

HMPPS National Research Committee (NRC)

Please note that this word document is available to help with drafting your NRC application to agree content as a research team or gain sign off from your supervisor if applicable.

Information must be copied across and submitted via the online application form - <https://apply-for-hmpps-research.service.justice.gov.uk/Introduction-and-Guidance/>.

Please also refer to the associated guidance for completing NRC application forms.

SECTION 1 – PROJECT DETAILS	
Title of Project	An Experiment in Upside-Down Management in Probation <i>Please enter the full title of your research project. Note 'project' here refers to your analytical activity.</i>
Is this project a resubmission?	Yes ☒ No ☐ <i>Please select 'yes' if you have previously received a decline decision for this project. Only one resubmission is allowed per project.</i>
Original application number	<i>If yes, the reference number of the previously declined application should be entered here.</i> 2025-1865
Please select the most relevant strategic outcome	Select one: ☐ Protect the public from serious offenders and improve the safety and security of our prisons ☒ Reduce Reoffending ☐ Deliver swift access to justice
Which of the Department's Areas of Research Interest does this project address?	Reduce rates – and also protect public Select one: ☐ Cost of Policing ☐ Ensure access to justice in a way that best meets people's needs ☐ Support a flourishing legal services sector ☐ Provide a transparent and efficient court system ☐ Ensure that prisons are decent, safe and productive places to live and work ☐ Protect the public from harm ☒ Reduce rates of reoffending and improve life chances
Keywords	Practitioner-centred Probation management; Three Purposes of Probation; Inspection criteria; Outcomes; Likelihood of Reoffending, Risk of Harm to others; Constructive Interventions, Restrictive Interventions; Role clarification; Self-assessing in real time <i>Enter keywords associated within the research project to enable people to search for relevant content.</i>
Date of application	<i>This is the date on which you submit your application via the online form.</i>
Expected completion date	2028/9 <i>This is the expected completion date of the research project.</i>

SECTION 2 – STUDENT STATUS	
Are you applying as an academic student or an HMPPS trainee forensic psychologist?	☒ Yes ☐ No <i>If yes, you will need to complete the following questions. If no, go to section 3</i>
What is your level of study?	Undergraduate: <i>The NRC does not accept applications from undergraduates. You will not be able to progress any further with the online application form.</i>
	Postgraduate (Masters level): <i>Applications cannot be accepted for Masters students without confirmation of business support. Please see Application Guidance document for further information.</i> - Name of MoJ/HMPPS Business Support for Postgraduate Masters student applications - Occupation of MoJ/HMPPS Business Support - Email of MoJ/HMPPS Business Support - Letter of support (this must be uploaded here to progress to the next section).
	Postgraduate (Doctoral level): Details of student / trainee supervisor Dr Ben Hunter Deputy Head of School of Law and Criminology Associate Professor of Criminology Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences University of Greenwich Email B.Hunter@Greenwich.ac.uk And Dr Madeline Petrillo Associate Professor in Criminology Programme Lead, MSc Criminology and Criminal Psychology Centre Lead, Centre for Communities and Social Justice (Interim) Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences University of Greenwich Email: m.r.petrillo@gre.ac.uk
	HMPPS Trainee Forensic Psychologist: Details of student / trainee supervisor

SECTION 3 – TEAM	
Name of lead researcher / analyst	Andrew Michael Bridges CBE

Occupation of lead researcher / analyst	Currently Strategic Director for NAPA CIC Formerly HM Chief Inspector of Probation 2004-11
Email address of lead researcher/analyst	napa@napacic <i>We will use this email address for any correspondence</i>
Do you want to add additional researchers /analysts	NO <i>If yes, please add the name, email and occupation of other researchers / analysts in the research team</i>

