



Joint Thematic Inspection by HM Inspectorate of
Probation and HM Inspectorate of Prisons

Youth resettlement work

Interim report into work in custody

October 2018 – April 2019

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2019

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons> and www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation

Printed and published by:

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
3rd floor
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
London
E14 4PU
England

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
1st Floor Civil Justice Centre
1 Bridge Street West
Manchester
M3 3FX

Contents

Acknowledgements	5
Introduction	7
Key facts	9
Section 1. Executive summary	11
Section 2. Inspection context	13
Section 3. Background	17
Section 4. Outcomes	19
Section 5. Youth resettlement work during the custodial period	25
Section 6. Information sharing	33
Section 7. Recommendations	35
Section 8. Appendices	37
Appendix I: Methodology	37
Appendix II: Glossary	39
Appendix III: References	41

Acknowledgements

This inspection was led by HM Inspector Jane Attwood for HMI Probation and Angus Mulready-Jones for HMI Prisons, supported by a team of inspectors and operations, research, communications and corporate staff. This was overseen by Alan MacDonald and Martin Lomas. We would like to thank all those who participated in any way in this inspection. Without their help and cooperation, the inspection would not have been possible. Please note that, throughout the report, the names in the practice examples have been changed to protect the individual's identity.

Introduction

In this inspection, we examined the operational work by staff in young offender institutions (YOIs) and external agencies to help children being released from custody to resettle back into their communities.

YOIs fulfil a number of functions: to punish, to protect the public and to rehabilitate. We recognise the difficulties in managing these needs and risks; however, we focused solely on resettlement work in this report. Effective resettlement is an essential part of the process of rehabilitation. Work in custody should contribute to children leaving custody in a better position to lead productive, fulfilling lives and make them less likely to return to custody in the future.

Resettlement work cannot be carried out by YOIs alone, however. It requires joint working between internal and external agencies to provide for the complex needs and risks of children who are held in secure establishments.

This interim report focuses on the outcomes for children immediately on release, and the operational work carried out to prepare them for release. It is largely, but not exclusively, about work carried out by staff working within YOIs.

We looked at a sample of 50 children released from all five YOIs, interviewing both case managers and children. Data were also gathered on 115 children released in the first three months of 2019 and from a survey of over 600 children in custody.

We saw some examples of excellent resettlement work which offered children the best opportunities to change their lives and successfully reintegrate into their communities. In all of those cases, internal and external agencies had worked together across agency boundaries to ensure that accommodation, education, training and employment, and support services were in place on release.

More often, though, we found that, while children were in custody, there was not enough productive resettlement work; this had detrimental consequences for them when they were released. The most damaging outcome was a lack of suitable accommodation identified in time for other services to be in place. Ten days before release, almost 14% of children released in the first three months of 2019, did not know where they would be living after leaving the YOI. Most did not have education, training or employment arranged. We judged that 38 out of 50 children whose cases we inspected did not have these services in place at an appropriate time before their release. Mental health support was also, too often, not in place. Transition to adult offending services was problematic for some children, and was not always managed well.

Staff in YOIs – in casework, education and health care – tended to concentrate on delivering services while the child was in custody that met their immediate needs and risks. Not enough thought was given to their future, and how the resettlement work prepared them for that. Of concern, they did not consider sufficiently often the risk to others that the child might pose on release. There was often a view that that was the remit of external agencies, and that resettlement really started on the day of release. Simply referring children to outside agencies, towards the end of the custodial period, has been deemed by too many internal health and education, training and employment providers to constitute adequate resettlement work. It does not.

We found that resettlement work was not well integrated across the agencies and departments, who all carried out their own assessments, planning and interventions; there was far too little coordination of the work to gain an understanding of the full picture. The main vehicle for resettlement planning was meetings often attended predominantly by outside agencies. They were rarely well attended by the internal agencies and departments. That made it difficult to use a 'team

around the child' approach, which was a feature of the cases we judged to be delivering good resettlement work.

YOIs have not fully grasped the essential function of resettlement. They frequently neither enabled nor required their casework and other teams to deliver it. In addition, they have not ensured that resettlement work is understood, respected and prioritised across the whole YOI.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Justin Russell
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

June 2019

Key facts

70.3%	Reoffending rate for children leaving custody after serving a sentence of less than 12 months (April 2016 to March 2017) ¹
57.4%	Reoffending rate for children leaving custody after serving a sentence of 12 months or more (April 2016 to March 2017) ¹
64.6%	Reoffending rate for children sentenced to a youth rehabilitation order (April 2016 to March 2017) ¹
70%	Percentage of the youth custody population (under-18s only) imprisoned in young offender institutions ²
37%	Percentage of the youth custody population (under-18s only) imprisoned 50 miles or more from home ²
619	Number of releases from custody of 15–17-year olds (October 2017 to September 2018) ³

There are no reliable data available about the accommodation or education, training and employment outcomes for children leaving custody. Information is collected by the Youth Justice Board but there are serious issues with the reliability of both sets of data. Work is being carried out to address these issues in order to have better quality data in the future. We were also unable to obtain data about breach or recall rates for children leaving custody.

¹ Ministry of Justice (2019). *Proven offending statistics: January to March 2017*.

² Youth Justice Board (2019). *Youth justice statistics: 2017 to 2018*.

³ Ministry of Justice (2019). *Offender management statistics quarterly: July to September 2018*

Section 1. Executive summary

Outcomes

- 1.1** Every year, hundreds of children are released from custody into the community – many of them with very profound needs for support and follow up care. This inspection looked at the experience of 50 of these children who were released between October 2018 and April 2019 from all five YOIs. As well as examining the case files, our inspectors interviewed the case managers and children themselves wherever possible. They also used data collected on 115 children released in the first three months of 2019 and drew on a survey of over 600 children in custody undertaken by HMI Prisons.
- 1.2** We found that, with some notable exceptions, children were not being prepared to re-enter their communities effectively and start to live productive and safe, law-abiding lives. The services that they needed on release were too often not in place to help them resettle, and the risks that they posed were not always sufficiently managed in their early days in the community. In a particularly damning finding, none of the children to whom we spoke felt that the work that they had done in the YOI had helped them towards doing better on release. In a larger survey by HM Prisons, fewer than two in five of the 600 children surveyed answered ‘yes’ to the question, ‘Is anybody here helping you to prepare for when you leave?’.
- 1.3** The timely provision of safe and suitable accommodation remained problematic for a small number of children, some of whom did not know where they were going to live until the day of release or very shortly before. As a result, there were no other services in place for them when they left custody. Ten days before release, almost 14% of children released in the first three months of 2019, did not know where they would be living after leaving the YOI. Three children did not find out until the day before release.
- 1.4** Good work in mental health support during custody was often negated by a lack of attention to continuing support on release. Education, training and employment (ETE) work rarely led to purposeful activity in the community, or contributed to helping the child consider, meaningfully, his future possibilities. We judged that 38 out of 50 children whose cases we inspected did not have these services in place at an appropriate time before their release. We did not see any collaboration or joint working between the casework teams and ETE providers or between them and the education providers
- 1.5** The risks that the child posed to other people once back in the community – to families and children, and to the public – were too often not sufficiently considered, leaving some people at risk of harm. Additionally, the risk to the children themselves was not always fully considered and they were left vulnerable to being drawn back into unsafe behaviour. For three-fifths of the children in our sample, we judged that suitable services were not in place at an appropriate time before release to manage their risk of harm to others.
- 1.6** The children who became 18 years old while serving a custodial sentence and were transferred to adult offending services, faced additional difficulties with the loss of their rights to children’s services and the different expectations placed on them, often with little preparation or understanding, by the new agencies.

