



THE LONDON BOROUGH  
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Steve Wood  
*stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk*

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4316

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 13 July 2015

To: Members of the  
**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE**

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)

Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Julian Benington, David Cartwright, Will Harmer, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Tom Philpott, Michael Tickner and Richard Williams

Non-Voting Co-opted Members –

Precious Adewunmi, Bromley Youth Council

Terry Belcher, Safer Neighbourhood Board

Dr Robert Hadley, Bromley Federation of Residents Associations

Alf Kennedy, Bromley Neighbourhood Watch

Runa Uddin, Bromley Victim Support

A meeting of the Public Protection and Safety Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee will be held at Bromley Civic Centre on **WEDNESDAY 22 JULY 2015 AT 6.30 PM**

**This meeting will be held concurrently with meetings of the Care Services PDS Committee and the Education PDS Committee**

MARK BOWEN

Director of Corporate Services

**Paper copies of this agenda will not be provided at the meeting. Copies can be printed off at <http://cbs.bromley.gov.uk/>. Any member of the public requiring a paper copy of the agenda may request one in advance of the meeting by contacting the Clerk to the Committee, giving 24 hours notice before the meeting.**

## **PART 1 AGENDA**

**Note for Members:** Members are reminded that Officer contact details are shown on each report and Members are welcome to raise questions in advance of the meeting.

### **STANDARD ITEMS**

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 QUESTIONS TO THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS CHAIRMAN FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING**

To hear questions to the Public Protection and Safety PDS Committee received in writing by the Democratic Services Team by 5.00pm on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> July 2015 and to respond. Questions must relate to the work of the scrutiny committee.

### **PORTFOLIO PRESENTATIONS AND DECISIONS**

- 4 QUESTIONS TO THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING**

To hear questions to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder received in writing by the Democratic Services Team by 5.00pm on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> July 2015 and to respond. Questions must relate to the work of the Portfolio.

### **POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS**

- 5 FINDINGS OF THE FULL JOINT INSPECTION OF YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICES WORK IN BROMLEY 2015 AND POST INSPECTION IMPROVEMENT PLAN (Pages 3 - 56)**

Please note that this item will be considered concurrently with the Education PDS Committee and the Care Services PDS Committee.

Members are requested to appoint a Chairman for the joint session.

.....

Report No.  
ED15104

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Date:** 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2015

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

**Title:** FINDINGS OF THE FULL JOINT INSPECTION OF YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICES WORK IN BROMLEY 2015 AND POST INSPECTION IMPROVEMENT PLAN

**Contact Officer:** Kay Weiss, Assistant Director: Safeguarding and Social Care  
Tel: 020 8313 4062 E-mail: kay.weiss@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Chief Executive

**Ward:** Borough-wide

---

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides information to members on the findings of the Full Joint Inspection of Youth Offending Services 2015 and the Post Inspection Improvement Plan.
- 

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **Members are invited to comment on the Full Joint Inspection of Bromley Youth Offending Service and the Improvement Plan at Appendix 1 and 2.**

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Safer Bromley Supporting Independence
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Bromley Youth Support Programme
  4. Total current budget for this head: £779,970
  5. Source of funding: Youth Justice Board and Mainstream Funding
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 22.5
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012.
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All service users
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

### **3. COMMENTARY**

#### **Introduction**

3.1 Section 39(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places a duty on the Local Authority, Police, Probation and Health (Clinical Commissioning Group) partners to form a Youth Offending Service (YOS). Additional partners may also be recruited to support the YOS and indeed this is recommended in best practice guidance provided by the Youth Justice Board. The primary function of the YOS partnership is to:

- coordinate the provision of youth justice services for all those in the authority's area who need them
- to carry out the functions assigned in the local authority's youth justice plan
- to reduce young people offending and reoffending.

3.2 The work of the YOS is overseen at a local level by a YOS Management Board who provide strategic direction at a local level and produce the annual Local Youth Justice Plan with agreed priorities and objectives.

3.3 The performance of the YOS against national priorities and standards is overseen by HM Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP). In addition to Full Joint Inspections by HMIP, thematic inspections are also undertaken. The Bromley YOS had a Full Core Case Inspection in 2012 and achieved the highest score in all three categories requiring 'Minimum Improvement', one of only a few YOTs nationally, it also has had safeguarding thematic inspection in November 2013 and received positive feedback.

3.4 The current Full Joint Inspection was undertaken on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2015 and consisted of two fieldwork weeks with eight inspectors on site. Inspectors consisted of a team of inspectors drawn from HMIP Probation, Ofsted (Children's Social Care), Care Quality Commission (Health) and the Police. The outcome of the inspection was disappointing with four out of six key judgements considered to be poor, 1 unsatisfactory and 1 satisfactory (Appendix 1).

#### **3.5 Summary of Recent Inspection Outcomes**

##### **3.5.1 Reducing reoffending**

Overall work to reduce reoffending was judged as poor. Information to courts to help with sentencing was generally good and efforts were made to understand why children and young people were offending.

##### **3.5.2 Protecting the public**

Overall work to protect the public and actual or potential victims was judged as poor. Neither the assessment of the risk that children and young people posed to others, or the planning to manage that risk and protect the public, was done well enough.

##### **3.5.3 Protecting children and young people**

Overall work to protect children and young people and reduce their vulnerability was judged as unsatisfactory. Too often, case managers did not recognise what needed to be done to protect a child or young person.

##### **3.5.4 Ensuring the sentence is served**

Overall work to ensure that the sentence was served was judged to be satisfactory. Case managers and other YOS staff identified and recognised the diversity needs of children and young people and engaged well with them. Inspectors commented on a number of cases that case managers had a clear understanding of the issues.

### 3.5.5 Governance and partnership

Overall, the effectiveness of governance and partnership arrangements was judged as poor. The separation of the YOS management into operational and strategic levels was not working effectively.

### 3.5.6 Interventions to reduce offending

Overall, the delivery and management of interventions to reduce reoffending was judged as poor. Children and young people had to 'fit in' to a group work schedule whether it was the right time to deliver the work to them or not.

## 3.6 Improvement Plan

3.6.1 The CEO immediately implemented the HMIP recommendations to create a single, strengthened YOT Management Board with senior representation. The Board is chaired by the CEO and has met on three occasions.

3.6.2 An Improvement Plan (Appendix 2) has been developed and agreed by the YOS Management Board to address the following areas which incorporate the outcomes:

- Leadership and Partnership
- Quality
- Looked After Children
- The Voice of the Young Person.

3.6.3 Work is being undertaken by the Head of Service to action the plan with the support of the Youth Justice Board (YJB) and this is being overseen by the Assistant Director for Children's Social Care. A monthly "Improvement Board" meeting is held with the above attendees to monitor the progress of the plan, with a report on progress being provided to the YOS Management Board. A mock inspection will be undertaken by the YJB at the end of January 2016, in preparation for a re-inspection by HMIP.

## 4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Whilst there are no specific resource implications arising from this report, the Inspection raises a number of areas which could involve changed investment or use of resources. Any specific resource implication arising from the Improvement Plan will be presented to the Portfolio Holder as appropriate.

## 5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

HMIP have a statutory duty to inspect YOS and it is also required to make its report available to the public.


## 6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

Any personnel implications arising from the improvement plan to address the issues raised by the inspection will be presented to the Portfolio Holder as appropriate.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Policy Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	[Title of document and date]

This page is left intentionally blank





# Full Joint Inspection of Youth Offending Work in Bromley

An inspection led by HMI Probation



# Foreword

This inspection of youth offending work in Bromley is one of a small number of full joint inspections that we are undertaking annually with colleagues from the criminal justice, social care, health and learning and skills inspectorates.

We chose to inspect in Bromley primarily because reoffending rates had been rising for some time and were worse than the national average. Custody rates had also risen, bucking the national trend and offending by Looked After Children was higher than average.

Bromley had achieved a reduction in the number of children and young people entering the youth justice system and the most recent published data showed a reduction in reoffending, however, the numbers reoffending remained higher than the average in England and Wales at 43.6% compared with 35.7%. The use of custody had showed a steady rise, month on month for over a year; the most recent figure being 0.61 per 1000 of the population of 10-17 year olds compared with 0.47 across England and Wales.

The strategic and operational management of Bromley YOS had been separated and was the responsibility of different people. This was not working effectively. There were two management boards in place as a result of an historic decision, one executive, one operational. This arrangement was not working effectively either and resulted in little strategic partnership work. The YOS was well resourced operationally but specialist workers and case managers did not integrate their work. There was some good work to improve physical health and to access education, training and employment. Engagement with children and young people was also good although this needed to improve with parents/carers. Children and young people were not assessed properly for interventions and generally had to 'fit in' with what was being delivered at any one time.

The recommendations made in this report are intended to assist Bromley in its continuing improvement by focusing on specific key areas.



