



HM Inspectorate
of Probation

Probation inspection standards

HM Inspectorate of Probation, April 2025

V1.5

Contents

Domain one – Organisational arrangements and activity	3
Domain two – Service delivery.....	5
Public protection	5
Desistance.....	6
Court work.....	7
Unpaid work	7
Resettlement	8
Statutory victim work.....	9
PDU standards	10
Domain one – Organisational arrangements and activity	10
P 1.1 Leadership	10
P 1.2 Staffing.....	11
P 1.3 Services.....	12
Domain two – Service delivery.....	13
P 2.1 Assessment.....	13
P 2.2 Planning	13
P 2.3 Implementation and delivery.....	14
P 2.4 Reviewing	15

Regional standards

Domain one – Organisational arrangements and activity

R 1.1 Leadership

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

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

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

- a) Do regional arrangements for commissioned services deliver high-quality services to people on probation?
- b) Are high-quality services available to all people on probation in this region?
- c) Do regional leaders understand and drive improvement to the quality of work across the region?
- d) When carrying out changes to systems, processes, or staffing, is the impact on service delivery, including equality impact, assessed and appropriate action taken?
- e) Do regional leaders collaborate sufficiently with partners and stakeholders to ensure effective delivery of the vision and strategy?
- f) Does the regional leadership take a deliberate, strategic, and informed approach to meeting diverse needs?
- g) Are risks to service delivery understood sufficiently, with appropriate mitigations and controls in place?

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

- a) Are staff in the region engaged, motivated, and proud to work for the Probation Service?
- b) Does the region's culture promote openness, constructive challenge, and ideas?
- c) Do regional leaders provide promotion opportunities equitably, and recognise and reward exceptional work?

- d) Do regional leaders ensure that 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?

R 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 probation services?
- b) Are the views of people on probation and other key stakeholders sought, analysed, and used to review and improve the effectiveness of commissioned services?
- c) Do regional leaders understand and use diversity information to drive improvement?
- d) Are services improved through evaluation and development of the underlying evidence base?
- e) Does the region learn systematically from things that go wrong, including Serious Further Offences?
- f) Where necessary, is action taken promptly and appropriately in response to performance monitoring, audit, or inspection?

R 1.2 Staffing

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

R 1.2.1 Do arrangements for regional staffing support the delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?

- a) Are regional staffing levels sufficient?
- b) Are regional staff workloads manageable?
- c) Is the potential of regional staff developed?
- d) Is sufficient access provided to training for regional staff?
- e) Is a culture of learning and continuous improvement promoted actively across the region?
- f) Do staff receive effective supervision that enhances and sustains the quality of work with people on probation?
- g) Is poor regional staff performance identified and addressed?
- h) Are management oversight arrangements effective?

R 1.2.2 Do arrangements for PDU staffing support the delivery of a high-quality service for all people on probation?

Aggregated ratings for standard P 1.2 from all of the region's PDU inspections generate a rating for key question R 1.2.2 which is combined with the evidence for R 1.2.1. The Rules and Guidance provides full details.

Domain two – Service delivery

Public protection

R 2.1 High-quality, personalised, and responsive services are delivered to protect the public.

R 2.1.1 Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) Does assessment identify and analyse clearly 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?

R 2.1.2 Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) Does planning address sufficiently 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?

R 2.1.3 Does the implementation and delivery of services support the safety of other people effectively?

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

R 2.1.4 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?
- d) Are written reviews completed as appropriate as a formal record of the management of the risk of harm?

Desistance

R 2.2 High-quality, personalised, and responsive services are delivered to promote desistance.

R 2.2.1 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?

R 2.2.2 Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting desistance?

- a) Does planning reflect sufficiently 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?

R 2.2.3 Does the implementation and delivery of services support desistance effectively?

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

R 2.2.4 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?

Court work

R 2.3 The pre-sentence information and advice provided to court supports its decision-making.

R 2.3.1 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?

Unpaid work

R 2.4 Unpaid work is delivered safely and effectively, engaging the person on probation in line with the expectations of the court.

R 2.4.1 Is the assessment and planning of unpaid work personalised?

