Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in England and Wales

Report on youth offending work in:

Ceredigion

Foreword

This Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in Ceredigion 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 74% 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 57% of the time, and the work to make each individual less likely to reoffend was done well enough 69% 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%.

Overall, we consider this a mixed set of findings. Whilst Safeguarding practice was strong, insufficient attention to managing Risk of Harm to others was of some concern. This was similar to the findings from the last inspection in 2007. The quality of management oversight needed to be more meaningful to provide adequate support and direction to workers. The YOS was aware of this and had taken steps to make improvements by introducing some promising changes to management practice.

Staff provided a good and supportive level of assistance to children and young people. They were open to the inspection process and to improving the quality of practice. This will stand the YOS in a good position to make further improvements against the recommendations in this report.

Andrew Bridges
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

June 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

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

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 and plan, using Asset, is completed when the case starts (YOS Manager)

2. specifically, 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. (YOS Manager)

3. 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 (YOS Manager)

4. the plan of work with the case is regularly reviewed and correctly recorded in Asset with a frequency consistent with national standards for youth offending services (YOS Manager)

5. there is evidence in the file of regular quality assurance by management, especially of screening decisions, assessments and plan, as appropriate to the specific case (YOS Manager).

Furthermore:

6. all staff and other agencies ensure that sufficient information about interventions delivered, and the level of the child or young person’s engagement, is recorded in the YOS case record to contribute to the management of the case (YOS Manager).

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

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

- All of the children and young people said they knew why they had to attend the YOS and felt well informed about what would happen when they attended. Five said the YOS worker had made it easy for them to understand the help available.
- All but one of the children and young people said staff were interested in helping and they felt listened to. Five also said the YOS took action to deal with things they needed help with. Education, training and employment, alcohol misuse and poor decision-making were the problems most commonly addressed.
- All but one of the children or young people had completed the self-assessment form What do YOU think?
- They all knew what their contract or intervention plan was and five had been given a copy. Only two of the six children or young people could recall a review of their contract or intervention plan.
- Three children or young people said their health or educational situation had improved and they felt less likely to reoffend because of the work they had done with the YOS.

Victims

Victims of offending by children and young people completed three questionnaires

- One of the three victims said they were told what service the YOS could offer and had their individual needs taken into account.
- One respondent said they had a chance to talk about any worries they had about the offence or the child or young person who had committed it.
- Two of the three victims were dissatisfied with the service provided by the YOS, one recalling poor communication as the main issue.
**Sharing good practice**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment and Sentence Planning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Criterion: 1.2</td>
<td>A learning style assessment was introduced in the autumn of 2009. VARK (Visual, Auditory, Reading and writing, Kinaesthetic) was used to identify how the child or young person processed information, so that the intervention could be adapted to promote effective communication. The results of the assessment informed an individual learning plan that could be taken into account by all staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery and Review of Interventions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Criterion: 2.2</td>
<td>The YOS had reviewed its range of offending behaviour programmes. The new materials were of good quality, clearly written and user friendly. They were based on effective practice principles and had a responsive style of delivery. In one case, a young person explored thoughts, feeling and motives to offending through creative writing, rather than using formal worksheets. This involved the use of storyboards and poetry to provide a detailed insight into offending behaviour.</td>
<td></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>61%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. An Asset RoSH screening was completed in 90% of the cases inspected and was accurate in 79%.

2. The RoSH to others, posed by the child or young person, was correctly classified in all but four cases (83%). In our opinion, the original classification was too low in three of the four cases.

3. A RoSH analysis was completed in 8 of 11 (73%) relevant cases. This was an improvement on the 2007 inspection findings, where an analysis was completed in 60%.

4. The RoSH was forwarded to the custodial establishment within 24 hours in the two relevant cases.

5. RMPs were completed in 71% of relevant cases.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Assets were duplicated from previous orders with new information added, rather than being thoroughly reviewed using up-to-date evidence of RoH. Just over one-third (37%) of Asset RoSH screenings were completed late. Four of eleven (36%) RoSH analyses were completed on time.

2. Nearly three-quarters of the RoSH analyses recorded in the structured assessment tool (Asset) were of an insufficient quality. In 38%, the RoSH assessment in Asset did not draw adequately on all available information, such as other assessments. Others omitted previous relevant behaviour and relied on the current conviction or had not considered victim issues.

3. RMPs were completed on time in three out of seven cases (43%). Four were of insufficient quality. The main reasons for this were the failure to specify
roles and responsibilities or provide a clear approach to the management of RoSH to others. In one case, the RMP and the VMP were identical, suggesting a lack of understanding of the important differences between the RoH and vulnerability.

