



HM Inspectorate
of Probation

Response to our consultation on the inspection of approved premises

V1.4 July 2025

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Consultation questions	3
3. Summary of responses.....	5
4. Summary of HM Inspectorate of Probation decisions.....	11
5. Contacts	17
6. Annexe one: Approved premises inspection standards	18

1. Introduction

The national network of approved premises (APs) is one of the least visible and least well-known corners of the criminal justice system. They provide temporary residential placements with enhanced supervision and support to high-risk and complex individuals released from prison. APs exist to help rehabilitate and resettle some of the most serious offenders and to make sure that the public are protected during an individual's early months in the community. Yet there is currently no routine inspection of their work. We think this needs to change.

In 2024, we consulted with our stakeholders about whether and how we should inspect APs. We held three consultation events to discuss our proposals. We asked for your views on our proposed standards, as well as on how we should rate the quality of delivery. We spoke to residents of APs about their experiences and heard about the things that were important to them. This breadth of activity has been incredibly helpful to us in finalising our approach.

Our inspections of APs will begin in July 2025. In our consultation activities, we asked you for your views on our proposed changes to standards. Our focus will be on ensuring that activities to protect the public and promote rehabilitation are delivered in a safe and decent environment, by sufficient skilled staff, and supported by effective leadership. Our proposed standards were well received.

We also asked about the way in which we deliver our inspections. We will decide where we inspect, on the basis of where we can have the greatest impact. We will undertake our inspections without an announcement period, and they will consist of both on-site and off-site activity. We will rate the quality of delivery in each AP against our five standards, based on the evidence that we see, and will award an overall rating. We will publish our findings, explain our judgements, and make recommendations to drive improvement.

Hearing from our stakeholders is important to us. Thank you for taking the time to respond to our consultation.



Martin Jones CBE

HM Chief Inspector of Probation

1. Consultation questions

We asked the following 12 questions:

Question 1 – Should HM Inspectorate of Probation inspect APs?

Question 2 – Is our overall focus on protecting the public and promoting rehabilitation in a safe environment the right approach to take?

Question 3 – Is it right that we focus on delivering in a safe and decent environment?

Question 4 – Does the standards framework cover the key areas that contribute to the effective service delivery of an AP? If not, what is missing?

Question 5 – Are any of the proposed prompts insufficiently linked to effective service delivery? If so, which ones?

Question 6 – Are any of the proposed prompts insufficiently precise? If so, which ones?

Question 7 – Should any parts of the standards framework be weighted more heavily within the ratings system? If so, which parts?

Question 8 – Is there anything in our proposed standards or the way we suggest we will rate APs that you think could lead to undesirable behaviours, outputs, or outcomes? If so, please tell us.

Question 9 – Does the way we are proposing to rate APs make sense? Is it fair?

Question 10 – How soon after an inspection should we expect to see improvement action taken?

Question 11 – Should our inspections be unannounced?

Question 12 – What are the benefits and drawbacks of publishing a report and recommendations for each AP?

2. Summary of responses

Question 1 – Should HM Inspectorate of Probation inspect APs?

There was unanimous agreement that we should inspect APs. The responses offered included that they play a vital role in public protection and supporting vulnerable people, that APs need to be held accountable for the services they deliver, and that there should be a mechanism for learning from best practice. Respondents expected that closer scrutiny would drive improvements which are in the public interest. For example:

"We welcome the proposed inspection...establishing inspections for all Approved Premises will ensure accountability and help create a culture of continuous improvement, transparency, equity of service and accountability".

Our proposed short, focused approach was welcomed.

Question 2 – Is our overall focus on protecting the public and promoting rehabilitation in a safe environment the right approach to take?

