Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in England and Wales

Report on youth offending work in:

Cardiff

Foreword

This Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in Cardiff took place as part of the Inspection of Youth Offending programme. We have examined a representative sample of youth offending cases from the area, and have judged how often the Public Protection and the Safeguarding aspects of the work were done to a sufficiently high level of quality.

We judged that the Safeguarding aspects of the work were done well enough 72% of the time. With the Public Protection aspects, work to keep to a minimum each individual’s Risk of Harm to others was done well enough 73% of the time, and the work to make each individual less likely to reoffend was done well enough 78% of the time. A more detailed analysis of our findings is provided in the main body of this report, and summarised in a table in Appendix 1. These figures can be viewed in the context of our findings from the regions of England inspected so far. To date, the average score for Safeguarding work has been 64%, with scores ranging from 38-82%, the average score for Risk of Harm work has been 60%, with scores ranging from 36-85%, and the average score for Likelihood of Reoffending work has been 66%, with scores ranging from 50–82%.

We found a team where there was commitment by staff to make a positive difference to the lives of the children and young people under their supervision. The work benefited from the positive contributions by a range of co-located partner agencies.

However, more needs to be done to ensure that good quality risk and vulnerability management plans are produced and actioned in all relevant cases.

Overall, we consider this to be a very encouraging set of findings. Under the leadership of the management team, the prospects are good that the Cardiff YOT will respond to the recommendations in this report and further improve the services they offer.

Andrew Bridges
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

September 2010
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Scoring – and Summary Table

This report provides percentage scores for each of the ‘practice criteria’ essentially indicating how often each aspect of work met the level of quality we were looking for. In these inspections we focus principally on the Public Protection and Safeguarding aspects of the work in each case sample.

Accordingly, we are able to provide a score that represents how often the Public Protection and Safeguarding aspects of the cases we assessed met the level of quality we were looking for, which we summarise here.

We also provide a headline ‘Comment’ by each score, to indicate whether we consider that this aspect of work now requires either MINIMUM, MODERATE, SUBSTANTIAL or DRASTIC improvement in the immediate future.

### Safeguarding score:

This score indicates the percentage of Safeguarding work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality. This score is significant in helping us to decide whether an early further inspection is needed.

| Score: 72% | Comment: MODERATE improvement required |

### Public Protection – Risk of Harm score:

This score indicates the percentage of Risk of Harm work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality. This score is significant in helping us to decide whether an early further inspection is needed.

| Score: 73% | Comment: MODERATE improvement required |

### Public Protection – Likelihood of Reoffending score:

This score indicates the percentage of Likelihood of Reoffending work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality.

| Score: 78% | Comment: MINIMUM improvement required |

We advise readers of reports not to attempt close comparisons of scores between individual areas. Such comparisons are not necessarily valid as the sizes of samples vary slightly, as does the profile of cases included in each area’s sample. We believe the scoring is best seen as a headline summary of what we have found in an individual area, and providing a focus for future improvement work within that area.
**Recommendations** (primary responsibility is indicated in brackets)

Changes are necessary to ensure that, in a higher proportion of cases:

1. a timely and good quality assessment of the individual’s vulnerability and *Risk of Harm to others* is completed at the start, as appropriate to the specific case (YOT Manager)

2. as a consequence of the assessment, the record of the intervention plan is specific about what will now be done in order to safeguard the child or young person’s well-being, to make them less likely to reoffend, and to minimise any identified *Risk of Harm to others* (YOT Manager)

3. intervention plans incorporate victim and diversity issues (YOT Manager)

4. there is evidence in the file of regular quality assurance by management, as appropriate to the specific case (YOT Manager)

5. joint work with Children’s Services, to address relevant Safeguarding issues for children and young people, is evident (Chair of the YOT Management Board).

**Next steps**

An improvement plan addressing the recommendations should be submitted to HM Inspectorate of Probation four weeks after the publication of this inspection report. Once finalised, the plan will be forwarded to the Youth Justice Board to monitor its implementation.
Service users’ perspective

Children and young people

Thirteen children and young people completed a questionnaire for the inspection.

