



HM Inspectorate of Probation

Independent inspection of adult & youth offending work

Plan 2011 - 2012

Helping to improve effectiveness in the Criminal Justice System

April 2011

HM Inspectorate of Probation • Second Floor • Ashley House • 2 Monck Street • London • SW1P 2BQ

Tel: 020 7035 2202 • Fax: 020 7035 2237 • Email: HMIP.enquiries@hmiprobation.gsi.gov.uk

<http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectors/hmi-probation/>

ISBN 978-1-84099-460-5

HM Inspectorate of Probation

Plan 2011/2012

Independent inspection of adult & youth offending work

Summary

This Plan describes the key areas of work that we expect to undertake between April 2011 and March 2012, and why we are doing them.

Our aim is to promote long-term steady improvement in the Criminal Justice System (CJS) in general, and in adult & youth offending work in particular, and we describe how a well-focused inspection regime can fulfil this aim.

Almost all of our inspection work is undertaken jointly, with different inspectorates both inside and outside the CJS, and both in England and in Wales. Our scope includes work with both adults and young people who offend, and we undertake both thematic inspections and core programmes that focus on frontline practice with real cases, not merely on the organisational arrangements. From examining representative samples of cases, we can judge how often the right thing is being done well enough with the right individuals in the right way at the right time. We do this with a particular reference to 'public safety' work (i.e. work to protect the public and to protect children), since this cannot be readily measured by any means other than by independent inspection.

We constantly quality assure our methodology, and periodically review and refine our inspection design accordingly. Plans for the new core programmes of inspection of both youth offending and adult offending work will start in 2011, for implementing in 2012.

All this is being done within the context of a reduced budget for 2011/2012, with further reductions projected for the following three years. We will continue to tailor each of our Annual Plans to the resource available, each year ensuring that we get 'more from less' – i.e. the highest possible quality and quantity of inspection for the public money we are allocated. We are on target to achieve this.

We are an independent Inspectorate, but we operate as part of a broader 'team' of public servants aiming to help improve public services. This Plan outlines how our inspection work provides *Assurance* to the public and helps to promote what we call the 'Long Haul' of continuous incremental *Improvement* over time.

Contents:

1. Introducing this plan
2. Where our work fits
3. What we'll be doing, why and how:
 - 3.1 Inspecting Adult offending work***
Offender Management Inspection ('OMI 2')
 - 3.2 Inspecting Youth Offending work (IYO)***
Core case inspections (CCI)
 - 3.3 Thematic Inspections (Adult and Youth)***
 - 3.4 'Public safety' work (i.e. work to protect the public and to protect children)***
 - 3.5 Other work***
 - 3.6 Diversity and Equality***
4. Where our work leads to (benefits):
 - 4.1 Assurance***
 - 4.2 Improvement (a catalyst)***
 - 4.3 Looking further into the future***
5. Appendix (reference material):
 - HMI Probation Statement of purpose & Code of practice***
 - HMI Probation Financial Annex***