SECTION 4 – BUSINESS SUPPORT	
Please select the project supporters	From a drop-down list, select all that apply: ☒ HMPPS HQ (Prison / Probation Senior Managers / HQ Staff) ☐ Ministry of Justice ☐ Not applicable ☐ Other (specify below) ☐ Other govt. department (specify below) ☐ Private Sector Prison
Other project supporters	<i>Enter 'n/a' if not applicable</i>
HMPPS / MoJ project lead	Gabriel Amahwe, interim Area Executive Director, and recent Regional Probation Director, confirms that he is in principle interested in seeing this project pursued, and thinks that other Probation Directors would be interested too. At this early stage, he's not actually a "project lead". Also, Linda Neimantas, Regional Probation Director, Kent, Surrey and Sussex <i>Please provide the name, role and contact details for the HMPPS/MoJ project lead supporting this study. If your project does not have a HMPPS/MoJ project contact, please also state this. For HMPPS Psychologists (trainees and chartered), a copy of the approved commissioning document must be uploaded as part of the supporting documentation. Please note that any named contact(s) will be approached for confirmation of support during the application process.</i>
Please select the funding providers	From a drop-down list, select all that apply: ☐ HMPPS HQ (Prison / Probation Senior Managers / HQ Staff) ☐ Ministry of Justice ☒ Not applicable ☐ Other (specify below) ☐ Other govt. department (specify below) ☐ Private Sector Prison
Other funding providers	n/a <i>Enter 'n/a' if not applicable</i>
HMPPS / MoJ funding amount (research	n/a <i>Enter 'n/a' if not applicable</i>

element of the project only)	
Other Government funding amount (research element of the project only)	n/a <i>Enter 'n/a' if not applicable</i>
Relationship with other organisations	n/a <i>Please detail any funding, sponsoring or commissioning relationships with other organisations that are relevant to this research and not already stated. If none, please state n/a.</i>
Funding amount from non-government organisations (research element of the project only)	n/a <i>Enter 'n/a' if not applicable</i>

SECTION 5 – AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	
Brief description of your project (max 3000 characters)	Summary (see fuller Rationale/evidence doc attached): An Experiment in Upside-Down Management for Probation practitioners <u>Problem:</u> Probation is currently performing poorly, by the expectations of the Inspectorate et al, compared with 15 years ago, and morale is not high. Although workload per officer is an important factor, equally significant is that Probation practitioners (PPs) in England & Wales face an excessive demand of well-intended top-down micromanaging detailed instructions about the actions they must take every day in the course of their work with each of their cases. Recent attempts to ease this - SEEDS2 & Impact - have ironically only increased the quantity of detailed ever-changing 'process' instructions that PPs are required to absorb. <u>Potential solution:</u> Modern Probation Theory (MPT) offers a 'whole system' model of how PPs could and should be managed that avoids the constant need to issue detailed top-down instructions. It is a grounded theory, based on the experience of a very successfully managed area Probation Service 1999-2000. It is a very specific version of 'practitioner-centred' management, but it also has very strong parallels with the 'Upside-Down Management' described very fully by both the current Prisons & Probation Minister and his father. MPT first specifies The Three Purposes of Probation: • "Am I helping to Reduce this individual's Likelihood of Reoffending?" • "Am I helping to Implement this individual's Court sentence, or Licence?" • "Am I helping to Contain this individual's Risk of Harm to others?"

	- (all to be done within a Framework of public service ‘parameters’). - And then it Defines ‘success’ with each of them – i.e. “what good looks like” as Timpson would say. These closely parallel the criteria & standards employed by HM Inspectorate since 2008 in their case inspections. Some language might at first seem unfamiliar, but the concepts are readily recognisable to most practitioners and managers. Overall, while MPT Prescribes the WHAT that needs to be achieved, it does no more than Advise (and train, develop & support) HOW PPs might go about achieving it with each case. <u>Where this project fits in:</u> A key point in MPT: By Defining clearly WHAT PPs should be aiming to achieve with each case – also emphasising that “Rehabilitation” is every bit as integral to PP work as is “Public Protection” – MPT directs the PP’s attention towards where each case needs to ‘arrive at’ when it closes. To this end, PPs should be able to see for themselves, in real time, whether or not they are ‘on course’ for doing that (achieving the Three Purposes). But how to enable that in reality? - this is where the proposed Experiment comes in. As a local Chief in 1999, I devised a combination of a paper form plus database for this purpose – clearly not appropriate now. For the 2020s the obvious mechanism for enabling ‘real time self-inspection’ is by means of an app, to be called the “<i>How’m I Doing?</i>” app. I have now, myself, almost completed writing the ‘front end’ of the app (the screens that the user sees / interacts with). My links with Unilink assure me that my design of the ‘back end’ (the supporting database) is sound in principle, so I am now well into the process of programming that in. The obvious next step is to ‘road test’ the app - the purpose of the proposed Experiment. If the ‘road test’ fails, then MPT will need rethinking; if it succeeds, HMPPS’s management of PPs may need rethinking! 2,889 characters
What are the primary research questions and/or objectives	The “<i>How’m I Doing?</i>” app will, in ‘real time’, constantly clarify and reinforce for the PP where she or he should be heading with each of that PP’s cases, i.e. heading towards the Definitions of ‘success’ or whether they need to take corrective action. MPT presupposes that the PP will want to take responsibility for identifying what needs doing with each case, and also for deciding how to try to make that happen. So the primary research questions are: - Are practitioners willing and able to try using the tool for this purpose? (Some might volunteer, but then not use it in practice) - If they do use it, do they find it useful in the way intended? i.e. by directing their attention towards <i>what they wish to have <u>achieved</u> with the case by the time it closes?</i> - Does it thereby (re-)introduce the idea of the PP taking responsibility for the key decisions with the case, and liberate their creativity and initiative in their daily work with cases?

