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Foreword

This Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in Monmouthshire and Torfaen 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 67% 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 69% of the time, and the work to make each individual less likely to reoffend was done well enough 74% 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%.

Changes to public protection and vulnerability management processes had already been introduced prior to the inspection, demonstrating that the YOT management were aware of the need for improvement and had taken action to address these issues.

Overall, we consider this an encouraging set of findings. We think that Monmouthshire and Torfaen has good prospects for the future, on the basis that the staff team are committed and competent, and have the full support of enthusiastic and capable managers.

Andrew Bridges
HM Chief Inspector of Probation

October 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguarding score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</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>Public Protection – Risk of Harm score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</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>Public Protection – Likelihood of Reoffending score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This score indicates the percentage of Likelihood of Reoffending work that we judged to have met a sufficiently high level of quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</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 good quality assessment of the individual’s *Risk of Harm to others* is completed at the start, which includes an analysis of all harm-related behaviour rather than a description (YOT Manager)

2. risk management plans and vulnerability management plans are completed on time and are of good quality. They clarify the roles and responsibilities of staff, and include planned responses to changes in the *Risk of Harm* or vulnerability of the child or young person (YOT Manager)

3. as a consequence of the assessment, plans are 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)

4. there is evidence in the file of regular quality assurance by management of the work done to safeguard the child or young person or to minimise their *Risk of Harm to others* and vulnerability, as appropriate to the specific case (YOT Manager).

Furthermore:

5. the YOT should ensure there are clear arrangements in place for managing cases they hold for other YOTs, or for their own cases held by other YOTs, and that those arrangements are clearly understood by all staff and applied consistently (YOT Manager)

6. all staff and other agencies should ensure sufficient information about intervention work, in particular in ISS and custody cases, and the level of the child’s or young person’s engagement, is recorded to inform future work and action on the case (YOT 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

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

- Children and young people said that staff explained what would happen when they came to the YOT.
- Most children and young people felt that the YOT staff had been interested in helping them, and staff had listened to what they had to say.
- Every child or young person felt that the YOS took action to deal with things they needed help with.
- All of the children and young people who responded remembered being given a copy of their supervision or sentence plan.
- Almost all children and young people felt positive about the service given to them by the YOT.
- One young person said: “The YOT has helped me understand that I do not need to get into trouble and smoke cannabis. I feel the YOT has been helpful and understanding of my needs”.

Victims

Nine questionnaires were completed by victims of offending by children and young people.

- All except one of the victims felt that the YOT had explained the services it could offer.
- Eight of the nine victims thought the YOT had taken their needs into account.
- All victims stated that they had the chance to talk about any worries they had about the offence or about the child or young person who had committed the offence.
- One-third of the victims benefited directly from work done by the child or young person who committed the offence.
- Although most victims felt that the YOT had paid attention to their safety, one did not feel that this was the case.
- Overall, six of the nine victims were ‘completely satisfied’ with the service given by the YOT.
- One victim commented: "I felt that the Yot were very helpful and professional doing their job. They were a good support to me. Keep up the good work”. Another victim told us: "The staff I was involved with were very approachable and professional. They offered valuable support to the school and also offered advice for a couple of questions I had about children I had concerns over - above the call of duty and very helpful".
Sharing good practice

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

**Assessment and Sentence Planning**

**General Criterion: 1.1**
The YOT police officers made contact with every victim of the children and young people supervised by the YOT. Information regarding the wishes of the victim and any safety issues were fed back to the case manager and were included in the assessment and sentence planning, where appropriate.

**Assessment and Sentence Planning**

**General Criterion: 1.2**
Darren, 13, was subject to an action plan order for criminal damage. The YOT had been made aware of concerns regarding Darren’s inappropriate sexual behaviour and an unproven allegation of rape. The case manager took into account other agencies’ assessments when making his own assessment and planning. This led to close, multi-agency work to protect potential victims.

**Delivery and Review of Interventions**

**General Criterion: 2.2**
Chloe, 17, lived in a children’s care home in Monmouthshire. She had a history of aggressive and disruptive behaviour and had never successfully completed any of her previous court orders. Chloe’s case manager, Ruth, worked out a programme of solution focused work with Chloe, looking at what she could do, rather than concentrating on her problems. Chloe successfully completed her order. She was able to move back to her home area and was planning to start an art course in the autumn.