Paul Wilson

*HM Chief Inspector of Probation*

*May 2015*

## Key judgements

<b>Reducing reoffending</b>	★☆☆☆
<b>Protecting the public</b>	★☆☆☆
<b>Protecting children and young people</b>	★★☆☆
<b>Ensuring the sentence is served</b>	★★★☆☆
<b>Governance and partnerships</b>	★☆☆☆
<b>Interventions to reduce reoffending</b>	★☆☆☆

# Summary

## Reducing reoffending

*Overall work to reduce reoffending was poor.* Information to courts to help with sentencing was generally good and efforts were made to understand why children and young people were offending. Planning often did not reflect those reasons and neither assessments nor plans were reviewed well or frequently enough. Outcomes related to education, training or employment were generally good but there was not enough progress made by children and young people towards stopping offending.

## Protecting the public

*Overall work to protect the public and actual or potential victims was poor.* Neither the assessment of the risk that children and young people posed to others, or the planning to manage that risk and protect the public, was done well enough. Too often, the work to protect the public was judged to be not good enough and management oversight was not considered effective in many cases. Where there was an identified victim, however, work to protect them was generally considered to be satisfactory.

## Protecting children and young people

*Overall work to protect children and young people and reduce their vulnerability was unsatisfactory.* Too often, case managers did not recognise what needed to be done to protect a child or young person. The assessment, planning and work to safeguard was not always done well enough and management oversight had not rectified this. Children's social care services withdrew services from children and young people involved with the Youth Offending Service (YOS) when there were still welfare needs.

## Ensuring the sentence is served

*Overall work to ensure that the sentence was served was satisfactory.* Case managers and other YOS staff identified and recognised the diversity needs of children and young people and engaged well with them. Inspectors commented on a number of cases that case managers had a clear understanding of the issues for the child or young person and that they had worked hard to establish good working relationships. Where necessary, the YOS also responded appropriately to a lack of compliance. Involvement with, and engagement of, parents/carers was carried out less routinely.

## Governance and partnerships

*Overall, the effectiveness of governance and partnership arrangements was poor.* The separation of the YOS management into operational and strategic levels was not working effectively. Neither of the two management boards, one operational and one strategic, had supported or held the YOS to account effectively. Data and other information had not been used to scrutinise, monitor or support performance. There was insufficient, effective strategic partnership working yet the YOS was well resourced by partnership agencies.

## Interventions to reduce reoffending

*Overall, the delivery and management of interventions to reduce reoffending was poor.* Children and young people had to 'fit in' to a group work schedule whether it was the right time to deliver the work to them or not. Their suitability or ability to carry out a programme was not assessed. There was little integration of the work that children and young people were undergoing with different workers. The effectiveness of programmes of intervention was not evaluated.

# Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Key judgements</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Theme 1: Reducing reoffending</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Theme 2: Protecting the Public</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Theme 3: Protecting the child or young person</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Theme 4: Ensuring that the sentence is served</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Theme 5: Governance and partnerships</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Theme 6: Interventions to reduce reoffending</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Appendix 1 - Background to the inspection</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Appendix 2 - Acknowledgements</b>	<b>36</b>

# Recommendations

Post-inspection improvement work should focus particularly on achieving the following outcomes within 12 months following publication of this report:

## **The Chair of the YOS Management Board should ensure that:**

- reoffending is reduced and, in particular, reoffending by Looked After Children
- the number of children and young people receiving custodial sentences is reduced to the national average or below
- data is commissioned, scrutinised and used to evaluate and improve outcomes for children and young people who have offended
- partners are involved at an appropriate level of seniority and work together effectively
- links between the strategic and operational work of the YOS work effectively
- the YOS makes an effective, strategic contribution to wider partnerships including the Bromley Safeguarding Children Board and the Safer Bromley Partnership
- children's social care services continue to work with children and young people involved with the YOS where there are outstanding welfare needs
- the variety of the education, training and employment provision is increased.

## **The Head of Youth Support should ensure that:**

- early help services target those children and young people who are already offending and work with the YOS to prevent offending behaviour becoming entrenched
- the standard of assessment, planning and work in the YOS to reduce offending is of good quality and positive outcomes are achieved across all types of interventions
- information is shared and all work with children and young people is coordinated and integrated
- recording of YOS work takes place routinely and expeditiously
- management oversight is effective.

Please note – throughout this report all names referred to in the practice examples have been amended to protect the individual's identity.

# Reducing reoffending

# 1

# Theme 1: Reducing reoffending

## What we expect to see

As the purpose of the youth justice system is to prevent offending by children and young people we expect youth justice partners to increase the likelihood of successful outcomes by undertaking good quality assessment and planning, deliver appropriate interventions and demonstrate both positive leadership and effective management.

## Case assessment score

Within the case assessment, overall 39% of work to reduce reoffending was done well enough.

## Key Findings

1. Efforts were made to understand the reasons that a child or young person was offending but the assessments were not reviewed well or regularly enough.
2. Planning was not judged to be good enough and, again, was not always reviewed during the period of supervision.
3. Overall there was not enough progress by children and young people towards stopping offending.
4. Information to the courts, pre-sentence reports, were generally of good quality.
5. Education, training or employment (ETE) outcomes were largely good, however, post-16 year old outcomes did not match those of the under 16 years age group.

## Explanation of findings

1. Generally, sufficient effort had been made to understand the reasons that children and young people were offending; where this was not the case, it was due to unclear or insufficient information. Reviews of those reasons, and what might reduce them, were either not carried out or were not of good enough quality in too many cases. We found some duplication of effort where both case managers and intensive supervision and surveillance workers were carrying out separate assessments – some of which contradicted each other. Intelligence sharing with the police was not as effective as it should have been.
2. Conversely, pre-sentence reports to assist courts with sentencing were generally of good quality; those that were not judged good enough lacked assessment of vulnerability or the risk of harm posed, or were not sufficiently analytical.
3. Planning in both community and custody cases was not judged to be of good enough quality; nor were plans reviewed sufficiently well. We found insufficient progress in reducing offending-related factors and no identifiable evidence that children and young people were less likely to offend.

## Good practice example

Pam was subject to a Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO) for stealing from her mother. At 16 years old, Pam had been in care for several years. She had a very difficult relationship with her mother and felt that she was not as good, or as loved, as her siblings. The case manager recognised this and one of the actions on Pam's intervention plan was to remind her that she was a capable young woman who could achieve. As a result of the support and guidance given by the case manager, Pam's self-worth had increased and she was better able to deal with her emotions. She had not reoffended and was actively looking to become involved in training and education.



4. In custodial cases, there was not always sufficient focus on resettlement. For example, we were told that substance misuse work was put on hold while children and young people were in custody and that they would be offered an appointment on the day they were released. ETE provision was frequently not in place at release and plans for constructive activity while children and young people were waiting to start college courses were often not carried through.
5. The level of reoffending by Looked After Children had reduced since 2013, at which time a significant proportion of them were reoffending (13.4% compared with the national average which was 6.2%). It was not possible to attribute this reduction to any targeted work streams across the local authority's children's social care services or the YOS.
6. Overall, ETE outcomes for children and young people working with the YOS were good, with most being referred successfully into some form of ETE. YOS information indicated that approximately 74% were in ETE at the end of their order during the period 2013/2014. Within that figure, outcomes were better for the pre-16 year old group at around 88%.

### **Quotes from children and young people about help they had received from the YOS**

*"They've given me loads of support. They've got me into college, they've got me a CSCS card [Construction Skills Certification Scheme], training thing in February. They've done a lot for me. The education man at YOT got me into college. I just asked the man and he said 'are you interested in getting into college?' and I said 'yeh, I'd love to do that' and he said 'what are you interested in?' and I said 'something physical like construction or something' and he went away and a couple of weeks later he said 'I've got you a starting date'. So I started. I started attending college and obviously I was attending regular so he decided to pick me to go on this course because I was like a trusted person who'd actually attend, so I did that. He even said, when I've finished I could go up and sit with him in the jobcentre; that's where he's based, and he'd help me next to him on the computers, so I could revise next to him and he'd help me."*

*"It would be cool if it was stuff that was actually going to help me; they help me to not reoffend but then I need stuff that is going to help me get a job, stuff that is actually good for me when I finish here."*

7. The local authority education team worked with the YOS to intervene quickly to develop strategies where children and young people were in danger of being excluded. They worked with the school to maintain their learning and, where this was not possible, other options were found.
8. For those children and young people who were not in ETE or were in danger of becoming so, the youth support worker carried out an assessment of the barriers and produced an action plan which focused on the steps that were necessary to progress. Case managers and the youth support worker worked hard to find alternative placements.
9. The recording of education and training interventions was generally very good by the education welfare officer and the youth support worker within their own respective systems. It was clear in these systems what progress has been made by the child or young person and whether the original objectives were achieved. However, the same level of information was not sufficiently well communicated to all YOS staff working with the child or young person.
10. Health workers generally worked well with children and young people. There was evidence that they had built professional relationships and offered both one-to-one and group interventions. We observed that children and young people felt able to ask questions about sensitive areas in a safe environment and that staff dealt with these questions in a professional and open manner. A counsellor was employed to carry out anger management sessions.

