




HM Inspectorate
of Probation

Youth Inspection Programme

November 2024

Presentation Aims:

- To provide information that will assist all YJS in working with their staff, partners, board members and volunteers to understand the new youth inspection framework from HM Inspectorate of Probation
 - To explain the different types of inspection and how inspections will be conducted
 - To outline the Inspectorate's standards, how they are intended to drive effective practice in youth justice, and how they are used in inspections
 - To provide guidance on where to find information to help understand the inspection process.
- 


The journey to a new youth inspection programme:




- Started scoping in January 2023.
- Set up an internal youth programme board.
- Engaged with the YJB/YJPU and other inspectorates (England and Wales).
- Utilised feedback and learning from the current inspection programme, including post inspection meetings with Heads of Service.
- Set up a stakeholder working group with YJS representatives across England and Wales.
- Discussed and shared proposals with our academic advisory group.
- Engaged with the ADCS.
- Held six in-person and one virtual roadshow events – over 180 participants engaged in discussion.
- Held the online consultation December 2023 – January 2024.
- Feedback from children.
- Completed a number of pilots, learning from and refining the programme following these.
- Updated, amended and changed the draft standards and proposals as we have developed our thinking.

Why have a new programme and what is the Inspectorate aiming to achieve?


The inspectorate wants to:

- Have children and victims at the forefront of its inspections
 - Be proportionate in its inspection activity
 - Be responsive and agile
 - Ensure inspections have positive impact
 - Drive effective practice and improvement
 - Look at the quality of work based on the needs of the child rather than the type of disposal they receive
 - Have a greater focus upon the service victims are receiving – many of whom are children
 - Increase the frequency with which inspections occur to avoid long delays between inspections.
- 


What are the critical changes?

- The new programme is based heavily on up-to-date contextual safeguarding and desistance research combined – it is evidence and research led
 - There is a significant change of language and focus throughout – which is compatible with the language of child first and child first principles
 - The standards for organisational arrangements have been significantly updated. The role of the YJS partnership is critical.
 - IT and facilities are now included within leadership and governance, staffing, partnerships and services, and are no longer a separate standard
 - All work with children has been combined into a single domain two standard (to include children receiving court, out-of-court, bail and remand and resettlement support)
- 

What are the critical changes? (continued)

- There is a clearer focus on the child's needs, not the disposal/outcome they have received.
 - The focus has moved from desistance, safety and wellbeing, and risk of harm to a focus upon achieving positive change and keeping children and communities safe
 - The reviewing standard has been removed and dynamic reviewing is embedded across assessing, planning and implementation and delivery
 - A victims' standard has been introduced
 - A focus upon the delivery and provision of appropriate adults has been introduced
- 

Introduction of two types of inspection:

- Inspection of youth justice work with children and victims' (IYJWCV)
 - Inspection of youth justice services (IYJS)
- 

Inspection of youth justice work with children and victims – inspecting against domain two and the victims' standard only (IYJWCV)

Majority of inspections per year likely to be this type of inspection (85 per cent)

Work delivered to children and victims at the **forefront** of this inspection
Significantly less evidence in advance requested

Delivered over one week (on site Monday afternoon to Friday morning)

Will have a lead inspector, deputy inspector and assistant inspectors on site. Where applicable may also have local assessors.

Will include a meeting with HoS and a presentation from the chair of the management board on Monday afternoon.

3 ½ week announcement period (announce on a Wednesday, planning meeting Friday or Monday)

Will include some focus groups – but very different to existing model

Will include a showcase slot and two multi-agency case discussion meetings on two cases within the case sample.

Will include children's, parents and carers participation and opportunity for them to engage through a variety of methods during the week

Will have a 'context visit' to understand the context of the YJS

Work with children (domain two) and the victims' standards will be rated. Scores will be combined to give an overall rating.

Shorter report publication time

Leadership and governance, staffing and partnerships and services will be inspected through the **lens of the work** delivered with children.