- All three of the children and young people with a referral order said they knew what the order was, but only one said that they had been given an explanation of their referral order contract. Seven of the nine, who said they were subject to supervision, had been given the opportunity to discuss their supervision or sentence plan.
- All 12 who answered the question said they knew why they had to come to the YOT and that the staff had explained what would happen during supervision.
- Eleven of the twelve children and young people who answered the question said they thought that the YOT staff were interested in helping them. They also said that the YOT staff listened to what they had to say.
- All 11 respondents said YOT workers had made it easy for them to understand how the work of the YOT could help them. One said ‘my yot worker told me in usual words’. Another said ‘they talk to you about crime and how it effects people’.
- One respondent said there were things in their life that made them feel afraid, and that the YOT had helped them to deal with those issues.
- When asked if the YOT took action to address their needs, seven said yes, three said mostly and one did not know. One respondent said: ‘there a good team 4 wot they do’. Another added: ‘well they help u wen u in need of help and that’s good anuff for me’.
- Five of those who had responded to the question said they had completed a What do YOU think? form, two said they had not and four could not remember.
- Five of the eleven respondents said things had improved for them as result of work they had done with the YOT and six said things had not improved.
- Nine of the eleven children and young people, who answered the question, said they thought they were less likely to reoffend as a result of the work they had done with the YOT. Two said it had made no difference. One respondent said ‘coming to yot has helped me stay out of trouble and got me place in training’. Another said he was less likely to reoffend because ‘it aint worth the stress.’ Yet another added ‘cos it sorts out my drug use and how much I drink’.

Victims

No questionnaires were completed by victims of offending by children and young people.
Sharing good practice

Below are examples of good practice we found in the YOT.

Assessment and Sentence Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criterion: 1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom was 16 years old and had experienced considerable family trauma in his formative years. His parents had both been drugs users and his father had died of a drugs overdose. Tom had received social work support due to the neglect he had experienced. When aged 15, he was convicted of several robbery offences and was made subject to intensive supervision. The assessment and planning identified the key issues in the case, and the planned range of interventions addressed both his offending and his needs as a vulnerable child. Tom fully cooperated with the staff providing services to him and the case manager adjusted her style of work to secure his engagement. By the time of the inspection his accommodation and family support arrangements had improved. Although Tom had reoffended on one occasion, this was for a much less serious offence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivery and Review of Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criterion: 1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben was aged 17 and had been sent to custody following an escalating series of offences. His behaviour had deteriorated after he had been excluded from the family home. Ben had previously been wrongly diagnosed with an attention deficit disorder, and this was associated with his eventual exclusion from school. The case manager obtained a specialist assessment of his needs and it revealed a severe learning disability. This helped to explain Ben's difficulty in understanding and abiding by rules at home and at School. During the custodial period the case manager helped the family to plan for having Ben back at home, and referrals were made to relevant community services to support his needs. Ben successfully completed the licence period, was stable in his behaviour at home and had not reoffended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criterion: 2.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim was a Looked After Child who was living with her foster parent following the breakdown of her relationship with her mother and step-father. The case manager involved the YOT psychiatric nurse and CAMHS workers at an early stage to work with Kim, who was displaying signs of depression and self-harm. As a result of their work Kim’s mental health stabilised, she resumed her education and by the end of the order she was planning to go on to six form college.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. ASSESSMENT AND SENTENCE PLANNING

1.1 Risk of Harm to others:

**General Criterion:**

The assessment of RoH is comprehensive, accurate and timely, takes victims’ issues into account and uses Asset and other relevant assessment tools. Plans are in place to manage RoH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. An Asset RoSH screening was completed in 94% of the cases in the sample and almost all of these had all been completed on time. Over three-quarters of the RoSH screenings were considered to be accurate. The screenings indicated the need for a full analysis in 36 cases. This had been done in all but three of the relevant cases.

2. We considered that the classification of RoSH was accurate in 93% of cases.

3. RoSH assessments had been forwarded to custodial establishments, within 24 hours, in all 12 relevant cases.

4. Four cases met the criteria for a referral to MAPPA. These had all been made in a timely fashion and all four had the correct MAPPA classification.

5. There was evidence that the details of RoSH had been communicated to all relevant staff in 89% of the appropriate cases.

6. Of the 24 cases that required a RMP, this had been done for 79%.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. For cases where there was no requirement for a RMP, the need for planning for the RoH issues had been acted upon in 53%.