(4) We found evidence of effective management oversight of the RMP in only one of the seven cases. A case audit tool was implemented three months prior to the inspection and it was beginning to provide evidence of more management oversight. However, it had not been used long enough to influence the inspection data.

(5) In cases that presented RoH issues, or were classified as low RoSH, the case manager was expected to identify and make plans to manage them. This happened in 43% of relevant cases inspected.

1.2 Likelihood of Reoffending:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criterion:</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(1) An initial assessment of LoR was completed in all but two cases (93%). It was forwarded to the custodial establishment within 24 hours of sentence in the three relevant cases.

(2) An intervention plan or referral order contract was produced in 89% of cases. All plans were completed on time and sufficiently addressed factors related to offending in three-quarters of cases. The most commonly identified factors were substance misuse (93%); attitudes (90%); thinking and behaviour (88%); and emotional or mental health (86%).

(3) Intervention plans and referral order contracts had positive characteristics. Safeguarding needs were taken into account in 67% and positive factors were included in 79%. The plan gave a clear shape to supervision in 72% of cases; focused on achievable change in 80%; and reflected sentencing purposes in 96%. All but one of the children and young people were meaningfully involved in the planning process. Other agencies, for example, ETE and children’s social care services, were actively involved in the planning process in 83% and 78% of cases respectively.
(4) Objectives in intervention plans or referral order contracts included appropriate Safeguarding work in 70% of cases and took account of victim’s issues in 74%.

**Areas for improvement:**

(1) The initial assessment of LoR was completed late in one-third of cases and was of insufficient quality in 27%. In six assessments, quality was adversely affected by unclear or insufficient evidence and in three, vulnerability issues had not been identified. In some cases the core assessment was pulled through from a previous version without being thoroughly reviewed. Information on new circumstances was added, but not thoroughly analysed.

(2) We found evidence of learning styles being taken into account at the start of the order in only 17% of cases. The YOS had introduced a structured approach to assessing the learning styles of children and young people. However, our case sample pre-dated this development. The use of the assessment tool in cases starting after autumn 2009 was evident. It provided useful information to the case manager and those delivering interventions.

(3) The initial assessment of LoR was informed by a What do YOU think? self-assessment in 59% of cases. In some of the more recently started orders, we saw examples of evidence from the self-assessment being used to inform the initial Asset.

(4) The initial assessment of LoR was informed by contact with Children’s Social Care Services in 55% of cases; contact with ETE providers in 62%; and contact with substance misuse services in 38% of cases. Not reviewing evidence in the initial assessment contributed to these findings.

(5) We assessed some intervention plans and referral order contracts as insufficient in a number of important respects. RMPs were not integrated in eight out of nine cases; relevant goals and realistic timescales were set in 56%. The learning style of the child or young person was incorporated in only 28%. Just less than half (46%) were sensitive to other diversity issues.

(6) Just over one-third (35%) of intervention plans or referral order contracts prioritised objectives according to RoH and 64% sequenced objectives according to offending related needs.

(7) A review of the LoR assessment was undertaken at appropriate intervals in 37% of cases and the plan or referral order contract was reviewed in 48%. The YOS were aware of these issues and had introduced a case audit tool to improve the frequency of reviews.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. An Asset vulnerability screening was completed in 90% of cases. A VMP was completed in all but one relevant case.

2. The secure or custodial establishment was made aware of vulnerability issues in the three relevant cases.

3. Copies of other plans were available within the YOS in 71% of relevant cases. A contribution had been made through the CAF and other assessments and plans in six out of eight.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Completion of the Asset vulnerability screening was late in 27% of cases. It was completed to a sufficient quality in 67%. Issues we judged to be linked to vulnerability were not always included in the screening, for example, use of antidepressants, heavy alcohol use and risk of sexual exploitation. Safeguarding needs were reviewed in 63% of cases.

2. The VMP was completed late in three out of eight cases and was of insufficient quality in six. The main deficits were unclear roles and responsibilities and a lack of specific actions with the desired outcome.

3. Effective management oversight of the vulnerability assessment was evident in 56% of cases.
OVERALL SCORE for quality of Assessment and Sentence Planning work: 66%

COMMENTARY on Assessment and Sentence Planning as a whole:

Work aimed at assessing and planning for the management of RoH was insufficient in too many cases. Practice in assessing and planning for the management of Safeguarding issues was of a better quality, perhaps reflecting the professional backgrounds of the case management team.

Many initial assessments were copied from previous ones. Whilst new information was added, it was not reviewed or analysed, resulting in Asset becoming more of a case recording system rather than an assessment of risk and needs. The YOS had reviewed this approach and some of the more recently completed assessments showed more analysis and assessment rather than simply recording.

Multi-agency risk management meetings had been established for cases presenting a high RoH or vulnerability. These would benefit from regular attendance by all the key agencies, including Children’s Social Care Services and the Local Education Authority and from having dedicated administrative support.