11. There was confusion between health staff and case managers about when health referrals should be made. Very recent changes in the health screening process meant that all children and young people would now be subject to a physical and mental health screening at pre-sentence stage.


### **Case illustration**

Jack was a 16 year old sentenced to a 12 month YRO for theft from a shop. The case manager identified early in the order that Jack had some difficulties engaging with her. She met with the Speech and Language Therapist (SALT) to gain a better understanding of his special educational need (SEN) statement and language difficulties. As a result the case manager was better able to plan her sessions and use different approaches where appropriate. This resulted in Jack retaining more of the information that was discussed.

## Data Summary

The following chart summarises data from some of the key questions assessed during the inspection of cases. [NB: 34 cases were inspected. However, the total answers may not equal this, since some questions may not have been applicable to every case.]

### Reducing Reoffending



# Protecting the Public

# 2

## Theme 2: Protecting the Public

### What we expect to see

Victims, and potential victims, of crime have the right to expect that everything reasonable is done to manage the risk of harm posed by children and young people who have offended. We expect to see good quality assessment and planning with the delivery of appropriate interventions, and positive leadership, effective management and partnership work which reduces the risk of harm to others.

### Case assessment score

Within the case assessment, overall 51% of work to protect the public was done well enough.

### Key Findings

1. The risk of harm that children and young people posed to others was not always sufficiently well assessed or regularly and thoroughly reviewed.
2. The planning to protect other people was not good enough in too many cases and often did not reflect the assessed risk of harm.
3. Work to protect the public was not carried out well enough overall although it was better where there was an identified victim.
4. Management oversight of this area of work was generally not effective.
5. Information and intelligence was not always shared or effectively used.


### Explanation of findings

1. The risk of harm posed to other people was not sufficiently well understood, nor was it reviewed well enough. Planning to manage the risk of harm was not timely or good enough in many cases and, too often, planned interventions to manage or reduce the risk of harm were not consistent with the assessment or were not delivered.
2. Where there was an identified victim, the risk of harm had been effectively managed. Overall however, the work to effectively manage the risk of harm posed by children and young people was not carried out well enough and management oversight was not effective in ensuring that good quality work was delivered.
3. Bromley was not officially designated as a 'gangs area', although it was surrounded by boroughs that were, and as such it had a multi-agency panel including representatives from education, housing, YOS and mental health services, that met monthly to discuss emerging youth gang issues. This was primarily an intelligence sharing meeting. Recently, a bid had been submitted for funding to conduct an education programme in schools to prevent children and young people being drawn into gangs.
4. We saw evidence that health staff attended multi-agency meetings including those under the Deter Young Offender (DYO)<sup>1</sup> scheme and internal risk panel meetings. This helped to ensure there was a health perspective offered.
5. Although we were told that police intelligence was easily accessible, we saw a number of cases where intelligence had not been accessed or used effectively by case managers.

<sup>1</sup> The Youth Justice Board define DYO's as being those that are likely to cause the most harm to communities and pose a high risk of reoffending. Local authorities should have arrangements in place to identify, and work with, those children and young people who meet the criteria.

## Data Summary

The following chart summarises data from some of the key questions assessed during the inspection of cases. [NB: 34 cases were inspected. However, the total answers may not equal this, since some questions may not have been applicable to every case.]



# **Protecting the child or young person**

# **3**

## Theme 3: Protecting the child or young person

### What we expect to see

Whether the vulnerability of children and young people is due to the consequences of their own behaviour or the behaviour of others, we expect to see that they are kept safe and their vulnerability is reduced. This should be through good quality assessment and planning with the delivery of appropriate interventions, positive leadership and management, and an effective contribution to multi-agency child protection arrangements.

### Case assessment score

Within the case assessment, overall 55% of work to protect children and young people and reduce their vulnerability was done well enough.

### Key Findings

1. The work to assess, plan and deliver work to keep the child or young person safe was not carried out well enough. Case managers often did not identify what needed to be done.
2. Management oversight of this work was judged to be ineffective.
3. The contribution of physical health work to promote well-being was a strength.
4. Children's social care services too often withdrew services from children and young people involved with the YOS when welfare needs remained outstanding.

### Explanation of findings

1. In too many cases, sufficient effort to understand and explain vulnerability and safeguarding needs was not made. Although assessments were carried out, there was no coherent, joined-up analysis of what risk the child or young person was at as a result of the various factors identified. It was not surprising therefore, that the planning to protect was also not done sufficiently well; case managers, too often, did not recognise what interventions were required. Reviews of both the needs of the child or young person and the plans were not carried out regularly or well enough.
2. The work carried out to safeguard the child or young person was often not consistent with the assessment of need or the plans; there was no clear link between what was needed and what was carried out. In too many cases there was not sufficient active or effective work to safeguard the child or young person. In particular, we judged that work to address emotional or mental health issues and alcohol abuse had not been delivered effectively in enough cases. This was, in some instances, as a result of a lack of referral to those specialist services.

### Case illustration

**B**rian is 15 years old and had been sentenced to an 18 month YRO for burglary and driving offences. The case manager had worked with Brian for over 12 months and had developed a good relationship with him. As a result of a number of physical health concerns, the case manager challenged his father about Brian's reluctance to access medical help. Following a hospital visit for a broken foot the case manager realised that Brian's reluctance was actually a direct result of his father's fear of medical interventions. The case manager encouraged Brian to have further health assessments and also involved children's social care services regarding his father's lack of care for Brian's health. As a result, Brian accessed help and his anxiety about receiving medical intervention was reduced.




3. In the small number of custodial cases that we inspected, we judged that the transition from custody to community was generally managed well in regard to vulnerability and safeguarding need. Overall, we judged that the YOS had too often not done enough to keep the child or young person safe and that management oversight of this area of work had not been effective.
4. YOS staff were routinely invited to, and attended, planning meetings with partner agencies. These included regular involvement in child protection conferences and core groups. Invitations to YOS and attendance by YOS staff at Looked After Children and care leaver reviews and planning meetings were more variable. Information was routinely exchanged at these meetings however the action plans did not set specific tasks for YOS staff over and above their general monitoring role. This seldom added value or maximised the likelihood of children and young people being protected or their welfare needs being met. YOS staff did work collaboratively alongside staff from partner agencies although joint work and joint visits, where these would have been beneficial, were seldom evident.
5. Communication between YOS staff and partner agencies did take place at key events, but most case files seen did not show regular information sharing between agencies outside of key planning meetings. For example, YOS staff reported that often they were not kept sufficiently up to date with what was happening with Looked After Children with whom they were working and relied more on residential placements or carers than social workers for information.
6. Clear information was provided by YOS staff to support referrals to children's social care services, although not all staff understood the thresholds and, where they had referred concerns, they did not routinely know the outcome.
7. Health staff did not routinely attend planning and review meetings; there were limited integrated health targets within plans and a lack of clarity about whether health outcomes had been achieved. Notwithstanding this, work to promote physical health, where it had been identified as necessary, was delivered well. Amongst other things, the nurse was able to supply and administer some medicines to children and young people promptly without the need for a doctor's authorisation. These included immunizations and antibiotics for sexually transmitted infections.
8. It was of concern that there were a number of examples where health staff had not felt that it was appropriate, due to confidentiality, to share information with case managers. These included misuse of Class A drugs and low level self-harm. There was little recognition that this information was needed to help assess overall vulnerability and protect the child or young person. Case managers reported that they felt that they did not always receive sufficient or timely information about the interventions delivered and that the approach was "*disjointed*".

## Data Summary

The following chart summarises data from some of the key questions assessed during the inspection of cases. [NB: 34 cases were inspected. However, the total answers may not equal this, since some questions may not have been applicable to every case.]

### Protecting the Child or Young Person



**Ensuring that  
the sentence  
is served**

**4**

## Theme 4: Ensuring that the sentence is served

### What we expect to see

Children and young people should serve their sentences as the court intends. We expect that the YOT will maximise the likelihood of successful outcomes by effective engagement with them and their families, responding to relevant diversity factors including paying attention to their health and well-being, and taking appropriate action if they do not comply.

### Case assessment score

Within the case assessment overall 65% of work to ensure the sentence was served was done well enough.

### Key Findings

1. Engagement of children and young people by case managers and other YOS staff was a strength and diverse, individual needs were recognised.
2. The involvement of parents/carers was not given sufficient attention.
3. Overall the YOS responded appropriately to lack of compliance.

### Explanation of findings

1. We judged that efforts to understand the diverse and individual needs of children and young people, and to engage with them, were a strength.