What are the secondary research questions and/or objectives (if applicable)?	As above, this “Experiment” focuses on just one component of the overall approach set out in MPT. If successful, it will demonstrate that it is possible for everyone involved in HMPPS operations – senior managers, analysts, independent Inspectorate, frontline managers, and most importantly practitioners – to be working to the same definition of ‘what “Success” looks like, when doing Probation work (Currently, many PPs do NOT feel that to be the case – see the Rationale paper attached.) See also below.
What are the potential benefits of the research to MoJ / HMPPS policy and/or business areas?	In short, it enables MoJ/HMPPS to define successful Probation practice in a way that can be operationalised with its PPs, and potentially with other frontline staff too. Strategically, it enables Probation to become “outcome-focused instead of process-focused” [How to Think about AI, R Susskind], essential if Future Probation is to employ AI effectively. This will be necessary, given that in reality, Probation can neither salami-slice nor recruit its way out of its current mismatch between staffing and workload. <i>This Experiment may therefore help to make Future Probation ‘AI-ready’.</i> How does one define “What Good Looks Like”? MPT defines that in terms of The Three Purposes, plus how to measure them. This is consistent even now with what the Inspectorate looks for when they inspect a sample of cases. The essential idea of the old Berkshire system, and of MPT, is that practitioners should, in effect, be able to check, and indeed ‘self-inspect’, their own cases ‘in real time’, i.e. at the same time that they are actually carrying out the supervision, rather than waiting until some time after the case has closed, <u>then</u> to be told <i>by someone else</i> how they performed. The practical problem has been how to implement that principle operationally. The Berkshire system was a combination of paper plus separate data entry, but that’s obviously not the right method now. MPT itself is silent about how to operationalise the principle, though it strongly advocates it as a key component of the ‘whole system’ Theory. In the late 2020s the now-obvious mechanism for operationalising it is an app that a practitioner can carry on their own person, and refer to conveniently and instantly at any time of their own choosing. As above, if the “Experiment” proves to be successful, then HMPPS should consider adopting the entire MPT approach to managing its Probation work, starting with the strategic definition of what Probation is intended to achieve – the Three Purposes of: Reducing Likelihood of Reoffending, Implementing the Sentence, and Containing Risk of Harm to others, including the MPT method of defining when these Purposes are being successfully achieved. Further to that point, Probation practice can be characterised as a “professional assemblage” (see below). If the managers of Probation in the 2020s are to maintain any way of accommodating Government and public expectations, while also managing their organisation(s) in a way that is appropriate for a professional assemblage, they will have to make use of the skills, behaviours and actions that are the right ones for this particular type of organisation. Probation practice takes place in a dispersed setting, where managerial supervision is principally indirect, and where managers need their practitioners to ‘own’ and ‘internalise’ the purpose(s) of the organisation – this is because they need staff to achieve management’s objectives in settings that are not directly supervised. Because every case is different, they also need their practitioners to exercise wide discretion in how they go about doing that. So in

