

Islington Youth Offending Service Asset / Integrated Risk and Vulnerability Management Plan Quality Assurance Tool

Worker to pass to Manager for QA monitoring	
(within 2 days of completion)	
Manager to pass feedback form to Performance Manager for QA collation	

DATE OF ASSET

Please indicate with a tick the type of asset that this is		INITIAL ASSET	
Has the author proposed/reviewed the intervention Plan for start and review assets	Yes/ No N/A	REVIEW ASSET	
Has the author completed the intervention progress and feedback sections for and end Asset	Yes/ No N/A	END ASSET	

YP Name):		Author of Asset:
Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Quality Assured by:
	Male		Quality Assured by.
	Female	White / Black /Asian /Chinese /Mixed	

Accounting Rules: ASSET Quality Assessment tool.

The Personal Details Section

• This section should only be scored SATISFACTORY (2) or better if all the National Standards have been met (or there are reasonable explanations for why they have not been met).

All other sections

The 0 – 4 section ratings are defined as follows.

4 (Excellent)	All assessments for that section are either: detailed/insightful information; well evidenced or very well.
3 (Good)	Assessments for that section are a mixture of: well evidenced/insightful/very well and adequate/adequately evidenced.
2 (Satisfactory)	Assessments for that section are a mixture of adequate, poorly evidenced and partially, there should be no more than one 'poorly evidenced' response.
<u>1 (Poor)</u>	Sections with a mixture of poorly evidenced, limited/no evidence, partially and not at all.
0 (Unacceptable)	Any section with more than one response of: no information, limited/no evidence, not at all.

Perso	nal Details	;							
1.	Are all the c	letails about the ir	ndividual c	completed	correctly?		YES 🗌	NO [
2.	Has the eth	nic classification b	een com	pleted?			YES 🗌	NO [
3.	(National standards require at least one interview)							NO [
4.		ing person's name					YES 🗌	NO [
5.	National Standards require that parents/carers should be interviewed – unless yp is 16 years old or over, or estranged from parents).							NO [
6.	used to complete this assessment?							NO [
7.	7. Have checks been completed to establish that the young person is in education or training? (National Standards require this to take place) (Have we received the Education Enquiry form back?) YE							NO [
8.	Has the PNC number been provided? YES							NO [
9.	Has PNC been checked to inform Asset / ROSH / RMP? YES							NO [
10.	10. If significant information appears to be missing have adequate details been provided about problems in obtaining information/action being taken to obtain it?							NO [
Unac	0 ceptable	section satisfacti 1 Poor	Satisf	2 actory	3 Good		4 cellent		
Unac	0 cceptable o' is recorded aga	1	Satisf	2 actory	3 Good		cellent	Unaccept	able.
Unac (NB If 'No Feedb	0 cceptable o' is recorded aga	1 Poor ainst questions 3, 4, 5 or	Satisf	2 actory	3 Good		cellent	Unaccept	able.
Unac (NB If 'No Feedb	oceptable o' is recorded againack	1 Poor ainst questions 3, 4, 5 or	Satisf 7 without a sa	actory reas	3 Good		cellent ded as POOR or		able.
Unac (NB If 'No Feedb	onal to ASS Have partne	1 Poor inst questions 3, 4, 5 or	Satisf 7 without a sa	actory reas	3 Good son being given this	s should be record	cellent ded as POOR or		able.
Unac (NB If 'No Feedb Additi 1.	onal to ASS Have partner Have all need	Poor sinst questions 3, 4, 5 or ET ership issues beer	Satisf 7 without a sa	actory reas	3 Good son being given this	s should be record	cellent ded as POOR or		able.
Unac (NB If 'No Feedb Additi 1. 2. Offer	onal to ASS Have partner Have all necessity	Poor ainst questions 3, 4, 5 or ership issues beer cessary referrals be	Satisf 7 without a sa n identified been mad	actory reas	3 Good son being given this	s should be record	cellent ded as POOR or		
Unac (NB If 'No Feedb Additi 1. 2. Offer	onal to ASS Have partner Have all need accorded against to ASS Are the offer	Poor inst questions 3, 4, 5 or ership issues beer cessary referrals to	Satisf 7 without a sa in identified been mad sis	d? e to releva	3 Good son being given this	s should be record	cellent ded as POOR or		
Unac (NB If 'No Feedb 11. 2. Offer 11.	onal to ASS Have partner Have all need accorded against to ASS Are the offer	Poor inst questions 3, 4, 5 or ership issues beer cessary referrals to sand Analys ince details record	Satisf 7 without a sa in identified been mad sis	d? e to releva	3 Good son being given this	s should be record	cellent ded as POOR or NO [