Resettlement work

- I.7** With the exception of the casework team in Wetherby, none of the YOI-based agencies or departments we inspected were sufficiently focused on resettlement.
- I.8** The work by YOI staff was mainly concentrated on the time that the child spent in custody, with little consideration of how the work would contribute to changing their behaviour and lifestyle once they were released. There was little evidence that external agencies made any attempts to influence the work carried out in custody or vice versa. We did not, for example, see any instances of health services in the YOIs facilitating meetings with outside agencies while the child was in custody.
- I.9** Planning and interventions were mostly resource led and formulaic. Children were ‘fitted in’ to what was available within the institution, with little attention paid to their individual needs. While planning for accommodation was always considered early on in the sentence, it was too often assumed that a return to the family home was suitable, without proper regard to risk factors. For those who could not return home, planning was often left until far too late.
- I.10** Resettlement work was not prioritised by YOIs. The casework teams, who were responsible for the coordination of resettlement planning alongside the external agencies, were peripheral to the main activities of the regime. They were too often not understood, valued or respected by other departments and, as a result, were not as effective as they needed to be. Other agencies and departments – health, education, interventions – carried out their own processes, generally independently of the casework team.
- I.11** As a result, there was no one person in the YOI who fully understood the needs and risks of the child, coordinated activity and drove forward resettlement work. The external agencies, which support, supervise and monitor the child on release, were therefore not always aware of the child’s up-to-date needs and risks on release. Resettlement work was fragmented, leaving gaps in provision on release. The planning to provide services in the community too often started after release, rather than before.

Information sharing

- I.12** There were numerous databases, systems and files used within the YOIs and by the external agencies to record information, assessments and plans. Not all of the information was available to all of those working with the child, and, where the information was accessible, it was not always used.
- I.13** The database intended to connect the YOIs with outside agencies, the Youth Justice Application Framework (YJAF), was not fully accessible inside the institution or to all external agencies. Its functionality was also not fully operational. As a result, it was not always an aid to resettlement work, and in some cases it acted as a barrier.
- I.14** The wealth of information about the needs of children and their outcomes had not been collected and collated effectively, which meant that service provision was not well connected to their needs or risks. There were no reliable data about the accommodation or education outcomes for children post-release.

Section 2. Inspection context

What is resettlement?

- 2.1** In the context of children in custody, resettlement is the process by which children re-enter the community and settle back into their lives after a period in custody.
- 2.2** Custody disrupts children's lives. It involves separation from family and friends, interrupted education, potentially a loss of accommodation, and fear and emotional distress. Resettlement can also be frightening, and it poses practical problems. For some, it is as traumatic as their entry into custody, so it needs to be planned and delivered carefully.
- 2.3** The resettlement of children from custody is a statutory responsibility of local authorities, in partnership with the police, the National Probation Service (NPS), health care staff and Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service Youth Custody Service (HMPPS YCS). In practice, the planning and coordination is carried out mainly by youth offending teams (YOTs)⁴ and the young offender institution (YOI) casework teams.
- 2.4** Youth Justice Board (YJB) case management guidance (2014) on custody and resettlement⁵ outlines the roles and tasks for the YOI and the YOT as follows:

'It is vital that staff in the secure establishment and from the YOT focus on successful resettlement outcomes from the start of the sentence, even for long sentences.

The initial planning meeting therefore should look at the following and begin to work on supporting these for release:

- accommodation
- education or training
- family support
- any continuing or newly identified health needs⁶.

- 2.5** In practice this means that resettlement work should commence immediately on entry into custody. YOT and YOI case managers should work together with other internal and external agencies to establish what the child needs to successfully return to the community and to plan to provide for those needs and risks.
- 2.6** For resettlement to be successful, services need to be established prior to release and available immediately on release. For example, prior to release:
- children should know where they will be living well before they return to the community;
 - where children are not able to return home, they should have visited their accommodation and met the people with whom they will be living;
 - where they will be going to a new education or training provider, they should have made their application and visited the provider;
 - where they will be accessing mental health or substance misuse services, they should have met with the professional delivering the service;
 - where they will be transitioning to adult services, they should have met with their new worker(s).

⁴ Services providing supervision and support to children who have offended have a variety of names. In this report, they are referred to as youth offending teams (YOTs).

⁵ Custody and resettlement. Section 7: Case management guidance. Published 15 October 2014.

The role of the YOI in resettlement

- 2.7** The YOI case managers⁶ work directly with the child, to support him⁷ to achieve the targets in his sentence plan⁸ and prepare for release. They are the key contacts for the parents/carers, YOTs, external health and substance use workers, and other professionals involved in the child's case.
- 2.8** Other agencies within the custodial estate work with the child according to the needs and risks he poses. These include health care (mental and physical) staff, education, training and employment (ETE) providers and substance use workers.
- 2.9** The YOI case manager convenes the planning meetings which drive the resettlement process.

The role of the YOT in resettlement

- 2.10** The YOT holds the responsibility for overall case management of custodial orders, and joint accountability with the secure estate for sentence planning and delivery. The YOT takes the primary responsibility for arranging the provision of services for, and on, release, which includes coordinating external health, education and children's social care provision.
- 2.11** In practice, this means jointly planning, and delivering, appropriate services and interventions to the child both in and out of custody.

The role of children's social care services in resettlement

- 2.12** Any child who was in the care of, or accommodated or supported by, the local authority children's social care services before entering custody continues to have a right to that support while in custody and on release.⁹ In practice, this means that children's social care services should continue to be involved while the child is in custody, and on release, and provide services, such as accommodation.
- 2.13** In addition, if the child becomes homeless during the period of custody, the local authority has the same duties that it would have to a homeless child in the community.

Transition to adult services

- 2.14** If a child has their 18th birthday on, or before, the mid-point of a custodial sentence of less than 24 months, they may be transferred to adult offending services. The transfer to adult services is not mandatory and should 'take into account the views of young people and what work needs to be undertaken to meet the aims of the sentence, to address likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm to others, and to manage vulnerability'.¹⁰

⁶ Across the five YOIs, the practitioners carrying out casework had various titles. Within this report, they will be referred to as case managers, as that describes the role that they carry out.

