% |
| Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support desistance? | 72% |
| Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people? | 55% |

Derby City PDU is rated as 'Requires improvement' for implementation and delivery due to the score of 55 per cent for the delivery of services to support the safety of other people.

Strengths:

- In 77 per cent of cases inspected, practitioners gave sufficient focus to maintaining effective working relationship with individuals. Proactive contact was made where there was a risk of non-compliance and a flexible approach was taken to enable people to complete their sentence.
- Accredited programme requirements had timely referrals and no delays in programme commencements, leading to a prompt start in key services.
- Home visits were completed in 25 out of 36 relevant cases, developing engagement and identifying key risk factors to inform plans.

Areas for improvement:

- User Voice heard from individuals subject to unpaid work requirements, that there was a lack of local opportunities, start delays and cancellations of groups.
- The involvement of other organisations was not sufficiently well coordinated in 18 out of 42 cases inspected to manage risk of harm. A consequence to this was the insufficient attention given to protecting actual or potential victims in 13 out of 33 per cases within sentence management teams and 8 out of 11 cases in standalone unpaid work teams.

⁸ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. [Full data and further information about inspection methodology is available in the data workbook for this inspection.](#)

2.5. Reviewing



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

Requires improvement

Our rating⁹ for reviewing is based on the percentage of cases we inspected being judged satisfactory against three key questions:

| Key question | Percentage 'Yes' |
|--|------------------|
| Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the compliance and engagement of the person on probation? | 77% |
| Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting desistance? | 72% |
| Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe? | 49% |

Derby City PDU is rated as 'Requires improvement' for reviewing. Professional discretion could be applied as the lowest score is within the five percentage points of the rating boundary of 50 per cent and we found evidence for a higher rating.

Strengths:

- In all inspected cases where there was a standalone unpaid work requirement, reviewing activity sufficiently took into account the compliance and engagement of the person on probation.
- Staff took a strengths-based approach to reviewing, building on the strengths of the individual. Staff were receiving feedback from agencies working with the person on probation which informed the review of offending and desistance.

Areas for improvement:

- Reviewing activity did not identify and address changes in the factors related to risk of harm in 23 out of 36 relevant cases inspected. The review of too few cases (21 of 36) was based on information sought from other key agencies involved in managing the risk of harm.
- Management oversight was insufficient, ineffective or absent in 16 of 34 cases within sentence management teams, which rose to 10 out of 11 for standalone unpaid work cases. While we heard of management oversight being provided, it was not clear in the cases inspected.
- We found that in 24 of 39 cases, the person on probation was not meaningfully involved in reviewing their risk of harm to others.

⁹ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table.

2.6. Outcomes

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

We do not currently rate the Outcomes standard, but provide this data for information and benchmarking purposes only.

| Outcomes | Percentage 'Yes' |
|--|------------------|
| Do early outcomes demonstrate that reasonable progress has been made, in line with the personalised needs of the person on probation? | 53% |

Strengths:

- Compliance had been sufficient in most inspected cases, which was a positive reflection given the strengths we found in how practitioners were engaging with people on probation. We identified five cases where a formal breach or recall action should have been taken but had not been.
- Inspectors identified that motivation to change was a key strength and a protective factor required to promote desistance in 13 cases inspected. We saw improvements in seven of those relevant cases – a further reflection of the impact of developing meaningful relationships.
- In 37 out of 47 cases there had been no further charges or convictions which, together with the low level of non-compliance, was a strength.

Areas for improvement:

- Improvements in accommodation status were only seen in six out of 18 cases when linked to offending, and six out of 13 cases when linked to risk of harm.
- There was no change or improvement to accommodation outcomes. At the start of their supervision, 28 per cent of people on probation were transient, homeless or 'unknown.' There was no change to this at the point of inspection.

Annexe one – Web links

Full data from this inspection and further information about the methodology used to conduct this inspection is available in [the data workbook for this inspection](#).

A glossary of terms used in this report is available on our website using the following link: [Glossary \(justiceinspectorates.gov.uk\)](https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/glossary)