

Throughcare Assessment for Release on Licence. (TARL) Frequently/ Previously Asked Questions

Question:	Parole Licence conditions – do licence conditions need to pertain to the index offence? - anecdotally it seems there have been some differing responses to this from PBS members. (This was in response to a discussion about someone with significant DA indicators having included within their licence despite it not being part of the index offence..)
Answer:	With regard to licence conditions – they are determined by risk and need to be lawful, necessary and proportionate, as such they do not need to directly relate to the index offence – the focus should be on manageability of risk. (Answer provided by Parole Board Scotland)
Question:	When the TARL process is introduced, will the process remain the same for prisoners not to be moved during the completion of these reports?
Answer:	Similar to when a prisoner is in the Parole Process, ideally they should not be moved to another establishment other than for exceptional operational reasons. In such circumstances, SPS are required to notify the Board and PBSW. (Answer provided by Scottish Prison Service)
Question:	Will the Parole co-ordinator(s) generate simultaneous requests for the TARL report (to CBSW & PBSW) at the 12 week stage?
Answer:	This has been agreed by and will be implemented through SPS HQ and Parole co-ordinators. (included in the SPS GMA)
Question:	What is the process for cross-border reports – e.g where the probation service in England or NI hold the CBSW part of the report?
Answer:	This will revert back to the previous process with PBSW submitting a standalone report as they do now.
Question:	Section instructions – Active collaboration/ consultation – why aren't all sections encouraged to be in active collaboration?
Answer:	The reason for the slight change in wording is to emphasise the section on which collaboration is most important, although it would be encouraged (best practice) where possible throughout.

Question:	Would a 12 month/ interim review of the process not make more sense rather than a 3 year review?
Answer:	a 12 month review of the process would not be feasible as there would not be enough information to go on, an 18 month review however had been committed to in the guidance foreword (from SWS justice standing committee chair)

Question:	In section 1.4 What is the purpose of stating the rationale when ROSH indicators are not present?
Answer:	It demonstrates the logic process for exclusion of RoSH – like showing your workings. This is actually quite a critical issue as workers would rarely be criticised for including a RoSH but if workers are ‘on the cusp’ and examine all the factors and do NOT think RoSH is required, the rationale of that decision must be made clearly for the Parole Board / Tribunal to examine and understand it.

Question:	in section 1.4 can the detail/ headings for this be copy and pasted from MAPPA ?
Answer:	This is something that will look to be addressed in the guidance update.

Question:	In section(s)1.5, 1.6 & 1.7 is the word prisoner required – section names make sense with this removed and is more Trauma informed?
Answer:	Amendment accepted, the word Prisoner has been removed.

Question:	Section 1.6 – what happens when a proposed release address is out of area? Is a third party brought in to write this part of the report as they would complete the home visit?
Answer:	This situation is no different from what happens presently, the agreement would need to be reached between Local Authorities about who holds the case before the report (TARL) was being written, a third party would not be writing on the report.

Question:	Should this(above) be recorded in 1.6 – why is this not mentioned in the guidance?
Answer:	yes, as is the case now, any decision on suitability would be recorded in 1.6 – It would impossible to cover every given scenario in a guidance document and as this is not a change from the current system should not need addressed.

Question:	1.8 victim issues – titles implies victim ownership, could this be titles Victim considerations?
Answer:	Amendment accepted

Question:	1.8: “In addition, consideration should be given to whether the victim of the index offence is part of the Victim Notification Scheme (VNS).” – why would
-----------	---

	this be considered here if the VNS would not be mentioned in this report? – seems that mentioning this in the guidance could lead to VNS being mentioned here and associated SJR
Answer:	The wording here will be revised within the guidance.

Question:	Q: 1.10 & 1.11 should these sections have numbers ? could lead to it being clear a section is missing (i.e non-disclosure) Could they not be titled differently as they are submitted separately anyway
Answer:	A: the sections will have numbers removed and will be removed from the template to write the report which will avoid this becoming an issue.

Question:	Section 1.10 – is this the total process for submitting non-disclosure items to the board? Delegates reported that there was previously a much more lengthy process and that this was a legal obligation.
Answer:	There has been an amendment to this section in the guidance and this should provide further context on Non-disclosure

Question:	Is there a central link AJTPN? (Adult Justice Thoughtcare Practitioner Network)
Answer:	You can check in on membership of the group with your service managers, the best way to join the group is through the SWS Justice Standing committee, an ask to update the membership will be going to all service managers in the near future.

Question:	When the Pilots were completed was this evaluated? Can we see the findings of the evaluation?
Answer:	The original pilots were completed by different members and are no longer available. A request to see the evaluation would need to be submitted with a rationale as to why.
Update:	Due to the passage of time and/or changeover of staff these evaluations are no longer available.

