



HM Prison &  
Probation Service

A Response to: Serious Further Offence Annual Report 2024-2025

Action Plan Submitted: 09 February 2026

Report Published: 09 December 2025

## INTRODUCTION

HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) and HM Inspectorate of Probation for England and Wales are independent inspectorates which provide scrutiny of the conditions for, and treatment of prisoners and offenders. They report their findings for prisons, Young Offender Institutions, and effectiveness of the work of probation, and youth offending services across England and Wales to Ministry of Justice (MoJ) and Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS). In response to the report HMPPS / MoJ are required to draft a robust and timely action plan to address the recommendations. The action plan confirms whether recommendations are agreed, partly agreed, or not agreed (see categorisations below). Where a recommendation is agreed or partly agreed, the action plans provide specific steps and actions to address these. Actions are clear, measurable, achievable, and relevant with the owner and timescale of each step clearly identified. Action plans are sent to HMIP and published on the GOV.UK website. Progress against the implementation and delivery of the action plans will also be monitored and reported on.

Term	Definition	Additional comment
Agreed	All of the recommendation is agreed with, can be achieved and is affordable.	The response should clearly explain how the recommendation will be achieved along with timescales. Actions should be as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound) as possible. Actions should be specific enough to be tracked for progress.
Partly Agreed	Only part of the recommendation is agreed with, is achievable, affordable and will be implemented. This might be because we cannot implement the whole recommendation because of commissioning, policy, operational or affordability reasons.	The response must state clearly which part of the recommendation will be implemented along with SMART actions and tracked for progress. There <b>must</b> be an explanation of why we cannot fully agree the recommendation - this must state clearly whether this is due to commissioning, policy, operational or affordability reasons.
Not Agreed	The recommendation is not agreed and will not be implemented. This might be because of commissioning, policy, operational or affordability reasons.	The response must clearly state the reasons why we have chosen this option. There <b>must</b> be an explanation of why we cannot agree the recommendation - this must state clearly whether this is due to commissioning, policy, operational or affordability reasons.



## ACTION PLAN: Serious Further Offence Annual Report 2024-2025

1. Rec No	2. Recommendation	3. Agreed/ Partly Agreed/ Not Agreed	4. Response Action Taken/Planned	5. Responsible Owner	6. Target Date
	<b>Recommendations</b>				
	<b>His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service should:</b>				
1	Devise and implement an approach to engaging with victims and their families following an SFO, which is directly informed throughout by victims, their families and relevant interested parties.	Agreed	<p>Victims' right to information following an SFO is set out in the Victim's Code. HMPPS recognise the vital importance of providing a quality service to victims. In response to the Chief Inspector's report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comprehensive process of consultation will be undertaken with Probation Heads of Service, Victim Liaison Units and other relevant parties to explore the experience of victims as outlined in the report and their own reflections of meeting with victims following an SFO.</li> <li>• Following the above consultation and dialogue with the Victims Commissioner, a best practice guide and mandatory checklist will be produced that will include a requirement to obtain information directly from victims about how best to engage and disclose the SFO review to them.</li> </ul>	Deputy Director Public Protection Group	March 2026
2	Devise and implement a clear mechanism by which feedback from victims and their families can be collected, understood and acted on, following sharing of an SFO review.	Agreed	<p>HMPPS recognise the importance of incorporating victim feedback to shape quality services to them following an SFO. Taking account of feedback processes already in place in some probation regions, HMPPS will devise and implement a common national process for victims to give feedback, should they wish to do so, on their experience of having an SFO review offered and disclosed to them.</p> <p>Responses will be evaluated to inform changes to activities covered in recommendations 1 and 3.</p>	Deputy Director Public Protection Group	June 2026
3	Carry out a review of the support and training provided to staff that deliver SFO findings to victims and their family	Agreed	HMPPS SFO Team will sequence a review of the support and approach to learning materials for the implementation of recommendations 1 and 2. This will	Deputy Director Public Protection Group	December 2026



	members, and act on the findings of that review.		<p>enable HMPPS to understand the support Heads of Service require to better engage with victims and which products are required.</p> <p>Once this is established the SFO team will work with learning and development colleagues to identify what support and training is required and how to deliver it efficiently.</p>	Deputy Director, Workforce and Capability	December 2026
4	Ensure that the process for countersigning of all SFO reviews is sufficiently robust to meet the required standard and that regional senior leaders are held to account for the quality and timeliness of SFO reviews.	Agreed	<p>HMPPS SFO Team have revised the countersigning checklist which is available on the SFO Share Point page. The team have re-promoted the checklist through the regular SFO meeting with SFO regional teams.</p> <p>The Chief Probation Officer, with delegated authority from the Director General of Operations, will monitor performance for both timeliness and quality of SFO reviews via Area Executive Director (AED) bilateral meetings. Where performance is not to the required standard, AED's will ensure the required steps are taken to mitigate risks and improve, as well as ensure sufficient expectations are set throughout the operational line. Where improved performance is not achieved, this will be escalated to the Director General of Operations.</p>	Deputy Director Public Protection Group  Chief Probation Officer	Completed  April 2026
5	Gather evidence that action plans are always being implemented, that recurring and thematic learning is identified to make improvements to practice, and that updates to action plans sufficiently reflect the progress and impact made.	Agreed	Assurance will be undertaken through local Quality Improvement Plans. Evidence that actions are being implemented and that learning is driving improvements will be provided through established governance structures such as the monthly Operational Performance and Quality Boards, with Heads of Function responsible for oversight and reporting.	Chief Probation Officer	Commenced and ongoing
6	Implement changes to ensure that all SFO reviews are timely and completed to a sufficient standard.	Agreed	<p>HMPPS is committed to ensuring the production of timely and quality SFO reviews and will continue to implement the backlog recovery model, an approach put in place to address the number of outstanding reviews.</p> <p>The impact of the recovery model on timeliness and quality will be evaluated to inform the future format of SFO reviews.</p>	Deputy Director Public Protection Group  Regional Probation Director, Performance & Quality	Commenced and ongoing  September 2026
7	Monitor and publish information on completion of overdue SFO reviews, including the size of the backlog,	Partly Agreed	The recommendation is partly agreed as there are currently no plans to publish information on the completion of overdue SFO reviews. In line with the commitment to transparency, accredited official statistics on the number of SFO	Deputy Director Public Protection Group	Commenced and ongoing

	<p>progress made, the quality of reviews completed against the standards, and the impact of the process.</p>	<p>notifications, the number of reviews and the number of charges that result in convictions are already published. All statistics published adhere to the standards set by the Office for Statistics Regulation (OSR).</p> <p>To ensure there is sufficient understanding of the time it is taking to complete SFO reviews and the progress on reducing delay, regular updates will be provided to ministers and senior leaders.</p> <p>The national SFO team will also provide senior leaders with quality assurance ratings for their region.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Recommendations	
Agreed	6
Partly Agreed	1
Not Agreed	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>