Again, there was unanimous support for our proposed approach, straddling public protection, rehabilitation, and safe environments. Respondents felt that all these elements were important and deserved a focus. Some respondents said that we need to consider the interfaces between APs and other parts of the criminal justice system:

"It is important, however, that APs are not looked at in isolation – their success is largely dependent on the assessment and treatment people have previously had in prison and the services they are able to move on to following their AP stay. It would also be helpful to know how HMIP [HM Inspectorate of Probation] will look at/try to understand the national picture and what national teams are doing to support frontline delivery in APs. For example, is there going to be alignment between regional Sentence Management inspections and APs to provide a holistic approach?"

One respondent suggested additional prompts, as follows:

"Is there a proactive relationship with the local primary care services to ensure timely registration and support?"

"Is there a positive relationship with local addiction treatment services i.e. drug and alcohol treatment services?"

Question 3 – Is it right that we focus on delivering in a safe and decent environment?

A focus on safety and decency was unanimously supported. Reasons cited by respondents included that safety and decency are important factors in both enabling desistance and in the principles of rehabilitation, such as promoting dignity in a residential environment.

Question 4 – Does the standards framework cover the key areas that contribute to the effective service delivery of an AP? If not, what is missing?

Most respondents agreed that the proposed standards cover the key areas. There was some discussion about how inspection would capture joint working between the

probation officer and the AP – for example, to ensure that roles and responsibilities are appropriately allocated and to avoid over-delegating responsibilities to a keyworker.

In addition, some respondents highlighted that APs do not sit in isolation, as follows:

"There is a dependence on the liaison and information provided by both prisons and the field Probation Practitioner. I hope this can be sufficiently uncovered in Standards 4.1e and 5.1d".

Both in discussion at the consultation events and in written responses, it was suggested that our inspection of leadership must extend beyond the Chief Executive Officer/AP manager/AP Senior Management Team, and cover management boards/trustees and wider AP governance arrangements.

There was a concern raised as to whether our proposed inspections were long enough:

"There is a concern around how HMIP [HM Inspectorate of Probation] could cover all necessary standards and gain a full picture in such a short inspection length at each site. There could be an element of 'lottery' depending who is on duty on particular days".

One respondent felt that we should include a prompt under standard 3.1 Safety in relation to accessibility and reasonable adjustments for people with mobility concerns or other disabilities.

"In relation to Standard 3.1 (providing a safe, healthy and dignified environment), one of the prompts should relate to accessibility and reasonable adjustments for people with mobility concerns or other disabilities".

Question 5 – Are any of the proposed prompts insufficiently linked to effective service delivery? If so, which ones?

There was widespread agreement that the proposed prompts all linked sufficiently to service delivery. There were suggestions (see also the responses outlined in Question 4) that more could be added in the Protecting the Public standard, in terms of the partnership role of the AP and probation practitioners:

"Are AP staff effectively included in sentence management implementation?"

There were suggestions for some additional prompts to ensure effective internal communication, including referral processes, checks that reasons for decisions to reject referrals are sufficient, as well as external information sharing about risk. There was discussion at the consultation events about the role that guidance would play, sitting beneath the prompts.

Question 6 – Are any of the proposed prompts insufficiently precise? If so, which ones?

The majority of respondents said that the prompts were sufficiently precise. Some respondents asked about further guidance and definitions.

One respondent advised that we need to update our language from 'purposeful activity' to 'rehabilitative activity':

"Purposeful Activity is referenced throughout the consultation; practice has evolved to delivery of 'Rehabilitative Activity' as part of the Rehabilitative Activity project".

There was a request to add more clarity on our expectations around equity, diversity, and inclusion practice, and to add a prompt:

"Will you assess if the diversity of the staff reflects the diversity of the residents, and whether the workforce understands the diversity needs of residents? This prompt could be adapted to ensure that understanding translates into behaviour change".

A small number of respondents felt that we should more explicitly reference 'enabling environments' throughout our prompts, where relevant.

Question 7 – Should any parts of the standards framework be weighted more heavily within the ratings system? If so, which parts?

Most respondents felt that none of the standards should be weighted. There were two exceptions to this. One respondent thought that the standards relating to the enhanced level of monitoring and risk management, and access to constructive activity and supportive services should have increased weighting. A small number of respondents felt that public protection should be more heavily weighted.