	this respect, too, this Experiment could equip HMPPS managers to enable more effective frontline practice by PPs. See the attached Rationale document for a fuller account. 2,750 <i>Please explain how your findings can be used / operationalised by MoJ/HMPPS (max 3000 characters).</i>
What are the potential benefits of the research to academic knowledge in the field of study?	The canon of academic literature on management evolved in the late 20th century from the earlier 'Classical' theories of Fayol, Taylor, and Drucker (see Bridges et al,* for a fuller review of this literature) into a series of 'horses for courses' debates, i.e. which style of management was best for which type of organisation? Vroom & Yetton, and Henry Mintzberg, are two examples of authors who ambitiously sought a <i>universal comprehensive</i> answer to that question. In their different ways they aimed to achieve a situational prescriptive 'science' that would guide future managers as to what would work best in different circumstances. But this was illusory. David Guest* describes how the decision-tree devised by Vroom & Yetton was so complex as to defy any means of verifying it empirically. Meanwhile, Mintzberg stopped trying to produce a comprehensive 'Theory of Management Policy' at some point in the 1980s The principle of 'seeking horses for courses' was right, but the idea that this could in time be distilled into a comprehensive 'prescriptive science' to guide future managers in any given circumstance was as impossible as it has proven with all the human sciences – including, by the way, frontline probation practice. The infinite variety of human beings, acting in an almost infinite variety of circumstances, means that while <i>approximations</i> can be deduced from evidence of past behaviour, <i>absolute accuracy</i> in predicting future behaviour is necessarily impossible. (Furthermore, a human can always choose consciously to avoid behaving as predicted.) Mintzberg seems to have taken this point in his later works, which remain focused on situational analyses, and on guiding managers in a practical way towards what actions and behaviours <i>are likely to be</i> successful. His observations are valuable, because in the tradition of Sune Carlsen and Rosemary Stewart he has widely studied what managers <i>actually do</i>, as opposed to what he surmises they might be doing. In his typology of five different types of organisation, the one he called in 1979 a "Professional Bureaucracy"* he renamed in <i>Bedtime stories for Managers</i> in 2019 a "professional assemblage" and gave it a much punchier description. The learning to be gained from it is still the same, because as a theoretical concept it was one that emerged from grounded observational research. Its implications for finding better ways of managing Probation properly are very clear, for Probation quite evidently fits the 'professional bureaucracy/assemblage' type, a structural configuration that is "common in universities, general hospitals, school systems, public accounting firms, social work agencies, and craft production firms. All rely on their skills and knowledge of their operating professionals to function; all produce standard products or services."* This type of organisation requires <i>standardisation of skills</i> rather than <i>standardisation of work processes</i>;* its strength is in the training and skill levels of its "operating professionals" and its weakness is when there is

	ambiguity – or even downright disagreement – over what specifically each practitioner is striving to achieve. Therefore this Experiment would contribute to these wider academic analyses about which management styles work best for which type of organisation, notably on the question of which approach is best for managing ‘professional assemblages’. [*See the Rationale paper for the references] 2924 <i>Please demonstrate how your research will add value to the existing evidence base (max 3000 characters).</i>
What previous research has been conducted in this area?	Historically there have been a few descriptive analyses of how managers really work (Sune Carlson, Rosemary Stewart, Henry Mintzberg), alongside the many anecdotal and the prescriptive ones. Henry Mintzberg has done the most to analyse the different ways of managing that are effective with different types of organisation (e.g. <i>The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research</i>, 1979). Concerning how a “professional assemblage” (in Mintzberg’s much more recent language) is best managed, centrally-driven micro-management is not recommended, though of course this is not specific to Probation. On Probation management themes specifically, there have been my own works on my website (e.g. ‘Private v “Private”’, 2020, about CRCs), while the most recent academic analysis has been by Kevin Wong et al, (‘A realist review to develop a theory of effective front-line management in probation and youth justice’, <i>Probation Journal</i>, April 2025). This refers to “new public governance (NPG)” principles, a term I can recognise but I think is only partly pertinent to the issue at hand. A highly relevant current text is that by the current Prisons & Probation Minister himself, <i>The Happy Index: Lessons in Upside Down Management</i>, 2024, which highlights the value he places on devolving responsibility for achieving success to his frontline managers and staff for his own business. As above, I would argue that there has been precious little material that I have seen in the last 52 years that makes any serious attempt to set out which management approaches might help to promote effective Probation practice – except my own writings of course. However, there are whole Schools of Management on the subject of effective management generally, and I have studied a wide range of this material for my MA, my MPhil, my Cranfield studies, and for my 2020 analysis of Kent, Surrey & Sussex CRC, in which I added a whole chapter on the subject alongside the main research findings. That report is <u>attached</u>. I have already cited Henry Mintzberg; what he says about managing “professional assemblages” is highly relevant to how Probation needs to be managed, as is what James Timpson says. Finally, I should emphasise that my MPT is a Grounded Theory, in that it is based on what I actually did in practice in Berkshire 1998-2001, and that the supporting evidence for this can be found on my website, as well as in the Inspectorate Performance Inspection Programme report of 2001 for Thames Valley: Berkshire was the third best of 54 Probation areas inspected.