### Case illustration

Ben is 15 years old and received a YRO for burglary offences. He had a history of similar offending linked with funding the use of cannabis. He had been diagnosed as suffering from Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and social isolation. The YOT case manager recognised that Ben had worked with a lot of different case managers and had not always complied with his orders. To try to better engage Ben, the case manager included an objective in his intervention plan:

*'to establish a working relationship with Ben as he has had a lot of change in regards to YOS officers and appears to be unhappy that he has to disclose all of the information about himself again'.*

As a result of being seen both at home and at the YOS office to further this objective, Ben's compliance improved and he was able to work with his new case manager.

### Quotes from children and young people about their case managers

*"I think I get on well with her... I can ask her things and she knows the answers...she gives me good advice."*

*"She talks to me with respect. She treats me how she'd want to be treated, so I respect that. So then that's why I respect her."*

*"I just know that there is someone always there to support me if you know I ever feel like I might go and do something that I shouldn't do."*

### **Comments from inspectors about case managers' efforts to engage children and young people**

*"The case manager inherited the case making him the young person's third case manager. He appeared to build a relationship quite quickly with the young person, meeting the family and establishing the needs of the young person quickly."*

*"The case manager has a clear understanding of the issues relating to the young person and his needs. Her relationship with the young person is also clearly supportive and engaging."*

*"The case manager built a good relationship with the young person and tried to work in a responsive and flexible way."*

2. In particular, it was evident that children and young people were involved in the preparation of their pre-sentence report which largely paid good attention to their individual needs.
3. This did not always follow through into the planning unfortunately. The involvement of parents/carers also needed to increase; assessments did not reflect their views and they were not sufficiently involved in planning or reviews.

### **Views of parents/carers about the work of the YOS**

*"Yeah, very supportive. I think my opinion was taken on board quite a lot."*

*"I just think they've really helped him in terms of keeping focused, given him a lot of support, a lot of time."*

*"They are doing all they can at the moment and they have done a good job."*

*"In my honest opinion, they've done more than enough for him, they've got him back into mainstream education. I'm very happy, they couldn't have done anymore. He's been out of school, when he was in pupil referral unit he never went there, you know they got him in college. Oh it's brilliant, different kid, different kid, it feels like I've got my old child back."*

### **And conversely**

*"There ain't no support for family. There needs to be more support for family."*

*"It was a complete waste of time. They didn't offer him nothing. I think they made him do a few written pages here and there but he didn't come out with nothing new from there."*

*"I asked them to help him to get to college and they gave him something to fill out and send off. He hasn't been at school since he was 11 years old. He needed help with that, that's what I requested from them and they never got round to it. Then he got this 4 months thingy [order] I said 'well while he's got this can we make some use of it and try to help him get back into education. They did nothing.'"*

4. There was good attention paid to health and well-being outcomes and, where this was not the case, it was generally because referrals had not been made or the work was not well coordinated.
5. Where children and young people did not comply with their order, the response of the YOS was generally active and sufficient to get them back on track. Where this was not the case, it was largely because unacceptable misses had not been recognised as such or acted upon.


### **Inspector's comments about work while the young person was in custody**

It was evident that the case manager was a strong advocate for Kyle. This involved liaison with a Barnados advocate while he was in custody. The case manager had tried to be flexible in her approach with Kyle and was creative in ways to get him to comply and engage. She had recognised the importance of understanding Kyle in relation to the community in which he lived and was keen to see him at venues away from YOS as this helped with compliance and engagement. The case manager had also developed links with Kyle's significant others in an attempt to secure better compliance.

## Data Summary

The following chart summarises data from some of the key questions assessed during the inspection of cases. [NB: 34 cases were inspected. However, the total answers may not equal this, since some questions may not have been applicable to every case.]

### Ensuring that the Sentence is Served



# **Governance and partnerships**

# **5**



# Theme 5: Governance and partnerships

## What we expect to see

Effective governance, partnership and management arrangements are in place. These enable the YOT to meet national and local criminal justice and related objectives, and to deliver and maintain good quality services.

## Key Findings

1. The management of the YOS was separated into operational and strategic levels and was not working effectively.
2. There were two management boards, one operational and one strategic. Neither had supported or held the YOS to account effectively. This had been recognised and changes were already taking place.
3. Data and other information had not been used to scrutinise, monitor or support performance. This had been recognised and plans were in place to improve it.
4. There was insufficient, effective strategic partnership working; agencies tended to operate independently of each other.
5. The YOS was well resourced by partnership agencies and there was some excellent work but it was not always well integrated.

## Explanation of findings

### 1. Leadership and governance – offending is reduced and other criminal justice and related objectives are met

- 1.1. The strategic and operational management of Bromley YOS had been separated. The overall, and strategic, management of the YOS sat with the Head of Youth Support while the operational management sat with a group manager. This was not working effectively. Communication links were insufficient and role boundaries were blurred.
- 1.2. There were two management boards in place as a result of an historic decision. One, the executive board, was chaired by the local authority chief executive and the senior, strategic representatives from the partner agencies sat on this board. With the exception of a briefing about the forthcoming inspection, it had not met for over a year. The second, known as the operational board, was chaired by the Assistant Director, Safeguarding & Social Care and comprised mainly operational managers. The Head of Youth Support attended the operational board.
- 1.3. Health professionals sat on both boards; attendance, particularly at the operational board, was poor and those in attendance were not able to make the decisions needed. Attendance by the police representative was regular, but again, she was not able to make strategic decisions or commit resources. The problem of seniority had been recognised recently and was being addressed. The board member for ETE, who was of appropriate seniority, had held the position for around five months.
- 1.4. The level and quality of information to the operational board was insufficient in all areas including ETE, health, accommodation and offending behaviour and had not been challenged. This had recently been recognised and change was planned.
- 1.5. We could see that some changes had occurred as a result of the operational board, such as the engagement of a SALT worker, albeit at a slow pace.

- 1.6. The YOS was not sufficiently engaged in the strategic leadership of safeguarding or corporate parenting across the local authority. The Head of Youth Support was not a member of the Bromley Safeguarding Children Board (BSCB); there was representation on some of the sub-groups. YOS issues had been brought to the BSCB at the board's request, rather than being instigated by the YOS. No formal links had been established between the BSCB and the YOS, and although some representatives sat on both boards, there was little evidence to demonstrate that the YOS influenced safeguarding work across the partnership or that the specific needs of children and young people who had offended were being routinely considered.
- 1.7. Offending by Looked After Children had not been fully considered within the local authority corporate parenting strategic management and while the data showed that offending by this group had reduced, there was no evidence that this was as a result of strategic efforts by the local authority.

## **2. Partnerships – effective partnerships make a positive difference**

- 2.1. Strategic links across the partnership were fragmented and ineffective in supporting and challenging the YOS. We saw very little joined-up, solution-focused strategic partnership work.
- 2.2. As an example, we were told that, in Bromley, there was a small but significant number of children and young people responsible for committing a large number of theft and burglary offences. While each organisation appeared committed to working on this, there was no coordinated partnership plan at either a tactical or operational level to address it. While operational DYO meetings took place in the YOS, involving a number of operational partners, these arrangements had clearly been ineffective at preventing the children and young people in this cohort from reoffending.
- 2.3. Similarly, we were advised that a significant number of repeat offenders, known to other agencies, were not known to the YOS until their offending became entrenched and more difficult to address. The partnership links at the operational board had not resulted in a multi-agency approach to this being considered.
- 2.4. The YOS had access to the local authority children's social care services electronic case file system. This enabled case managers to see what work was being undertaken by social workers. However, information held on this system was not always readily accessible, with some information not recorded or easy to locate.
- 2.5. In cases where the child or young person had resisted engaging with professionals from other agencies, YOS staff were often left with little effective support from partners. Children's social care services 'step down' processes, from child protection to children in need and then to universal services, were sometimes implemented at too fast a rate, without adequately addressing the ongoing issues of concern, or ensuring that any improvements had been sustained. In these cases YOS staff were left to tackle longstanding welfare issues for those children and young people in addition to the offending issues. Partner agencies were sometimes reluctant to become re-involved with those young people, even where they had been very recently involved. This negatively impacted on the welfare of those particular children and young people, sometimes resulting in homelessness, substance misuse and repeat offending. While YOS staff did challenge other services, no use had been made of local authority formal escalation procedures, to ensure that the needs of these children and young people were properly addressed.
- 2.6. The provision for further education within the Bromley area was not extensive although the colleges and training providers were generally good. Bromley College had recently started to provide more flexible provision, better tailored to the individual needs of children and young people working with the YOS. Courses provided opportunities to develop skills to enable them to progress into training or employment. Opportunities for children and young people to improve their English and mathematics were generally good but more flexible courses were needed.