No Information	Limited Information	Adequate Information	Adequate and insightful Information	
13. Is the case stag	ge recorded?			Yes /
14. Indicate your as	ssessment of the details	provided about victims		
No Information	Limited Information	Adequate Information	Adequate and insightful Information	

,	ription of events)?					
No Analysis	Limited Ar	nalysis	Adequa	ate Analysis	Adequate and insightful Analysis	
analysis, ar	licable, have issue nd there links to th bronze" where app	ie young p			phlighted in the offence plored. (including	
No Analysis	Limited Ar		Adequa	ate Analysis	Adequate and insightful Analysis	
Satisfaction ratin			nalysis (d	circle rating)	4	
Unacceptable	1 Poor	_	actory	Good	4 Excellent	
Feedback						
Criminal History						7
17. Have the c	riminal history deta	ails been c	completed	?		Yes / No
18. Has the pre	evious disposals s	ection bee	en comple	ted?		Yes / No
19. If applicable evidenced?	e, how well have o	details of p	revious la	ck of complian	ce / breach been	
No Information	Limited Info	ormation	Adequat	e Information	Adequate and insightful Information	
No Information Feedback	Limited Info	ormation	Adequat	e Information		
	Limited Info	ormation	Adequat	e Information]
Feedback Care History 20. Has the care	re history been rec	corded and	d evidence	ed?	insightful Information	Yes / No
Feedback Care History	re history been rec	corded and	d evidence			Yes / No
Care History 20. Has the care Very limited or not Evidence Satisfaction ratio	re history been rec	corded and	d evidence Ade Ev	ed? equately idenced circle rating)	Well Evidenced	Yes / No
Care History 20. Has the care Very limited or note in the care.	re history been rec	corded and denced	d evidence Ade Ev	ed? equately idenced	insightful Information	Yes / No

1. Living Arr	angement					
21. Are the 'livi	ng arrangement' ti	ck boxes su	upported	by the eviden	ce?	Yes / No
Very limited or no Evidence	Poorly Evid	lenced	Adequately Evidenced		Well Evidenced	
22. Does the ev	vidence support ar	nd explain tl	he rating	of risk of re-of	ffending?	Yes / No
Not at All			Very Well			
Living Arrangeme	ents section satis	faction rati	ina (circ	le rating)		
0	1	2		3	4 Everyone	
Unacceptable	Poor	Satisfac	ctory	Good	Excellent	
Feedback						
Additional to ASS	SET					
	person on commun to become homel		es is the	re any indicati	ons YES□ N	NO [
	ral been made if th person is in custod		dication	of being home	eless, YES 🗌 N	NO [
Commentary Box t	o detail notes abo	ut homeless	s/custody	issues conce	erns	
2. Family an	d Personal Rela	ıtionships	i			
23. Are the 'fan	nily and personal r	elationships	s' tick bo	xes supported	by the evidence?	Yes / No
Very limited or no Evidence	Poorly Evid	lenced		quately denced	Well Evidenced	
24. Does the ev	vidence support ar	nd explain tl	he rating	of risk re-offe	nding?	Yes / No
Not at All	Partial	ly	Ade	quately	Very Well	
Family and Perso			atisfacti			
0 Unacceptable	1 Poor	2 Satisfac	ctory	3 Good	4 Excellent	
•					_	
Feedback						