**Outcomes**

**General Criterion: 3.2**
Mark was subject to a community sentence for sexual assault. The YOT case manager and education worker successfully secured a training and work placement for Mark. This was achieved by close working between the YOT workers and training provider, to ensure that safe working arrangements were in place and closely monitored on an ongoing basis, so that other students were protected.
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.

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

Strengths:

1. A RoH screening was undertaken in all cases in the sample, and completed on time in all but one case.
2. In all except two relevant cases a RoSH analysis had been completed. Most of the full analyses were completed on time.
3. The RoH classification recorded by the YOT was judged to have been correct in most cases.
4. All cases which required a RMP had one and in 71% of cases these had been completed on time.
5. In all but three cases, details of the RoSH assessment and management were appropriately communicated to relevant staff and agencies.

Areas for improvement:

1. In 14 cases the RoSH screening was inaccurate. In these cases there was a lack of an analysis as opposed to a description of the offences and in a majority of custody cases, the case manager had reduced the RoSH simply because the young person had been sentenced to custody without a thorough assessment of all RoH factors.
2. In over one-third (38%) of relevant cases the full RoSH analyses were completed to a sufficient standard. Omissions included previous relevant behaviour not being considered and lack of attention to the potential risk to victims.
3. Only 12% of RMPs were completed to a sufficient standard. Omissions included the absence of a clear definition of staff roles and responsibilities, and lack of clarity in the plans about how to respond if RoH increased or risk-related behaviours occurred.
(4) In cases that did not require a RMP the need to address potential RoH issues had not been recognised in five of 13 relevant cases.

(5) Effective management oversight of RoH assessments was evident in only 35% of cases. In some instances this was due to a lack of management recording in the case file. In other cases RoH assessments had been signed off, but we considered them to be of insufficient quality.

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: 73% | Comment: MODERATE improvement required |

**Strengths:**

(1) In all cases an initial assessment of LoR had been conducted; they were completed on time in all but one case. There were timely reviews of the LoR in all but four cases.

(2) The initial assessment of the LoR was satisfactory in 75% of cases. Good use was made of the information available from other agencies, including the police, educational providers, custodial establishments and mental health services. Initial assessments also included information from victims where appropriate.

(3) There was evidence of active engagement with the child or young person in 89% of cases, and with parents/carers in 81% of cases.

(4) Completion of the *What do YOU think?* form by children and young people contributed to the initial assessment of LoR in 70% of cases.

(5) Intervention plans/referral order contracts existed for all but three cases; 92% of them were completed on time, and 79% sufficiently addressed factors linked to offending.

(6) Children and young people were actively and meaningfully involved in the planning process in 76% of cases, and parents/carers were involved in over two-thirds of cases.

(7) Intervention plans focused on achievable change in 89% of cases; reflected sentencing purposes in 94% of cases; set realistic timescales in 86% of cases and met the requirements of the national standard in 94% of cases. Objectives within intervention plans were also sensitive to diversity issues in 86% of cases and to victim issues in 82% of cases.
Areas for improvement:

(1) The case manager had assessed the learning style of the child or young person in only just over half of all cases.

(2) Intervention plans were integrated into RMPs in only 32% of relevant cases and Safeguarding needs were taken into account in just 61%. Positive factors and the child or young person’s learning needs/style were taken into account in just over half the cases.

(3) Only 27% of the intervention plans or referral order contracts included objectives that were prioritised according to RoH, while 62% included appropriate Safeguarding work. Less than one-quarter (24%) of the plans/contracts were sequenced according to offending related need. In cases where the young person was also subject to ISS there was no evidence of the case manager contributing meaningfully to the ISS plan or of that document being integrated into the intervention plan.

(4) Initial assessments were reviewed sufficiently in less than two-thirds (62%) 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: 68%

Comment: MODERATE improvement required

Strengths:

(1) Asset vulnerability screenings were completed in all cases, and all but two of them were completed on time.

(2) The Safeguarding needs of children and young people were reviewed as appropriate in 78% of cases.

(3) VMPs were completed in 76% of the cases that required them.

(4) For those sentenced to custody, vulnerability issues were communicated promptly to the institution in all but one of the relevant cases. There was effective liaison and information sharing with custodial establishments.

Areas for improvement:

(1) Where VMPs were completed, they were timely in only 60% of cases, and only 17% were of sufficient quality. In some cases the quality was affected by
a lack of clarity about the roles and responsibilities of staff and agencies, involved with the child or young person, and the planned response to changes in the young person’s vulnerability.