1. Introducing this Plan:

- 1.1 HMI Probation independently inspects work done with both adults and young people who have offended (or might do), whoever is undertaking such work aimed at making further offending less likely. We measure how often that work is done well enough. We do this by exercising our qualitative judgements about the work, and then aggregating those judgements.
- 1.2 In so doing, our aim is that Probation and Youth Offending staff and their partners progress along the path of continuous improvement, and thus on a wider level we help to improve long-term effectiveness in the Criminal Justice System as a whole.
- 1.3 We have published an annual Plan for the year ahead for each year since 2003, but considerable changes have taken place during that time. As we have done since this Inspectorate was founded in 1936, we have adapted to the changing needs around us. In particular there has been a major increase since 2003 in the quantity of joint inspection we do, reflected in the annual CJS Joint Inspection Plan and other joint inspection work.
- 1.4 In our view strategic planning is about managing the right mix of *continuity* and *change*. Circumstances and policies both *change*, and we have to be flexible enough to accommodate and manage such *changes* – but in the end what the CJS mostly needs is the ‘Long Haul’ of steady annual incremental improvements in its many day-to-day work processes; this is a matter that is aided principally by *continuity*.
- 1.5 For ourselves, we too have therefore sought to provide both *continuity* and *change* by showing how the consistency of our approach contributes to steady incremental improvement in the CJS as a whole, but because our approach is flexible too it is also possible to adapt it to apply in a relevant way to changing contexts, policies and structures.
- 1.6 While we do not claim for ourselves the credit for the achievements of others, we do think it is relevant to note the steady incremental improvements made in adult and youth offending work in the last six years. Public protection work and child protection work are not readily measured by any means other than inspection, and we have given a prominent focus to these two areas of work since 2004. We have noted a slow but steady improvement from a national benchmark of less than two-thirds of such work being done ‘*Sufficiently well*’ by Probation in 2005/6 to well over two-thirds of it being so in 2009/10. Our Youth Offending inspections suggest that the national benchmark by Youth Offending is also rapidly improving, from a lower starting point, so that it too is now beginning to approach the two-thirds mark. These are encouraging incremental improvements, where we hope to see the upward path continue.
- 1.7 ‘Public safety’ work is a ‘high-risk’ (reputational risk) area of public service. It is inevitable that a catastrophic injury or death will occur on periodic rare occasions. When it does, and when deficient practice has been found in an individual case, people want to know if this represents a wider problem of poor practice. It is only through a regime of regular independent inspection that Ministers and the public can be assured about the general quality of the work being undertaken in these areas – are all the relevant authorities ‘doing all they reasonably can’ to protect people from harm? Although we consider that much improvement is still needed, we can note that a measure of such improvement is already clearly under way in both adult and youth offending work. We say more in the last chapter about how Inspection can result in both *Assurance* and *Improvement*.

2. Where our work fits

- 2.1 The Coalition government has embarked on an approach to public service that, in the context of reducing annual budgets as per the Comprehensive Spending Review, more responsibility will be devolved to local areas and centralised regulation will be diminished. Regulation will only be retained where it is essential, and it is expected that it will increasingly operate less by enforcing compliance with *procedural rules* and more by exercising *judgements* about what is being achieved.
- 2.2 Since this Inspectorate has no regulatory (enforcing) powers whatsoever, and since our inspection methodology has been unequivocally based on exercising judgements since 2003, we have little difficulty in operating within such expectations.
- 2.3 We also support the idea that the way we inspect should be transparent, and focus on what is actually being achieved. We aim to help the providers of the service to understand what we are looking for in a quality service, and to start to be able to tell for themselves whether they are achieving it. We publish on our website our Guidance documents for our core inspection programmes for this purpose.
- 2.4 Transparency should also rightly carry through to the citizen or ‘user’ of each public service, so we aim to take this perspective into account too in our inspections. However, in a contrast with most other public services, the ‘users’ who ‘receive a CJS service’ are often not the ‘customer’ of the service, in that when they are defendants or offenders they are often receiving a service they don’t necessarily want to receive. So although we take seriously the ‘user perspective’ in our inspections, we do so by taking into account the question of whether not a particular user is also the ‘customer’.
- 2.5 We also readily appreciate that there will be variations in how a quality service might be provided in different parts of the country, and we particularly value the need to tailor services to individuals rather than taking a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach [See Appendix]. In keeping with this, the heart of our inspection methodology is to judge *how often* work was done *Sufficiently well* with each individual in a representative sample of individual cases.
- 2.6 During 2011, we will be starting the planning of our core inspection programmes that will be implemented in 2012, after completion of the current programmes. We will review our inspection design and methodology in the light of comments made by Ministers and others, as well as our own experience and quality assurance practice.
- 2.7 Overall, we can still reference our work against the Ten Principles for Inspection (2003), though we continue to apply them with particular care in the specific CJS context [See Appendix]. As always, however, we will be prepared to respond as needed to evolving circumstances and policy developments.
- 2.8 Although we are an independent Inspectorate we are in a sense still part of a wider public service ‘team’. We make a contribution, albeit in an independent way, to the Ministry of Justice’s departmental strategic aims to protect the public and reduce reoffending. Our inspections, and some of our linked activities, aim to help all involved to increase the effectiveness of adult & youth offending work, i.e. this becomes an outcome of our *Improvement* function, as outlined in Part 4 below.

