

Youth Offending Team

Annual Report

June 2007



Contents

Youth Offending Team Report - April 06 – March 2007	6
Top Ten YOTS	10
YOT Family	10
YOT Region	11
Overall Performance Summary April 06 – March 07 Annual Update	13
1.Prevention	14
2.Community Asset	15
3.ETE	15
Effective Practice Quality Assurance	16
Remand Management	17
Mental Health:	18
Youth Justice Plan 2007/08 and	20
The Annual Performance Assessment 2007	20
A. Summary	27
Key objectives for 2007/08:	33
South Gloucestershire Yot Evaluation	36
Aims and objectives	39
Findings	42
Appendices	42
Yot Budget Per Disposal 2006/07	42
KPI Performance	42
KPI Improvement	42
National Standards Compliance	42
National Standards Improvement	42
Effective Practice Quality Assurance (EPQA) Performance	42
Effective Practice Quality Assurance (EPQA) Improvement	42
Recidivism Performance	42
General Performance	42
Overall Performance	42

Youth Offending Team Report - April 06 – March 2007

Having been placed in the top 2 Yots nationally for initial 9 months of the year, 1st over the past 6 months, we are delighted to report that South Gloucestershire Yot has maintained this position and therefore for the **annual** update are placed 1st nationally within the Youth Justice Board performance management Framework.

The final quarterly data submission (January – March 07) was made to the Youth Justice Board (YJB) at the end of April 07. Included in this quarterly submission was the recidivism annual update. We have received the validated consolidated performance management framework for the period covering April 2006 – March 2007.

The Yot have submitted reviews on action plans drawn up and completed in relation to the Quality Assurance audits undertaken by the YJB in 2005 for the areas of practice covering substance Misuse and Resettlement. We are currently awaiting confirmation that an overall final rating of 3 will be given for both.

South Gloucestershire Yot has maintained the overall performance rating of Level 5 for whole of the period. The final overall performance percentage score is 93.3%, an increase of 11.4% on the previous year (2005/06).

South Gloucestershire Overall Performance Summary April 2006 – March 2007

		Level / Target	South Gloucestershire	Family	South West	National
Overall Performance ↑ 11.4%	2006/07	Level 5	93.3%	75.3%	67.5%	63.2%
	2005/06	Level 5	81.9%	70.6%	69.3%	67.2%
KPI Performance ↑ 5.0%	2006/07	Level 4	93.3%	87.1%	85.7%	82.7%
	2005/06	Level 4	88.3%	87.7%	85.9%	84.0%
KPI Improvement ↑ 7.5%	2006/07		51.9%	45.1%	47.5%	44.5%
	2005/06		44.4%	45.1%	42.2%	48.5%
N Standards Compliance ↑ 3.7%	2006/07	Level 5	100.00%	78.7%	81.6%	72.8%
	2005/06	Level 5	96.3%	78.2%	72.8%	70.6%
N.S Improvement ⇔ N/A	2006/07		100.0%	46.6%	61.4%	50.5%
	2005/06		100.0%	69.8%	50.8%	59.9%
EPQA Performance ↑ 22.8%	2006/07	Level 5	97.4%	78.8%	74.0%	69.2%
	2005/06	Level 3	74.6%	71.2%	72.6%	66.4%
EPQA Improvement ↑ 53.8%	2006/07		100.0%	64.7%	49.6%	47.4%
	2005/06		46.2%	50.1%	47.0%	47.0%
Re-offending Performance ↓ 2.9%	2006/07	Level 5	85.2%	62.0%	60.6%	56.4%
	2005/06	Level 5	88.1%	51.1%	46.9%	45.2%