⁷ This inspection covered only the cases of boys. Girls are not currently held in YOIs.

⁸ Under a detention and training order, the sentence is served partly in custody and partly in the community. The plan should link the two, ensuring that the custodial phase is focused on preparing the child for a law-abiding life in the community.

⁹ Statutory guidance Children Act 1989: former looked-after children in custody.

¹⁰ Joint national protocol for transitions in England: Joint protocol for managing the cases of young people moving from youth offending teams to probation services 2018 between HMPPS, NPS and YJB.

- 2.15** In practice, those who are eligible are often transferred to adult probation services while they are in custody. Supervision by adult services can be considerably different to that by youth offending services. Additionally, these individuals may lose access to other children's services, such as children's social care, children's mental health and substance use services.
- 2.16** Where transition happens, probation staff need to forge new relationships with young people who have not always had good experiences of professional help. It is essential that new agencies meet the child in custody, and start to build a relationship before release.

Release on temporary licence (ROTL)

- 2.17** There are services and activities that need to be in place immediately on release, to ensure that the child has the best the opportunity to succeed in reintegrating into the community. The maintenance of key relationships is also important for successful resettlement.
- 2.18** To facilitate these objectives, a temporary release into the community on a licence may be useful – for example, a visit to an accommodation placement or a meeting with an education provider.
- 2.19** In YOIs, children must serve half of their custodial period, or be 24 months from release, whichever is the later date, before becoming eligible for ROTL.

Section 3. Background

Why this thematic?

- 3.1** Resettlement work involves YOIs, YOTs and other agencies working together to prepare children in custody for their release. Successful resettlement work cannot be carried out, either by custodial agencies or community agencies, in isolation; they must work together from the beginning of the sentence.
- 3.2** HMI Prisons inspects YOIs and the work carried out in custody. HMI Probation inspects the work of YOTs, the primary agencies working with children leaving custody. Joint inspection allows examination of how the agencies carry out joint resettlement work, and the outcomes that it delivers for children.
- 3.3** A joint thematic inspection led by HMI Probation in 2015 found that:
- outcomes for children leaving custody were poor. The worst examples were the lack of suitable accommodation being considered early enough and the failure to organise appropriate, realistic education, training and employment provision or constructive activities at the point of release;
 - resettlement work often started too late, and work in the community was not proactive enough during the custodial stage.
- 3.4** Since that inspection, the children's custodial estate has been reorganised, and the Youth Custody Service, which oversees the estate, has been created. Youth justice services in the community have evolved and change how they deliver services across England and Wales. Anecdotal reports continue, from YOIs and YOTs, that lack of accommodation and suitable ETE provision remains a stubborn problem. The recommendation, from the 2015 inspection, aimed at improving accommodation provision has not been implemented.

Aims and objectives

- 3.5** The inspection will be carried out in two phases. The initial phase, the focus of this report, concentrates on the work carried out while the child is in custody. The second phase, the subject of a subsequent report, will focus on the work by external agencies during custody and following release, up to the three-month point.
- 3.6** The present inspection looked at operational resettlement work during the custodial phase of the sentence, and the barriers to its effectiveness. We inspected the cases of children who were close to being released, to allow us to see the support and services that were in place in the community to help them resettle successfully.

Report outline

- 3.7** This interim report looks at the operational work done, predominantly but not exclusively, by YOIs during the custodial phase. It was not always possible to gain a full picture of the work done by external agencies, as recording within custodial systems was not comprehensive.

- 3.8** We firstly consider outcomes. At the time of writing this report, 10 of the 50 children whose cases we inspected had reached three months in the community. Early outcomes for these children were therefore known. For the rest of the children, we refer to the services that were in place for them on release.
- 3.9** The report then looks at the operational resettlement work carried out, mainly focusing on the YOI – casework teams, and health, substance use and ETE.
- 3.10** Finally, we report briefly on information systems and how they affect resettlement work.
- 3.11** The second report will focus on the work of the external agencies, and how well all agencies have worked together, when all cases have been inspected up to three months after release. The outcomes reported then will show how well children were able to settle into the community at the three-month mark.

Section 4. Outcomes

Case studies and data

- 4.1** We inspected 50 cases of children close to release across the five YOIs. At the time of drafting this report, 10 of those children had already been released from custody for three months or more. This section draws on outcomes for these 10 children. For the remaining 40 children, there are not yet outcomes to report as they are not yet three months post-release. We assessed their circumstances at the time of release however, as this is indicative of what may follow and therefore we include statistical information about all 50 children. Case studies are also drawn from the stories of all 50 children.
- 4.2** Of the 50 cases we inspected, we judged that suitable services were not in place, **at an appropriate time** before release, to meet their risks and/or needs, as follows:
- Accommodation 22
 - ETE 38
 - Substance use 26
 - Physical/mental health 27
 - Risk of harm to others 32
- 4.3** In practice, unless services have been organised prior to release, there is likely to be a delay in the child accessing help on release. In particular, unless accommodation is in place, it is difficult to organise other services. Referrals to colleges, health and other services take time and some agencies have waiting lists. Accessing some services requires identification which also takes time to obtain. All of this should be in place prior to release so that the child has somewhere safe and suitable to live, can undertake purposeful activity and receives the support for mental health and drug use where relevant, **immediately** on release.
- 4.4** Some cases were well managed, where the professionals all worked together taking a ‘team around the child’ approach and, as a result, the child had the opportunity to resettle successfully back into the community and start to enjoy a more productive life.

Good practice example: joint resettlement work

Jacob, 16 years old when sentenced, had received an 18-month detention and training order for robbery. Before committing the offence, Jacob had been groomed by adult males and, as a result, had been addicted to drugs. While on bail, he had been unable to live at home and had been placed in a supported accommodation project; he had no support from family.

All the agencies involved with Jacob had worked together to deliver support to him throughout his sentence. As a result of this, and his own hard work, Jacob had made a very successful return to his community and was doing well in his life. When we met him, he was working five days a week in construction, had taken on a part-time job at weekends working with a dog breeder and had completed a personal fitness qualification.

Immediately after sentence, all external agencies started preparation for his resettlement. Children’s social care services remained proactively involved throughout his sentence and, along with the YOT, ensured that he was able to return to the same accommodation. Jacob knew that this was the plan from the start of his sentence.

ETE work during custody was effective. It started early on in Jacob's sentence. The YOT ETE worker liaised regularly and continuously with the training provider which Jacob had attended while on bail. Jacob wanted to work in construction and was also interested in cooking and personal fitness, and was fond of animals. The ETE worker put more than one contingency plan in place, in case the initial plan, of a place with the training provider, was not successful. The YOI facilitated ROTL at an animal welfare sanctuary.

Jacob's education had been disrupted, and he took full advantage of the courses that were offered to him in the YOI. He completed literacy and numeracy courses. As a result of his early release, he had been unable to take an exam for numeracy, and the YOI was facilitating his return for a day to take the exam.