2. Only 14 of the 25 relevant cases had a satisfactory RMP. Victim’s issues and a lack of clarity about the planned responses, and the roles and responsibilities of staff, were the factors that most often limited the quality of these documents.
1.2 Likelihood of Reoffending:

**General Criterion:**

The assessment of the LoR is comprehensive, accurate and timely and uses Asset and other relevant assessment tools. Plans are in place to reduce LoR.

| Score: 76% | Comment: MINIMUM improvement required |

**Strengths:**

1. There was a timely assessment of the factors linked to offending for children and young people in all but one of the 61 cases.
2. In preparing assessments, we saw evidence of active engagement with 89% of children and young people and with their parents/carers in 79% of cases.
3. The quality of the initial assessment of the LoR was satisfactory in 76% of cases. Good use was made of the information available from other agencies including the police, educational providers, custodial establishments, mental health services and substance misuse workers.
4. Assessments were forwarded to custodial establishments, within 24 hours, in all 17 relevant cases.
5. Almost all of the cases had an intervention plan. 89% of these had been completed on time and 85% sufficiently addressed factors linked to offending.
6. All but two of the intervention plans reflected national standards. They addressed the sentencing purpose in 95% of cases. Almost all focused on achievable change and 88% gave a clear shape to the order. Over three-quarters set relevant goals.
7. We found that 80% of the children and young people had been actively involved in the planning process as had 74% of parents/carers. A range of professionals from other agencies had also contributed to the plans. We saw routine involvement of custodial establishments, the police, education providers, mental health professionals and those addressing substance misuse needs.
8. Reviews of intervention plans were undertaken at appropriate intervals in 80% of cases.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Only 54% of cases had evidence that the learning style of the child or young person had been assessed.
2. We found up to date *What do YOU think?* forms in only 55% of cases.
1.3 Safeguarding:

**General Criterion:**
The assessment of Safeguarding needs is comprehensive, accurate and timely and uses Asset and other relevant assessment tools. Plans are in place to manage Safeguarding and reduce vulnerability.

| Score: 69% | Comment: MODERATE improvement required |

**Strengths:**

1. Asset vulnerability screening was completed in 98% of the cases. Almost all of these had been completed on time.

2. Safeguarding needs had been reviewed as appropriate in 75% of cases.

3. There was prompt notification to the secure establishments of Safeguarding concerns in nine of the ten relevant cases and we saw active liaison on those issues, with staff from the secure establishments.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Only 45% of VMPs had been completed to a sufficient level of quality. The factors that most often limited the quality of these documents were; planned responses being inadequate or unclear; roles and responsibilities being unclear and the implications of diversity issues not being fully considered.

2. Copies of other care related plans were found in less than half of the 23 applicable files. Relevant YOT staff did not have access to the Children’s Services Care First information system. This limited the information sharing and joint working arrangements between the YOT and Children Services.

3. Evidence of adequate management oversight of the vulnerability assessments was seen in only 20 of the 41 relevant cases.

**OVERALL SCORE for quality of Assessment and Sentence Planning work: 75%**

**COMMENTARY on Assessment and Sentence Planning as a whole:**

In 2007, the YOT established a case planning forum which focused on all children and young people identified as posing high and very high RoH, LoR and with high levels of vulnerability. The case planning forum facilitated the coordination of multi agency and MAPPA responses in relevant cases. We found evidence of this facility assisting YOT staff to effectively assess and plan for work in the relevant cases. The inspection data showed that cases that had been assessed as being high in respect of RoH concerns performed slightly better than the average position, in relation to assessment and planning for those issues.
2. DELIVERY AND REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS

2.1 Protecting the public by minimising Risk of Harm to others:

**General Criterion:**

_All reasonable actions have been taken to protect the public by keeping to a minimum the child or young person’s RoH to others._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Score:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td><em>MODERATE improvement required</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(1) The RoH had been reviewed in a timely fashion in 85% of cases.

(2) Effective contributions to other multi-agency meetings were noted in all 14 of the custody cases and in 24 of the 27 cases in the community.

(3) Purposeful home visits, in accordance with the level of RoH posed, had been undertaken in 91% of the cases.

(4) Appropriate resources had been allocated according to RoH issues in 95% of the sample.

(5) Specific interventions to manage RoH were delivered as planned in 80% of custody cases.

(6) Effective use of MAPPA was seen in all of the four of the cases where it had been required.