- a) Does assessment and planning consider the individual's diversity, protected characteristics, and personal circumstances, and the impact that these have on their ability to comply and engage with unpaid work?
- b) Does assessment and planning for unpaid work identify and build upon the individual's strengths and enhance their protective factors?
- c) Does assessment and planning for unpaid work identify and address factors related to risk of harm?

R 2.4.2 Do arrangements for unpaid work maximise rehabilitative elements and support desistance?

- a) Is the allocated work suitable, taking account of the individual's diversity and personal circumstances?
- b) Does unpaid work offer opportunities for education, training, and the development of employment-related skills?
- c) Is clear information given to the person on probation to enable compliance?

R 2.4.3 Is unpaid work delivered safely?

- a) Does the delivery of unpaid work take account of risk of harm to other people on probation, staff, or the public?

- b) Does unpaid work consider issues relating to the health and safety, or potential vulnerability, of the person on probation?

R 2.4.4 Is the sentence of the court implemented appropriately?

- a) Does unpaid work commence promptly and happen regularly?
- b) Do arrangements for unpaid work encourage the individual's engagement and compliance with the order?
- c) Are appropriate professional judgements made in relation to decisions about missed appointments?
- d) Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?

Resettlement

R 2.5 Resettlement work is timely, personalised, and coordinated, addressing the individual's resettlement needs and supporting their integration into the community.

R 2.5.1 Is resettlement timely, personalised, and coordinated, and does it address key resettlement needs and support the individual's integration into the community?

- a) Was there a clear handover from the prison offender manager to the community offender manager at an appropriate point before release?
- b) Was there sufficient information sharing between prison-based staff and the community offender manager?
- c) Did the community offender manager ensure a proportionate level of contact with the prisoner before release?
- d) Did the community offender manager identify and address the key resettlement or desistance needs before release?
- e) Did the community offender manager identify and address the key risk of harm issues before release?
- f) Are resettlement services delivered in line with the individual's resettlement needs, prioritising those which are most critical?
- g) Is there effective coordination of resettlement activity with other services being delivered in the prison?
- h) Do resettlement services support effective handover to local services in the community?

Statutory victim work

R 2.6 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.

R 2.6.1 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 prisoner/person on probation 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?

R 2.6.2 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 individual?

R 2.6.3 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 prisoner/person on probation 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?

PDU standards

Domain one – Organisational arrangements and activity

P 1.1 Leadership

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

P 1.1.1 Does 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?

P 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?

P 1.1.3 Do PDU leaders engage actively 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 that 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?

P 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 diversity 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 Serious Further Offences?
- e) Is learning communicated effectively?

P 1.2 Staffing

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

P 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?

P 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) Does the 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?

P 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) Are there effective management oversight arrangements that enhance and sustain the quality of work with people on probation?
- d) Is the appraisal process used effectively to ensure that staff are delivering a high-quality service?
- e) Are the learning needs of staff identified and met?
- f) Is poor staff performance identified and addressed?
- g) Is a culture of learning and continuous improvement promoted actively?

P 1.3 Services

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

P 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) Are services delivered in appropriate and accessible locations?
- e) Is the delivery of services informed by regular, robust, evidence-based monitoring, evaluation, and review?

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

- a) Does the volume of services available meet demand consistently?
- 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?

Domain two – Service delivery

Most cases where contact has not been suspended are inspected against our core standards. These are marked through the standards framework with the prefix 'PC' (PDU core). Most cases where contact has been suspended are inspected against our adjusted standards marked by the prefix 'PA' (PDU adjusted).

Cases that will be inspected under our PDU adjusted standards are where:

- there was PSS only from the date of release, or
- there was a formal licence period of eight weeks or less from the date of release.

Core standards ('PC')

PC 2.1 Assessment

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

PC 2.1.1 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?

PC 2.1.2 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?

PC 2.1.3 Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) Does assessment identify and analyse clearly 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?

PC 2.2 Planning

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

PC 2.2.1 Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?

- a) Is the person on probation involved meaningfully in planning, and are their views taken into account?
- b) Does planning take sufficient account of the protected characteristics 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?

PC 2.2.2 Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting desistance?

- a) Does planning reflect sufficiently 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?

PC 2.2.3 Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) Does planning address sufficiently 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?

PC 2.3 Implementation and delivery

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

PC 2.3.1 Is the sentence or post-custody period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the person on probation?