Top Ten YOTS	Region	KPI	KPII	NSC	NSI	EPQA	EPQAI	Recidivism	General	Overall	Level
South Gloucestershire	South West	93.3%	51.9%	100.0%	100.0%	97.4%	100.0%	85.2%	100.0%	93.3%	Level 5
Leicestershire	East Midlands	92.4%	39.4%	90.0%	92.3%	90.1%	87.7%	53.3%	100.0%	83.0%	Level 5
North Tyneside	North East	95.2%	46.2%	100.0%	95.8%	79.8%	59.9%	60.0%	83.3%	82.0%	Level 5
Sunderland	North East	93.7%	22.2%	96.7%	33.3%	83.9%	82.7%	70.0%	100.0%	81.9%	Level 5
Lincolnshire	East Midlands	93.7%	28.2%	85.0%	59.0%	75.5%	67.2%	91.7%	100.0%	81.6%	Level 5
Rotherham	Yorkshire	95.2%	41.0%	81.0%	74.4%	78.2%	90.0%	66.7%	100.0%	81.5%	Level 5
Richmond-upon-Thames	London	92.1%	63.3%	87.9%	66.7%	67.7%	64.7%	80.0%	100.0%	80.7%	Level 5
Stockton-on-Tees	North East	85.7%	52.8%	100.0%	100.0%	72.4%	89.2%	44.4%	100.0%	80.5%	Level 5
West Berkshire	South East	90.5%	36.7%	94.4%	50.0%	89.0%	84.9%	47.6%	100.0%	79.8%	Level 4
North Somerset	South West	87.3%	33.3%	82.4%	75.0%	92.1%	84.0%	59.3%	100.0%	79.8%	Level 4

YOT Family	Region	KPI	KPII	NSC	NSI	EPQA	EPQAI	Recidivism	General	Overall	Level
South Gloucestershire	South West	93.3%	51.9%	100.0%	100.0%	97.4%	100.0%	85.2%	100.0%	93.3%	Level 5
Leicestershire	East Midlands	92.4%	39.4%	90.0%	92.3%	90.1%	87.7%	53.3%	100.0%	83.0%	Level 5
West Berkshire	South East	90.5%	36.7%	94.4%	50.0%	89.0%	84.9%	47.6%	100.0%	79.8%	Level 4
North Somerset	South West	87.3%	33.3%	82.4%	75.0%	92.1%	84.0%	59.3%	100.0%	79.8%	Level 4
Buckinghamshire	South East	86.4%	50.0%	81.0%	28.6%	79.7%	69.4%	66.7%	100.0%	75.6%	Level 4
Cheshire	North West	93.7%	48.5%	92.1%	25.0%	76.1%	26.0%	63.3%	100.0%	74.0%	Level 4
Bedfordshire	Eastern	78.8%	66.7%	78.3%	75.4%	60.3%	57.7%	76.7%	100.0%	73.8%	Level 4
East Riding of Yorkshire	Yorkshire	86.7%	27.3%	93.3%	50.0%	63.5%	48.8%	42.9%	100.0%	70.0%	Level 4
Warwickshire	West Midlands	75.8%	46.7%	35.0%	11.1%	81.2%	80.0%	70.0%	100.0%	64.5%	Level 3
West Sussex	South East	71.2%	46.7%	46.0%	22.9%	67.7%	61.5%	46.7%	100.0%	58.8%	Level 2

YOT Region	Region	KPI	KPII	NSC	NSI	EPQA	EPQAI	Recidivism	General	Overall	Level
South Gloucestershire	South West	93.3%	51.9%	100.0%	100.0%	97.4%	100.0%	85.2%	100.0%	93.3%	Level 5
North Somerset	South West	87.3%	33.3%	82.4%	75.0%	92.1%	84.0%	59.3%	100.0%	79.8%	Level 4
Swindon	South West	92.4%	40.5%	79.4%	80.0%	79.6%	38.4%	81.0%	100.0%	77.9%	Level 4
Somerset	South West	89.5%	50.0%	82.5%	50.0%	87.5%	75.0%	50.0%	100.0%	77.0%	Level 4
Torbay	South West	90.5%	39.4%	88.2%	66.7%	83.8%	71.3%	33.3%	100.0%	75.3%	Level 4
Cornwall	South West	86.7%	46.2%	70.4%	42.9%	77.2%	83.5%	66.7%	100.0%	75.1%	Level 4
Devon	South West	93.7%	30.0%	91.7%	38.1%	71.8%	54.3%	56.7%	100.0%	74.9%	Level 4
Bournemouth and Poole	South West	87.3%	73.8%	70.0%	53.8%	64.7%	48.9%	76.7%	100.0%	73.3%	Level 4
Wiltshire	South West	69.7%	35.9%	76.7%	76.7%	75.4%	68.1%	70.0%	100.0%	72.0%	Level 4
Bath and North East Somerset	South West	80.3%	51.5%	90.0%	75.0%	50.5%	39.9%	66.7%	100.0%	71.0%	Level 4
Plymouth	South West	90.5%	28.2%	81.7%	40.5%	67.8%	54.2%	43.3%	100.0%	69.5%	Level 3
Gloucestershire	South West	80.3%	80.4%	81.0%	61.4%	55.8%	42.6%	46.7%	100.0%	68.0%	Level 3
Dorset	South West	76.2%	46.7%	68.8%	12.5%	83.3%	35.2%	70.8%	100.0%	67.4%	Level 3
Bristol	South West	71.2%	44.4%	79.4%	86.7%	66.7%	33.0%	46.7%	100.0%	65.5%	Level 3