3. What we'll be doing, why and how:

Almost all our inspection work for 2011/2012 will continue to be joint inspection work of one kind or another, working with partner inspectorates in different combinations for different purposes at different times both in England and in Wales. Under the current arrangements we expect to have available to us as our main resource some 34,000 '*deployable hours' worth of work*' to allocate in order to undertake our inspections and other directly related activities in the year ahead. Note that because we give 'limited notice' of our inspection visits to Probation Trusts and YOTs, this Plan does not list the detailed inspection schedule.

3.1 Inspecting Adult offending work:

Offender Management Inspection 2 ('OMI 2'):

We started this new programme of inspections of adult offending work in September 2009, in succession to the original OMI programme. There were some significant changes in the methodology of the new inspection programme, dubbed 'OMI 2' for short, which took into account various developments in the NOMS world, the feedback we have received, and our own reflections on what we have learned to date.

Nevertheless there was also a large element of continuity: a key focus on quality of work with a representative sample of cases, especially work to protect the public. We measure the quality of work, using benchmarked qualitative judgements: essentially, we provide a measure of *how often* the offender management work with each individual is being done *well enough* in each area.

We expect to undertake 15 'OMI 2' inspections in the year ahead, each covering an area serviced by one of the new Probation Trusts. We will also again collate the findings for the 'region' as a whole in each case (including in Wales, which is not a region). As part of this programme, we also work jointly with HMI Prisons to assess the quality of offender management work inside each of the prison establishments where they undertake a full announced inspection – and in 2011/2012 we are strengthening our work on these inspections. We will continue our new practice of contributing to each of the relevant HMI Prisons reports, and will also prepare at least one report during the year ahead that will summarise our findings from these 'Prison OMI' visits.

We are allocating a total of 12,500 'deployable hours' in total in the full year for this programme, which will be led by Sally Lester.

3.2 Inspecting Youth Offending work (IYO):

We started the Inspection of Youth Offending (IYO) programme in April 2009. It is a much slimmer and more focused programme than its predecessor programme, but it will be completed in three years instead of five. Its much more focused nature means that per year the average amount of extra work for inspected bodies caused by our inspections is no greater than previously, with each individual inspection being markedly leaner than its predecessor.

Core case inspection (CCI):

HMI Probation visits every relevant area of England & Wales over the current 3-year period and examining a representative sample of case files in order to assess how often certain aspects of youth offending work are being done well enough – principally work to protect the public and work to protect children.

We are working through all the areas in England by region, completing three Regions each year – last year we also completed the equivalent set of these inspections in Wales, tailored as appropriate to the different local government arrangements there. Although the formal structure of regional government in England is currently being dismantled, it will probably be pragmatic for us to continue to undertake these inspections by regional grouping through to the end of the current programme early in 2012. Also during 2011 we will review our inspection design and methodology, in the light of our experience and of current policy developments, that will take effect when the successor programme starts in 2012.

We expect to carry out at least 52 of these IYO core case inspections (CCIs) in the year ahead, plus two or more reinspections made necessary by our findings in 2010/2011. We are allocating just over 12,500 'deployable hours' for this purpose, with the programme being led by Julie Fox.

3.3 *Thematic Inspections:*

All our joint Thematic inspections are planned as an integral part of the Joint Plan for the four CJS Inspectorates as a whole (published separately). Of the inspections involving HMI Probation, some of them focus principally on adult offending work, some of them include a youth offending dimension in addition, and some involve solely youth offending work. This section covers all of these types of thematic inspection.