Question:	Feedback to PBS – PBSW are not privy to SPS “intelligence” and will not be able to answer to this.
Answer:	Members should be aware of this but we can remind them. The best point to do so would be when TARL goes live (Answer provided by Parole Board Scotland)

Question:	Section 1.6 – No strengths are listed in the consideration.
Answer:	The items listed for consideration are items which could produce red flags or risk indications, of course if there are overwhelming strengths/ protective factors these could be recorded here.

Question:	Section 1.9 should always be completed by the CBSW given that despite the
-----------	---

	recommendation the individual could be released.
Answer:	A: Amendment rejected. Where the recommendation is that the individual remain in custody the section should be completed by PBSW.
Update:	After further consideration and consultation through the AJTPN and operational manager this amendment has been accepted to the guidance.

Question:	On the “go live” date in October 22 – will this be going live for cases in October (therefore requests sent in July) or live for cases in January ?
Answer:	October would be when the process starts, requests being made then.
Update:	The “Go live” date has been revised to 14/11/22

Question:	In a situation where an individual has already been through the Parole process (e.g Life sentence) and is coming up for review, would their review report be a TARL report or would this revert to the current system given that this is how the previous reports have been completed?
Answer:	This is an issue which should be addressed on a case by case basis and decided upon by the report writers along with their line manager where applicable. Where it is seen to have merit to maintain the “current” system of report writing rational for this should be recorded on file.
Update:	This <i>discretion</i> of the writers will be the case until 31/03/2023, after which the expectation is that all applicable reports will follow the TARL process

Question:	How will reports be exchanged between prison and community SW staff?
Answer:	Use of existing secure email is recommended. However, it was noted some local authorities have restrictions on the use of e-mail and may require removal of personal identifying information during the co-production phase. This will need to be bottomed out when agreeing the Work Plan.

Question:	How will version control be managed? Could a best practice naming convention be included in the Guidance?
Answer:	Ultimately Version control will be managed by the writers but a table has been added into the TARL template which will hopefully assist with this.

Question:	Who assesses and decides that the report is TARL or not?
Answer:	parole co-ordinator following the GMA notice. In early stages of the implementation, they may seek advice from PBSW manager

Question:	When will the GMA be circulated? AH/SS advised they would raise with SWS Chair (LS) as some PBSW managers concerned their parole co-ordinator in
-----------	--

	the dark about TARL
Answer:	The GMA was issued 20/10/22

Question:	Are sub-headings permitted within the report template? Noted balance to be struck between being too prescriptive and offering a structure to support the reader
Answer:	Sub headings are not included within the generic TARL template, however it is understood that some areas may wish to add these locally.

Question:	Who leads on “non-disclosure” issues within the report PBSW or Community?
Answer:	This Section is to be completed by <i>either</i> CBSW or PBSW following active collaboration. The decision should be made between the writers who is best placed to provide this information.

Question:	Is there a template for up-date reports?
Answer:	No – view had been this would be in form of addendum and be provided by who was best placed to provide update being sought. However, dialogue between both parties would be encouraged to avoid an addendum being submitted in isolation.

Question:	What is the contingency if the report cannot be completed on time?
Answer:	This is a local issue for discussion with line manager

Question:	Who is responsible for discussing the report with the individual and submits the report to PB?
Answer:	Best practice would dictate the report would be discussed with the individual by the PBSW following a discussion with CBSW

Question:	Is the report signed by both authors?
Answer:	Yes, see Guidance (page 12)

Question:	Who is the target group for TARL?
Answer:	<p>The roll out will target new parole qualifying cases involving Long Term Prisoners (LTP) from 14th November 2022. After 31st March 2023, TARL will be extended to all LTPs. There are however exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the cases of Section 17 Recalls (for recall tribunal <u>only</u>). • Cross Border cases. • Short Term sex offenders.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urgent Compassionate Release Cases. • Order of Lifelong Restriction prisoners
Update:	This information has been added to the main body of the guidance following the interim review (2023)

Question:	How should we respond to existing LTP cases where a decision is made by PBS on or after 14 th November 2022 to have them subject to further review and the review date is scheduled for after 31 st March 2023?
Answer:	<p>The launch of TARL on 14th November 2022 focuses on new LTP parole cases (with some previously cited exceptions).</p> <p>For existing parole cases, where a new dossier is being opened for review, after the 14th November 2022, a TARL report should be requested (excepting the previously cited categories). Any additional exceptions to this would be with the agreement of both PBSW and CBSW following early consultation with Parole Co-ordinators..</p> <p>In cases where the Parole Board has requested an update or addendum report as a result of additional queries or deferment existing arrangements should continue.</p>