- 2.7. The variety of opportunities outside the main college provision to develop employability skills was insufficient. The pupil referral unit had been found to require improvement by Ofsted in July 2014. This provision was now part of the Bromley Academy Alternative Trust with a clear improvement plan in place. It was recognised by the board that the suitability of the provision was the main problem. Plans were in place to develop a multi-skills course for hard to engage YOS children and young people (pre-16) that will be put in place during 2016.
- 2.8. Links made by the YOS with the local college were developing and were benefiting children and young people by helping to identify the type of support that they needed to attend college courses. The youth support worker had started to build partnerships with local organisations to help develop and extend the provision. For example, a link with an housing association (Affinity Sutton) had led to developing Construction Skills Certification Scheme training for children and young people from the YOS; this was due to start imminently, and was to take place at the YOS premises. A recent link developed with the local jobcentre had led to a scheme using local employers to undertake mock interviews and offer opportunities for work experience; again, this was due to start over the next few months.
- 2.9. The YOS panel which considered children and young people not in ETE, met monthly. It was working well to develop an understanding of the characteristics of those in this group. A good level of information on individual progress identified what was proving successful. The panel provided good opportunities to develop internal partnership working, linking the youth support programme, 16-19 Education Commissioner, Bromley Mentoring Programme and the Bromley Education Business Partnership. The information from these meetings was starting to be used to with providers to shape provision.

### **3. Workforce management – effective workforce management supports quality service delivery**

- 3.1. All practitioners interviewed said that they felt that their supervisors had the skills and knowledge to assess their work and to supervise, support and help them improve their practice. Most thought that the management oversight/countersigning process was adequate. It was our judgement however, that supervision and other quality assurance processes had not made a positive difference to most of the cases we inspected.
- 3.2. YOS staff understood their roles and responsibilities in relation to identifying and referring concerns about vulnerable children and young people to partner agencies. They had attended a range of safeguarding training courses, which enabled them to identify concerns. They routinely discussed concerns with their managers and other colleagues, many of whom were social work trained. This was enhanced by workers from other agencies, such as social workers, routinely visiting the YOS as part of their induction to better understand respective roles and responsibilities. YOS staff had received training on, and were familiar with, issues of child sexual exploitation. They had also received *AIM 2* training which focuses on children and young people who have carried out sexually harmful behaviour.
- 3.3. The police officers in the YOS were not co-located with other YOS staff; they worked from Bromley police station. There was a sense from existing YOS staff that police work was not fully embedded and a corresponding view from the police officers that the provision of information to them from the YOS was not as good as it should be. We heard reference during staff interviews to "*council YOS*" and "*police YOS*".
- 3.4. A vast amount of police time was spent carrying out administration, which included searching the custody recording system for details of children and young people arrested in the borough; checking, updating and forwarding notifications of incidents to other agencies, and updating records. While these processes were useful, they did not seem to us to be tasks that needed to be carried out by police officers and were not the best use of their time. More useful, in our view, was their attendance at risk panels and DYO meetings.

- 3.5. Generally, the police officers' role and tasks complied with official guidance. The exception was managing the interface between Integrated Offender Management and the YOS where children and young people were approaching 18 years old. The new model of policing in the Metropolitan Police area is intended to bring IOM and YOS police officers closer together under a common management structure spanning all aspects of offender management.

### **Good practice example**

The YOS police officers attended quarterly forums (along with the other YOS police officers from across the London Metropolitan Police Service). These meetings were used to share information relevant to the role and best practice.

- 3.6. Bromley was a well-resourced YOS in regard to health services. The health team comprised a substance misuse worker, a part-time nurse, a part-time counsellor and a dedicated Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) worker based at the YOS for three days per week. Bromley Young Persons Alcohol and Substance Service (BYPASS) was the local drug and alcohol service for children and young people. They dealt with the cases that required Tier 3 services (structured community-based treatment) and pathways were in place for the YOS to refer.

### **Good practice example**

The YOS had a pilot involving a SALT worker. Part of this pilot included delivering training to staff to increase their awareness of speech and language difficulties and help them identify when a child or young person needed an assessment or extra support. It was evident that case managers had used the SALT worker to gain advice to allow them to adapt their practice with individual children and young people.

- 3.7. The working agreements and protocols between the YOS and health agencies were out of date, some by several years, and two were not signed by both organisations. They had not been reviewed to ensure that the correct level of service and support for staff was being provided. As an example of this, the CAMHS nurse was based at the YOS three days a week and two days at the wider CAMHS service dealing with mainly emergency cases. These emergency cases often needed follow-up appointments in the week and therefore impacted on the time at the YOS. The managers of both CAMHS and the YOS were aware of this but had not resolved the issue.
- 3.8. Managerial supervision for health staff did not always occur on a monthly basis. The health practitioners, with the exception of the substance misuse worker, received clinical supervision. It was of concern that the substance misuse worker did not. We were informed by the commissioner that procedures were in place for it to be carried out by BYPASS; this conflicted with information from BYPASS. The substance misuse worker had not accessed any recent role specific training or attended team meetings with BYPASS for approximately 18 months.
- 3.9. The educational welfare service provided an experienced education welfare officer to work within the YOS. The priority was to work with children and young people of school age without an educational placement. The YOS and the education welfare officer worked well together to reintegrate children and young people back into education. The targeted youth support worker was seconded in to work with post 16 year old children and young people who were not in ETE. The post of teacher at the YOS was vacant.

#### **4. Learning organisation – learning and improvement leads to positive outcomes**

- 4.1. Not all staff thought that the YOS had a culture of learning and continual improvement.
- 4.2. We saw no evidence that the YOS or the Management Board used performance data or other information such as feedback from children and young people to improve practice or outcomes. There were no partnerships with local universities or other research or management facilities to evaluate and aid the work of the YOS.

# **Interventions to reduce reoffending**

# **6**

# Theme 6: Interventions to reduce reoffending

## What we expect to see

The work with children and young people to reduce reoffending should include a broad range of good quality interventions. They should take into account individual need and ability, be delivered well and be monitored and evaluated to ensure their effectiveness. Where children and young people are working with more than one agency, partnership work should be integrated.

## Case assessment score

Within the case assessment overall 43% of interventions to reduce reoffending were done well enough.

## Key Findings

1. Programmes were delivered sporadically and children and young people had to 'fit in' to the schedule.
2. The effectiveness of programmes was not evaluated.
3. There was no assessment of the suitability and ability of a child or young person to carry out particular programmes.
4. Work being carried out with individual children and young people by different practitioners was not integrated.
5. The delivery of programmes by different agencies was fragmented and, as a result, resources were wasted.

## Explanation of findings

1. The YOS produced a menu of programmes to be delivered over the forthcoming quarter. The programmes included health work such as 'Healthier Living', offending behaviour work, 'Victim Awareness' and life skills such as 'First Aid' and 'Streetlife' which focused on stop and search powers. Other programmes such as 'Weapons Awareness' ran at different intervals. There was some confusion, during the inspection, about who was running the 'Weapons Awareness' course. We observed a session run by the YOS. This was a surprise to the police who thought that theirs was the agency that ran this programme.
2. The 'Healthier Living' group was reported to be a positive intervention by case managers. It had been carried out on a 'one off' basis and had covered emotional and mental health, sexual health and substance misuse. There were concerns however, that health staff did not always have sufficient information about the children and young people in the group, including the nature of their offence. The nurse was also trained to offer smoking cessation, however no children and young people had taken up this programme.
3. The targeted youth support worker ran a structured employability course 'Future prospects' at the YOS which provided opportunities to discuss future employment objectives. Children and young people received good support in helping them develop employability skills, such as curriculum vitae building, job search, college applications and interview techniques. Those who lacked confidence were accompanied to college interviews.
4. Bromley Police ran a cadet scheme for those aged between 11 and 17, who lived or studied in the borough. The YOS was able to refer children and young people to the cadets as an intervention.



5. Some of the recording of individual interventions was so poor that it was impossible to say what work had been carried out with children and young people. Where we could determine what had been delivered, the interventions were, too often, not consistent with the reasons for offending.
6. As far as we could ascertain, less than half of the interventions planned were actually delivered; it was unclear why this was the case. They were not reviewed, so that no account was taken of whether the work was making a difference, whether the child or young person's circumstances had changed or just whether they were responding. Too few took account of the need to manage risk of harm and only slightly more took account of vulnerability factors. Restorative justice did not feature sufficiently in delivered interventions, nor did the support for positive factors in the child or young person's life. The delivery of interventions in custody was particularly lacking.

### **Quotes from children and young people about offending behaviour work**

*"It made me aware of other people's feelings, made me aware that not everyone is the same that you shouldn't treat everyone on the basis of how you think they should be, you should treat them on how they are."*

*"I had to write a letter to the woman, to the victim and then we were just talking about how crime or being a victim can change people like. Say someone got robbed and how they'd be scared to do certain things or paranoid and what not and we just had conversations about what I could do to help and that stuff. I got an understanding of what it feels like to be a victim."*

7. Between practitioners, interventions were not well integrated. Information was not always shared by the various people that were working with a child or young person, meaning that risk or vulnerability were not always fully understood. Interventions overlapped and not all specialists focused on their remit; practitioners were doing some of the same things with individual children and young people. Intelligence was not always known or used effectively. Individual interventions and programmes did not inform each other. We got little sense of coherent, joint working between practitioners within the YOS.
8. We found that children and young people were, too often, referred to programmes as a matter of course, without their suitability for the particular programme being assessed. For example we saw a group work session which involved considerable reading of programme material but the participants' literacy was not known. The decision about when a child or young person undertook a particular piece of work (sequencing) appeared to be a matter of what was available when, rather than being delivered when it would be most suitable and useful. None of the programmes had been evaluated to determine their effectiveness.