We expect to lead joint inspections of: provision of accommodation for young people on remand, work with sex offenders who are under 18 years of age, and work with 'looked-after' children who have offended away from their home area. We will also lead scoping studies on subjects such as sentencer involvement in reviewing cases (in liaison with the judiciary), and on work with life sentences. We will support other inspections examining issues such as 'Value for Money' in the CJS and the Victim Experience, including examining work done by Probation Service Victim Contact units.

Additionally we have made provision so that we could assist with any joint inspection on child protection should we be asked by Ofsted, and if resources permit we may also conduct a thematic inspection assessing the quality of reports submitted by Probation to the Parole Board.

For this purpose we will continue to work not only with our colleague CJS Inspectorates (HMI Prisons, HMI Constabulary, and HM CPS Inspectorate) but also with Ofsted, the Care Quality Commission and the National Audit Office and Audit Commission in England where relevant, and in Wales with Estyn, Health Inspectorate Wales, Care & Social Services Inspectorate Wales, and the Wales Audit Office.

We will allocate 7,000 'deployable hours' in the full year for this purpose. Liz Calderbank will be our overall lead for our programme of Thematic Inspections, but as is the case with each of our other inspection programmes, that does not necessarily mean that she will lead on each individual inspection.

3.4 *'Public safety' work (i.e. work to protect the public and to protect children)*

This work is integral to our core inspection practice, because it is work that is not readily measured by any means other than by inspection. Accordingly it is a key example of where and how inspection uniquely adds value.

But it is important for us to be clear about how inspection can, and cannot, inform Ministers and the public, and about how it can help managers and practitioners to improve. With child protection work the focus is on current and potential victims (individuals who are at risk of harm from others, or themselves), while with Public Protection work the focus is on current and potential offenders (individuals who are a Risk of Harm to others). Hence for this Inspectorate there is an underlying approach that applies broadly for both aspects of this work:

- It continues to be necessary to emphasise that ‘risk to the public’ can never be eliminated, but the public are entitled to expect the authorities to do their job properly.
- ‘Doing one’s job properly’ means ‘doing all that one reasonably could’ – with Public Protection this is “taking all reasonable action to keep to a minimum each offender’s Risk of Harm to others”.
- When this Inspectorate reviews an individual case (e.g. Hanson and White, or Anthony Rice), we report on whether the authorities ‘did all they reasonably could’ in that particular case – this is a qualitative judgement, and is a judgement of *reasonableness*, not of perfection.
- When we inspect a sample of cases (40 – 250+) we report on *how often* the authorities ‘did all they reasonably could’ in that sample of cases. To put it another way, if and when a Serious Further Offence (SFO) or other catastrophe should occur in a particular area - and it can happen anywhere - our inspection finding indicates the likelihood that the authorities there would be able to demonstrate that they had done ‘all they reasonably could’.

This is the basis for the *Assurance* that we offer Ministers and the public (not reassurance, which is a very different thing!). But this approach to inspection can also help to promote *Improvement*, if practitioners and managers can learn from an inspection what is expected from them in these two difficult areas of practice.

This benefit of inspection can be magnified several times, however, if it becomes an integral part of a systematic regime of properly benchmarked self-assessment coupled with independent inspection. We have been starting to work more closely with the NOMS Agency and the Youth Justice Board to help develop such regimes in both the adult and the youth offending worlds, notably recently with London Probation. The 2,000 ‘deployable hours’ we have allocated specifically to this subject are for the purpose of undertaking any specific reviews or inquiries requested by Ministers or others in the year ahead, but also equally importantly for helping to develop such systematic regimes of properly benchmarked self-assessment coupled with independent inspection.

This work has been gathering pace over the last twelve months, and it demonstrates that there can be a legitimate specific role for an independent inspectorate, in addition to just inspecting, in ***promoting practice improvement***.