Table 1 Category	Weighting %
KPI Performance	25.0%
KPI Improvement/Local Targets	5.0%
National Standards Audit	20.0%
National Standards Improvement	5.0%
EPQA	12.5%
EPQA Improvement	12.5%
Recidivism	15.0%
General	5.0%

Performance Level	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Overall	>=80%	>=70%	>=60%	>=50%	<50%
KPI	>=95%	>=85%	>=75%	>=65%	<65%
EPQA	>=90%	>=80%	>=70%	>=60%	<60%
NS	>=80%	>=60%	>=50%	>=35%	<35%
Recidivism	>=80%	>=70%	>=55%	>=40%	<40%

Table2

Overall Performance Summary April 06 – March 07 Annual Update

Key Performance Indicators:	Target%	Performance%	Data
Prevention	-5%	-0.5%	385 (06/07) v 387 (05/06)
Final Warnings	95%	95.0%	19/20
Use of remand	<30%	27.8%	5/18
Custodial sentences	<5%	202%	6/274
Restorative processes	75%	100.0%	100/100
Victim satisfaction	75%	100.0%	51/51
Parenting	10%	26.5%	62/234
Parental satisfaction	75%	100.0%	50/50
Community Asset - Start	95%	93.1%	258/277
Community Asset - End	95%	99.4%	157/158
Custodial Asset - Start	95%	100.0%	6/6
Custodial Asset - Transfer	95%	100.0%	6/6
Custodial Asset - End	95%	100.0%	8/8
PSR	90%	100.0%	47/47
DTO planning	95%	100.0%	5/5
ETE	90%	84.7%	203/239
Accommodation	95%	98.8%	237/240
CAMHS - Acute	95%	N/A	N/A
CAMHS - Non Acute	95%	100.0%	14/14
Substance Use - Assessment	90%	96.3%	78/81
Substance Use - Intervention	90%	100.0%	72/72

- Prevention** – Identified were issues surrounding the accuracy of baseline data as recorded by the YJB for some Yots. This is primarily due to late notification of reprimands/final warnings by police, but also in some cases due to gaps in submission, inputting errors or misinterpretation of the counting rules. It was agreed to give Yots an opportunity to resubmit their baseline data where one of the above has occurred. Where Yots had reason to think that their recorded baseline data was affected by one of the above issues they are invited to re-submit the numbers of FTEs for each quarter of 05/06. The Yot therefore resubmitted the baseline data.
- Community Asset** – Start 258 / 277 assets were completed. The 19 missed were on final warnings where the YP's refused to engage and received their disposal outside the final warning surgery scheme.
- ETE** – 203 / 239 YP's were receiving suitable ETE provision during the final week of their order. This represents an overall increase of 1.1% on the previous year (05/06). Of the 36 YP's not receiving suitable ETE provision 24 were unemployed & over statutory school age, 12 were receiving less than 25hrs per week.

There continues to be contention in relation to the changes in which the YJB count this measure. The reporting tool is not sophisticated enough to recognise there are a number of YP's in South Gloucestershire in receipt of ETE that is appropriate to their needs & circumstances. In some cases this is below the recognised number of hours (25hrs per week School attendees, 16hrs per week post 16). Therefore, the Yot reported suitable ETE for YP's where there was clear indication via

appropriate assessments, SEN's etc... to show each YP's was in fact accessing a suitable & appropriate amount of ETE.