Although Jacob had stopped taking drugs before sentence, the YOT drugs worker kept a close eye on the situation and went into the YOI to meet Jacob and offer whatever support he might need. As Jacob did not have family to support him, the YOT provided a support worker. He went into the YOI to meet Jacob and, on release, encouraged and helped him to access the gym and other community facilities.

The YOT worker coordinated all the services, visited and supported Jacob, attended all the planning meetings, and drove and monitored the plans for release. On the day of release, the YOT worker picked Jacob up from the YOI and set aside the entire day to help him get settled. During his first week of release, Jacob started his construction placement.

- 4.5** There were some cases where the child left custody with little or no supervision or support to meet their resettlement needs and manage the risks they posed to other people. It was not unusual for these cases to have received good support from the YOI during the custodial phase. However, this was focused on behaviour and risk management while the child was in custody, where resettlement work did not take place alongside that support, it disappeared on release.

Poor practice example: joint resettlement work

Jack turned 18 during his 16-month detention and training order for dangerous driving.

In the YOI, he was considered to be a particular risk to female staff. It was his fifth time in custody and he had previously assaulted several officers and other children. He had been arrested previously for violence to his partner and had been assessed as posing a high risk of harm to others, including professionals, partners and the public. His own young children were considered to be at risk from him, and children's social care were involved with them as a result. There was also information suggesting that he posed a risk of sexual exploitation to girls.

Jack himself was also highly vulnerable. He had been diagnosed with conduct disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and bipolar disorder. He had experienced psychosis and had attempted suicide. He had exhibited 'bizarre and worrying behaviour' in the YOI, and staff had expressed concerns about his mental state. In custody, he had had the support of a mental health worker, which he said he had found helpful.

He had had several episodes of either being in care or being involved with children's social care services (although there had been no input from them during his period in custody). He had not received visits from anyone while he was in custody, although he still had a relationship with his mother.

There had been no interventions carried out with Jack while he was in custody. The assessment of risk provided to the YOI by the YOT was out of date. The information about the people in his life to whom he posed a risk was not current, leaving them insufficiently well protected from his behaviour on release.

He had met his YOT worker only a few days before he was released, when she told him that he would be going to an adult hostel and that he was to be transferred to adult probation services. He was given a travel warrant and was expected to find his own way to report to the YOT on release. His YOT worker had told him that she would then transport him to the hostel and refer him to a food bank.

On release, Jack went to approved premises (an adult hostel for offenders). He did not have any clothes that fitted him, and he had few belongings. He was not receiving benefits, and had no bank account. There was no mental health support in place, and there was no ETE arranged. The children's social care services staff who were involved in the protection of his children did not know that he was being released, or that he was planning to see them the following day. His YOT worker planned to transfer him to adult probation services during the week of release. Jack failed to attend his probation appointments shortly after release.

Accommodation

- 4.6** While most children had somewhere to go to on release, a small number did not find out where they would be living until shortly before they left custody – sometimes with only one day's notice. In too many cases, satisfactory accommodation was not in place well enough in advance to ensure that other services could be organised to meet need and manage risk.
- 4.7** Data collected from four of the five YOIs (one establishment failed to provide the information to inspectors) indicated that 115 children were released in the three months to 31 March 2019. Of these, 16 children did not know where they would be living at the date of the final review meeting (which finalises resettlement planning 10 days before release); three of the 16 did not find out until the day before release; and two found out two days before release.

Poor practice example: provision of accommodation

Owen, aged 16, had been sentenced to eight months in custody. He had experienced a lot of early trauma in his life, being subjected to domestic violence and neglect. As a result, he was in the care of the local authority and was allowed supervised contact with his mother once every two months. He had often run away from previous placements, to return to his home area.

Children's services were involved in finding him somewhere safe and suitable to live. Before sentence, he had been living in the North-West but he wanted to return to the Midlands area on his release. The day before release, he was provided with a placement in a town over 60 miles away from his home area.

The delay in confirming accommodation prevented planning for his release. There was no education, mental health or substance use support in place, and he had not met the YOT worker who would be supervising his licence. He knew no one at all in the area in which he was sent to live.

Education, training and employment

- 4.8** Children were generally ‘fitted into’ what was on offer in the establishment, which meant that it did not contribute to helping them when they left custody. With some notable exceptions, we did not see the child’s future education or training being taken into account. There was little evidence of planning towards a longer-term goal or imagination about what children could achieve.

Poor practice example: education and training on release

Jozef, aged 16, was serving a six-month sentence. During his custodial phase, everyone agreed that he had matured considerably. He was returning to live with his family. English was not Jozef’s first language and he had asked for help with improving his English as soon as he had entered custody. He had not received any help, apart from the standard literacy classes, in which he had struggled. He had reiterated his request at subsequent planning meetings, but without result.

We observed Jozef’s final planning meeting, just before he left custody. There was no education or training in place for his release.

Health

- 4.9** Health services in YOIs carried out their own resettlement work, which typically involved making referrals to outside agencies and was not always coordinated with other work. We did not see any instances of health services facilitating meetings with outside agencies while the child was in custody, to establish relationships, or even making checks that their referrals had resulted in appointments being made.

Poor practice example: YOI health resettlement

Aled, aged 17, was serving an eight-month sentence for threats to his mother and to the police. Before custody, he had been on bail, in supported accommodation, as he had not been able to go home. He had a long history of mental health problems and had made two suicide attempts, for which he had been hospitalised. The risk that he posed to other people was also bound up with his mental health issues.

In custody, he had received excellent mental health support; however, the resettlement planning for this to continue had not taken place. Referrals had been made by the YOI mental health team, but these had been sent to the wrong place and not been followed up.

When Aled left custody, on New Year’s Eve, there was no support in place for him. This was only picked up, by his supervising officer, several weeks later, when his mental health started to deteriorate and he again made threats of violence. The officer had not been aware of the referral to mental health services.

Risk to others

- 4.10** There were cases where the child's well-being was considered during planning but the risk to other people was not recognised or fully explored. In too many cases, when the child wanted to go home and the parents/carers agreed to this, there was no further discussion about accommodation.

Poor practice example: risk posed to others

Nawaz, aged 16, was serving a three-month recall following breach of his licence and new offences. His original offence was for possessing a knife, and he had a history of possessing offensive weapons and robbery. There were indications of gang and county lines activity, and some information about him having debts that made him vulnerable.

The YOI decided that, as he had previously been remanded, there was no need to have a planning meeting, although the YOT case manager disagreed. As a result, there was little planning for his release. Although children's services had been involved previously, as a result of Nawaz's remand status, there was no input from them once he was sentenced.

Nawaz said he wanted to return home, and his parents agreed. There were three young children in the house, and there was no consideration of the risk that his return might pose to them. Within weeks of his return, adult men wearing balaclavas came to the house and directly threatened the family. The possibility that the family would be threatened was foreseeable, given what was known of his circumstances. He was then moved out to a different address.