# Appendices

# Appendix 1 - Background to the inspection

## Inspection arrangements

The Full Joint Inspection (FJI) programme inspects youth offending work, predominantly in statutory community and custodial cases, in a small number of local authority areas each year.

The majority of the Youth Offending Teams selected for these inspections are those whose performance – based on reoffending rates, National Youth Justice Outcome Indicators and supported by other information, such as recent inspections – is of significant concern. Periodically, we also include high performing areas to establish a benchmark of good practice.

The primary purpose of the Youth Justice System is to reduce offending. This is the main theme of the inspection. The other core themes are protecting the public, protecting the child or young person, ensuring the sentence is served and governance and partnerships.

## Criteria

A copy of the inspection criteria is available on the HMI Probation website:

<http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/about-our-inspections/youth-inspection-programmes/inspecting-youth-offending-work/full-joint-inspection/>

## Methodology

YOTs are informed approximately 11 working days prior to the inspection taking place.

Fieldwork for this inspection was undertaken on the weeks commencing:

19 January 2015 and 2 February 2015.

In the first fieldwork week we looked at a representative sample of 34 individual cases up to 12 months old, some current, others terminated. The sample included a number of those who are a high risk of harm to others, are particularly vulnerable, are young women, or are black and minority ethnic children and young people. Cases were assessed by a team of inspection staff. They examined these wherever possible with case managers, who were invited to discuss their work in depth, explain their thinking and identify supporting evidence in the record.

We also received copies of relevant local documents.

During the week in between, the data from the case inspections was collated and a picture about the quality of the work of the YOT developed.

The second fieldwork week is the joint element of the inspection. HMI Probation was joined by colleague inspectors from police, health, social care and education. We explored the lines of enquiry which emerged from the case inspections. The leadership, management and partnership elements of the inspection were assessed, with a particular focus on reducing offending.

We also gathered the views of others, including strategic managers, staff and service users – children and young people, parents/carers and victims, and observed work taking place.

At the end of the second fieldwork week we presented our findings to local strategic managers, the YOT Management Team, YOT staff and other interested parties.

UserVoice<sup>2</sup> undertook a total of 20 one to one interviews for the purpose of this report. These interviews were semi-structured in nature and digitally recorded, transcribed and analysed.

### **Children and young people**

- 7 children and young people currently engaging with Bromley YOS were interviewed.
- The age range of the children and young people was from 15 to 18 years old; 4 were 16 years of age with one 15, 17 and 18 year old respectively.
- 6 of the children and young people interviewed were male and one was female.
- 4 of the interviewees were from a White British background, with 1 coming from a Black African, Black British and Dual Heritage background.

### **Parents/carers**

12 parents/carers were interviewed.

- 8 parents/carers were female, 4 were male.
- All the 8 were mothers, 3 of the males were fathers and 1 was a brother.
- 4 of the parents/carers were from a White British background, 2 from a British Caribbean background, 2 chose not to disclose, while 1 was from a Black African, Oriental, Middle Eastern and Dual Heritage background respectively.

### **Scoring Approach**

Details of how our inspection judgements are made can be found on our website.

<http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/about-our-inspections/youth-inspection-programmes/inspecting-youth-offending-work/full-joint-inspection/>

### **Publication arrangements**

A draft report is sent to the YOT for comment three weeks after the inspection, with publication approximately six weeks later. In addition, a copy goes to the relevant Ministers, other inspectorates, the Ministry of Justice Policy Group and the YJB. Copies are made available to the press and placed on our website.

FJI reports in Wales are published in both Welsh and English.

Further details about how these inspections are conducted can be found on our website in the document '*Framework for FJI Inspection Programme*' at:

<http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/about-our-inspections/youth-inspection-programmes/inspecting-youth-offending-work/full-joint-inspection/>

---

2 User Voice is a charity, led by majority ex-offenders, which aims to reduce offending by presenting the voice of the people in the criminal justice system: [www.uservice.org](http://www.uservice.org)

## **Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice**

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

[www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation](http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation)

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  
1st Floor, Manchester Civil Justice Centre  
1 Bridge Street West  
Manchester  
M3 3FX

## Appendix 2

### Acknowledgements

<b>Lead Inspector</b>	Jane Attwood, <i>HMI Probation</i>
<b>Deputy Lead Inspector</b>	Yvonne McGuckian, <i>HMI Probation</i>
<b>Inspection Team</b>	Joe Coleshill, <i>HMI Probation</i> Verity Southwell, <i>Local Assessor</i> Catherine Raycraft, <i>Care Quality Commission</i> Paul Eveliegh, <i>HMI Constabulary</i> Pietro Batista, <i>Ofsted Social Care</i> Steve Miller, <i>Ofsted Learning and Skills</i> Shauna Dacres, <i>User Engagement Officer, User Voice</i>
<b>HMI Probation Support Services</b>	Joanna Hewitt, <i>Support Services Officer</i> Rob Turner, <i>Support Services Manager</i> Oliver Kenton, <i>Assistant Research Officer</i> Alex Pentecost, <i>Communications Manager</i>
<b>Assistant Chief Inspector</b>	Helen Mercer, <i>HMI Probation</i>



IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS	
<b>LEADERSHIP &amp; PARTNERSHIPS</b> (1) Ensure there is effective governance, partnership and management arrangements are in place. The governance arrangements will ensure that the YOS meets local and national criminal justice targets and objectives, and maintain good quality services.	a	Create a single Strategic YOS Management Board, with Senior agency representation.	YOS to be given clear strategic direction.	<b>Acting Chair of the Management Board (Kay Weiss)</b>	Commence: May 2015 Complete: July 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YOS Board membership has been reviewed and includes senior agency representation.</li> <li>First meeting held May 2015.</li> <li>Doug Patterson appointed Chair</li> <li>Meetings will take place every other month.</li> </ul>
	b	Undertake a <u>GAP analysis</u> of the management Board in line with “Modern youth offending partnerships (YJB 2013) and Partners in crime? Findings from inspections on youth offending team partnerships (HM Inspectorate of Probation 2014).	Clear analysis identifying key areas of risk.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service/ Acting Chair of the Management Board (Kay Weiss)</b>	Commence: June 2015 Complete: July 2015 Review: June 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gap Analysis drafted June 2015.</li> <li>Document to be presented to YOS Board for sign off on 14 July 2015</li> </ul>
	c	Create a training plan in conjunction with the YJB, to enable the new Board to have a collective understanding of their roles and responsibility.	Clarification over YOS Board member’s roles and shared responsibilities.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service/Richard Vaughan YJB</b>	Commence: September 2015 Complete: December 2015 Review: Yearly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training/expectations exercise to be undertaken.</li> </ul>
	d	Develop a relevant data report in a clear format for the board to scrutinise monitor or support performance.	Standardisation of data analysis across the YOS to inform decision making and effective challenge.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service/Richard Vaughan YJB/ Pratheepan Jeyapragasam</b>	Commence: July 2015 Complete: August 2015 Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YOS Performance indicator report has been created.</li> <li>National and Local targets have been established.</li> <li>Document to be presented to YOS Board for sign off on 14 July 2015.</li> <li>Business Development Manager and Crime Analyst to meet with a high performing London YOS analysts</li> </ul>
	e	Explore and initiate joint strategic partnerships to meet local and national criminal justice targets and objectives and provide good outcomes for children and young people in or at the margins of the criminal justice system.	Whole system approach established to meet the Youth Justice agenda.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service</b>	Commence: September 2015 Complete: November 2015 Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth Justice to remain a standing item on partner strategic Boards.</li> <li>Meeting dates have been diarised</li> <li>Explore integrated targets</li> <li>Youth Justice Plan</li> </ul>
	f	Restructure the YOS staff structure to ensure that it is fit for purpose. By ensuring all YOS core business is adequately staffed and resourced to meet the needs of children and young people.	Structure to meet the changing landscape.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service/YJB</b>	Commence: August 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a contemporary organisational structure to reflect the partnership and clarify roles/responsibilities</li> <li>Workforce development policy</li> </ul>

IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS	
<b>QUALITY</b> (2) Increase the likelihood of successful outcomes by undertaking good quality assessment and planning, deliver appropriate interventions and demonstrate both positive leadership and effective management.	a	Reintroduce the locally agreed quality assurance audit informed by "infopath" to facilitate improvement.	Quality reports and interventions in place.	Pat Jennings Head of Service/Richard Vaughan YJB	Commence: January 2016 Complete: February 2015 Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review/create/implement QA audit</li> <li>Excel QA from YJB</li> <li>Map "infopath"</li> <li>Training to Managers and staff by YJB</li> <li>Mock inspection and Report by HMIP</li> </ul>
	b	Case files to be (dip sampled) scrutinised by the management team and supervisors during supervision in line with the policy and that this analysis is robust. Managers should record this on CVYJ as a file check.	Quality reports and interventions in place.	Pat Jennings Head of Service	Commence: July 2015 Complete: Ongoing Review: Monthly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supervision Plan has been drafted and disseminated to staff.</li> </ul>
	c	From case file supervision, individual training needs are identified and addressed through team or one to one training sessions where appropriate.	Fully trained staff complement addressing all pertinent youth justice issues.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)/Richard Vaughan YJB	Commence: July 2015 Complete: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PAD's undertaken by management and disseminated to staff</li> <li>Supervision Plan has been drafted and disseminated to staff.</li> </ul>
	d	Develop and embed, QA sessions of Assets and Intervention plans undertaken. Staff will attend and convey learning and reasons for interventions to facilitate active participation in the QA process.	Quality reports and interventions in place.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)/ Richard Vaughan YJB	Commence: July 2015 Complete: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YJB has shared draft QA audit tool training to be arranged.</li> </ul>
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and update Supervision policy in line with CSC</li> <li>Implement and embed supervision audit/reflective observation to be embedded</li> </ul>	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dates arranged</li> <li>YJB APIS training</li> <li>Issues identified through QA</li> <li>The child's journey</li> </ul>	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement and embed QA audit</li> <li>Creation of a managers list of young people at the start and three months to be reviewed</li> <li>Completion rate of audits to be recorded in Performance Digest</li> </ul>	



IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS	
	e	Managers to meet and train prior to implementation to ensure a consistent approach.	Consistently of QA across the management team.	<b>Richard Vaughan YJB</b>	Commence: September 2015 Complete: September 2015 Review: Six monthly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YJB to deliver training on planning and assessment tools.</li> <li>Training day to be arranged.</li> <li>Managers to QA Asset/review with YJB to ensure consistency</li> <li>Training completed</li> </ul>
	f	Children social care QA to audit files to check that appropriate referrals are being made.	Appropriate referrals made to Social Care	CSC	Commence: May 2015 Complete: Ongoing Review: Monthly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Date set for audits</li> <li>Diarised meetings set and sent to staff</li> <li>Audits have been undertaken and are ongoing</li> </ul>
	g	Screening undertaken by specialist workers to ensure appropriate referrals are made.	Young people receive appropriate interventions based on need.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)/CSC	Commence: August 2015 Complete: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial meetings set with YOS and specialist workers (YOS secondees) and CSC</li> <li>Meeting with YOS management and secondees re referrals to specialist services</li> <li>Undertake Pre-sentence planning meetings</li> </ul>
(3) Good quality assessments and planning with the delivery of appropriate interventions, and positive leadership, effective management and partnership work which reduces the risk of harm to others.	a	Evidence of involvement of Social care/ Police/ Probation/Health/ Education/Housing as appropriate to inform assessment and ensure a relevant plan is in place to identify appropriate anticipated outcomes.	All partners information is included in assessments.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)/Richard Vaughan YJB	Commence: September 2015 Complete: Ongoing Review: Monthly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>YJB has shared draft QA audit tool training to be arranged.</li> </ul>
	b	Refresher training in RoH and vulnerability. Staff will convey learning and feedback (recorded) at the next supervision session.	All staff will understand risk of harm and vulnerability issues that relate to young people who offend.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton) Richard Vaughan YJB	Commence: December 2015 Complete: December 2015 Review: Yearly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Date to be arranged for training</li> <li>YJB and Management team to train staff</li> <li>Review RoH and VMP panel arrangements</li> <li>Training completed</li> </ul>

IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS
	c The management team will observe the supervision sessions with young people, in order to inform overall practice and feedback (recorded) is given to staff at the next supervision session, as reflective practice.	To ensure consistent approaches to interventions to young people.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: September 2015 Complete: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time tabled observation periods throughout the year (diarised)</li> <li>Reflected in supervision notes</li> <li>Supervision audits completed</li> </ul>
	d Safeguarding refresher; and signs of safety training CSC threshold and referrals which is outcomes focussed and enables staff to understand the processes adopted by CSC.	All staff understand safeguarding issues relating to young people.	<b>Anita Gibbons</b> / Pat Jennings Head of Service	Commence: September 2015 Complete: December 2015 Review: Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Making Research Count, training to be undertaken by team scheduled to take place September 2015</li> <li>Training dates set</li> <li>Training completed</li> </ul>
	e Establish a focus group to discuss thresholds with YOS and CSC staff to create an understanding of relevant legislation.	YOS and CSC staff will have a clear understanding of thresholds and actions.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service</b> / CSC	Commence: January 2015 Complete: Ongoing Review: Six monthly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Topics sourced in liaison with CSC Heads of Services</li> <li>Open forums (issue specific e.g. AIM2), staff forums possible presentations</li> <li>Diarised</li> </ul>
	f Joint induction between YOS and CSC	Improve communication links between teams. Streamline partnership working arrangements with CSC.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service</b> /CSC	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dates to be arranged for new starters</li> <li>Observation visits to be organised.</li> </ul>
	g Arrange for Tackling Troubled Families to attend YOS team meeting.	Improve communication links between teams. Streamline partnership working arrangements with CSC.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: Ongoing Complete: Ongoing Review: June 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Member of TTF attended YOS Team meeting.</li> <li>BCP Surgeries have been established (June 2015) and continue to be held every two weeks.</li> </ul>
	h Joint AIM training to be undertaken (YOS/CSC) and information of the principles disseminated across both teams.	Joint assessment undertaken by staff of young people with sexually concerning behaviour.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service</b> /CSC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Date set</li> <li>Attendance at training</li> <li>Dissemination across teams</li> </ul>
(4) Good quality assessment and planning with the delivery of appropriate interventions, planning and positive leadership, effective	a Ensure that refresher training is undertaken for all practitioners on assessment; production and review of risk management plans. Staff will convey learning and feedback (recorded) at the next supervision.	Quality plans are completed.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton) /Richard Vaughan YJB	Commence: September 2015 Complete: December 2015 Review: Yearly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review/create/implement protocol</li> <li>Supervision audit training completed by the managers</li> <li><a href="#">Induction Checklist</a></li> </ul>

IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS	
management and partnership which reduces the risk of harm; vulnerability and effective contribution to multi-agency child protection arrangements.	b	Ensure that refresher training is undertaken for all practitioners on assessment; production and review of vulnerability plans. Staff will convey learning and feedback (recorded) at the next supervision session.	Quality plans are completed.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton) /Richard Vaughan YJB	Commence: September 2015 Completion: December 2015 Review: Yearly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review/create/implement protocol</li> <li>Training completed by the managers</li> </ul>
	c	Review and produce clear materials /guidelines for ensuring victim safety are a key priority in all assessment, planning and service delivery.	The community is protected from harm through quality interventions.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service</b>	Commence: October 2015 Completion: November 2015 Review: October 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review/create/implement protocol for victims informed by guidance and legislation</li> <li>Date set</li> <li>Training of staff completed</li> </ul>
	d	Ensure all partner information is recorded on CVYJ and that appropriate actions are taken based upon the information.	Accurate information in place to produce person centred interventions.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: September 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>QA audits</li> <li>How do we do this and escalation</li> <li>Review/create/implement protocol for of all partner agencies</li> </ul>
	e	Ensure that there is 100% compliance in connectivity by reducing the number of "missing docs2 notification to zero.	Information is sent to the secure estate for all young people receiving a remand or custodial sentence.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: July 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensuring the local IT system is functioning to aid smooth transition</li> <li>Through team meetings ensure staff are aware of the importance of the documents being sent and managers are informed immediately of any difficulties.</li> </ul>
	f	Ensure all information is being used the QA audit reviews.	Quality reports in place.	<b>Pat Jennings Head of Service</b>	Commence: September 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diarised programme of dip sampled QA reviews</li> </ul>
	g	Review and implement a SLA with CSC and deliver mixed briefings or information disseminated to staff re: content and implications for each team.	Joint work will be undertaken by both agencies to reduce the likelihood of re-offending.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: September 2015 Completion: September 2015 Review: September 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review/create/implement a communication strategy across the YOS and partner agencies</li> </ul>

IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS
	h Joint AIM training to be undertaken (YOS/CSC) and information of the principles disseminated across both teams	Joint assessments of all young people displaying sexually concerning behaviour.	Pat Jennings Head of Service/CSC	Commence: February 2016 Completion: Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training date set</li> <li>• Payment arrangement from CSC for staff</li> <li>• Participants sourced</li> <li>• Training undertaken</li> <li>• Cascaded</li> </ul>
(5) Ensure that the work with children and young people reduces reoffending and contain a broad range of evaluated interventions. These interventions will account for individual needs and abilities, be SMART and take into consideration partner interventions, these interventions will be monitored to ensure effectiveness.	a Restructure the YOS staff structure to ensure that it is fit for purpose. By ensuring all YOS core business is adequately staffed and resourced to meet the needs of children and young people.	Ensure that the YOS structure is fit for purpose and all partners provide resources to reduce Youth Crime.	Pat Jennings Head of Service/YJB	Commence: July 2015 Completion: September 2015 Review: Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft contemporary structure drafted to reflect the partnership and roles/responsibilities.</li> <li>• Meeting set 08/07/15</li> </ul>
	b Ensure all young people are screened to ensure that interventions take account of their individual leaning styles. The outcome needs to be that high quality interventions address risk of re-offending, tailored to the need of each young person, are delivered in all cases.	Good quality person centred interventions are delivered.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: August 2015 Completion: N/A Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review/create/implement a learning styles questionnaire</li> <li>• Training of staff</li> <li>• Create an intervention database</li> </ul>
	c Monthly QA sessions of Assets and Intervention plans undertaken. Staff will attend and convey learning and reasons for interventions to facilitate active participation in the QA process.	Quality assets and intervention plans in place.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: September 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review/create/implement QA audit</li> <li>• Excel QA from YJB</li> <li>• Creation of a managers list of young people at the start and three months to be reviewed</li> <li>• Audits completed and reported in Performance Digest (completion rate)</li> <li>• All cases that are QA'ed will have interventions appropriate to the ASSET assessment</li> </ul>

IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS
	d Explore and initiate joint operational partnerships to meet local and national criminal justice targets and objectives and provide good outcomes for children and young people in or at the margins of the criminal justice system.	Whole system approach established to meet the Youth Justice agenda.	Pat Jennings Head of Service	Commence: November 2015 Completion: January 2015 Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth Justice a standing item on partner strategic Boards</li> <li>Diarised meeting dates</li> <li>Explore integrated targets</li> <li>Establish Satellite reporting hubs in Penge &amp; Orpington</li> </ul>
	e Ensure all staffs through the QA; and gatekeeping process accesses all systems electronic or human to create SMART plans.	Good quality plans are in place.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: September 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to appropriate IT systems</li> <li>Appropriate secondees in place</li> </ul>
	f Staff to be trained in the usage of "ASSETplus" and good intervention plans.	All staff will understand and complete good quality end to end assessments.	Henry Onojaife /YJB	Commence: January 2016 Completion: Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training date to be arranged with JYB</li> <li>Training to be undertaken by YOS Team</li> </ul>
	g Establish a monthly multi-agency panel to review interventions for all young people on the re-offending cohort to reduce offending by children and young people.	Reduce the number of young people who reoffend.	Pat Jennings Head of Service/YOS Staff/ TTF/CSC/Education/MPS/ YPS	Commence: November 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish ToR</li> <li>Design reporting form and master copy</li> <li>Invite attendees</li> <li>Meetings held</li> </ul>
LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN (6) Offending and reoffending is reduced amongst the looked after children population of Bromley.	a Establish a YOS SPOC (manager and practitioner) to co-ordinate services to reduce offending by looked after children (ROLAC).	A clear strategy is developed to reduce offending and divert LAC young people from the youth justice system.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton) CSC	Commence: October 2015 Completion: October 2015 Review: October 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A CSC Social Worker "secondee" has been identified and will start in August 2015</li> <li>Identify a member of staff/manager from the programmes team</li> <li>Contact made with Foster carers through CSC and private Children's homes providers</li> <li>Placements within 20 miles of the Bromley</li> <li>Surgeries/Consultation for IRO's and SW</li> </ul>
	b Monitor the number of LAC, LBB & other on the YOS caseload by offence type and outcomes. Benchmark against comparator areas.	A clear strategy is developed to reduce offending and divert LAC young people from the youth justice system.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: August 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present information to Management Board, as part of the targets for the service</li> <li>Form part of the data booklet</li> </ul>



IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS
c	Ensuring CSC are notified when a LAC is appearing in court and are accompanied by their allocated social worker. Where this is not possible; the court worker will have access to the young person's history; care plans; placement information and support packages to comply with any subsequent order.	All information is available to courts to aid sentencing.	Pat Jennings Head of Service /CSC	Commence: June 2015 Completion: Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looked After Children and Young People in contact with the Youth Justice system</li> <li>Presentation to SMT/DMT/SW Teams</li> <li>Workshops Court staff (YOS) are notifying CSC</li> </ul>
d	Provide restorative training to private children residential care homes and LBB's Foster carers on restorative justice principles to respond to minor infractions and offending.	A reduction of LAC young people entering or re-entering the criminal justice system.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton) /CSC	Commence: October 2015 Completion: Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and update Protocol with CSC</li> <li>Training date set</li> <li>Training undertaken</li> </ul>
e	Review and update the protocol between LBB; MPS; YOS and children's residential home providers. Meet with the partners to clearly set out what are the expectations of dealing with in-house incidents and when it is appropriate to call the Police.	A reduction of LAC young people entering or re-entering the criminal justice system	Pat Jennings Head of Service/ Richard Vaughan YJB /CPS/MPS/Courts	Commence: October 2015 Completion: October 2015 Review: October 2016	Review/create/implement
f	Ensure that there are effective mechanisms in place for consulting with and involving the Living in care council about LAC offending and what would make a difference.	The voice of the child is reflected in YOS business.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)/CSC	Commence: October 2015 Completion: November 2015 Review: October 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and update joint protocol with CSC</li> </ul>
g	Attendance by YOS and CSC staff at meetings i.e.  Child Protection Conferences/Strategy Meetings/Professional Meetings/Children in Need Meetings/Child Care Reviews/Remand Reviews/Initial Sentence Planning Meetings/Risk Management Panel Meetings/Safeguarding Meetings.	All information is sourced to provide quality person centred intervention.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)/CSC	Commence: July 2015 Completion: Review:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and update joint protocol with CSC</li> <li>Speak to Head of Safeguarding to write to IRO's and Conference chairs</li> <li>Discuss at SMT/DMT to ensure the message is disseminated</li> </ul>
h	Ensure LAC placed beyond LBB's borders receives the same level of support and services as other young people and this is embedded in practice.	Consistent approach to LAC young people is administered.	YOS Management Team (Pat Jennings; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: October 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: October 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protocol</li> <li>Placement monitoring panel</li> </ul>

IMPROVEMENT PLAN BROMLEY YOS 2015

RECOMMENDATIONS	ACTIONS	OUTCOME OF ACTIONS	LEAD	TIMESCALE	RAG/PROGRESS	
<b>THE VOICE OF THE YOUNG PERSON</b> (7) Ensure that the Voice of the young person is recorded and listened to in line with the UN Convention on the rights of the child and the Children’s Acts which require LBB to ascertain the “wishes and feelings” of children.	a	Children and young people should have the opportunity to describe things from their point of view. They should be continually involved.	The voice of the child is heard and reflected in interventions.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: July 2015 Completion: Review: Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff have been informed through the HOS briefing (July)</li> <li>• Training days set</li> <li>• YJB to undertake training with staff to demonstrate what is a “Good” plan</li> <li>• APIS training</li> <li>• Referral forms</li> <li>• Dip-sampling</li> <li>• HOS Briefing</li> </ul>
	b	There should be evidence that their voice has influenced the decisions that YOS practitioners have made.	The voice of the child is heard and reflected in interventions.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: July 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training days set</li> <li>• YJB to undertake training with staff to demonstrate what is a “Good” plan</li> <li>• APIS training</li> <li>• Dip-sampling</li> <li>• Referral forms</li> </ul>
	c	Where appropriate recordings and reports indicate “Voice of the child/young person” in bold. This will include Demeanour; non-verbal communication; or responses to parent/carers.	The voice of the child is heard and reflected in interventions.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)	Commence: July 2015 Completion: Ongoing Review: Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff have been informed through the HOS briefing (July)</li> <li>• Training days set</li> <li>• YJB to undertake training with staff to demonstrate what is a “Good” plan</li> <li>• APIS training</li> <li>• Referral forms</li> <li>• Dip-sampling</li> </ul>
	d	Create a user forum of current and ex Young people to Ensure that there are effective mechanisms in place for consulting with offending young people and what would make a difference.	The voice of the child is heard and reflected in interventions.	YOS Management Team ( <b>Pat Jennings</b> ; Elayne Stewart; Henry Onojaife; Geraldine Bolton)/ YSP	Commence: January 2016 Completion: Quarterly Review: January 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protocol</li> <li>• Group formed</li> <li>• Group feeding back to YOS</li> </ul>

This page is left intentionally blank