Effective Practice Quality Assurance

<u>EPQA</u>	South Gloucestershire	Family	South West	National
Resettlement base rating	3.00	2.58	2.34	2.25
Remand base rating	3.00	2.34	2.33	2.08
SMU base rating	3.00	2.36	2.22	2.19
Mental Health base rating	2.69	2.30	2.14	1.93

In November 2006 the Youth Justice Board undertook an effective practice audit on two areas of Yot service. The visit went very well and there were positive comments from both monitors. Each area is scored out of a possible 3 and we are delighted that for both the Remand Management and Mental Health elements of Yot practice were finally validated at 3.

Remand Management:

Comments made by the YJB monitors included:

- ❖ The YOT offers an extremely high quality and effective Remand Service
- ❖ All cases are clearly documented and updated,
- ❖ Individually tailored interventions that are well supported by partner agencies.
- ❖ An effective small service well supported by partnership working with the police, courts and other service providers.
- ❖ Very high quality YOIS entries that are well supported by the electronic case notes

Comments on Yot Action Plan:

The small areas detailed clearly demonstrates this is an effective high quality service. The YOT is currently reviewing its overall Remand strategy which may need to be reflected in the Action Plan.

Mental Health:

Comments made by the YJB monitors included:

- ❖ Consistent high quality service for young people.
- ❖ Thorough and concise initial assessment via Asset.
- ❖ Young people have access to additional services both internally and externally to the YOT.
- ❖ Clear commitment to ensuring quality mental health provision from YOT Managers and strategic partners.

Comments on Yot Action Plan:

The areas of improvement identified will further strengthen the service and ensure it becomes embedded within the YOT. It is clear that a quality and

consistently high performing YOT will assist this process and underpin the development of Mental Health services for young people.

Youth Justice Plan 2007/08 and The Annual Performance Assessment 2007

Both the Youth Justice Plan and the Yot's contribution to the APA were completed by the YOT Manager. The APA report is based on information contained in the Youth Justice Plan and quarterly performance data.

The Youth Justice Plan was approved by all Chief Officer's prior to submission. The APA was approved by the Director of Department for Children & Young People prior to submission. The Youth Justice Plan has been approved and signed off by the YJB Regional Manager.

The YJB Regional Manager is in agreement with contextual report submitted in the APA added the required comments to our analysis or performance. There is confirmation the YJB Regional Manager did not contradict the Yot's analysis.

Prior to the final submission of the APA the Yot had concerns over the accuracy and validity of data the Youth Justice Board intended to provide to Dfes/Ofsted. These concerns were highlighted in the Yots APA submission.

Prevention:

YJB Response: "However, we are aware of some issues surrounding the accuracy of baseline data as recorded by the YJB for some Yots. This is primarily due to late notification of reprimands/final warnings by police, but also in some cases due to gaps in submission, inputting errors or misinterpretation of the counting rules. It has therefore been agreed to give Yots an opportunity to resubmit their baseline data where one of the above has occurred. Where Yots have reason to think that their recorded baseline data is affected by one of the above issues they are invited to re-submit the numbers of FTEs for each quarter of 05/06" – (Youth Justice Board Memorandum April 2007

In light of this development it can reported that the Yot has re-submitted the 2005/06 baseline data. Therefore FTE Apr-Dec 2005 is 291 & Apr-Dec 2006 (283) this represents a 2.7% reduction (8yp). The Yot has concerns regarding the information/data that has been passed on by the YJB to Ofsted inspectors in relation to the APA. Youth Justice Plans will have been completed, in a number of cases with a revised figure for number of FTE.

Re-Offending:

The Yot has concerns regarding the information/data that has been passed on by the YJB to Ofsted inspectors in relation to the APA.

Youth Justice Plans will have been completed in line with the YJB key performance indicator for recidivism. The measure is clearly defined, there are four co-horts; Pre-court, First Tier Penalties, Community Penalties, and Custody that should be compared & figures provided for each individual co-hort comparison. Secondly, the YJB revised the period to be monitored. The recidivism period is 12 months not 24 months.

The extrapolation of data in relation to the 4 re-offending co-horts is taken very seriously by Yots, and for this to be aggregated as a single figure is not how Yots are asked to report the rates of re-offending. This is not the way Yots would report on performance in the YJ Plan, there is an expectation that we provide a full explanation across all 4 co-horts. Even within the APA template the following is given "*Achieve a reduction in re-offending rates by 5% in 2006/07 when compared with 2002/03, with respect to each of the following four populations: pre-court, first tier penalties, community penalties, and custodial penalties*" for Yots to comment on.