**Areas for improvement:**

(1) Changes in RoH factors were anticipated wherever feasible in only 58% of the relevant cases. These were identified swiftly and acted upon in only 54% of these.

(2) Only 8 of the 44 relevant cases had evidence that a full assessment of victims safety had been carried out. Only nine of these cases demonstrated that a high priority had been given to victims’ safety.
2.2 Reducing the Likelihood of Reoffending:

**General Criterion:**

The case manager coordinates and facilitates the structured delivery of all elements of the intervention plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. Interventions were delivered in accordance with the intervention plan in 73% of cases. Almost all the interventions were of good quality and were designed to reduce the LoR. Over three-quarters of the interventions were appropriate to the learning style of the child or young person.

2. Interventions were reviewed, in the appropriate time period, in over two-thirds of cases.

3. YOT staff had contributed appropriately to the review of interventions in 88% of custody cases and in 93% of those in the community.

4. In 94% of custody cases and in 98% of those in the community, YOT staff had actively motivated the child or young person and had reinforced positive behaviour.

5. Appropriate resources had been allocated to address LoR issues in 93% of cases.

6. In 92% of custody cases and in 94% of those in the community, YOT workers had actively engaged with parents/carers.

**Area for improvement:**

1. Incorporation of all diversity issues into the delivery of interventions was found in 59% of cases.
2.3 Safeguarding the child or young person:

**General Criterion:**

All reasonable actions have been taken to safeguard and reduce the vulnerability of the child or young person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(1) All necessary action had been taken to safeguard the child or young person in all the custody cases and in 24 of the 33 relevant community cases.

(2) Action to address Safeguarding issues in relation to other children or young people, including brothers and sisters, was seen in all three relevant custody and in 12 of the 14 community cases.

(3) Purposeful home visits to address Safeguarding concerns were carried out in 88% of the sample.

(4) Referrals to other agencies to ensure Safeguarding were noted in five of the six relevant custodial cases and 22 of the 28 relevant community cases.

(5) Joint work with other agencies, to promote Safeguarding for children and young people in the community, was a common feature of the work of the YOT. We saw evidence of regular joint work with a number of partner organisations; including the police and secure establishments, education providers, mental and physical health services and substance misuse services. A similar pattern in respect of joint work with other agencies to promote Safeguarding for children and young people in custody was noted.

(6) For custody cases, specific interventions to address Safeguarding concerns were identified in 75% of cases and 80% of them had been reviewed.

(7) Evidence that all staff had supported and promoted the well-being of the child or young person throughout the sentence was evidenced in 82% of community cases and 11 of the 16 custody cases.

**Areas for improvement:**

(1) Evidence that YOT staff had worked with others, to ensure continuity in the provision of services in the transition from custody to the community, was seen in only four of the seven cases that required joint work with Children’s Services.

(2) Specific interventions to promote safeguarding in custody were delivered in only three of the nine relevant cases.
OVERALL SCORE for quality of Delivery and Review of Interventions work: 77%

COMMENTARY on Delivery and Review of Interventions as a whole:

Interventions were delivered by case managers who also accessed services available from the specialist staff in the resources team. The processes helped to ensure that specialist input into cases, based on risk and need assessments, was available to children and young people. The YOT was well resourced in respect of a range of services, including; education; substance misuse and primary health services. It had also recently appointed a family support worker. However, the YOS had lost the funding for its victim liaison worker, and this had weakened its ability to develop restorative justice services. The inspection found insufficient focus was being given to victims issues in work with children and young people who had offended. The absence of joint work with Children’s Services, in a number of cases, limited the extent to which Safeguarding concerns were being addressed on a multi-agency basis.
3. OUTCOMES

3.1 Achievement of outcomes:

**General Criterion:**
Outcomes are achieved in relation to RoH, LoR and Safeguarding.

| Score: 68% | Comment: MODERATE improvement required |

**Strengths:**

1. RoH was effectively managed in 82% of relevant cases.
2. Children and young people had complied with the requirements of their sentences in 61% of cases. Adequate enforcement action was taken in 17 of the 24 relevant cases.
3. We found that progress had been made against factors linked to offending in a number of cases. The factors that most often saw progress being made in cases were: Thinking and behaviour (39%); lifestyle (38%); living arrangements (36%) and substance misuse (34% of cases).
4. All reasonable action to keep the child or young person safe had taken place in 85% of cases.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Only half of the cases we assessed had seen a reduction in Asset scores.
2. Evidence of a reduction of risk factors linked to Safeguarding concerns was found in only 40% of cases.
3.2 Sustaining outcomes:

**General Criterion:**

Outcomes are sustained in relation to RoH, LoR and Safeguarding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(1) Full attention had been given to community integration issues in 82% of both community and custody cases.