One respondent thought that it would be perverse for leadership to be rated in isolation from the other delivery areas. For example, they felt that it would be wrong to rate leadership as 'Good' if aspects of service delivery, rehabilitation, and public protection fail to rate as highly.

One respondent felt that different APs might need different weightings in the future:

"Initially all parts should be weighted equally, and all types of AP should have the same weightings applied, but the guidance for Women's APs needs to reflect the difference in issues and delivery".

A number of respondents wanted to see a more explicit focus on equity, diversity, and inclusion:

"Diversity practice should also be considered overall and if deemed to be insufficient or poor, this should be reflected in the proposed overall rating in line with the approach taken in other Criminal Justice Inspections".

Question 8 – Is there anything in our proposed standards or the way we suggest we will rate APs that you think could lead to undesirable behaviours, outputs, or outcomes? If so, please tell us.

One respondent was strongly against the idea of 'lighter touch' inspections based on previous inspection findings, especially if there has been a gap of over two years.

Another had significant concerns about the scope of the leadership standard:

"Any assessment of leadership is going to be highly personalised and risks becoming a performance management assessment of the AP Manager or Area Manager. This is not the role of the Inspectorate and would not be appropriate for any inspection regime if it made individuals identifiable or easily inferred. There are ethical considerations in the event of stakeholders, ministers, etc wanting specific action taken against individual managers and could have a deeply chilling effect on our ability to recruit to those roles, resulting in loss of service".

Question 9 – Does the way we are proposing to rate APs make sense? Is it fair?

There was unanimous support for the rating of individual standards. This was judged to be fair and likely to drive improvement best. Our usual four-point scale was seen as an appropriate way to do this. For example:

"It is fair in that is consistent with other HMIP [HM Inspectorate of Probation] formats for probation services and is not too dissimilar to that used by HMI Prisons in terms of a 4-point rating".

There was limited support, however, for the awarding of an overall rating, with some respondents feeling that this was unfair and would not drive improvement.

"I remain strongly opposed to the idea of providing a single overall 'rating' as the outcome of any inspection. It is highly popular with politicians and journalists, and people who like devising league tables, but I can see no way in which it 'adds value' to the inspection, once you have 'rated' the individual pieces of work".

Some respondents were concerned that publishing an overall rating would create risks for individual APs to manage – both externally if individual APs were identified, and internally in terms of the wellbeing of residents and staff morale. For example:

"I strongly believe the section scores should stand on their own, and that would substantially reduce the likelihood of negative local public reaction to a failing AP".

One respondent felt that the inspection regime must include overnight arrangements:

"Evening activity is a core part of rehabilitative activity, and overnight work is critical to safety and public protection. Any inspection regime needs to consider how to assess the full 24-hour operational cycle of Approved Premises not just 9-5 activity or day and evening activity, otherwise it would be deeply flawed".

Question 10 – How soon after an inspection should we expect to see improvement action taken?

There were mixed views about this, and some questions were posed to help further understanding. For example, some respondents wanted to know whether this would depend on the rating, whether we would adopt an approach similar to HM Inspectorate of Prisons, in terms of triggering an urgent strategic response, or whether there could be a 12-month progress review.

The mixed views included those who thought action should be taken immediately:

"Because APs house the most dangerous offenders, action to improve should be implemented straightaway".

Others thought a longer timescale was more suitable:

"I think a reinspection could reasonably be undertaken within six to twelve months following the original visit".

Question 11 – Should our inspections be unannounced?

There were mixed views about when we should announce each inspection. Some respondents strongly supported unannounced inspections because of the residential

nature of the establishments and the belief that unannounced inspections were the best/only way for us to see the AP as it ordinarily is. For example:

"Yes, I think this is important for the reasons specified in the consultation document and is more in line with prison inspections, which would seem appropriate for a residential facility".