	See the attached Rationale document for a fuller picture. 2,218 <i>Summarise the existing evidence base underpinning the rationale for this project. Please do not just provide a list of references (max 3000 characters).</i>
--	--

SECTION 6 – PROPOSED METHODOLOGY	
Is your project an evaluation?	Yes ☒ No ☐
If yes, please select which type(s) of evaluation will be undertaken	Select all that apply: ☒ Process ☒ Theory-based ☐ Counterfactual Impact ☐ Economic ☐ Outcome ☐ Other If other, please specify:
What type of data will be collected/used?	Select one: ☒ Primary ☐ Secondary ☐ Both No identifiable personal data of people on probation will be collected at all. Any data re Practitioners will be anonymised and protected in the customary way.
Data collection approaches	Select all that apply: ☒ Mixed methods ☐ Other ☐ Qualitative only ☐ Quantitative only ☐ Secondary data request only No identifiable personal data of people on probation will be collected at all. Any data re Practitioners will be anonymised and protected in the customary way. If other, please specify:
How will the primary research be conducted?	Select one: ☐ Telephone ☐ Online ☐ Face to face ☐ Via post ☒ Mixed methods ☐ Not applicable – secondary data only

Access to MoJ / HMPPS datasets	Select all that apply: ☐ Civil (CaseMan/PCOL) ☐ Crown Court (Xhibit) ☐ Family justice (FamilyMan) ☐ Magistrates' Court (HOCAS/TAR from CREST) ☐ Ndelius ☒ No access to existing HMPPS/MoJ datasets required. ☐ OASys ☐ Other ☐ PNOMIS ☐ Police National Computer (PNC) If other, please specify:
Has access to this data already been sought?	Yes ☐ No ☒ <i>If yes, please detail who in the MoJ/HMPPS you have been in contact with and the progress of any discussions and/or data sharing agreements.</i>
Provide details of your primary outcome measure if applicable	1. Frequency of the "How'm I doing?" tool being used (per case per practitioner and if possible how often) 2. Incidence (or not) of the practitioner saying that they found it 'helpful' in their everyday work in directing their attention towards the eventual desired outcomes. <i>If applicable, please explain what your primary outcome will be and how it will be measured.</i>
Provide details of your secondary outcome measure if applicable	The 'success' - or otherwise - of the tool will then in itself have an impact on its 'parent' concept of 'Modern Probation Theory (MPT)', so the effect of that impact will be to test the continuing validity of MPT itself. Meanwhile a potential secondary outcome measure might be an analysis of which 'criminogenic' factors were worked on by PPs, and of which such factors they report either an outcome, or at least interim progress when the cases were closed. <i>If applicable, please explain what your secondary outcome will be and how it will be measured.</i>
Describe the population you are targeting in this project	☐ Children and young people in custody ☐ Young offenders (18-21 yrs) ☐ Adult male prisoners ☐ Adult female prisoners ☐ Individuals on probation ☐ HMPPS Prison staff ☒ HMPPS Probation staff ☐ HMCTS staff