(2) Action had been taken to ensure that positive outcomes were sustainable in 84% of community cases and in 69% of those in custody.

**OVERALL SCORE for quality of Outcomes work: 71%**

**COMMENTARY on Outcomes as a whole:**

The YOT had carried a vacancy in the information officer role for some time. The replacement had been in post for just a short period at the time of the inspection. The YOT acknowledged that its arrangements for reporting on outcomes were underdeveloped. Plans were in hand to address this through the new post holder.
Appendix 1: Summary

Cardiff CCI
General Criterion Scores

1.1: Risk of Harm to others – assessment and planning: 79%
1.2: Likelihood of Reoffending – assessment and planning: 76%
1.3: Safeguarding – assessment and planning: 69%
Section 1: Assessment & Planning: 75%

2.1: Protecting the Public by minimising Risk of Harm to others: 69%
2.2: Reducing the Likelihood of Reoffending: 83%
2.3: Safeguarding the child or young person: 77%
Section 2: Interventions: 77%

3.1: Achievement of outcomes: 68%
3.2: Sustaining outcomes: 77%
Section 3: Outcomes: 71%
Appendix 2: Contextual information

Area

Cardiff YOS was located in South Wales.

The area had a population of 305,353 as measured in the Census 2001, 10.4 of which were aged 10 to 17 years old. This was about the same as the average for Wales, which was 10.6%. The comparable figure for England and Wales was 10.4%.

The population of Cardiff was predominantly white British (91.6%). The population with a black and minority ethnic heritage (8.4%) was above the average for Wales of 2.1%. The comparable figure for England and Wales is 8.7%.

Reported offences for which children and young people aged 10 to 17 years old received a pre-court disposal or a court disposal in 2008/2009, at 62 per 1,000, were above the average for England and Wales of 46.

YOT

The YOT boundaries were within those of the South Wales police area, The Wales Probation Trust and the Cardiff and Vale University Health Board.

The YOT was located within the Cardiff City Council Directorate of Children’s Services and was managed by the YOT operations manager.

The YOT Management Board was chaired by the Corporate Director Social. All statutory partners attended regularly.

The YOT headquarters was in the City of Cardiff. The operational work of the YOT was also based in Cardiff. ISS was provided by the Cardiff and the Vale consortium.

YJB performance data

The YJB summary of national indicators available at the time of the inspection was for the period April 2008 to March 2009.

Cardiff’s performance on ensuring children and young people known to the YOS were in suitable education, training or employment was 55.9%. This was a drop on the previous year, and below the Wales average of 69.0%.

Performance on ensuring suitable accommodation by the end of the sentence was 96.8%. This was an improvement on the previous year and better than the Wales average of 96.1%.

The ‘Reoffending rate after 9 months’ was 87%, worse than the Wales average of 74% (See Glossary).
Appendix 3a: Inspection data chart

Case Sample: Age at start of Sentence

- Under 16 years: 21
- 16-17 years: 41
- 18+ years: 0

Case Sample: Ethnicity

- White: 50
- Black & Minority Ethnic: 12
- Other Groups: 0

Case Sample: Sentence Type

- First Tier: 14
- Community Supervision: 31
- Custody: 17

Case Sample: Risk of Harm

- High/Very High ROH: 5
- Not High ROH: 57

Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in Cardiff
Appendix 3b: Inspection data

Fieldwork for this inspection was undertaken in March 2010

The inspection consisted of:

- examination of practice in a sample of cases, normally in conjunction with the case manager or other representative
- evidence in advance
- questionnaire responses from children and young people, and victims

We have also seen YJB performance data and assessments relating to this YOS.

