

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

Date: 22nd 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 19th 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.

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