The primary concerns are that because the data is inaccurate, and or out of date that the commentary produced by the Yot in the APA template will bear no relation to the data set given to Ofsted by the YJB.

Youth Justice Plan 2007/08

South Gloucestershire YJB Unique ID: 104911

Author: Steve Waters Youth Offending Service Manager

© YJB 2007

www.yjb.gov.uk

A. Summary

Overview by the chair of the steering group on how the Yot delivers youth justice services in South Gloucestershire, including a review of performance over the preceding year, information on the performance measures, the results of EPQA self assessment and action improvement plans and the main findings arising from the analysis of the re-offending cohort evaluation. Included is a summary of the key objectives for the forthcoming year.

South Gloucestershire Yot continues to perform to a high standard within the Youth Justice Board's Performance Management Framework (see Appendix E). The Yot has been the highest performing Yot nationally, regionally and within its family, for the duration of the data period for this plan: April to December 2006. Within the Performance Management Framework South Gloucestershire Yot 's Overall Performance falls within Level 5, with only 4 Yots currently achieving Level 5. At 85.4% for Overall Performance South Gloucestershire Yot is the number one Yot in England & Wales. This overall performance figure is generated through an aggregated performance score of a number of different performance areas. This includes Key Performance Indicators (88.3%), National Standards Compliance (100%), Effective Practice Quality Assurance (89.7%) and Reoffending Performance (88.1%).

Of the twenty key performance indicators reported quarterly, the Yot failed to score the maximum in only four of them. In the Final Warning KPI the maximum was almost achieved (93.3%) but for the refusal of one family to engage. In the Use of Remands KPI small numbers in the cohort (16 remand episodes) meant that the maximum target was missed with only 5 secure remands in the period. However, it is pleasing to see an improvement with the Custodial Sentences KPI with a significant reduction in the numbers of custodial sentences made on the same period last year (from 22 to 9). The Community Asset – Start KPI was adversely affected by the voluntary nature of the Final Warning process, with the refusal of a small number of families to engage meaning that an Asset could not be completed. Finally, the Education, Employment and Training (EET) KPI at 85.2% missed the maximum but did improve on last year's performance by 2%. Nevertheless, all the Not in EET (NEET) young people continue to be identified and monitored. This includes placing each in the Prevent and Deter group and having an action plan which involves the Yot, Education Services and Connexions.

Regarding performance in the Effective Practice Quality Assurance (EPQA) component of the Framework the consistently complementary feedback from the YJB across all the key elements of practice validated to-date is testimony to good performance. In November 2006, the Youth Justice Board undertook an Effective Practice Audit on two areas of Yot service – Remand Management and Mental Health. The audit went well with the Yot scoring maximum (3) in both EPQA areas.

Against the Key Objectives identified in the last YJP the Yot and its partners have remained focused. Synergy between the Children and Young people Plan and the Youth Justice Plan in the five ECM outcomes were maintained throughout 2006 (Objective 1). Overall the Yot has sustained its good performance against the YJB's KPI's and EPQA Improvement Plans (Objective 2). The Yot is closely involved in the Integrated Working initiatives across the Council area (Objective 3) and works closely with the YJB funded Junior Youth Inclusion Project. The Yot is a key partner in the Respect Action Plan (Objective 4). The Yot is able to send and receive information via secure email with partner Criminal Justice Agencies who have that capacity (Objective 6). And a protocol has been established with the police and the local authority over the use of fixed penalty notices with 16 and 17 yr olds.

The only objective still outstanding is Objective 5 regarding the implementation of the recommendations from the independent evaluation of the views of parents and young people. The evaluation is still to report having struggled to identify and engage sufficient numbers of parents and young people to

validate the study. However, feedback from the evaluation is that both parents and young people are extremely positive over the quality of service they have received from the Yot.

The Yot has continued to develop its role in the preventive strategy and services and continues to have the lead in the PPOS Prevent and Deter Action Plan. And the Yot continues to be central in the local evolution of children's service towards Children's Trust arrangements through Integrated Working agenda.