There were, however, a number of concerns which centred around the destabilising effect of an unannounced inspection on the AP's regime and the impact on residents. Comments included:

"Approved Premises are very small sites which operate on a minimum staffing basis, dealing with the highest risk cohort. Unannounced inspections risk destabilising activity and placing additional pressure on a small staff group, which could have safety risks. A large number of residents are neurodiverse and the upset in the day-to-day operation of the AP may also cause significant stress – increasing risk. This would be better managed in a more structured, planned way. This is particularly the case in APs which operate as Psychologically Informed Planned Environments where any activity should be part of that planned environment ethos".

And:

"Have you considered the impact of unannounced visits upon Residents - particularly those who have suffered significant Trauma - and the impact on their feelings of safety/trust?"

Question 12 – What are the benefits and drawbacks of publishing a report and recommendations for each AP?

There were mixed responses to this question. A benefit of this approach was identified by one respondent as:

"You would be better able to identify and share good practice and it enables each AP to build in improvements by reading other inspection reports and looking at APs similar to their own".

There were also concerns about this approach, including the identification of individual residents and the identification and targeting of APs by local communities. For example:

"It is part of the role for the senior manager of the local area to deal with that for 'area' reports. But as I think you already recognise, there's a high risk that with an AP report it may well be the AP manager in situ, and her/his staff, who may find themselves more immediately in the firing line for any febrile reactions – as has happened in the past when an AP resident has committed a notorious SFO [Serious Further Offence]".

And:

"We are concerned that AP managers and area managers will take on disproportionate responsibility for the outcomes of the inspections. The AP manager is graded at the equivalent of a NPS [Probation Service] senior probation officer, and we feel it would not be appropriate for an individual at this level to effectively be singled out (given the ease it would be to identify them with publicly available reports)".

Question 13 – What are the alternatives to publishing a report and recommendations for each AP?

There were a number of suggestions as to what the alternatives could be, as follows:

- Publish anonymously
- Publish in batches
- Publish recommendations but not ratings
- A collective report drawing out key themes
- An inspection of individual APs but with a code rather than their name used, to limit identification.

3. Summary of HM Inspectorate of Probation decisions

Following a review of consultation feedback from the online consultation, consultation events, and discussion with residents, along with extensive testing through six pilot inspections, we have made the following decisions.

	Question	Post-consultation decision
1	Should HM Inspectorate of Probation inspect APs?	<p>We will undertake a programme of AP inspections.</p> <p>The first AP inspection will take place in July 2025.</p> <p>We anticipate inspecting each AP around once every four years, although this may be more frequent where we have inspected and have particular concerns.</p> <p>We will focus our resources where we believe we can have the most impact, including through the identification and dissemination of effective practice. We will decide where to inspect by considering a combination of the risks that we think each AP is facing, along with a degree of random selection. To inform our risk-based decisions, we will review the performance information and intelligence that is available to us. We will not base our decisions solely on risk, however, as we want to inspect a mixture of APs for which there are concerns and those that are performing well.</p> <p>As this is a new inspection programme, we will keep our approach under regular review.</p>
2	Is our overall focus on protecting the public and promoting rehabilitation in a safe environment the right approach to take?	<p>We will inspect all APs against five standards. All five of the standards will be supported by comprehensive rules and guidance documents to ensure that the judgements that we make are fair, consistent, and transparent.</p> <p>We have focused our standards on inputs and activities. We want to ensure that activities to protect the public and promote rehabilitation are delivered by APs and that these are delivered in a safe and decent environment. These activities are at the forefront of our standards and must be enabled by the right inputs of high-quality leadership and partnerships, and effective staffing arrangements. The complete framework of</p>