Appendix 4: Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice

Information on the Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice can be found on our website:

http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectorates/hmi-probation

The Inspectorate is a public body. Anyone wishing to comment on an inspection, a report or any other matter falling within its remit should write to:

HM Chief Inspector of Probation
2nd Floor, Ashley House
2 Monck Street
London, SW1P 2BQ
### Appendix 5: Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB/ASBO</td>
<td>Antisocial behaviour/Antisocial Behaviour Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset</td>
<td>A structured assessment tool based on research and developed by the Youth Justice Board looking at the young person’s offence, personal circumstances, attitudes and beliefs which have contributed to their offending behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAF</td>
<td>Common Assessment Framework: a standardised assessment of a child or young person’s needs and of how those needs can be met. It is undertaken by the lead professional in a case, with contributions from all others involved with that individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMHS</td>
<td>Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services: part of the National Health Service, providing specialist mental health and behavioural services to children and young people up to at least 16 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careworks</td>
<td>One of the two electronic case management systems for youth offending work currently in use in England and Wales. See also YOIS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>Criminal Records Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTO</td>
<td>Detention and Training Order: a custodial sentence for the young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estyn</td>
<td>HM Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETE</td>
<td>Employment, training and education: work to improve an individual's learning, and to increase their employment prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>Her Majesty’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIC</td>
<td>HM Inspectorate of Constabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMI Prisons</td>
<td>HM Inspectorate of Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMI Probation</td>
<td>HM Inspectorate of Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions;</td>
<td>Work with an individual that is designed to change their offending behaviour and/or to support public protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructive and</td>
<td>A constructive intervention is where the primary purpose is to reduce Likelihood of Reoffending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restrictive interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Intensive Supervision and Surveillance - introduced under the YRO arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSP</td>
<td>Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme: this intervention is attached to the start of some orders and licences and provides initially at least 25 hours programme contact including a substantial proportion of employment, training and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoR</td>
<td>Likelihood of Reoffending. See also constructive Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Learning and Skills Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCB</td>
<td>Local Safeguarding Children Board: set up in each local authority (as a result of the Children Act 2004) to coordinate and ensure the effectiveness of the multi-agency work to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in that locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPPA</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills: the Inspectorate for those services in England (not Wales, for which see Estyn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO</td>
<td>Prolific and other Priority Offender: designated offenders, adult or young, who receive extra attention from the Criminal Justice System agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-CAF</td>
<td>This is a simple ‘Request for Service’ in those instances when a Common Assessment Framework may not be required. It can be used for requesting one or two additional services, e.g. health, social care or educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>Pre-sentence report: for a court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Reoffending rate after 9 months'</td>
<td>A measure used by the Youth Justice Board. It indicates how many further offences are recorded as having been committed in a nine-month period by individuals under current supervision of the relevant YOT, and it can be either more or less than 100%. ‘110%’ would therefore mean that exactly 110 further offences have been counted as having been committed ‘per 100 individuals under supervision’ in that period. The quoted national average rate for England in early 2009 was 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>Risk management plan: a plan to minimise the individual’s Risk of Harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoH</td>
<td>Risk of Harm to others. See also restrictive Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'RoH work', or 'Risk of Harm work'</td>
<td>This is the term generally used by HMI Probation to describe work to protect the public, primarily using restrictive interventions, to keep to a minimum the individual’s opportunity to behave in a way that is a Risk of Harm to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoSH</td>
<td>Risk of Serious Harm: a term used in Asset. HMI Probation prefers not to use this term as it does not help to clarify the distinction between the probability of an event occurring and the impact/severity of the event. The term Risk of Serious Harm only incorporates ‘serious’ impact, whereas using ‘Risk of Harm’ enables the necessary attention to be given to those offenders for whom lower impact/severity harmful behaviour is probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding</td>
<td>The ability to demonstrate that all reasonable action has been taken to keep to a minimum the risk of a child or young person coming to harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFA</td>
<td>Screening Interview for Adolescents: Youth Justice Board approved mental health screening tool for specialist workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQIFA</td>
<td>Screening Questionnaire Interview for Adolescents: Youth Justice Board approved mental health screening tool for YOT workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMP</td>
<td>Vulnerability management plan: a plan to safeguard the well-being of the individual under supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YJB</td>
<td>Youth Justice Board for England and Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOI</td>
<td>Young Offenders Institution: a Prison Service institution for young people remanded in custody or sentenced to custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOIS+</td>
<td>Youth Offending Information System: one of the two electronic case management systems for youth offending work currently in use in England and Wales. See also Careworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS/T</td>
<td>Youth Offending Service/Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>