What children said

- 4.11** HMI Prisons carried out a survey in each of the five YOIs during this thematic inspection, asking children about their experiences in custody. A total of 603 completed questionnaires was received.
- 4.12** Questions relating to resettlement that children answered 'yes' to were as follows:
- Have you learned anything here that will help you when you are released (e.g. education or skills)? 48%
 - Is anybody here helping you to prepare for when you leave? 39%
 - Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you leave here? 43%
 - Do you think your experiences here have made you less likely to offend in the future? 55%

Conclusions and implications

- 4.13** In the cases we examined, when effective resettlement work had taken place, we saw children who were doing well in the community. Good resettlement work does not guarantee that children will do well but it offers the best opportunity for them to change their offending behaviour and become productive members of their communities.
- 4.14** In the cases where we saw poor or non-existent resettlement work, it was clear that those children were at more risk of failing to make the changes that would improve their lives, and

those of others around them. Responses to the HMI Prisons survey showed that too few children felt that they had learned anything from their time in custody or that they were in a better position to make changes in their lives.

Section 5. Youth resettlement work during the custodial period

The role of casework in resettlement

- 5.1** When a child enters custody, the YOT is meant to provide a comprehensive assessment of them to the YOI. This is called Asset Plus. It should contain all necessary and appropriate information about the child, his circumstances, his health and his education. It should inform all initial planning, and be used to consider and plan for resettlement needs and risks.
- 5.2** All services should be coordinated and integrated to meet the needs and risks of the child effectively, both inside the YOI and on release; this is the role of the casework team. The main vehicle for planning, coordinating and monitoring resettlement work is the casework planning process. Under this process, the initial planning meeting takes place, within 10 days of sentence.
- 5.3** Appropriate external agencies, such as children's social care and adult services (when the child is due to turn 18 during the sentence), should be invited, along with parents/carers and relevant internal agencies/departments, depending on the child's individual circumstances.
- 5.4** Review meetings, to monitor the progress of resettlement planning, take place at intervals which vary depending on the length of the sentence. Final meetings take place 10 days before release, to check that everything is in place to facilitate successful resettlement back into the community.¹¹
- 5.5** The YOI case manager is central to resettlement work. They should identify the needs and risks of the child, ensure that these are addressed in the initial planning meeting, coordinate and drive forward the work throughout the custodial phase, and hold the other agencies, internal and external, to account for delivery of the planned services.
- 5.6** Education and health services (physical, mental and substance use) carry out their own assessments, and deliver interventions on the basis of these. They have their own systems to refer to external services for provision after release, but these need to be fully integrated with other work, to ensure that all of the child's needs are met, and risks managed.

Our findings

Overall

- 5.7** Planning processes were in place in all of the YOIs. The planning meetings generally took place on time, plans were produced and children undertook education courses and programmes in the establishment. Each agency – education, health, psychology, residential staff – carried out their own procedures, independently of each other.
- 5.8** We saw some thoughtful and effective resettlement work, but too often it was formulaic, process driven and resource led. It was focused not on helping the child to reintegrate back into the community successfully, but on filling their time in custody. Children were 'fitted into' what was available.

¹¹ Custody and resettlement. Section 7: Case management guidance. Published 15 October 2014.

- 5.9** It was possible for children to be subject to a number of different assessments and uncoordinated plans. There was no one person coordinating all of the work, and who understood the whole picture. This should have been the role of the YOI case manager, who is, through the YOT, the main link between the internal and external services that are needed on release.
- 5.10** This fragmentation impacted on children's knowledge of their plans and targets. In the HMI Prisons survey only 65% of children knew they had a sentence or remand plan and only 50% of these reported staff were supporting them to achieve objectives or targets.
- 5.11** None of the YOIs had facilitated the casework role or promoted an understanding by the other agencies within the YOI of the centrality this work. Casework had become the vehicle for fulfilling the YOI regime, rather than driving and coordinating resettlement. Case managers were too often organisers of meetings, referral generators and facilitators of communication with the outside agencies, often carrying out mainly administrative tasks and a welfare role. As a result, we found cases where children's needs were not met, or risks managed, on release.

Casework

- 5.12** The models of casework varied across the YOIs, and there were strengths in all of them. Wetherby was more focused on resettlement than other YOIs, and also had social workers in the team. Parc had defined the role differently, and recruited accordingly, to meet the job specification of engaging children and meeting their welfare needs. Its case managers also developed and delivered programmes. Cookham Wood had moved from having a casework team of seconded YOT workers, to having YOI case managers. Feltham had public protection and multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) within its remit, and Werrington described casework as 'a caring role linked to sentence planning with an external focus'. In some places, case managers were drawn into day-to-day issues that could have been more appropriately dealt with by residential staff. Wetherby, in particular, had avoided that situation.
- 5.13** However, consistent among all the YOIs was commitment and enthusiasm for the work among the teams who delivered it. All the YOI case managers we spoke to were interested in the welfare of the children they were working with, and worked hard to promote it.
- 5.14** We saw some imaginative resettlement work in all the YOIs. In Wetherby, a social worker told us about a case where the child had turned 18 while in custody and was no longer eligible for services from children's social care. The YOI social worker had considered him to be vulnerable, and had pursued and accessed adult social care services in the relevant local authority. We saw many instances, in all of the YOIs, of staff 'going the extra mile' for children.
- 5.15** There was inconsistent delivery within the teams however. Case managers had differing ideas about their role although they all shared a narrow understanding of it. There was an assumption that some work was entirely the remit of other agencies, both inside and outside of the YOI. In some cases, there was evidence of YOI case managers being proactive and holding the external YOTs to account for the delivery of services. However, we did not see them make any attempts to hold internal agencies to account, and they often did not attend planning meetings.
- 5.16** YOI case managers did not consider that the education, health and interventions within the YOI needed to be integrated or considered as part of resettlement, and that they had a role in that. Other internal agencies appeared to share this view, as they did not prioritise

attendance at planning meetings or liaison with case managers. Of most concern was that not all case managers understood their role in planning for the management of risk post-release.

- 5.17** Relationships between case managers and children were good across the board. All the children we spoke to knew their case manager and felt that they could talk to them. However, there were varying levels of contact. In Parc and Werrington, the contact levels were good. In Wetherby and Feltham, the regime restricted contact with the children, which meant that case managers had to have conversations through door flaps or, when confidentiality was necessary, pass notes under the cell doors. In Cookham Wood, we saw varying levels of contact, and these seemed to be mainly welfare orientated.
- 5.18** Not all contact was recorded and it was not always clear that it was purposeful. Case managers described ‘keeping in touch’ and checking on welfare more than anything else. Checking on the progress of education courses, programmes and other interventions was often left until planning meetings.
- 5.19** Casework teams worked hard in all of the YOIs but, with notable exceptions, resettlement work – as opposed to custody-focused work – was often not delivered effectively.