3.5 ***Other work***

Having completed both a Probation and a Youth Offending inspection on the Isle of Man, and a contribution to a Military Courts inspection, all in 2009, we continue to be available to assist with inspections in Northern Ireland or other parts of the British Isles, if needed. Inspectors and Inspection managers have also assisted, and will continue to assist, with various pieces of development work in various Eastern European countries, in Jamaica and in New Zealand.

Alan MacDonald is on secondment as a residential twinning advisor leading a European Union funded project to develop the probation service in Albania, supported periodically by other staff from the Inspectorate.

3.6 Diversity and Equality

We aim to integrate the best principles of diversity into our inspection practice, as well as into the management of our own staff. We devise and implement a separate annual plan for this purpose, following on from our ***Single Equalities Scheme 2007-10***. In our Scheme we set ourselves an overarching objective: ***Working to remove improper discrimination in the Criminal Justice System***.

In our core inspection programmes we assess what measures the people whose work we are inspecting have in place to address the diverse needs of individuals who have committed offences. We have previously published, and will publish again periodically, reports collating findings from a set of inspections to show *how often* work has been undertaken *well enough* with different specific groups of individuals i.e. by race, gender, age-group etc, for comparison purposes.

Within our own organisation we have developed a wide ranging approach to promoting diversity which is published on our website. Measures include staff training, positive action to recruit black and minority ethnic inspection staff (for example, through our shadowing scheme), and the recruitment of Welsh-speaking inspectors. Our Welsh Language Scheme was approved by the Welsh Language Board in 2007; we have maintained it conscientiously, and we aim to have a renewed Scheme approved by the Board early in 2011/2012. Through induction, training and the appraisal process all HMI Probation staff are encouraged to consider promoting diversity and equality across all areas of their work.

4. Where our work leads to (benefits):

4.1 Assurance:

An inspection regime establishes whether or not a public service is being delivered effectively. The existence of the system of inspection therefore provides Assurance to Ministers and the public – even though the findings on any individual occasion may not necessarily be experienced as ‘reassuring’ at all! *Assurance* is the benefit that arises for the public from knowing that a particular regime of independent inspection exists.

4.2 Improvement (a catalyst):

Our inspection work also aims to provide the benefit of *Improvement*. By measuring accurately, openly and fairly, against transparent inspection criteria, and engaging constructively with the people whose work we are inspecting, we intend to serve as a catalyst for improvement. Where we are successful, practitioners and their managers will be encouraged and enabled by us to progress further along the road of continuous improvement – and when they succeed with that the achievement will be theirs not ours. This is what we mean when we say that the way we work aims to ‘maximise the likelihood of improvement’.

4.3 Costs:

It is for others to judge whether in practice we achieve the benefits we aspire to attain – and that judgement needs to be made against costs. This is particularly relevant in the context of the current four-year public expenditure round. We are taking our ‘fair share’ of the budget reductions that are having to be managed by our ‘parent Department’, the Ministry of Justice, as a whole, and we are making our outline plans accordingly for the next four years.

Our Financial Annex to this Plan shows a revenue budget from the MoJ for 2011/2012 that is over six percent less than it was in 2010/2011, and we have been given prospective figures for the following three financial years, each showing a further reduction, so that we expect our budget in 2014/2015 to be 15% less than our 2010/2011 figure.

Our approach is to construct our Plan almost from first principles each year, deciding how much 'quantity and quality of inspection' we can create and deliver with the resources that we are able to obtain (through 'earned income' as well as budget allocation). Through being cost-conscious, and being careful with what and how we spend as well as what we 'earn', we aim to do the best we can with what we've got.

Our budget for 2011/2012 - £3.848 million, plus some income - has meant that we plan to deliver our inspection programmes outlined above with one fewer manager by the end of the year, and two fewer Inspection staff than we had in 2010. Our Inspection Support staff numbers have already been reduced, following the successful introduction of Isis, our software programme for project managing each of our inspections. We are on a course where it is highly likely that the further projected budget reductions will be able to be made through 'natural wastage' during the next four years.