	Question	Post-consultation decision
		standards, key questions, and prompts that we propose is attached in Annexe A. The standards framework will be supported by inspection guidance materials, ensuring that we make reliable and valid judgements.
3	Is it right that we focus on delivering in a safe and decent environment?	<p>In a residential setting, the provision of a safe and decent environment is vital to enable desistance and support rehabilitation.</p> <p>We have one standard that focuses on the AP's environment. We expect to see that facilities are provided, and that the systems and practices delivered provide a safe, healthy, and dignified environment for residents.</p> <p>This separate standard enables us to comment specifically on the environment and target recommendations in the most effective way.</p>
4	Does the standards framework cover the key areas that contribute to the effective service delivery of an AP? If not, what is missing?	<p>The standards framework, when taken with the detail provided by the rules and guidance, provides a clear and detailed picture of the key areas that contribute to the effective service delivery of an AP and those areas that AP residents told us are important to them. We have structured these areas into five standards: leadership, staffing, safety, public protection, and rehabilitation.</p> <p>Leadership</p> <p>Our standards will enable us to see whether leadership drives an effective AP for all residents. We want to see that leaders engage effectively with their staff, promoting an open culture of engagement, and that staff are proud to work for the AP. We will expect to see leaders that use analysis and learning to drive improvements in the service.</p> <p>Staffing</p> <p>Our staffing standard focuses on the arrangements and activity that are in place to ensure high-quality delivery. We are interested in whether staff have manageable workloads, have the right skills, are trained effectively, and are supported by the right levels of management oversight. Staff should be competent in their roles and be able to make and develop positive relationships with</p>

Question	Post-consultation decision
	<p>residents. We will look at this across all job roles.</p> <p>Safety</p> <p>We are interested both in the facilities at the AP and the systems and processes used by the AP. We want to see that that the AP provides a safe, healthy, and dignified environment for residents and staff. Safeguarding and behaviour management arrangements should be appropriate and actively in place. Residents' rooms and shared facilities should be fit for purpose, clean, and properly maintained.</p> <p>Public protection</p> <p>We want to see that the AP proactively undertakes the right activities to keep the public safe. We are interested in effective multi-agency and community arrangements, as well as internal processes such as how shift handovers work, drug and alcohol testing, and how enforcement decisions are made.</p> <p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>We recognise the importance of effective relationships between residents and staff in rehabilitation activity. We want to see relationships that enable individuals to build on their strengths alongside the delivery of keywork and rehabilitative activities appropriate to each individual.</p> <p>We envisage that our standards framework will evolve over time. We will keep it under review and will continue to evaluate how well it works. We expect always to have standards that cover the way that APs are run (leadership and staffing), as well as standards that cover the longstanding aims of APs. We may make changes to some individual prompts or key questions as we learn from applying them on inspection. If and when we do that, we will publish the changes on our website. If we propose to make any significant changes to the standards themselves, we will consult before doing so.</p>

	Question	Post-consultation decision
5	Are any of the proposed prompts insufficiently linked to effective service delivery? If so, which ones?	<p>All of the proposed prompts can be linked directly to effective AP delivery.</p> <p>Our standards, key questions, and prompts outline the areas that we will focus on in our AP inspections. Comprehensive rules and guidance are in place for each prompt. This includes the details about where we expect to find evidence, what we expect in terms of equity, diversity, and inclusion, what we expect to see from evidence, and how we judge sufficiency for each individual prompt.</p>
6	Are any of the proposed prompts insufficiently precise? If so, which ones?	<p>Our standards form the basis for transparent and independent AP inspections. Our standards, key questions, and prompts are coherent, sufficiently comprehensive, and balanced. They are sufficiently discrete and will support fair and transparent inspection judgements.</p> <p>All the key questions and prompts have a binary 'yes' or 'no' response. A number of prompts were amended to reflect consultation responses and learning from our pilot inspections. Inspectors will cross-reference evidence from inspected cases to that collected during the AP inspection fieldwork.</p>
7	Should any parts of the standards framework be weighted more heavily within the ratings system? If so, which parts?	<p>We will rate the five individual standards: leadership, staffing, safety, public protection, and rehabilitation in each AP inspection. Each standard will be rated on the same four-point scale that we use in our probation inspection programme: 'Outstanding,' 'Good,' 'Requires improvement', and 'Inadequate.'</p> <p>We believe all of the standards to be equally important and, as such, we will not introduce any weightings to the standards.</p>
8	Is there anything in our proposed standards or the way we suggest we will rate APs that you think could lead to undesirable behaviours, outputs, or outcomes? If so, please tell us.	<p>We do not believe that there is anything in the detail of our standards, questions, and prompts, or the rules and guidance documentation that sits beneath them, that will lead to undesirable behaviours, outputs, or outcomes.</p> <p>Nonetheless, this is a new inspection programme and, as such, we will keep the</p>