None of the cases in our sample was eligible for management within MAPPA and the YOS had correctly identified this.
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>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. Case managers and other YOS staff contributed effectively to multi-agency meetings in each of the three custody cases and in 93% of those in the community.

2. Purposeful home visits were carried out throughout the course of the sentence in accordance with the RoH posed by the child or young person in 73% of cases. Where there were Safeguarding issues, home visits were used in 78%.

3. Appropriate resources were allocated to RoH in 93% of cases. Specific interventions to manage the RoH were delivered as planned in 79% of community and the three custody cases.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. RoH was not actively monitored. It was reviewed in line with the national standard in 37% of cases. Although we saw evidence of a significant change of circumstances in ten cases, none had been reviewed using Asset. Examples of changes included new offences or police notification of concerning behaviour. Changes in factors linked to RoH were anticipated, where feasible, in 18% of cases; identified swiftly in 20%; and acted on appropriately in 22%.

2. Interventions to manage the RoH in the community were reviewed in 30% of cases following a significant change.

3. A full assessment of the safety of victims was evidenced in 64% of cases where there was an issue; high priority was given to victim safety in 54%.
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>73%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. Staff showed enthusiasm and commitment to working with children and young people. For example, a case manager had actively and meaningfully supported the child or young person throughout their order in the three custody cases and in 83% of those in the community. Positive behaviour by children and young people was reinforced in each of the custody and 88% of community cases. Parents/carers were actively engaged in each of the custody and nearly three-quarters of community cases.

2. Community based interventions were designed to reduce reoffending in 93% of cases, delivered in line with the plan and of good quality in 79%. Both of the relevant children and young people received interventions in-line with their PPO status.

3. YOS staff were involved in reviewing the intervention plan in the three custodial cases.

4. In all cases, appropriate resources were allocated to the assessed LoR throughout the sentence.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Interventions delivered in the community were appropriate to the learning style of the child or young person in 31% of cases and were reviewed in 37%.

2. Community based interventions incorporated all diversity issues in 63% and were sequenced appropriately in 66% of cases. Over half of the total population of Ceredigion speak Welsh. However, insufficient resources within the team made it difficult to deliver case management services in Welsh. We found little evidence of the active promotion of the child or young person’s preferred language, for example, it was not fully explored in the induction process.

3. Although case managers were able to recall work delivered to a child or young person, contact logs and other records did not fully evidence the work undertaken.
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>84%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. Immediate action was taken to safeguard and protect the child or young person in all relevant community cases. Action to safeguard and protect other affected children and young people was evidenced in the one relevant custody case and seven out of eight community cases.

2. Referrals to ensure Safeguarding were made in the one relevant case in custody and in 95% of those in the community.

3. YOS workers and other relevant agencies (especially children’s social care, ETE and substance misuse services) worked together to promote the Safeguarding and well-being of children and young people in custody and the community.

4. Specific interventions to promote Safeguarding in the community were identified in 89% and delivered in 83% of cases. Interventions incorporated factors identified in the VMP in 71%. In both of the relevant custody cases, specific interventions to promote Safeguarding were identified.

5. Staff supported and promoted the well-being of children and young people throughout the course of the sentence in each of the custody cases and in 90% of those in the community.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Interventions to promote Safeguarding in the community were reviewed as required or following a significant change in 29% of relevant cases.

2. Management oversight of Safeguarding and/or vulnerability issues required significant improvement as it was judged to be ineffective in just under half of the relevant cases (42%).
OVERALL SCORE for quality of Delivery and Review of Interventions work: 73%

COMMENTARY on Delivery and Review of Interventions as a whole:

Safeguarding practice was of a good quality overall but the quality of management of RoH was of some concern. Reviews were not undertaken often enough or following significant change in the circumstances of the child or young person.

Multi-agency working was strong, but inadequate recording in the YOS case record was hindering evidence of progress made. A review of programmes had produced good quality interventions that included user-friendly materials and promoted a positive delivery style in-line with effective practice.

The YOS had some resources to deliver programmes in Welsh if the need arose but none of the case managers could speak Welsh, restricting the team’s ability to respond to this important need.
3. OUTCOMES

3.1 Achievement of outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criterion:</th>
<th>Outcomes are achieved in relation to RoH, LoR and Safeguarding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(1) In all but two cases, the child or young person had complied with the requirements of the sentence.

(2) In 62% of cases, the frequency of offending had reduced. We judged that the seriousness of reoffending had reduced in 59%.

(3) Risk factors linked to Safeguarding had reduced in 58% of relevant cases and all reasonable action was taken to keep the child or young person safe in 93%.

**Areas for improvement:**

(1) RoH was not managed effectively in just over one-third of cases.