The development of the Department for Children and Young People continued throughout 2006 working to the commitments made in its first Children and Young People Plan. This proved a useful basis for developing the three-year C&YP Plan from 2006. The Yot contributes several KPI's to this Plan. The Yot remains fully integrated into all other relevant partner planning processes. This is reflected in its contribution to other performance monitoring mechanisms including Connexions, the DAT, CDRP, Annual Performance Assessment (APA) and the Local Area Agreement (LAA). The Yot is also a member of the Local Children's Safeguarding Board, the Domestic Violence Multi-agency Risk Assessment Conference, and the Anti-social Behaviour Review Panel.

In 2007 through the Integrated Working agenda South Gloucestershire is to move to Locality based integrated service delivery. Three localities have been identified and at the heart of each is a 'hub' through which services will be accessed. This restructuring of service delivery into localities will be assisted by the introduction of the Common Assessment Framework, Lead Professional and Information Sharing. The establishment of ContactPoint (Information Sharing Index) will also contribute to these developments.

The Junior Youth Inclusion Programme, called PIP, established through the YJB's Prevention Funding has been operating for a year and benefiting the parents and children who are engaged with the project. The project is yet to reach the optimum number of users but it is anticipated that the introduction of the Integrated Working components of the CAF and Information Sharing will identify more suitable referrals. Despite this the YJB Review of the Project validates it at maximum GREEN. Anecdotal reports from the local police describe significant improvements in the behaviour of the children involved with the project.

The Yot data for 2005 indicated that there had been a 22% (88 cases) increase in the number of young people formally processed for committing offences, which had resulted in a 28% increase in the number of recorded offences (217) against juveniles. This was a trend repeated across the other Yot areas in Avon and Somerset. This increase is widely accepted as a consequence of the success of the Home Office PSA Target 3: increasing the numbers of Offenders Brought to Justice. This increase in numbers of offenders has continued in 2006 with a further 11% (53 offenders) brought into the Youth Justice system. However, unlike last year there has not been a corresponding significant increase in the number of offences committed by these young people with a just above 1% increase (12) in offences.

Like last year most of these offenders were first time offenders – Reprimand (13% increase 33 cases) and Final Warning (32% increase 32 cases) stage. It is fair to say that by increasing the number of young people charged and convicted directly contributes to an improved rate of detection as by definition every case represents a case solved and therefore each of these cases contributes to the 'Offences Brought to Justice' target. And like last year the contradiction between the Offences brought to Justice target and the Yot's KPI on prevention (5% reduction in number of first time entrants to the YJ System) means that most Yots across the country continue to fail to achieve the Prevention KPI.

It is almost certain that an increasing juvenile population (by 4.11%), within South Gloucestershire is also impacting adversely on the data.

The offender/offences data for 2006 indicates several potential issues requiring further analysis and action. Although the majority of the increase is at the Pre Court stage (44.5%), there has been an increase in 'violence against the person' offences (10.7%), yet again this is reflected across the adult data. However, most of these offences against the person are of the less serious nature. Only two offences (1%) were serious violent offences. And 85% of all these offences were dealt with either with a pre-court disposal (reprimand or final warning) or with a 1st Tier sentence (Referral Order or discharge). There has also been a significant reduction in the number of sex offences (16 to 5) and of racially motivated (18 to 12) crimes.

The increase in numbers of offenders and offences (YJB prevention KPI 1) in South Gloucestershire has to be set against the continuing promising performance this year against the YJB's Recidivism measure (KPI 2) which indicates (against a 5% reduction target) a significant reduction in all non custodial included cohorts; Pre Court (-22.2%), First Tier (-18.9%), Community Penalties (-53.4%). The high (100%) increase in the custody cohort represents an increase from zero young people in 2002 to one young person in 2006!

Although not a Yot/YJB specific KPI the offending levels of Looked After Children (LAC) is a priority in South Gloucestershire. The numbers involved are small (10 from 102 in the 05/06 cohort) but the present LAC Offending rate of just over 4% against a general offending rate of 2.2% requires urgent and on-going attention. Analysis of the LAC population has already started and will continue in an effort to try to identify why some LAC offend whilst others do not. This priority will be included in the LAC Implementation Plan. It is also anticipated that the increasing emphasis on prevention work and introduction of integrated working through the newly introduced Locality service delivery model will impact positively on both offending levels and numbers of children requiring being Looked After.