	Question	Post-consultation decision
		standards framework under regular review.
9	Does the way we are proposing to rate APs make sense? Is it fair?	<p>Each of the five AP standards will be scored on a scale of 0 to 3, in which 'Outstanding' = 3; 'Good' = 2; 'Requires improvement' = 1, and 'Inadequate' = 0. We will calculate the overall rating for each AP by adding up the scores for the four standards to produce a total score ranging from 0 to 15, which will be banded to produce an overall rating for each AP as follows:</p> <p>13–15 = Outstanding 8–12 = Good 3–7 = Requires improvement 0–2 = Inadequate</p>
10	How soon after an inspection should we expect to see improvement action taken?	For each AP that we inspect, an action plan should be produced within two months of the report's publication. This action plan is the responsibility of the regional director, in agreement with the Performance, Assurance and Risk Group within HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS). The action plan should address the recommendations in the inspection report, which may include national recommendations, as well as those specific to the AP.
11	Should our inspections be unannounced?	<p>Our inspections will be unannounced but with a two-day period before the on-site inspection fieldwork begins at the AP.</p> <p>On the Monday morning of the inspection week, we will telephone and email the AP before 9.30am to announce our inspection. Inspectors will spend Monday and Tuesday analysing evidence in advance and inspecting case files. Inspectors will arrive on-site at the AP at 1pm on the Wednesday of the inspection</p>

	Question	Post-consultation decision
		week to start the fieldwork.
1 2	What are the benefits and drawbacks of publishing reports and recommendations for each AP?	<p>We will publish a short report for each AP that we inspect. This will include the rating that we have awarded the AP for each of the five standards, as well as the overall rating. We will explain the rating and outline the evidence that supports our judgements. The report will include recommendations for the AP and HMPPS to implement. We believe this to be in the public interest.</p> <p>Reporting in this way aligns to our approach to probation inspections, where we award overall ratings to probation delivery units (PDUs), probation regions, and nationally on the basis of the ratings against individual standards.</p> <p>We recognise that some respondents were concerned about a negative impact on APs of publication. We will ensure that the overall rating is fully explained through a balanced and non-sensationalist narrative, and that recommendations are targeted to the areas where improvement is most needed.</p>
1 3	What are the alternatives to publishing a report and recommendations for each AP?	<p>In the interests of transparency and driving improvement, we will publish a report for each AP that includes ratings alongside a narrative about our findings and targeted recommendations.</p> <p>This approach enables us fully to explain our ratings for each of the APs that we inspect and to target our recommendations at the right level to drive improvement. This approach is consistent with how we publish reports to drive improvement across our probation inspection programme.</p>

4. Contacts

Enquiries about this consultation response should be directed to:

Email: helen.mercer@hmiprobation.gov.uk

General enquiries about the work of HM Inspectorate of Probation can be emailed to: hmip.enquiries@hmiprobation.gsi.gov.uk

5. Annexe one: Approved premises inspection standards

Leadership and governance

1. Leadership and governance drive the delivery of a high-quality service.

1.1 Do leaders drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all residents?

- a) Is there an appropriate vision that sets out how high-quality provision will be delivered to residents?
- b) Do leaders promote a positive culture?
- c) Are the views of residents actively sought, analysed, and used to review and improve the service provided?
- d) Do leaders collaborate effectively with local communities to utilise opportunities for residents and manage risks?
- e) Are risks to delivery understood, with appropriate mitigations and controls in place?

1.2 Do leaders use analysis, evidence, and learning to drive the effective delivery of high-quality services for all residents?