(2) YOS records showed an improvement in the factors linked to offending in 41% 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>78%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strength:**

(1) Full attention was paid to community integration issues in two of the three custodial sentences and in 90% of those in the community.

**Area for improvement:**

(1) We found that action was taken, or plans had been put in place, to ensure positive outcomes were sustainable in 68% of those cases supervised in the community.

**OVERALL SCORE for quality of Outcomes work: 69%**

**COMMENTARY on Outcomes as a whole:**

Evidencing outcomes was hindered by the insufficiencies noted throughout the assessment, planning and delivery sections of this report. However, the staff group was receptive to the inspection and eager to demonstrate outcomes through the improved use of Asset and better recording.
Appendix 1: Summary

Ceredigion CCI
General Criterion Scores

1.1: Risk of Harm to others – assessment and planning
61%

1.2: Likelihood of Reoffending – assessment and planning
66%

1.3: Safeguarding – assessment and planning
68%

Section 1: Assessment & Planning
66%

2.1: Protecting the Public by minimising Risk of Harm to others
60%

2.2: Reducing the Likelihood of Reoffending
73%

2.3: Safeguarding the child or young person
84%

Section 2: Interventions
73%

3.1: Achievement of outcomes
65%

3.2: Sustaining outcomes
78%

Section 3: Outcomes
69%
Appendix 2: Contextual information

Area
Ceredigion YOS was located in the Dyfed Powys region of Wales.

The area had a population of 74,941 as measured in the Census 2001, 9.0% of which were aged 10 to 17 years old. This was lower than the average for Wales, which was 10.6%. The comparable figure for England and Wales was 10.4%.

The population of Ceredigion was predominantly white British (98.6%). The population with a black and minority ethnic heritage (1.4%) was below 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 45 per 1,000, were below the average for England/Wales of 46.

YOS
The YOS boundaries were within those of the Dyfed Powys police and probation areas.

The YOS was located within the Children’s Services section of Ceredigion County Council. It was managed by the Assistant Director of Children’s Social Care Services.

The YOS Management Board was chaired by the Chief Executive of Ceredigion County Council.

The operational work of the YOS was based in Aberystwyth, Lampeter and Cardigan. ISSP was provided from within the YOS.

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.

Ceredigion’s performance on ensuring children and young people known to the YOS were in suitable education, training or employment was 71.8%. This was a decline on the previous year, but above the Wales average of 69%.

Performance on ensuring suitable accommodation by the end of the sentence was 97.8%. This was an improvement on the previous year and better than the Wales average of 96.1%.

The “Reoffending rate after 9 months” was 38%, much better than the Wales average of 74% (See Glossary).
Appendix 3a: Inspection data chart

Case Sample: Sentence Type
- First Tier: 15
- Community Supervision: 3
- Custody: 1

Case Sample: Risk of Harm
- High/Very High ROH: 1
- Not High ROH: 29

Case Sample: Age at start of Sentence
- Under 16: 19
- 16-17: 11
- 18+: 0

Case Sample: Ethnicity
- White: 29
- Black & Minority Ethnic: 1
- Other Groups: 1

Case Sample: Gender
- Male: 25
- Female: 4

Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in Ceredigion
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**

**ASB/ASBO**  Antisocial behaviour/Antisocial Behaviour Order

**Asset**  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

**CAF**  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

**CAMHS**  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

**Careworks**  One of the two electronic case management systems for youth offending work currently in use in England and Wales. See also YOIS+

**CRB**  Criminal Records Bureau

**DTO**  Detention and Training Order: a custodial sentence for the young

**Estyn**  HM Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales

**ETE**  Employment, training and education: work to improve an individual’s learning, and to increase their employment prospects

**FTE**  Full-time equivalent

**HM**  Her Majesty’s

**HMIC**  HM Inspectorate of Constabulary

**HMI Prisons**  HM Inspectorate of Prisons

**HMI Probation**  HM Inspectorate of Probation

**Interventions; constructive and restrictive interventions**  Work with an individual that is designed to change their offending behaviour and/or to support public protection.

A **constructive** intervention is where the primary purpose is to reduce Likelihood of Reoffending.

A **restrictive** intervention is where the primary purpose is to keep to a minimum the individual’s Risk of Harm to others. Example: with a sex offender, a constructive intervention might be to put them through an accredited sex offender programme; a restrictive intervention (to minimise their Risk of Harm) might be to monitor regularly and meticulously their accommodation, their employment and the places they frequent, imposing and enforcing clear restrictions as appropriate to each case. NB. Both types of intervention are important

**ISSP**  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

**LoR**  Likelihood of Reoffending. See also constructive Interventions

**LSC**  Learning and Skills Council

**LSCB**  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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>