Elsewhere we have produced figures that show that the cost of our inspections, including the costs necessarily incurred by the body whose work is being inspected, total less than a half of one percent of the cost of the delivery of the relevant service. Others will have to make the judgment about whether the benefit is worth this cost.

4.4 Looking further into the future:

This Inspectorate is small in size, but 'small' can also be efficient and adaptable. We do not have our own separate corporate centre – instead, we share support facilities with our 'parent' department and/or with other inspectorates as appropriate. Inspectorates such as ours that focus on quality of practice can be both effective and lean. Our independent inspections occupy a role that no one else can provide – i.e. they have 'unique added value'. And we ensure that we only do 'just enough' inspection in order to achieve the desired benefits above – i.e. we sustain just the necessary 'minimum critical mass'. This enables us to produce a high quantity and high quality of inspection reports for a modest budget allocation.

For the future, our role could be expanded if Ministers wish - for example if we were asked to take on regulatory duties with the recently-constituted Probation Trusts and other service providers that may become established. We are flexible and efficient enough to adapt to changing needs, as we have adapted frequently in the course of our 75-year history. However, neither such possible new roles, nor the prospective major cuts in public expenditure, should reduce our core inspection activity below the current minimum critical mass if the benefits that our inspections bring are to be sustained.

5. Appendix (reference material):

HM Inspectorate of Probation: statement of purpose

HM Inspectorate of Probation is an independent Inspectorate, funded by the Ministry of Justice and reporting directly to the Secretary of State. Our purpose is to:

- ▣ report to the Secretary of State on the effectiveness of work with individual offenders, children and young people aimed at reducing reoffending and protecting the public, whoever undertakes this work under the auspices of the National Offender Management Service or the Youth Justice Board
- ▣ report on the effectiveness of the arrangements for this work, working with other Inspectorates as necessary
- ▣ contribute to improved performance by the organisations whose work we inspect
- ▣ contribute to sound policy and effective service delivery, especially in public protection, by providing advice and disseminating good practice, based on inspection findings, to Ministers, officials, managers and practitioners
- ▣ promote actively race equality and wider diversity issues, especially in the organisations whose work we inspect
- ▣ contribute to the overall effectiveness of the Criminal Justice System, particularly through joint work with other inspectorates.

Our annual Plan sets out our work for the year. It is agreed between the Secretary of State and HM Chief Inspector and is published on our website.

HMI Probation Code of Practice

While carrying out our work we aim in particular to follow the established ten principles of inspection in the public sector, namely that inspection should:

- have the purpose of improving the service inspected
- focus on outcomes
- have a user perspective
- be proportionate to risk
- encourage rigorous self-assessment by the managers of the service inspected
- use impartial evidence
- disclose the criteria used to form judgements
- show openness about inspection processes
- have regard to value for money
- continually learn from experience

We aim to achieve our purposes and meet these principles by:

- ▣ working in an honest, professional, fair and polite way
- ▣ reporting and publishing inspection findings and recommendations for improvement in good time and to a good standard
- ▣ promoting race equality and wider attention to diversity in all aspects of our work, including within our own employment practices and organisational processes
- ▣ for the organisations whose work we are inspecting, keeping to a minimum the amount of extra work arising as a result of the inspection process.

While carrying out our work we are mindful of Ministerial priorities and strategic plans for the Criminal Justice System. We work closely not only with the other CJS Inspectorates, but also with other Inspectorates assessing work with young people. Furthermore, through the relevant Inspection & Audit Forum, we co-ordinate our work closely with the Audit Commission, the National Audit Office and the Ministry of Justice Internal Audit Division.