- a) Where necessary, is action taken promptly and appropriately in response to performance monitoring, audit, or inspection?
- b) Is a culture of learning and continuous improvement promoted actively?
- c) Do leaders understand, respond to, and utilise equity, diversity, and inclusion information in delivery arrangements?

Staffing

2. Staff are enabled to deliver a high-quality service.

2.1 Does staffing support the delivery of a high-quality service for all residents?

- a) Is there always a sufficient number of staff on duty?
- b) Are staff competent in their roles?
- c) Do staff understand and meet the individual needs of residents?
- d) Are there positive relationships between staff and residents?
- e) Are staff engaged, motivated, and proud to work for the AP?

2.2 Do arrangements for managing and supporting staff drive the delivery of a high-quality service for residents?

- a) Is an effective induction programme delivered to new staff?
- b) Do staff receive effective supervision and appraisal that enhance the quality of work with residents?
- c) Are resources managed actively to maintain service delivery?
- d) Are there effective management oversight arrangements that enhance and sustain the quality of work with residents?
- e) Are arrangements in place to ensure that staff safety and wellbeing are prioritised for effective service delivery?

- f) Is poor staff performance identified and addressed?

Safety

3. The AP provides a safe, healthy, and dignified environment for staff and residents.

3.1 Do AP systems and practices provide a safe, healthy, and dignified environment for staff and residents?

- a) Are effective arrangements in place to identify and support residents who are at risk of suicide or self-harm?
- b) Is prescribed medication, including controlled drugs, securely stored and effectively administered in accordance with a safe system of work?
- c) Do staff take appropriate action where there are safeguarding concerns about residents?
- d) Are appropriate arrangements for managing behaviour implemented and fully understood by residents?
- e) Are there sufficient and appropriate observations of residents' behaviour?

3.2 Do the AP's facilities provide a safe, healthy, and dignified environment for staff and residents?

- a) Are residents provided with a clean, decent, and well-maintained bedroom?
- b) Are adaptations made to bedrooms to manage risk where appropriate?
- c) Are residents provided with a clean, decent, and well-maintained wider environment?
- d) Are there clean, decent, and well-maintained shower and toilet facilities?
- e) Is security equipment appropriately used, including to capture and review incidents?

Public protection

4. The AP effectively protects the public.

4.1 Does the AP deliver public protection arrangements effectively?

- a) Does the AP attend and contribute to key multi-agency risk management forums, including MAPPA)?
- b) Does the AP have appropriate oversight and influence in the allocation of residents to the AP?
- c) Are appropriate enforcement decisions made and sufficiently recorded?
- d) Do staff take appropriate action where there are safeguarding concerns about children and vulnerable adults?
- e) Are the required arrangements in place for monitoring and sharing of information with the PDU to manage risk sufficiently?
- f) Are the required arrangements in place for monitoring and sharing of information with other agencies to manage risk sufficiently?
- g) Are shift handovers comprehensive and supported by written records that appropriately capture risk and safeguarding management information?
- h) Is drug and alcohol testing undertaken appropriately in relation to risk or safeguarding concerns?

Rehabilitation

5. The AP delivers rehabilitative activity to reduce reoffending.

5.1 Does the AP deliver rehabilitative activity to reduce reoffending?

- a) Are there effective relationships and activity with local services to enable effective rehabilitation?
- b) Are rehabilitative activities sufficient, planned, and delivered to support the reintegration of residents into the community?
- c) Are rehabilitative activities aligned with the work being delivered by the PDU?
- d) Do residents receive a suitable and timely induction into the AP?
- e) Are sufficient planning arrangements in place before residents arrive?
- f) Do relationships between staff and residents support rehabilitative work?
- g) Is key work delivered effectively, with appropriate referrals and signposting for residents to relevant services to support reintegration into the community?
- h) Are sufficient arrangements in place to support residents to prepare for moving on from the AP?
- i) Are residents engaged in appropriate activities to meet their needs and build on their strengths?