Additional to ASSE	:T								
Have siblings I			YES □ NC						
2. Have all neces	sary referrals been cons	idered to other agencies	YES NC)					
Commentary Box to d	etail notes about sibling	work							
3. Education T	raining and Employm	ent		7					
25. Are the ETE be	oxes supported by the ev	vidence?		Yes / No					
Very limited or no evidence	Poorly Evidenced	Adequately Evidenced	Well Evidenced	Ī					
Education Attainmer	nt			_					
26. Are the educat	ion attainment tick boxes	s supported by the evider	nce?	Yes / No					
Very limited or no evidence	Poorly Evidenced	Adequately Evidenced	Well Evidenced						
Engagement				_					
27. Are the other f	actors/engagement boxe	es supported by the evide	ence?	Yes / No					
Very limited or no evidence	Poorly Evidenced	Adequately Evidenced	Well Evidenced						
28. Does the evide	ence support and explain	the rating of risk of re-of	fending?	Yes / No					
Not at All	Partially	Adequately	Very Well						
ETE Section satisfaction				_					
0 Unacceptable	-	2 3 actory Good	4 Excellent						
Feedback									
4. Neighbourho									
		ported by the evidence?		Yes / No					
Very limited or no	Poorly Evidenced	Adequately	Well Evidenced	ł					

evidence			Evi	denced		
30. Does the e	evidence support a	nd explain	the rating	of risk of re-offe	ending?	Yes / No
Not at all	Partia	lly	Ade	equately	Very Well	
Neighbourhood s	section satisfaction	on rating (circle rat	<u> </u>		_
0 Unacceptable	1 Poor	Satisfa	actory	3 Good	4 Excellent	
Feedback						
5. Lifestyle						٦,, ,,,
	estyle' tick boxes s					Yes / No
Very limited or n evidence	o Poorly Evi	denced		equately idenced	Well Evidenced	
32. Does the e	evidence support a	nd explain	the rating	of the risk of re	-offendina?	Yes / No
Very limited or n			Ade	equately	Well Evidenced	
evidence				denced		
Lifestyle Section	satisfaction ratir	ng (circle r	ating)			
0	1	7 2		3	4	
0 Unacceptable	1 Poor)	3 Good	4 Excellent	
· ·	•	2)	~	•	
Unacceptable	•	2)	~	•	
Unacceptable	•	2)	~	•	
Unacceptable	•	2)	~	•	
Unacceptable Feedback	•	2)	~	•	
Feedback 6. Substance	Poor	Satisfa	ectory	Good	Excellent	Yes / No
Feedback 6. Substance	Poor ce Misuse ubstance misuse' ti	Satisfa	ectory	Good	Excellent	Yes / No
Feedback 6. Substance 33. Are the 'su	Poor ce Misuse ubstance misuse' ti	Satisfa	e actory upported	Good by the evidence	Excellent e?	Yes / No
Feedback 6. Substance 33. Are the 'su Very limited or nevidence	Poor ce Misuse ubstance misuse' ti	Satisfa Satisfa	upported Ade	by the evidence	Excellent ?? Well Evidenced	Yes / No
Feedback 6. Substance 33. Are the 'su Very limited or nevidence	Poor Ce Misuse abstance misuse' ti	ck boxes s denced nd explain	upported Ade Evi	by the evidence	Excellent ?? Well Evidenced	
Feedback 6. Substance 33. Are the 'substance Very limited or nevidence 34. Does the experiment of the substance Misus	Poor Poor bstance misuse' ti Poorly Evi vidence support a Partia Se Section satisfa	ck boxes s denced nd explain tilly ction ratir	upported Ade Evi	by the evidence equately of risk of re-offerquately rating)	Excellent Well Evidenced ending? Very Well	
Feedback 6. Substance 33. Are the 'su Very limited or nevidence 34. Does the elements of the substance o	Poor Poorly Evidence support a Partia	ck boxes s denced nd explain	upported Ade Evi	by the evidence equately of risk of re-offeequately	Excellent e? Well Evidenced ending?	
Feedback 6. Substance 33. Are the 'substance Very limited or revidence 34. Does the example of the limited or revidence Not at All Substance Misus 0	Poor Poorly Evi Poorly Evi evidence support a Partia Se Section satisfa 1	ck boxes s denced nd explain nlly ction ratir	upported Ade Evi	by the evidence equately of risk of re-offerquately rating)	Excellent Property Well Very Well 4	
Feedback 6. Substance 33. Are the 'substance Very limited or nevidence 34. Does the end of the substance Misus Unacceptable	Poor Poorly Evi Poorly Evi evidence support a Partia Se Section satisfa 1	ck boxes s denced nd explain nlly ction ratir	upported Ade Evi	by the evidence equately of risk of re-offerquately rating)	Excellent Property Well Very Well 4	