Key objectives for 2007/08:

- ❖ To ensure synergy between the Children and Young People Plan and the Youth Justice Plan in the five ECM outcomes through the inclusion of all relevant cross cutting actions and outcomes in the Youth Justice Action Plan for 07-08
- ❖ Sustain performance against the YJB's Performance Management Framework
- ❖ Consolidate the Yot's role and responsibilities in the Integrated Working agenda, including the division of the Council area into three Localities and the introduction of the three Locality Hubs
- ❖ To oversee the performance of the Junior Youth Inclusion Programme including the
- ❖ To participate in the local implementation of the Respect Action Plan
- ❖ Ensure the recommendations of the independent evaluation of the views of parents and young people are integrated into service provision
- ❖ To ensure the 10 key recommendations made by HM Inspectorate Probation as set out in: *Putting Risk of Harm in Context: An inspection promoting Public Protection (2006)* are embedded in practice for the management of offenders.
- ❖ To ensure the recommendations made by HM Inspectorate Probation as set out in the Thematic Inspection Report: *A summary of Findings on the Enforcement of Community Penalties 2007* become embedded in practice
- ❖ To ensure the key areas for Yot action described in the document Cross Government Action Plan on Sexual Violence and Abuse are implemented

South Gloucestershire Yot Evaluation

“ALL THAT YOT PALAVER”

AN EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE YOUTH OFFENDING TEAM

**Undertaken by
Rowan Associates and Lin Whitfield Consultancy**

Background

In late 2005 the Yot commissioned an independent evaluation of service provision as experienced by parents/carers and young people. Although the Yot has consistently performed to a high standard against the Youth Justice Board's Performance Management Framework the overall performance is generated through aggregating a number of different performance areas. These areas include Key Performance Indicators, National Standards Compliance, Effective Practice Quality Assurance and Reoffending Performance.

However, none of the areas included in the YJB Performance Management Framework relate to how those on the receiving end of the Yot's work, i.e. parents/carers and young people, experience those services.

The independent evaluation set out to identify the impact of Yot services, and the views of parents and young people on the effectiveness and quality of services received.

The Yot is committed to fully integrate the recommendations of this independent evaluation and ensure where possible they become integrated into service provision.

Steve Waters
Youth Offending
Service Manager

Aims and objectives

The main aim of the evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of the work of South Gloucestershire YOT through investigating the experiences of young people and their parents or carers in their dealings with the YOT. Effectiveness is a wide-ranging term. Following an initial period of familiarisation and desk research, and discussions with members of the YOT, it was decided to focus on four broad dimensions of effectiveness:

1. The extent to which clients **understand** what's going on.
2. The extent to which clients feel **involved and included** in what's going on.
3. The extent to which the YOT's work takes account of clients' whole lives i.e. is **holistic and realistic**. Did the intervention take into account the situation/circumstances/perspective of the young person and their family? Did the intervention take into account practical issues for the young person and their family e.g. timing, venue? Did the intervention work on underlying problems/issues for the young person and their family?
4. The **outcomes and changes** for clients as a result of the YOT's work. Did the intervention result in behavioural change for the young person and their family? Did the intervention change how the young person and their family see the future?

Findings

The evaluation found that South Gloucestershire YOT is highly effective. It works extremely well in difficult, resource-constrained circumstances. It responds to the diverse and specific needs of its client group with a high level of flexibility, particularly in the context of working within the structure of the Youth Justice system. It was noticeable that YOT interventions are welcomed (primarily by parents) and valued by most of the young people interviewed for this evaluation. This finding deserves attention: the relationship between YOT staff and young people is a compulsory one. We analysed the factors that underpin these positive relationships, and found that South Gloucestershire YOT staff communicate effectively with young people, and this enables them to build trust and both win and engender respect. As a result, young people working with South Gloucestershire YOT were seen to make some real and often lasting changes through their work with the YOT.

Copies of the Full Report are available from:

Steve Waters
Youth Offending Service Manager
South Gloucestershire Youth Offending Team
48-50 Elm Park
Filton
BS34 7PP
Tel: 01454 868558
e-mail: sgyot@southglo.gov.uk

Appendices

Yot Budget Per Yot Disposal 2006/07

KPI Performance

KPI Improvement

National Standards Compliance

National Standards Improvement

Effective Practice Quality Assurance (EPQA) Performance

Effective Practice Quality Assurance (EPQA) Improvement

Recidivism Performance

General Performance

Overall Performance