The Ten Principles of Inspection in the Public Service (2003)

We took note of the Ten Principles of inspection, published in *Inspecting for Improvement* in July 2003. These place certain broad expectations on inspection providers and on the departments sponsoring them. As indicated we have also built them into our Code of Practice. We give account of our approach to implementing these ten principles as below:

1. **The purpose of improvement.** *There should be an explicit concern on the part of inspectors to contribute to the improvement of the service being inspected. This should guide the focus, method, reporting and follow-up of inspection. In framing recommendations, an inspector should recognise good performance and address any failure appropriately. Inspection should aim to generate data and intelligence that enable departments more quickly to calibrate the progress of reform in their sectors and make appropriate adjustments.*
We aim to achieve this, not only by measuring fairly against open criteria, but also by our commitment to behaviour that 'maximises the likelihood' that respondents will come with us on the path to continually improving their performance.
2. **A focus on outcomes,** *which means considering service delivery to the end users of the services rather than concentrating on internal management arrangements.*
Our mainstream inspection methodology focuses on what has been delivered to each individual person under supervision (primarily in terms of Quality of Assessment and planning, Interventions and initial Outcomes).
3. **A user perspective.** *Inspection should be delivered with a clear focus on the experience of those for whom the service is provided, as well as on internal management arrangements. Inspection should encourage innovation and diversity and not be solely compliance-based.*
A significant element within our methodology is to interview and listen to the perspective of the offender or young person, and of victims and parents. The user perspective is an important element in CJS inspection, but it does not necessarily provide on its own the basis for an inspection finding (e.g. an offender might particularly dislike something done to him or her by a Probation or YOT practitioner, but it might have been precisely the right thing for that officer to have done).
4. **Proportionate to risk.** *Over time, inspectors should modify the extent of future inspection according to the quality of performance by the service provider. For example, good performers should undergo less inspection, so that resources are concentrated on areas of greatest risk.*
We have never supported the idea of offering 'inspection holidays' as a way of implementing this principle, but we strongly support the idea of varying intensity of inspection according to identified need. We maintain rolling inspection programmes that focus in particular on 'public safety' work because these are areas of public service which are of "greatest risk" and concern to Ministers and the public, and because we uniquely 'add value' by doing so, since only independent inspection can measure effectiveness in work of this nature.
5. *Inspectors should encourage rigorous **self-assessment** by managers. Inspectors should challenge the outcomes of managers' self-assessments, take them into account in the inspection process, and provide a comparative benchmark.*
The criteria and guidance published on our website enable any practitioner or manager to assess his or her own practice at any time. Furthermore, in a long-planned development, we aim to work with NOMS to promote within the Agency a regime combining self-assessment with independent inspection and benchmarking.
6. *Inspectors should use **impartial evidence**. Evidence, whether quantitative or qualitative, should be validated and credible.*
Evidence has to consist of more than hearsay, and our Guidance provides a framework for making judgements to enable similar evidence to be interpreted consistently, even by different inspection staff in different locations.
7. *Inspectors should disclose the **criteria** they use to form judgements.*
Our inspection criteria are published on our website.
8. *Inspectors should be **open** about their processes, willing to take any complaints seriously, and able to demonstrate a robust quality assurance process.*
Our behaviour is such that we are able to explain at the time the reasoning for the scores we have awarded, and respond to questions to that effect. Thus we have responded to questions,

concerns and to the formal complaints that have been put to us in the last year. We also take the initiative, through our Quality Assurance strategy, in actively reviewing aspects of our methodology, so that we can be as confident as possible that our judgements are both fair and accurate.

9. *Inspection should have regard to **value for money**, their own included:*

- *Inspection looks to see that there are arrangements in place to deliver the service efficiently and effectively.*
- *Inspection itself should be able to demonstrate it delivers benefits commensurate with its cost, including the cost to those inspected.*
- *Inspectorates should ensure that they have the capacity to work together on cross-cutting issues, in the interests of greater cost effectiveness and reducing the burden on those inspected.*

We assess whether the interventions with each offender are proportionate both to cost and to the offender's individual need. We recognise that our methodology is (necessarily) labour intensive, and in March 2005 we published a case study that analysed both the benefits and the costs of an illustrative inspection, including the costs to the inspected body. We continue to measure costs using the methods described there. We not only undertake joint inspections with other CJ inspectorates, but we also co-ordinate our other work to avoid, for example, rapidly successive visits by ourselves and another scrutiny body whenever possible.