- a) Do the requirements of the sentence start promptly, or at an appropriate time?
- b) Is sufficient focus given to maintaining an effective working relationship with the person on probation, taking into account their diversity needs?
- c) Are sufficient efforts made to enable the individual to complete their sentence, including flexibility to take appropriate account of their personal circumstances?

- d) Are risks of non-compliance identified and addressed in a timely fashion to reduce the need for enforcement actions?
- e) Are enforcement actions taken when appropriate?
- f) Are sufficient efforts made to re-engage the individual after enforcement actions or recall?

PC 2.3.2 Does the implementation and delivery of services support desistance effectively?

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

PC 2.3.3 Does the implementation and delivery of services support the safety of other people effectively?

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

PC 2.4 Reviewing

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

PC 2.4.1 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 when appropriate as a formal record of actions to implement the sentence?

PC 2.4.2 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 when appropriate as a formal record of the progress towards desistance?

PC 2.4.3 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?
- d) Are written reviews completed when appropriate as a formal record of the management of the risk of harm?

Adjusted standards ('PA')

PA 2.1 Assessment

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

PA 2.1.1 Does assessment focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?

- a) Does assessment consider how to best engage the individual in order to plan for contact ending and compliance during suspension?
- b) Does assessment consider diversity factors and potential barriers to planning for contact ending and compliance during suspension?
- c) Is the person on probation involved meaningfully in their assessment, and are their views taken into account?

PA 2.1.2 Does assessment focus sufficiently on the factors linked to offending and desistance?

- a) Does assessment identify the critical factors requiring ongoing support/engagement from local services?

- b) Does assessment identify the strengths and protective factors of the person on probation?
- c) Does assessment draw sufficiently on available sources of information?

PA 2.1.3 Does assessment focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) Does assessment identify and analyse clearly 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?

PA 2.2 Planning

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

PA 2.2.1 Does planning focus sufficiently on engaging the person on probation?

- a) Is the person on probation involved meaningfully in planning, and are their views taken into account?
- b) Does planning consider diversity factors and plan for potential barriers to re-engagement post suspension?
- c) Does planning consider motivation and plan for potential barriers to re-engagement post suspension?

PA 2.2.2 Does planning focus sufficiently on reducing reoffending and supporting desistance?

- a) Does planning reflect sufficiently 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?

PA 2.2.3 Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

- a) Does planning address sufficiently 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?

PA 2.3 Implementation and delivery

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

PA 2.3.1 Is the sentence or post-custody period implemented effectively with a focus on engaging the person on probation?

- a) Is the person on probation sufficiently informed of the requirements of the suspension period?
- b) Is sufficient focus, including to diversity factors, given to engagement in order to identify appropriate support during the suspension period?
- c) Have sufficient services been identified to provide appropriate support during the suspension period?

PA 2.3.2 Does the implementation and delivery of services support desistance effectively?

- a) Are the intended services most likely to reduce offending and support desistance?
- b) Do the intended services build upon the individual's strengths and enhance protective factors?
- c) Are services engaged to provide support and sustain desistance during the suspension period?

PA 2.3.3 Does the implementation and delivery of services support the safety of other people effectively?

- a) Is sufficient attention given to protecting actual and potential victims?
- b) Is the involvement of other agencies in managing and minimising the risk of harm sufficiently well-coordinated?
- c) Was there effective multi-agency coordination in relation to child safeguarding?
- d) Was there effective multi-agency coordination in relation to domestic abuse?

PA 2.4 Reviewing

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

PA 2.4.1 Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the compliance and engagement of the person on probation?

- a) Are sufficient efforts made to re-engage with the person on probation following changes in circumstances?
- b) Is the person on probation sufficiently informed of any changes in relation to their supervision or contact arrangements?
- c) Is contact re-instigated when necessary?

PA 2.4.2 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?

PA 2.4.3 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?

ONLY in cases where there has been an increase to a very high Risk of Serious Harm (ROSH), Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) registration, new child protection registration or National Security Division (NSD) allocation we will ask the following additional prompts:

- c) Has appropriate recall action been taken where the risks can no longer be managed in the community?
- d) Has a sufficient review of assessment and planning taken place?
- e) Has sufficient management oversight been provided?