Inspection of Youth Justice Services (IYJS) (domains one and two and the victims' standard)

- Completed over two weeks Monday to Friday
- All case inspection data completed during week one and themes from this informs week two
- Lead inspector, Assistant Inspector (+Local Assessor's where applicable) for week one
- Lead Inspector and Deputy for week two
- Week one is presentation, case inspection (children and victims'), and children's, parents and carers participation
- Week two is triangulation meetings, focus groups, multi-agency case discussion sessions (two) and includes meetings with board, board chair, and staff.
- Will include a meeting with HoS and a presentation from the chair of the management board on Monday afternoon of week one.
- 3 ½ week announcement period (announce on a Wednesday, planning meeting Friday or Monday)
- Will have a 'context visit' to understand the context of the YJS and include a showcase slot
- Significantly less evidence in advance as per work with children and victims' inspections.
- All standards rated but overall rating on domain two and victim standard only (so comparable with IYJWCV)
- Report production reduced from current processes

To build in capacity to go from youth justice work with children and victims' inspection (IYJWCV) to Inspection of Youth Justice Services (IYJS) inspection where required – a 'reactive' IYJS

- Small number of inspections to be deployed at short notice per year where the inspectorate are concerned about our findings for youth justice work with children and victims (such as inadequate ratings or organizational alerts) or particularly impressed and wish to know more
- Will occur within 4-6 weeks of the original inspection
- Enable the inspectorate to explore in detail the governance arrangements and the impact they are having.

Inspection standards:

Domain One: Organisational Delivery

1.1 Governance and Leadership

1.2 Staffing

1.3 Partnerships and Services

Rating organisational arrangements:

- Under each key question is a series of **prompt questions** inspectors will seek to explore and find evidence of during each inspection.
- Detail of these and the evidence explored for them is contained in the inspectorate's youth rules and guidance.
- **Board members, partners** and **all managers** within the YJS need to ensure they read and are familiar with these.
- There is a very strong emphasis upon **the role** of the **partnership** and the **role** of the **management board** across **both types** of inspection.
- In YJS inspections, the link between what is found in case data the role of organisational arrangements is recognised. Therefore, for leadership and governance and partnerships and services, **decision rules** and **guidance apply**
- In inspections of youth justice work with children and victims (IYJWCV) organisational arrangement standards are considered through **the lens of the work that is being delivered with children and victims.**
- In our inspections of youth justice services (IYJS) these standards are **inspected** and **rated.**
- The decision for ratings is decided at the ratings panel

Domain Two: work with children

Three standards with two key questions each:

- Work to achieve positive change for the child
- Work to keep children and communities safe

2.1 Assessing

2.2 Planning

2.3 Delivery

Reviewing is included across assessment, planning and delivery

Keeping the child and communities safe: A change in inspection language:

- Pathways into offending tend to be multi-layered, and children within the justice system have a variety of lived experiences across the individual, family, social and environmental domains.
- The social-ecological framework recognises the importance of the context that a child finds themselves in, and how responses need to be holistic and child-centred, paying attention to the individual, interpersonal (family and peers), community, and societal levels.
- A whole systems approach recognises the need for a range of different activities at the various levels of the socio-ecological model, especially when rooted in a strengths-based, trauma-informed way that works with individual need.
- The key factors associated with offending, such as poverty, neglect and abuse, family and neighbourhood environments characterised by violence, to educational disconnect, substance misuse and relationship fragility, all highlight the importance of a holistic approach.
- Child first principles outline that addressing risks of harm to the child or others is crucial to provide the safe space for child development and for victims and potential victims, but stigma can be reduced if this understood in more positive terms like keeping everybody safe, safeguarding, or health and safety



The identification of safety concerns relating to children (*Research & Analysis Bulletin 2022*)

The safety concerns relating to the children themselves and to other people were often overlapping and intertwined, with links to the following:

- carrying knives or other weapons
- illegal drug possession
- drug and alcohol misuse
- adversity and trauma
- care experience
- criminal exploitation, including county lines
- mental health issues
- domestic abuse
- family issues
- negative peer influences.

The research identifies that we need to think of them as **two sides of the same coin**.

We need to think about **the safety and wellbeing of all**.

This has been recognised in why **keeping the child** and **community safe** is now drawn **together** within the inspectorate standards across assessing, planning, and delivery.

Rating work with children:


Under each key question is a series of **prompt questions** inspectors will seek to explore and find evidence of during each inspection. Detail of these, alongside the key questions, and the evidence expected is contained in the inspectorate's youth case assessment rules and guidance (CARaG).