10. *Inspectors should **continually learn** from experience, in order to become increasingly effective. This can be done by assessing their own impact on the service provider's ability to improve and by sharing best practice with other inspectors.*

We seek feedback on our individual interviews with the staff of inspected bodies, which we use to review and renew both our corporate and individual skills and methods, and we also take feedback at regional events. By these and other means we monitor our own impact on our inspected bodies, and keep our own practice under regular review, both as part of our normal programme, but also in joint work with other inspectorates.

HMI Probation
March 2011

Financial Annex to HMI Probation Plan 2011/2012: Summary of Activities

The first box below divides our work into 'Overheads' and six potential other 'Activities'. Each Activity has an allocation of 'Deployable hours', and some also have an allocation for fees. Deployable hours are the non-overhead hours of inspection staff allocated to each Activity; they carry with them the relevant proportion of Management and Support service staff hours. Hence it can be seen how the allocations of Deployable hours, and of Fees, lead to the projected production of c78 reports in 2011/2012 (but these are of a very wide range of scope.)

Code Lead mgr INPUTS:	Overheads		IYO - C Cases		OMI		Joint CJ		Risk of Harm		Outo Eng&W		Other		TOTAL
	OVHD AMB	Hrs not deployed	IYOC JF	OMIC SL	THCJ LC	INRV SL	OIEW AMB	OTHR AMB	INRV SL	OIEW AMB	OTHR AMB	None this year	None this year	None this year	
Hrs 'bought'			-	2,500	1,000	500	-							4,000 hrs	
Hrs Budget			12,500	10,000	6,000	1,500	-							30,000 hrs	
Total hrs			12,500	12,500	7,000	2,000	-							34,000 hrs	
OUTPUTS: No.: Insps			54	16	4	4								78	

Some joint inspections we lead;
we contribute to many others

HMI Probation Budget 2011/2012: Summary

Prospective budget for 2011/2012 from Ministry of Justice (being confirmed)
 Probable income from inspections outside England & Wales this year £100,000
 Secondment reimbursement (Residential Training Advisor in Albania) £12,000
 Other 'Short Term Expert' work via European Union £52,000
 Final income from CI's work in New Zealand, & a recent secondment £164,000
 Projected total income £3,848,000

PROJECTED TOTAL HMI PROBATION BUDGET (income)

£4,012,000

Salary costs (from separate spreadsheet):

Other staffing costs:
 Panel of Associate Inspectors (fees) £2,851,000
 Press Officer (share) £190,000
 Joint Secretariat and related costs (share) £25,000
 £15,000

Subtotal: (for c30k hrs) £2,851,000
 Subtotal: (for c4k hrs) £230,000
PROJECTED TOTAL HMI PROBATION PAY COSTS £3,081,000

Accommodation (inc fuel, utilities) - Trafford House £129,000
 IT services £100,000
 Printing and other office costs £145,000
 Telecoms, Voice etc £12,000
 Training £45,000
 Travel & Subsistence £490,000
 Development costs £10,000

PROJECTED TOTAL HMI PROBATION NON-PAY COSTS

£931,000

PROJECTED TOTAL EXPENDITURE

£4,012,000

Allocation of 'Total deployable hours'



Notes:

Joint CJ reports, using a total of 7,000 hours, constitute 20% of the Total deployable hrs
 Inspections of Youth Offending (IYO), using a total of 12,500 hours per year, constitute 37%
 Offender Management Inspections (adult offending), using 12,500 hours, also constitute 37%

Unit costs:

HMI Probation uses the Absorption method to calculate unit costs.
 Each deployable hour carries its share of the overheads for the Inspectorate as a whole.
 Hence the total cost per person-hour when inspecting can be calculated by dividing:

Total Planned Expenditure	4,012,000
Total deployable hours	34,000
to give a Total cost per 'inspection hour' per person of	£118.00 per hour