Assessment and planning

- 5.20** Assessments received from YOTs contained information about the child’s needs and risks, and we judged that most of them were of a good enough quality to enable the YOI to manage the child safely and plan for resettlement.
- 5.21** However, not all YOI departments had direct access to this assessment, and not all case managers read the assessments before planning took place; those who did, did not always recognise or appreciate the risks or needs. Some YOI case managers took the view that planning for release was the remit of the YOT case manager, and their approach to the assessment was to use it to inform the custodial period.
- 5.22** Initial planning meetings were well attended by YOI case managers and YOT workers, and took place on time. The attendance of other professionals varied. We saw various, separate, internal planning meetings in the YOIs, carried out early in the custodial period, which staff from other internal agencies attended and which seemed to duplicate, at least in part, the initial planning meetings. However, these did not plan for resettlement.
- 5.23** The quality of planning varied considerably across the YOIs. We saw some excellent planning that started as soon as the child had entered custody, and was pursued by the team of professionals, internal and external, throughout the course of the custodial phase, both in and outside of formal meetings. This had resulted in the successful reintegration of a child who had had several previous unsuccessful episodes of resettlement.

Good practice example: effective joint resettlement work

James, aged 17, was sentenced to 12 months for an assault involving weapons – his third custodial sentence. He was heavily convicted and considered to pose a very high risk of causing harm to others. His violent behaviour continued in custody.

There were a number of external professionals working with James – a social worker, YOT case manager, YOT psychologist – as well as the YOI case manager and other prison departments. In spite of the use of several different databases, differing team remits and priorities, separate roles and responsibilities, and the barrier of the prison walls, the professionals used a ‘team around the child’ approach and worked seamlessly together.

The YOI case manager took a full part as the lead professional within the YOI, and the YOT case manager was the lead externally. Excellent communication and cooperation ensured that planning progressed, and that James and his family were at the heart of the work. When he left custody, all necessary services were in place to offer him the opportunity to lead a different life.

Three months after release, James was in settled accommodation and had not reoffended.

- 5.24** Initial planning was focused on the child's behaviour and the regime too often. We saw too much planning that was formulaic and did not fully consider the individual circumstances, needs and risks of the child.
- 5.25** Planning for release was often delayed until the later meetings, when opportunities for meaningful interventions had already passed. For children on shorter sentences, by the time the next meeting took place, it was too late to arrange support in the community, unless ongoing planning took place outside of formal meetings – and there was not always evidence that it did.
- 5.26** In practice, unless the planning for resettlement starts at the initial planning meeting, continues in between meetings, takes into account the child's individual needs and risks, and is proactively driven forward, the child is likely to leave custody without services being in place.
- 5.27** Of the 50 cases that we inspected, we judged that plans made at the initial planning meeting were not sufficient in the following number of cases:
- | | |
|--------------------------|----|
| • Accommodation | 26 |
| • ETE | 30 |
| • Substance use | 21 |
| • Physical/mental health | 25 |
| • Risk of harm to others | 33 |

Risk of harm to others

- 5.28** The risks that a child poses inside a YOI are managed through various processes. Resettlement planning needs to consider the risks posed on release. Many YOI case managers held the view that this was the work of external agencies. The result was that decision-making about risk, particularly concerning accommodation and the safety of others, was not always on the agenda of planning meetings.

- 5.29** Case workers did not always consider that they had a role to play in assessing the risk posed to others on release. The lack of an investigative approach meant that the issue was sometimes prejudged, as in the cases where children and parents/carers agreed on the child returning home, without further exploration.

Work by other YOI agencies and departments

- 5.30** When a child leaves custody, the support for health (physical and mental), substance use and ETE reverts immediately to external services, so it is imperative that these services are in place, to begin on the day of release.
- 5.31** In all of the YOIs, health services had systems to arrange for the continuation of services after release; however, these did not always ensure that the services were in place. Referrals to outside agencies were not followed up to confirm immediate availability. Health work was often independent of the other resettlement work, so the YOT and/or parents/carers did not always know about the health care being provided.

Poor practice example: YOI health resettlement work

Rhys, aged 17, received an eight-month custodial sentence. He initially had nowhere to live, but late into his sentence his father agreed that he could live with him.

During his sentence, he became more and more anxious, and started to refuse to leave his cell. He was referred to mental health services and asked for medication but was refused it.

Rhys was released over the Christmas period, and when he met the YOT drugs worker he revealed to her that he had been given a two-week supply of antidepressants. Neither his father nor any of the professionals working with him were aware of this, and no appointment had been made for him to see a GP.

- 5.32** In four out of the five YOIs, there was an education and resettlement provider (separate to the education provider), whose role was to help children to access ETE for release. They also delivered pre-release courses and helped children to produce CVs. We did not see any collaboration or joint working between the casework teams and these providers, or between them and the education providers. YOI work to access ETE on release was not effective.
- 5.33** As a result of the absence of professionals, other than YOI and YOT case managers, at many planning meetings, there was no vehicle for ensuring that the necessary services were in place and coordinated, and that risks were being managed, where necessary.

Interventions

- 5.34** The term ‘interventions’ covers a wide variety of activities. It includes accredited and non-accredited programmes aimed at issues such as anger, general offending behaviour, sexually harmful behaviour and thinking skills, as well as health interventions and those aimed at ETE. Interventions can be delivered in a group or one-to-one, and by both internal and external agencies. They may comprise a one-off session or a programme of work.

- 5.35** Where interventions had been delivered, we found little evidence of planning to carry on, or build on, the intervention on release.
- 5.36** There were specific pre-release programmes, but none of the children whose cases we inspected had attended one. With the exception of these programmes, we found nothing delivered that focused specifically on resettlement or aimed at preparation for release.
- 5.37** Of the 50 cases that we inspected, we judged that work carried out in the custodial phase did not meet resettlement needs or risks in the following areas:
- Accommodation 23
 - ETE 22
 - Substance use 25
 - Physical/mental health 24
 - Risk posed to others 27
- 5.38** It was evident that children were ‘fitted into’ what was available. They were referred to interventions routinely, with not enough account taken of their readiness to engage with the work or benefit from it. None of the 50 children to whom we spoke felt that the work that they had done in the YOI had helped them towards doing better on release.

Work by external agencies

- 5.39** For a small but significant number of children leaving custody, accessing suitable accommodation is the biggest hurdle that they face. This issue takes many forms, including overcrowding at home, fractured relationships with parents/carers, posing a risk to parents/carers or vice versa, and also problems for those who were already living away from home before custody. There were a small number of cases where children did not know until the morning of release, or shortly before, where they were going to be living, which meant that there were no services in place to meet their other needs.
- 5.40** Conversely, we saw some cases where this had been managed well and the child had known, from a reasonable point in his sentence, where he would be living.

Good practice example: provision of accommodation

James, aged 17, had been a looked-after child before custody, and had lived in a number of places in and outside his home area. All of these had broken down because of his behaviour, which had been violent to staff and other children, and James had exhausted the usual accommodation options in his home area.

