



# Shared learning from being inspected by HMIP in the 2018/2019 round

AYM Seminar 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019.

# Preparation and Evidence in Advance

- **Essex:** Call comes on a Friday am – HOS was out at a conference and we have no admin! Ensure you have a contingency plan in place if your HOS is not available. Follow up call on the Tuesday but HMIP get the long list and papers out on the Friday so will need a SPOC. EIA is crucial – think about how the evidence supports the ‘question’ and how this will be demonstrated in both focus groups and case file read.
- **Bristol:** Get your list of EIA ready now and keep it up-dated. You need to provide a list, not the actual evidence. Work out in advance where you are going to store the evidence so that the inspectors can access it – shared folder etc. If you do this now, it will give you much more time to prepare when the call comes. Remember, it’s your BEST evidence, not all of your evidence.

- Hampshire: difficulties in compiling the long list due to staff absence which meant for the first couple of days this had to be done manually, taking time away from other preparation tasks. LP: where possible have more than one member of staff able to carry out IT functions!
- Barking and Dagenham – HOS in another country when call came in and new board chair 2 weeks into the job. Luckily we had completed a SEF which told the story of the service and service development managers had been involved so could already start to put the story together to answer the question.

# Logistics

- **Essex:** A lot of time can be taken up to-ing and fro-ing if the lists of cases and case managers aren't organised well from the start. Think now who you want in your focus groups and why – we had 8 focus groups. Encourage all staff/panel members to do the survey.
- **Bristol:** Make sure there is more than one person who can talk knowledgeably about each case – hard to do and to maintain, but will pay dividends if case managers are absent during inspection. Prepare your youth bench chair for receiving a questionnaire from the inspectors (we included our friendly DJ too). Identify where inspectors will be based – 7 or 8 rooms needed.

- Hampshire: covers a large area and has 4 area offices as well as HQ. Inspectors were placed in HQ and one area office which meant a lot of travel time for some staff who had multiple interviews. This took a lot of time to organise, arranging room bookings, passes and organising staff etc.
- Barking and Dagenham -Full joint inspection took a lot of organising. First on site week smaller rooms for each inspector to do one to one meetings, second on site week, larger rooms booked for focus groups. Utilise admin to meet and greet members of focus groups and another to deliver inspectors to rooms to reduce potential for 'wandering'.

# Experiences of process

- **Essex:** Overall good – looking for good practice and so this set the tone. Starts and ends with the YOS Management Board so if the chair and Board not really engaged this will show. Although no self assessment we were very honest about what we were proud of and worried about (Education). EIA – story of place told our lead this in advance.
- **Bristol:** Traumatized and still in recovery! Mainly because inspection took place in school summer holidays so several case managers on leave, plus one on maternity leave, one case held by student who has since left etc. Made the timetabling of meetings and focus groups a nightmare! Board members were unprepared for the process.

- Hampshire: staff told team managers that in the main they enjoyed their interviews and felt encouraged to highlight areas of good practice. Inspectors did question risk levels on a couple of occasions and asked for them to be reviewed with feedback prepared. These were reviewed by the case manager and a team manager and in one particular case, when our response was that we stood by the risk levels assigned the inspector said that he was pleased by this (although he didn't even read the feedback prepared).
- Barking and Dagenham- staff felt positive and received good feedback about casework, (however this can sometimes make it harder to deliver the results if it is not glowing). One inspector came in with a hypothesis and judged it to be true based on observation of local area.

# Reflections

- **Essex:** Staff spoke well of the inspection process and were of course bouncing off the ceiling at the result. We came before OFSTED – also Outstanding rating but wonder what this would have felt like if it was the other way round? LI and DLI were key – ours knew how many beans made 5!! Chair of the Board presented day 1 and knew the issues well and we made no attempt to hide poor outcomes - notably education and our concerns about emerging disproportionality. They may not have found these if not specifically highlighted.
- **Bristol:** Inspectors came with agenda of Bristol being under-resourced and looked very hard for evidence of impact on practice. Team members felt they were being manipulated into criticising YOT management and the Board. The Board and partner agencies needed to be much better prepared and evidence of relationship between Board and YOT needed to be much stronger.

- Hampshire: echo the importance of being open and honest about what we do well as a YOT but also what needs developing and how we are going to achieve this. At times our inspection felt like it was a joint YOT and CSD inspection as the inspectors asked CSD to take urgent action on at least 2 cases. Our senior management team was on hand throughout the inspection and responded swiftly to enquiries made.
- Barking and Dagenham – knowing the YOS and the story and where your issues were was key. Knowledgeable board helped and we had a pre meet with them to present the presentation that the chair would be doing to the inspectors beforehand to ensure we had not missed anything but to also inform them of what the inspectors would receive on their first day.

# YOT Practitioners' Top Tips

- The last couple of inspections I have been involved in have been less interested in sticking directly to the time period of the sentence and more about the overall circumstances including current. The inspectors sometimes covered ASSET dates and national standards, but their main concern was more around broader themes such as involvement of other agencies, how decisions are made, whether there had been multi-agency meetings regardless of the type. Less about processes and more about actual work carried out. I think they are trying to be less about tick boxes and focussed on getting a better understanding of the reality.

# YOT Practitioners' Top Tips

- I would say that the inspectors 'lull you into a false sense of security' by asking you about the case to put you at ease. I familiarised myself with the strengths within the case and spoke about them at the start but also made a note of the things that I could have done better and prepared myself for questions they may ask around the weaknesses.
- I took my laptop and was able to show the inspectors emails that related to a case that wasn't on CV/pieces of work that wasn't uploaded.
- They wanted to know about me e.g how long I have done the job.
- I enjoyed the process as it made me reflect on my decision making.
- I took a note pad and made notes of the things that they praised me for and the things I could have done differently.