	☐ Civil court users ☐ Family court users ☐ Crown court users ☐ Magistrates court users ☐ Others ☐ Not applicable
Define any relevant inclusion/exclusion criteria.	The participants must be Probation practitioners who have lead responsibility for managing individual Probation cases.
How will you recruit your sample ?	Select all that apply: ☐ Random sampling ☐ Systematic sampling ☒ Convenience sampling ☐ Purposive sampling ☐ Stratified sampling ☐ Snowball sampling ☐ Clustered sampling ☐ Quota sampling ☐ Other ☐ Not applicable
Please provide further detail regarding your proposed sampling and rationale, including sample size.	Since I will be testing and evaluating the tool, rather than the volunteer participants using it, the makeup of that group of volunteers is not of primary importance – though if there were a flood of volunteers I would gain the luxury of organising a stratified representative sample! Inevitably, the <i>a priori</i> factor that this experiment will only use volunteers means that that factor will have to be taken into account in the evaluation. More than 20 volunteer practitioners would be desirable but not essential since over time the practitioners are being asked to use it with almost all their cases for over a year, and that should be sufficient for testing the tool. <i>Please outline how you intend to sample and recruit participants from ALL groups selected. This should also include the risks and limitations associated with your approach and steps to monitor and mitigate them (i.e. sampling biases, attrition, low response rates, representativeness). You should also indicate if your sample will be stratified by protected characteristics. Please detail any power calculations if applicable.</i> <i>Please indicate your data collection start and end dates.</i> Potentially early 2026 to 2028
What is your proposed data collection approach?	Select all that apply: ☒ Action Research ☐ Case Studies ☒ Experimental ☐ Focus Groups ☒ Interviews ☐ Literature Review ☐ Observations / Ethnography ☒ Questionnaires

	☐ Rapid evidence assessment / Systematic review ☐ Secondary data analysis		
Please explain how you will conduct the data collection phase of your project.	Data entries made onto the “How’m I doing?” app (the equivalent of “Questionnaires” above) – coded and anonymised – can be transferred to SPSS or Excel.		
What is your proposed data analysis approach?	Select all that apply: ☐ Content analysis ☒ Descriptive statistical analysis ☐ Discourse analysis ☒ Grounded Theory analysis ☐ Inferential statistical analysis ☐ Interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) ☐ Narrative analysis ☐ Other ☐ Thematic analysis		
Explain how you will conduct the data analysis phase of your project.	I can use SPSS (or Excel) to analyse quantitative data, gained by collecting outputs from the “How’m I doing?” app I am used to making qualitative analyses of interview records (ref my MPhil).		
Do you plan to pilot your design?	Yes ☒ No ☐ If yes, provide details. Clearly, the provisionally finalised app itself will need to be ‘road-tested’ with a small number of volunteer staff, and checked for snags, before being fully finalised and being issued to a larger group of volunteer staff.		
What are the implications of this project on frontline resources ?	Theoretically staff time. Any participants who believe in working strictly solely to their contracted hours could <i>theoretically</i> reduce their efforts in their normal HMPPS work – which would be unwelcome. But in reality, as I understand it, even today, most Probation staff will ‘make time’ to do extra things that they find interesting and/or enjoyable, and I would be very surprised indeed if there were a negative implication for HMPPS frontline resourcing in practice. NB: Gabriel Amahwe, interim AED London, expects that deployment of the app might actually alleviate work pressures for PPs (I’m more circumspect). <i>Please consider all demands on resources in the establishment/s the research will be conducted in, including number of days/hours required in each establishment, staff time required, accommodation, whether you will have to be escorted etc.</i>		
What are the main limitations of the research proposed and what alternatives have been considered?	The project is specifically designed to be very “limited” - it is the experimental trialling of a specific tool. Ultimately, either the tool is successful – possibly after some slight adjustments – or it isn’t.		
Project Risks	Risk 1	Risk 2	Risk 3