Inspectors will inspect a **number** of **case records** of **work delivered with children** and answer these **key** and **prompt** questions.

The answers to the **key** questions will generate a **score**.

The **lowest** score for either work to achieve positive change for the child or work to keep the child and communities safe **will drive the rating** for **each standard** (assessing, planning and delivery).

Therefore, it is essential that there is **quality** of work **delivered**, both in terms of achieving positive change **and** keeping the child and communities safe.



Victims

The focus is on the service to victims rather than the work done with children (which is covered by 2.1-2.3).

V1.1 Is work with victims' high-quality, individualised and responsive?


V1.2 Do organisational arrangements and activity drive a high-quality, individualised and responsive service for victims?

The victims' standard: what are inspectors looking for?

Direct work with victims (V1.1):

- High-quality
- Individualised - meeting the needs and wishes of victims
- Victim support and victim safety

Organisational arrangements and activity (V1.2):

- Active and engaged management board driving victim work
 - Effective information sharing arrangements
 - Skilled and supported staff with manageable workloads
 - Monitoring, evaluation and review
- 

Rating the victims' standard


The victims' standard is rated by taking a view of the work seen in cases alongside the organisational activities and arrangements in place to drive an effective service for victims.

The victims' standard consists of two key questions:

V1.1 Is work with victims high-quality, individualised, and responsive?

- The scoring for this is generated entirely by the work delivered to victims and obtained through inspection of work delivered to individual victims
- We use the same % boundaries of sufficiency that we use in making judgements about work with children: inadequate, RI, good, outstanding
- The resulting rating is the starting point for judging the youth inspection victims' standard.

V1.2 Do organisational arrangements and activity drive a high-quality, individualised, and responsive service for victims?

- Qualitative question based upon evidence in advance and evidence gathered during fieldwork.
 - The yes/no judgement to key question V1.2 is combined with the rating for key question V1.1 generated by percentage scores
- 

Rating the victims' standard (2)

V 1.1 Cases where work with victims is sufficient	V 1.1 key question rating
Minority: <50%	Inadequate
Too few: 50-64%	Requires improvement
Reasonable majority: 65-79%	Good
Large majority: 80%+	Outstanding

Rating the victims' standard


Rating for V 1.1 (generated by % scores)	Answer to key question V 1.2 (generated by qualitative evidence)	Rating for the victims' standard
Outstanding	Yes	Good or Outstanding
Outstanding	No	Good or Outstanding
Good	Yes	Good or Outstanding
Good	No	Good or Requires improvement
Requires improvement	Yes	Good or Requires improvement
Requires improvement	No	Requires improvement or Inadequate
Inadequate	Yes	Requires improvement or Inadequate
Inadequate	No	Requires improvement or Inadequate

Multi-agency case discussion meetings (MACD's):


- Two in both types of inspection
- Should contain all relevant partners working with the child.
- The opportunity to see what has worked well, identify any barriers to effective partnership working and see how work has been tailored to the child.
- There will be a focus upon how the partners have worked together to meet the child's diverse needs, achieve positive change, and keep the child and the community safe.
- The intention is to bring the work inspectors see in case inspection 'alive' through discussion with partners and see the partnership working in practice




Multi-agency discussion meetings continued:

- The Inspectorate will ask the **partnership** to complete a review of the two cases (on a template provided).
 - The case manager will be interviewed as part of the case inspection
 - However, the MACD is focussed upon the partnership work, not just that of the case manager.
 - We would expect **all involved** in the work delivered to the child to be **part of the review** and **attend** the multi-agency discussion meeting
 - The reviews should be available by the Monday of the fieldwork week and given to the lead inspector.
 - This process is intended **to support** the **partnership to review** and **identify** their own **learning** prior to the MACD meetings.
- 


Case manager interviews:

- Case inspections include reading and assessing relevant information available through electronic records and assessment and planning tools. Inspectors need access to the local case management system and any other electronic recording system.
 - YJS need to provide any additional paper documents relevant to the inspected case.
 - Case managers are interviewed for each case within the selected sample.
 - If required, interviews can be scheduled using Microsoft Teams, rather than face-to-face meetings.
 - Case discussions last up to 1½ hours and cover assessing, planning and delivery.
 - Case managers are also asked about their broader experience of management oversight, and access to services for children.
 - Interviews are designed to provide the opportunity for the case manager to discuss the child, reflect and identify strengths in their practice as well as any learning to take forward
- 

Victim worker interviews

- The inspectorate recognises that many services will have a small number or a singular post of a victim worker.
 - To minimise the number of interviews a victim worker may have during inspection fieldwork and be proportionate, the inspection of victim work will be done by reviewing three cases for every interview and may involve a number of file reads (without an accompanying interview).
 - If required, interviews can be scheduled using Microsoft Teams, rather than face-to-face meetings.
 - Case discussions last up to one hour and cover the victims' standard.
 - Victim workers are also asked about their broader experience of management oversight, organisational support and access to services for victims.
 - Interviews are designed to provide the opportunity for the victim worker to discuss the work undertaken with individual victims, reflect and identify strengths in their practice as well as any learning to take forward.
- 

Children's, parents and carer's participation


- The inspectorate values children's, parents' and carers' participation, and encourage their involvement in inspections, to share their experiences of the services they have received.
 - Opportunities will be provided throughout the fieldwork week for all those who wish to engage with and talk to the inspectorate.
 - This includes telephone contact, meeting in person, video call, or meeting as a group of children (where determined by the YJS as safe and appropriate to do so) alongside responding to a text survey.
 - Feedback from children, parents and carers is included in the published report.
- 

Rating decisions:

For inspection of youth justice work with children and victims:

- A ratification meeting is held.
- Normally the Wednesday after the fieldwork.
- The service is informed of the outcome, normally by the end of the week (seven days) after the end of fieldwork.


For inspection of youth justice services:

- A ratings panel is held.
 - Normally the Monday (10 days) after the end of fieldwork.
 - The service is informed of the outcome by the end of the week (up to 14 days, most likely earlier) after the end of fieldwork.
- 


Ratings:

- Straightforward scoring rules are used to generate the overall YJS rating.
- Each of the four core standards (assessing, planning, delivery and victims) is scored on a scale of 0 to 3, in which 'Inadequate' = 0; 'Requires improvement' = 1; 'Good' = 2; and 'Outstanding' = 3.
- Adding the scores for the core standards produces a total score ranging from 0 to 12, which is banded to produce the overall rating, as follows:
 - 0–2 = Inadequate
 - 3–6 = Requires improvement
 - 7–10 = Good
 - 11–12 = Outstanding

Ratings continued:

- In IYJS inspections only, domain one standards are rated independently. So, there are ratings for leadership and governance, staffing, partnerships and services.
 - Decision rules and guidance applies to leadership and governance and partnerships and services, recognising the links organisational arrangements have upon the quality of work delivered.
 - These ratings do not contribute to the **overall** rating for the service.
 - The reason for this approach is to be fair to all YJS, irrespective of the type of inspection they receive.
 - This ensures that all overall ratings for every inspection are driven by the quality of work being delivered to children and victims.
 - Once received ratings can be shared with the team, partners and board members.
- 

Inspection report:

- The YJS normally receives a copy of the draft report on Monday morning four weeks after the end of the inspection fieldwork, for factual accuracy check, with a deadline to return any comments to the Head of Youth Inspection Programme and lead inspector within five working days.
 - The Head of Youth Inspection Programme and lead inspector consider the comments from the YJS and provide a response.
 - The communications team submits the final report and press release to the Secretary of State around five working days before publication.
 - The team sends an embargoed copy of the report and any press release to the inspected organisation.
 - For IYJWCV inspections, the report will usually be published 10 weeks after the inspection fieldwork (12 weeks in Wales).
 - The timescales for IYJS inspections are 11 and 13 weeks respectively.
 - Changes to the anticipated publication date may be made in advance.
 - The lead inspector will discuss any changes in the anticipated publication date with the YJS.
- 

Key inspection documents:

- Youth justice inspection manual
 - Youth justice inspection standards
 - Youth justice rules and guidance
 - Youth justice Case Assessment Rules and Guidance (CARaG)
- 