It was recognised by children’s services that he had specific needs and that he posed considerable risks to others. Children’s services were diligent in finding the right accommodation and support for James and, when they did so, agreed to pay to secure this housing for several weeks before his release. This enabled other services to ensure that support was in place and it helped James to prepare for life in the community.

Three months after his release, James was settled in his accommodation and benefiting from the support it offered.

Transition

- 5.41** Of the 50 cases we inspected, 10 children turned 18 while in custody. Some of these had been transferred to adult offending services. There were examples of good practice, where the transition had started at an early stage, and a probation supervisor had come into the YOI to meet the child and put in place services for release. However, in other cases practice was poor. For example, in some cases probation staff first met the child when they attended the final meeting before he left custody. In addition, the transition was sometimes left to be carried out during the first week of the community phase.
- 5.42** It was not always evident that the decision to transfer the child to adult services was necessary or in the best interests of the child. We were told that, without transferring a case to the NPS, the child could not have access to approved premises. We felt that this practice - the transfer of the case - was likely to be detrimental for the child. If it was necessary for them to live in approved premises, the continuation of a professional relationship, as opposed to a new one, was likely to be beneficial. It seemed that transition was 'all or nothing' in some cases. It would have been preferable, and sensible, for agencies to agree to work together in the interests of the child, rather than stick rigidly to agency boundaries.

Poor practice example: transition to adult services

Oliver had been sentenced, aged 17, to a two-year detention and training order for sexual offences. He had no previous convictions or involvement with any professional services. He was assessed as being vulnerable, and had been managed on a special wing in the YOI for vulnerable children. He was a small, quiet boy, who presented as very anxious.

From the beginning of his sentence, Oliver and his family had been told that he would return home after custody, and resettlement plans were made accordingly.

Oliver turned 18 six months before release, and was transferred to adult probation services. There was no allocated probation officer, so plans continued as before. His YOI case manager had asked the YOT on several occasions if it was necessary to transfer him to adult services, as she felt that he would be more safely and effectively managed by the YOT and children's social care services. She was never told the reason for his transfer.

When a probation officer was finally allocated, the decision was taken that Oliver could not return home. He and his family were told about this at his first meeting with his probation officer, a month before he was due to leave the YOI – 10 months after the planning started.

When we spoke to Oliver, it was clear that he did not know what approved premises were. He was anxious about going there and had asked for more information, but had not heard anything. YOI staff were frustrated by the poor transition work of the outside agencies, and concerned for Oliver's safety in approved premises. We shared their concerns.

Conclusions and implications

- 5.43** With some exceptions, resettlement work within YOIs was fragmented and uncoordinated, and too often depended on the skills and experience of the individual case manager. No one person understood the full picture and ensured that all services delivered in the YOI would continue on release. Casework, which should have been the mechanism for coordinating provision, was not fully understood or valued by the other departments in YOIs. Work to

meet need and risk was not started early enough, and was not based on the individual child. It was not pursued rigorously throughout the sentence, which meant that services were not always in place to help the child reintegrate into the community safely.

- 5.44** When resettlement work was carried out well, it provided a tailored, wrap-around support to the child to meet the needs and risks that he posed, and ensured that he was given the best opportunity to change his behaviour, reintegrate into the community and start to live a different life.

Section 6. Information sharing

- 6.1** Information sharing and liaison are essential for the joint work needed to ensure effective resettlement. The various agencies working with children in custody each have their own databases, as do the YOIs. This can be a barrier to information exchange and joint work.

Recording and databases

- 6.2** The recording of resettlement work within YOIs was held on a number of databases, including (but not exclusively):
- the prison database, P-Nomis
 - the Youth Justice Application Framework (YJAF), the YJB database which is intended to provide connectivity between the YOTs and the YOI
 - health systems
 - education systems.
- 6.3** There were separate files, electronic and paper, for recording and monitoring public protection, MAPPAs, self-harm and suicide, and other processes. There were separate meetings within the YOI which covered these, and other, issues.
- 6.4** The YOTs had their own databases, as did children's services and other external health, education and substance use services. Adult offending services – the NPS and community rehabilitation companies – also had separate information systems. There were, therefore, in-built barriers to information sharing and joint working. Not all internal YOI staff used the information available from the assessment made at the start of custody. Emerging issues or difficulties which were known to one department (for example, interventions teams were not always known to another – such as health care. Information did not always reach the external agencies to help them to plan and/or deliver services.
- 6.5** All of the good, joint working that we saw across internal and external professionals involved the use of a 'team around the child' approach, and proactive communication by attendance at meetings, email and telephone. The work being carried out by external agencies was recorded well within the YOI systems, so that internal departments and agencies could access this information.
- 6.6** However, the recording by YOI staff of casework – planning meetings, plans and contacts – was inconsistent, both across YOIs and within the teams themselves. This hindered their monitoring of the work that was being done throughout the sentence. The work being carried out by other internal agencies was often not accessible to others, and not communicated. Additionally, the recording of work being done by external agencies was not comprehensive.

YJAF

- 6.7** Before the introduction of electronic data transfer, information about the child was sent to the YOI in a paper format, directly from court. The YOI received an assessment and pre- and post-sentence reports from the YOT at the point that the child was admitted to custody. The post-court report detailed any urgent needs or risks. YJAF is now the platform for the transfer of assessments and reports. It was designed to help information transfer and joint work between YOIs and YOTs. While all YOI departments had access to P-Nomis, not all had access to YJAF, and therefore some did not see the information sent to the YOI from

the community about risks and needs. Additionally, not all YOTs had full access to YJAF, and those that did experienced difficulties with it, including periodic inability to access it.

- 6.8** As connectivity between YOIs and YOTs had yet to be fully established, the system was, in some cases, a barrier to joint working rather than an aid, and there was the potential for crucial information to be missed or received late.

Poor practice example: potential consequence of lack of connectivity

Thomas, aged 17, was sentenced to four months in custody. In the months before his sentence, he had been suffering from seizures which had resulted in him going to hospital twice. The problem had not been diagnosed at the point that he went into custody.

As a result of problems with YJAF, the YOI did not have an Asset Plus until two days after he arrived. No one in the YOI was therefore aware that he was having seizures until then. Prompt action was taken by the YOI when they received the information, and, fortunately, Thomas had not been ill in the interim (although he did have a seizure later on, while still in custody).

Use of data

- 6.9** There is a significant amount of useful data recorded within YOTs and YOIs which is not collated effectively by any agency currently. Without this strategic information, which is readily available, it is difficult to direct resources effectively and improve services. For example, the timely provision of suitable, safe and sustainable accommodation remains, anecdotally, a stubborn problem for a small number of children. Similarly, there is insufficient provision of high-quality ETE. Neither of these issues is new, and yet there are no reliable data to prove, or disprove, the reality or extent of either.