7. Physical H	ealth					
35. Are the 'phys	sical health' tick	boxes sup	ported by t	he evidence?		Yes / No
Very Limited or No Evidence	Poorly Evi	denced		quately denced	Well Evidenced	
36. Does the evi	dence support a	ınd explain	the rating	of risk of re-offe	ending?	Yes / No
Not at All	Partia	ally	Ade	quately	Very Well	
Physical Health Se 0 Unacceptable	ction satisfacti 1 Poor	2	(circle rati 2 actory	ng) 3 Good	4 Excellent	
37. Are the 'emo		alth' tick bo	oxes supp	orted by the evi	dence?	Yes / No
Very Limited or No	Poorly Evi					
Evidence		denced		quately denced	Well Evidenced	
Evidence 38. Does the evi			Evid	denced		Yes / No
		nd explain	the rating	denced		Yes / No
38. Does the evi	dence support a	and explain	the rating	of risk of re-offe	ending?	Yes / No
38. Does the evi	dence support a	and explain	the rating	of risk of re-offe	ending?	Yes / No
38. Does the evi Not at All Emotional and Mer 0 Unacceptable	dence support a Partia ntal Health satis	and explain	the rating Ade	of risk of re-offequately e rating)	ending? Very Well 4	Yes / No
38. Does the evi Not at All Emotional and Mer 0 Unacceptable Feedback 9. Perception	dence support a Partia ntal Health satis 1 Poor of Self and O	sfaction ra Satisfa	the rating Ade ating (circle actory	of risk of re-offequately e rating) 3 Good	ending? Very Well 4 Excellent	
38. Does the evi Not at All Emotional and Mer 0 Unacceptable Feedback 9. Perception 39. Are the 'perception	dence support a Partia ntal Health satis 1 Poor of Self and O eption of self an	sfaction ra Satisfaction ra Control Satisfaction ra Satisfaction ra Control Sa	the rating Ade Aditing (circle) actory ck boxes s	of risk of re-offequately e rating) 3 Good	ending? Very Well 4 Excellent e evidence?	Yes / No Yes / No
38. Does the evi Not at All Emotional and Mer 0 Unacceptable Feedback 9. Perception	dence support a Partia ntal Health satis 1 Poor of Self and O eption of self an	sfaction ra Satisfaction ra Control Satisfaction ra Satisfaction ra Control Sa	the rating Ade Ade Ating (circle) actory ck boxes s	of risk of re-offequately e rating) 3 Good	ending? Very Well 4 Excellent	
38. Does the evi Not at All Emotional and Mer 0 Unacceptable Feedback 9. Perception 39. Are the 'perception Very Limited or No	dence support a Partia ntal Health satis 1 Poor of Self and O ception of self an Poorly Evi	sfaction ra Satisfa thers d others' ti	the rating Ade Ade Ating (circle) actory ck boxes s Ade Evid	of risk of re-offequately e rating) 3 Good supported by the quately denced	ending? Very Well 4 Excellent e evidence? Well Evidenced	