(2) VMPs contributed to and informed interventions in just over half (53%) of the cases, and to other plans in three out of ten applicable cases.

(3) Management oversight of vulnerability assessments was sufficient in just one-quarter of relevant cases.

**OVERALL SCORE for quality of Assessment and Sentence Planning work: 72%**

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

Multi-agency risk management meetings had been established for cases presenting a high and medium RoH or vulnerability. These meetings had contributed to public protection and the Safeguarding of young people under the supervision of the YOT. However there were too many medium RoH cases for the meetings to work effectively. Plans were in place to restructure these meetings to focus on the higher RoH and vulnerability cases.

The YOT had until recently used RMP and VMP templates that were more of a review of the Asset rather than a plan to manage RoH or vulnerability. At the time of the inspection case managers were using YOIS management plan templates. This had improved the quality of planning but there was a need for staff to undertake further training in the completion of these management plans.

There was a culture within the YOT of copying assessments from previous ones. Whilst new information was added it was not reviewed or analysed, resulting in Asset becoming more of a case recording system than an assessment of risk and needs.
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><strong>72%</strong></td>
<td><strong>MODERATE improvement required</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. *RoH* was reviewed within the required timescales in three-quarters of cases. Changes in *RoH/acute factors* were identified swiftly in three-quarters of cases.

2. Purposeful home visits were carried out throughout the course of the sentence in accordance with the level of *RoH* posed and with Safeguarding needs in 93% of cases.

3. Case managers and other staff contributed effectively to other multi-agency meetings in all but two of the cases in the community and in all but one of the cases in custody.

4. A full assessment of victim safety had been carried out in 79% of cases and high priority was given to victim safety in 73% of cases.

5. Appropriate resources were allocated according to the *RoH* level throughout the sentence in 89% of cases.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. *RoH* was reviewed following a significant change in only 46% of cases.

2. Although changes in *RoH/acute factors* were identified swiftly (see strength 1 above) appropriate action was only taken in one-third of relevant cases.

3. Specific interventions to manage *RoH* were reviewed following significant change in 50% of custody and 33% of community cases.
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>74%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(1) Delivered interventions in the community were implemented in line with the intervention plan and were of a good quality in 73% of cases. In 76% of cases they were appropriate to the learning style of the child or young person. They were designed to reduce LoR and incorporated all diversity issues in 78% of cases.

(2) The YOT was involved in the review of interventions in custody in 83% of cases.

(3) Appropriate resources were allocated according to the assessed LoR throughout the sentence in 81% of cases.

(4) Case managers actively motivated and supported children and young people through the sentence in 67% of cases during their time in custody, and in 78% of cases in the community. They reinforced positive behaviour in custody and in the community in almost all cases.

(5) There was evidence of active engagement with parents/carers in 80% of appropriate cases in custody, and in 94% of cases in the community.

**Areas for improvement:**

(1) Interventions delivered in the community were sequenced appropriately in 39% of cases, and reviewed appropriately in 54% of cases. In none of the PPO cases in the sample was there evidence of interventions having been delivered to match their assessed PPO status.

(2) There was little evidence of what interventions had been delivered to address the young person’s LoR in any of the ISS cases inspected.
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><strong>Score:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. All necessary immediate action was taken to safeguard and protect the child or young person in all relevant cases in custody, and all appropriate cases in the community. In seven cases there had been concerns regarding the Safeguarding and protection of other children or young people; in all of these cases all necessary immediate action had been taken.

2. There was good evidence that the YOS workers and other relevant agencies, especially ETE/Career Wales, mental health and secure establishments, worked together to promote the Safeguarding and well-being of children and young people in custody and the community.

3. Specific interventions were identified to promote Safeguarding in 84% of the community and custody cases.

4. In the majority of cases there was evidence that staff supported and promoted the well-being of children and young people throughout the course of the sentence.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. In only half of custody and 60% of community cases were necessary referrals made to other agencies to ensure Safeguarding needs were addressed.

2. In nine cases we judged that Children’s Social Care Services had not worked together well enough with the YOT to promote the Safeguarding and well-being of the child or young person. A majority of these cases involved children and young people placed in local children’s homes within the YOT boundaries, by other local authorities.

3. Although specific interventions to promote Safeguarding were identified (see strength 3 above) these were included in the VMP in only 53% of community cases and none of the cases in custody. Interventions to meet identified needs were delivered in 40% and reviewed in 20% of cases during the custodial phase of the sentence. In community cases, interventions to promote Safeguarding were delivered in 63% of cases and reviewed in just over one-third (35%).