Conclusions and implications

- 6.10** Resettlement work was hindered by the existence of numerous databases and different recording systems used by the professionals working with a child. The recording by the various agencies was inconsistent, fragmented, uncoordinated and not available to all of the professionals involved. Some agencies or professionals were working without a full understanding of the circumstances of the child, and were therefore not fully taking into account his risks or needs.
- 6.11** The lack of data to inform service provision was disappointing, given the longstanding knowledge of accommodation and ETE issues within resettlement. It was not acceptable that reliance on YJAF made the YOIs vulnerable to missing or late information which could be crucial for children entering custody.

Section 7. Recommendations

- 7.1** The Ministry of Justice, Department for Education and Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government should develop a central payment system of accommodation retainers, where necessary, to ensure that children have suitable accommodation in place, a minimum of one month before the earliest date of release.
- 7.2** Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service should ensure that staff supervising those transitioning into adult offending services are trained to deliver age/maturity-appropriate services.
- 7.3** The Youth Justice Board should ensure that reliable outcome data on children leaving custody are available, to inform improvements in service provision.
- 7.4** The Youth Custody Service should promote understanding of effective resettlement work across all agencies and departments within young offender institutions (YOIs).
- 7.5** The Youth Custody Service should require all agencies and departments in YOIs to demonstrate effective and coordinated resettlement work.
- 7.6** The Youth Custody Service should define the role and tasks of casework teams, and train casework staff accordingly.
- 7.7** The National Probation Service (NPS) and the Youth Justice Board should allow access to approved premises without requiring supervision to be transferred from youth offending teams to the NPS.

Section 8. Appendices

Appendix I: Methodology

The fieldwork for the custodial phase of this thematic inspection was carried out during the annual inspections, by HMI Prisons, of the five YOIs, HMP/YOIs Parc, Cookham Wood, Feltham, Werrington and Wetherby and Keppel, from October 2018 to March 2019.

During the fieldwork, we examined a sample of cases across the five sites. Cases were selected for their proximity to release. HMI Probation inspectors carried out case reviews and interviewed YOI case managers and children, where possible. HM Prisons inspectors provided information about resettlement work in health and ETE.

The YOI fieldwork consisted of:

- 50 case reviews
- 39 interviews with YOI case managers
- five meetings with YOI heads of casework
- 36 meetings with children.

Case profile:

- all male and sentenced to detention and training orders
- 10 (20%) children were held in a Welsh YOI
- 47 (96%) identified English as their first language
- 28 (57%) were white
- 29 (58%) were either currently or previously looked after by a local authority.

There were indicators of:

- sexual exploitation in five (10%) cases
- county lines in nine (19%) cases
- modern-day slavery/trafficking in three (6%) cases
- gangs in 22 (44%) cases.

In the community phase, which started on 1 April 2019, we will track the cases into the community and inspect them three months after the child is released from custody. A final report will then be produced.

Appendix II: Glossary

Accredited programme	A programme of work delivered to offenders in groups or individually through a requirement in a community order or a suspended sentence order, or part of a custodial sentence or a condition in a prison licence. Accredited programmes are accredited by the Correctional Services Accredited Panel as being effective in reducing the likelihood of reoffending.
Asset Plus	Assessment and planning framework developed by the Youth Justice Board for work with children who have offended, or are at risk of offending, that reflects current research and understanding of what works with children.
Case manager	The YOI practitioner who holds lead responsibility for managing the case of a child in custody or under YOT supervision in the community.
County lines	Gangs and organised crime networks exploit children to sell drugs. Often these children are made to travel across counties, and they use dedicated mobile phone 'lines' to supply drugs.
CRC	Community rehabilitation company.
ETE	Education, training and employment: work to improve an individual's learning, and to increase their employment prospects.
HMPPS	Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS): the single agency responsible for both prisons and probation services.
Intervention	The work undertaken directly with the child, intended to help them to change their behaviour.
Licence	The conditions applied to a person for a fixed period following release from custody.
Looked-after child	A child in the care of the local authority, as a result of a court order or a voluntary agreement with the parents.
MAPPA	Multi-agency public protection arrangements: where probation, police, prison and other agencies work together locally to manage offenders who pose a higher risk of harm to others. Level 1 is ordinary agency management, where the risks posed by the offender can be managed by the agency responsible for the supervision or case management of the offender. This compares with levels 2 and 3, which require active multi-agency management.
P-Nomis	The database used by the prison service.
NPS	National Probation Service: a single national service which came into being in June 2014. Its role is to deliver services to courts and to manage specific groups of offenders, including those presenting a high or very high risk of serious harm and those subject to MAPPA.
Outcomes	The result, as opposed to the process to reach the result.
Personal officers	YOI staff who are the key contact for the child.
Providers	Providers deliver a service or input commissioned by, and provided under contract to, the NPS or CRC. This includes the staff and services provided under the contract, even

	when they are integrated or located within the NPS or CRC.
Resettlement	Returning into the community after time in custody.
ROTL	Release on temporary licence: facilitates time in the community before release. It should be used as an aid to successful resettlement.
Team around the child	The ‘team around the child’ approach brings together a range of different practitioners to support an individual child or young person and their family. It places the emphasis firmly on the needs and strengths of the child, rather than on organisations or service providers.
Transition	The move from children’s offending services to adult offending services.
YCS	Youth Custody Service: The part of Her Majesty’s Prison & Probation Service (HMPPS) focussed on delivering and commissioning custodial institutions holding children.
YJAF	Youth Justice Application Framework: an online platform created for YOTs and secure estates to communicate effectively (including sharing Asset Plus, case diary entries, and so on) and download formal documents and templates from the YJB that are not suitable for sharing with the wider public.
YJB	Youth Justice Board: a Government body responsible for monitoring and advising ministers on the effectiveness of the youth justice system. Providers of grants and guidance to the youth offending teams.
YOT	Youth offending team: team/services based in the community, working with children who have offended.
YOI	Young offenders institution: custodial facility for 15 to 18-year-olds.

Appendix III: References

1. Proven offending statistics: January to March 2017. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/proven-reoffending-statistics-january-to-march-2017>. Accessed 16 April 2019.
2. Youth Justice Board (2019). Youth justice statistics: 2017 to 2018. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/youth-justice-statistics-2017-to-2018>. Accessed 16 April 2019.
3. Custody and resettlement. Section 7: Case management guidance. Published 15 October 2014. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/custody-and-resettlement>. Accessed 13/05/19.
4. Statutory guidance Children Act 1989: former looked-after children in custody. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/children-act-1989-former-looked-after-children-in-custody>. Accessed 13/05/2019.
5. Joint national protocol for transitions in England: Joint protocol for managing the cases of young people moving from youth offending teams to Probation Services 2018 between HMPPS, NPS and YJB Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/joint-national-protocol-for-transitions-in-england>. Accessed 13/05/2019.
6. Youth to adult transition principles and guidance for Wales. Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/youth-to-adult-transition-principles-and-guidance-for-wales>. Accessed 13/05/2019.