<i>In the application form, you can add more than 3 risks. Each risk should be added as separate entries.</i> <i>More information on how to assess these risks is included in the application guidance document.</i>	What is the risk? Not getting volunteer participants	What is the risk? Not getting enough support from managers	What is the risk? That the app that I have nearly completed writing turns out not to work as intended.
	How do you plan to mitigate it? Seek additional opportunities to recruit	How do you plan to mitigate it? Seek dialogue to persuade	How do you plan to mitigate it? I have been offered technical help by Unilink should I need it.
	With these mitigations, what is the potential impact? Red ☐ Red/Amber ☐ Amber ☐ Amber/Green ☒ Green ☐	With these mitigations, what is the potential impact? Red ☐ Red/Amber ☐ Amber ☐ Amber/Green ☒ Green ☐	With these mitigations, what is the potential impact? Red ☐ Red/Amber ☐ Amber ☐ Amber/Green ☒ Green ☐
	With these mitigations, what is the likelihood? Red ☐ Red/Amber ☐ Amber ☐ Amber/Green ☐ Green ☐	With these mitigations, what is the likelihood? Red ☐ Red/Amber ☐ Amber ☐ Amber/Green ☐ Green ☐	With these mitigations, what is the likelihood? Red ☐ Red/Amber ☐ Amber ☐ Amber/Green ☐ Green ☐

SECTION 7 – RESEARCH SITES	
Does your project require physical or remote access to:	
An adult male or female prison?	Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, select from a drop-down list of prisons.
Under 18 YOI?	Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, select from a drop-down list of prisons.
Over 18 YOI	Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, select from a drop-down list of prisons.
Probation Region(s)?	Yes ☒ No ☐ If yes, specify locations: Probably London, South Central and Kent, Surrey & Sussex
Secure Training Centre (STC) or Secure Childrens Home?	Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, specify locations:
Please state your reason for choosing the selected research site(s)	Senior managers interested, e.g. Gabriel Amahwe, Linda Neimantas As previously indicated above, both these two Probation Directors have indicated interest and potential support: Gabriel Amahwe is interim Area Executive Director for London (previously Regional Director South Central) gabriel.amahwe@justice.gov.uk Linda Neimantas is Regional Probation Director, Kent Surrey & Sussex linda.neimantas@justice.gov.uk
Have any research sites already been approached about this research?	Senior managers, as above, yes – support in principle.
List any equipment which you are intending to use whilst at the research sites.	When visiting, I'd bring my own MacBook and phone

SECTION 8 – DATA PROTECTION AND SECURITY	
Personal data	Will personal data be processed and/or collected as part of this project? Yes ☒ No ☐ If no, go to section 9.

What type of personal data will be processed / collected?	<i>Please see guidance document for description of what is considered personal data.</i> 1. <u>People on probation</u>: No personal details will be collected at all by me. (The participant PPs will be asked to allocate a pseudonym or Ref No to each case they review on the app, so they will need a 'key' for their own purpose of correlating the pseudonym back to the 'real case'. I will not need to be involved in this at all.) 2. <u>Participant PPs</u>: Insofar as "audio recordings, consent forms, recorded notes and participant contact details" are categorised as personal data, then I will need to ensure I have taken the necessary protective steps, as below.
If personal data is to be processed / collected, what is the justification for using this personal data?	As above, re Probation practitioners only: a) The only "contact details" I will need are their 'work contact' details. b) Any written or audio interview notes are the only other personal data I may need, and this will be anonymised when used. In this form they are legitimate research findings.
If you are using personal data, what is your lawful basis under Article 6 of the UK GDPR?	As above, re Probation practitioners only: - On the basis of Consent.
Are you processing any sensitive data (special category data) e.g., health, ethnicity?	NO
If you are using special category data, what is your lawful basis under Article 9 of the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018?	I'm not needing any data other than that above.
Do you intend to inform participants of how their personal data will be processed? If so, how?	As above, re any interview notes or recordings with Probation practitioners only: I expect to advise them that it will be used 'pseudonymously', as I did with my MPhil participants 37 years ago.
How will personal data be stored?	The data (as above) will be stored solely 'pseudonymously' on my password-protected MacBook. Should I need a 'key' to correlate the pseudonyms with the real PPs, I will store this separately, on paper, in a locked location.
How will the research data be transferred securely between sites?	No identifiable data will need transferring at all "between sites". Although all my research data will be available on 'clouds' and on my MacBook, NONE of it will be identifiable 'personal data.'
How long will the research data be retained? Please provide justification.	I will have no need to retain individual pseudonymised data beyond the completion of the PhD. The paper 'key' will be shredded.