4. Effective management oversight of Safeguarding and vulnerability needs was evidenced in two out of five cases where the child or young person was in custody, and in 31% of community cases.
OVERALL SCORE for quality of Delivery and Review of Interventions work: 70%

COMMENTARY on Delivery and Review of Interventions as a whole:

The YOT’s ISS was delivered externally along with two neighbouring YOTs. In those ISS cases inspected there was a lack of liaison and joined up working. Of particular concern was a lack of knowledge on the part of case managers about work being delivered as part of the programme. We were also concerned that the ISS was only able to provide a weekend programme for Monmouthshire and Torfaen young people every third weekend.
3. OUTCOMES

3.1 Achievement of outcomes:

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

<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. RoH was effectively managed in 73% of cases.
2. Children or young person complied with the requirements of their sentence in 67% of cases. In nine out of 12 cases where they did not comply, enforcement action was taken sufficiently well.
3. There was evidence of a reduction in factors linked to offending in nearly 78% of all cases. Thinking and behaviour had improved (51%), substance misuse (46%) and motivation to change in 47% of cases.
4. There had been a reduction in the frequency and seriousness of offending in 67% of cases.
5. There had been a reduction in risk factors linked to Safeguarding in 61% of cases. All reasonable action had been taken to keep the child or young person safe in 77% 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>67%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. Full attention had been given to community integration issues in the 71% of cases in the community.
(2) Actions had been taken, or there were plans in place to ensure that positive outcomes were sustainable, in over two-thirds of relevant cases in the community.

Area for improvement:

(1) Full attention had been given to community integration issues in only 40% of custody cases. Action had been taken or plans were in place to ensure positive outcomes were sustainable in half of these cases.

OVERALL SCORE for quality of Outcomes work: 71%
Appendix 1: Summary
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1.1: Risk of Harm to others – assessment and planning
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Appendix 2: Contextual information

Area

Monmouthshire and Torfaen YOT was located in South Wales. The area had a population of 90,949 (Torfaen) and 84,885 (Monmouthshire) as measured in the Census 2001, 11.4% (Torfaen) and 10.7% (Monmouthshire) of which were aged 10 to 17 years old. This was slightly higher than the average for Wales, which was 10.6%. The comparable figure for England and Wales was 10.4%.

The population of Monmouthshire and Torfaen was predominantly white British. The population with a black and minority ethnic heritage 0.9% (Torfaen) and 1.1% (Monmouthshire) 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 40 per 1,000, were below the average for England and Wales of 46.

YOT

The YOT boundaries were within those of the Gwent police area and Wales Probation Trust (with effect from April 2010). The Gwent Healthcare NHS Trust, Monmouthshire LHB and Torfaen LHB covered the area.

The YOT was located within the Children’s Services Division of Monmouthshire Social and Housing Services Directorate. It was managed by the YOT manager.

The YOT Management Board was chaired by the Assistant Chief Executive of Torfaen County Borough Council.

The YOT headquarters and the operational work of the YOT was based in Mamhilad, Torfaen. ISS was provided by a Gwent-wide consortium, located within a neighbouring local authority and overseen by a steering group of the three YOT managers in the area.

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.

Monmouthshire and Torfaen performance on ensuring children and young people known to the YOT were in suitable education, training or employment was 65.7%. This was a decline on the previous year and below the Wales average of 69%.

Performance on ensuring suitable accommodation by the end of the sentence was 97.3%. This was a slight decline on the previous year but better than the Wales average of 96.1%.

The Re-offending rate after 9 months was 78%, better than the Wales average of 74% (See Glossary).
Appendix 3a: Inspection data chart

Case Sample: Sentence Type

- First Tier: 23
- Community Supervision: 6
- Custody: 8

Case Sample: Risk of Harm

- High/Very High ROH: 31
- Not High ROH: 6

Case Sample: Age at start of Sentence

- Under 16 years: 23
- 16-17 years: 12
- 18+ years: 2

Case Sample: Ethnicity

- White: 37
- Black & Minority Ethnic: 0
- Other Groups: 9

Case Sample: Gender

- Male: 28
- Female: 9

Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in Monmouthshire and Torfaen
Appendix 3b: Inspection data

Fieldwork for this inspection was undertaken in June 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 YOT.

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

Data charts in this report are available electronically upon request
Appendix 5: Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</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; constructive and restrictive interventions</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</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>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</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 Wales in early 2009 was 74%</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>