Perception of Se	If and Others sect	on satisfac	tion ra	ting (circle rat	ing)	
0 Unacceptable	1 Poor	2 Satisfact	orv	3 Good	4 Excellent	
Chaocoptable	1 001	<u> </u>	o. y		Exconone	
Feedback						
40 TI 'I '	IDalaadaaa					
	and Behaviour					
41. Are the 'thi	inking and behaviou	ır' tick boxes	suppo	rted by the evid	dence?	Yes / No
Very Limited or N	No Poorly Evid	enced		equately	Well Evidenced	
Evidence			EVI	denced		
42 Does the e	evidence support an	d evolain th	a rating	of risk of re-of	fending?	Yes / No
Not at All		•				103 / 110
NOT AT AII	Partial	у	Aue	equately	Very Well	
Thinking and Bel	haviour section sa		ating (c			_
0 Unacceptable	1 Poor	2 Satisfact	ory	3 Good	4 Excellent	
F						
Feedback						
11. Attitudes	to Offending					
		10.1.1.			0	
	titudes to offending					Yes / No
Very Limited or N Evidence	No Poorly Evid	enced		equately denced	Well Evidenced	
LVIGETICE				deliced		
44. Does the e	evidence support an	d explain th	e ratina	of risk of re-off	fendina?	Yes / No
Not at All	Partial	•		equately	Very Well	
NOT at All	i artial	У	Auc	quatery	very wen	
	nding section sati	sfaction rat	ing (cir		4	
^	1	_		3	-	
0 Unacceptable	Poor	Satisfact	ory	Good	Excellent	
——————————————————————————————————————	Poor	Satisfact	ory	Good	Excellent	
Unacceptable	Poor	Salisiaci	ory	Good	Excellent	
~	Poor	Salisiaci	ory	Good	Excellent	
Unacceptable	Poor	Salisiaci	ory	Good	Excellent	
Unacceptable	Poor	Salisiaci	ory	Good	Excellent	

12. Motivation to	Change				-
45. Are the 'motiva	tion to change ' tick l	boxes suppor	ed by the evid	lence?	Yes / No
Very Limited or No Evidence	Poorly Evidenced		equately denced	Well Evidenced	
46. Does the evide	ence support and exp	lain the rating	of risk of re-o	ffending?	Yes / No
Not at All	Partially	Ade	equately	Very Well	
Motivation to Change	e section satisfaction	on rating (cire	cle rating)		
0	1	2	3	4	
Unacceptable	Poor Sa	atisfactory	Good	Excellent	
Feedback					
Static Factor Score	Dynamic Fac	ctor		s box the Recorded Tot re (not the QA monitorii scor	ng
Positive Factors Individual Factors (if					N/A
	ence provide details on the like	•		·	Yes / No
Very Limited or No Evidence	Poorly Evidenced		equately denced	Well Evidenced	
Family Factors (if no	factors have been	identified in t	his section, o	circle N/A here)	N/A
	ence provide details o ve on the likelihood o	•	•	explain what impact	Yes / No
Very Limited or No Evidence	Poorly Evidenced		equately denced	Well Evidenced	
Community Factors ((if no factors have b	oeen identifie	d in this sect	ion, circle N/A here)	N/A
	ence provide details on the like			s and explain what	Yes / No
Very Limited or No Evidence	Poorly Evidenced		equately denced	Well Evidenced	
Feedback					

Other Factors

50. Are any other positive factors identified and evidenced?	Yes / No

Positive Factors section satisfaction rating (circle rating)

			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	0	1	2	3	4
U	Unacceptable	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent

			_
Feedback			

Indicators of Vulnerability and Risk of Serious Harm to Others

51. Are the indicators of vulnerability section completed?	Yes / No
---	----------

52. Are the indicators of vulnerability tick boxes supported by the evidence?	Yes / No
53. Where rating of medium or above has been given, has a Vulnerability Management plan been completed.	Yes / No

Not Consistent with Evidence	Poorly Evidenced	Adequately Evidenced	Well Evidenced

54. Is the "indicators of serious harm" to others section completed?	Yes / No
	1

_		
	55. Are the indicators of serious harm tick boxes supported by the evidence?	Yes / No
	56. Where rating of medium or above has been given, has a ROSH & Risk Management plan been completed.	Yes / No

Satisfaction rating for indicators of vulnerability and risk of harm to others section (circle rating)

Unacceptable	Poor	Satisfacto	ry G	ood	Excellent	
Indicate Level of R	isk of Harm	Low	Med	High	V High	incomplete

		I			
Indicate Level of Vulnerability	Low	Med	High	V High	incomplete

Risk / Vulnerability Feedback

57. Is the assessment free from discriminatory language?	Yes / N
Is there evidence that the young person has been directly asked about 58. his / her diversity needs?	Yes / N
Are barriers to engagement clearly identified throughout the 59. assessment?	Yes / N
60. For Start and PSR Assets, has a Learning Style Assessment been completed	Yes / N
Diversity needs & learning Style feedback	
verall feedback of the quality of the assessment	
entified areas of development	
sset Author Feedback to Quality Assurer	

Diversity needs & learning Style