How will personal data be disposed of safely?	As above, the 'key', kept on paper, will be the only means by which any of the other individual pseudonymised data could become identifiable, and once the project is complete, this will be shredded.
---	--

SECTION 9 – RESEARCH ETHICS

Has the relevant Ethics Committee approved the research?	<i>If ethical approval is also required from your workplace/governing body, this should be sought prior to submitting an NRC application. These include: University Ethics Boards, NHS Research Ethics Committee (REC), Health Research Authority (HRA) Approval.</i> ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Waiting for outcome If yes/waiting for outcome, state which ethics committee: University of Greenwich Ethics Committee
Please summarise the main ethical considerations for your proposed project	<i>This should include, but not limited to, securing informed consent, enabling participation for intended group(s) and minimising personal and social harm for participants and researchers.</i> Naturally, volunteer participants will need to have given informed consent, and will need to be monitored for any adverse effects on their personal or working lives. I am not actually collecting personal data from either people on probation or from participant practitioners.
Is informed consent required from participants?	☐ No ☒ Yes If yes, how will you obtain informed consent from participants? My information sheet for potential participants is attached. Since these will be Probation practitioners, once they have understood from the information sheet what is required, the standard University consent form should be sufficient to obtain informed consent.
Does your research involve vulnerable populations?	☒ No ☐ Yes If yes, please explain which vulnerable populations will be involved and what special precautions will be taken to ensure informed consent.
How will you ensure the safety of participants and researchers?	<i>Explain the steps you will take to mitigate any safeguarding concerns associated with your research</i> N/A
How will you ensure participants remain anonymous in any research outputs?	The project design will allocate number codes or pseudonyms to participants and to the cases they use the tool for. I have no interest in exporting any personal data out of HMPPS. <i>Where applicable, if anonymity cannot be ensured please also outline how participants be informed.</i>

Are there any conflicts of interest?	<i>Please declare any likely personal, social and/or financial interests or obligations of anyone involved in the research which may affect or influence the findings of the study. If you are an MoJ/HMPPS employee with a dual practitioner-researcher role consideration should also be given to, but not limited to, the potential for power imbalance, response bias or personal bias/experience impacting the analysis or interpretation of findings.</i> ☐ No ☒ Yes If yes, please provide details. The obvious conflict of interest is that I as the project designer of a tool that I am road-testing would very much like my project to succeed! However, my track record demonstrates that I am and have always been a 'proper scientist' - someone who assesses evidence dispassionately, and I have never feared to arrive at conclusions and decisions that might adversely affect my own personal advantage or interests. (I can cite if necessary) Since I am funding my research myself, I see no other potential conflicts.
--------------------------------------	---

SECTION 10 – DISSEMINATION PLAN, INCLUDING PUBLICATION	
When will the research findings be made available to MoJ?	2028/9 formally, But by the nature of the project, informally almost contemporaneously. Obviously, I will complete the required template and in good time. <i>Insert expected date</i>
How else will the results of the research be disseminated (e.g. article, book, thesis)?	PhD thesis, plus a separate 'plain English' summary to be agreed.
The NRC should be informed of any changes to the dissemination of this research	☐ No ☒ I agree to inform the NRC of any changes to my dissemination plans for this research

SECTION 11 – SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION	
Supporting documents	Please ensure all essential supporting documentation is submitted with this application form. Details on essential documents is outlined in the application document but include: 1. CVs for all members of the research team 2. For HMPPS Chartered and trainee forensic psychologists – a copy of the approved commissioning document. 3. For MSc students – a letter/email of support from a PGD or RPD 1. Participant information sheet / consent form / debrief sheet if applicable 2. Ethical approval from relevant governing body 3. Any relevant data sharing agreements

	Space to upload up to 10 supporting documents. CV Academic certificates Full Rationale Experiment Plans & Illustrations Introduction to Modern Probation Theory Evidence from Berkshire Probation Private v “Private”? report Participant information sheet
--	---

SECTION 12 – DECLARATION	
I confirm I will comply with all relevant legislation and expectations as outlined above	☐ No ☒ Yes, I agree. If yes, please add the date

Prior to final submission of the online form, applicants can view their responses and make any necessary changes before pressing the submit button.

Please note that once a form has been submitted, no further changes are possible via the application portal.