



An inspection of youth offending services in

East Riding

HM Inspectorate of Probation

MAY 2019

This inspection was led by HM Inspector Maria Jerram, supported by a team of inspectors, as well as staff from our operations and research teams. The Head of Youth Offending Team Inspections, responsible for this inspection programme, is Alan MacDonald. We would like to thank all those who helped plan and took part in the inspection; without their help and cooperation, the inspection would not have been possible.

© Crown copyright 2019

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available for download at:

www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation

Published by:

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
1st Floor Civil Justice Centre
1 Bridge Street West
Manchester
M3 3FX

Contents

Foreword	4
Overall findings	5
Summary of ratings	7
Recommendations	8
Introduction	9
Contextual facts	10
1. Organisational delivery	11
1.1 Governance and leadership	11
1.2 Staff	12
1.3 Partnerships and services	13
1.4 Information and facilities.....	15
Summary.....	16
2. Court disposals	17
2.1 Assessment	17
2.2 Planning.....	18
2.3 Implementation and delivery	19
2.4 Reviewing	20
Summary.....	21
3. Out-of-court disposals	23
3.1 Assessment	23
3.2 Planning.....	24
3.3 Implementation and delivery	25
3.4 Joint working.....	26
Summary.....	27
Annex 1 – Methodology	28
Annex 2 – Inspection results	29
Annex 3 – Glossary	34

Foreword

This inspection is part of our programme of youth offending service (YOS) inspections. As planned, we have inspected and rated East Riding YOS across three broad areas: the arrangements for organisational delivery first, and then the quality of court disposals work, and out-of-court disposals work.

We have given East Riding YOS an overall rating of 'Outstanding'. We also awarded the YOS 'Outstanding' ratings for every one of the 12 individual aspects of work that we inspected. This is the first time that either a youth offending or probation service has achieved full marks across the board.

The YOS has been on a continuous and steady journey of improvement since our inspection in 2010. Strategic leaders have prioritised improvements and monitored progress to make sure that opportunities for learning and development are harnessed.

An active Management Board with good representation and attendance sets the vision and priorities for the service. These are understood and embedded by YOS staff and the partnership. Services are well coordinated across the geographically large county, which includes rural, urban and coastal areas, each presenting with different challenges.

Securing a stable and capable workforce who have the skills and resources to achieve the organisation's ambitions has been fundamental to progress. We found a highly motivated staff team that engages meaningfully with young people, considers their diversity needs and delivers effective interventions. Staff approach their work with creativity and tenacity. High-quality work, supported by effective management oversight, is evident in most cases. Feedback received from children and young people, parents and carers confirms that the work of the YOS is making a difference.

In terms of areas for improvement, we noted that an unusually high number of criminal behaviour orders (CBOs) were in place for children and young people. The YOS has recently identified that breaches of CBO conditions were linked to an increase in custodial sentences. Clear processes and oversight must be established to monitor the use of CBOs in East Riding given the serious implications of breach. The YOS also needs to make sure that all children and young people get their legal entitlement to education.

I would like to thank leaders and staff at East Riding YOS for their hard work and commitment. I hope other youth offending teams will draw on the good practice in this report.



Dame Glenys Stacey
Chief Inspector of Probation

Overall findings

Overall, East Riding YOS is rated as: **Outstanding**. This rating has been determined by inspecting the YOS in three domains of its work. The findings in those domains are described below.

	Organisational delivery
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------

Our key findings about organisational delivery are as follows:

- There is strong strategic leadership and a fully constituted Management Board that understands the YOS children and young people, practice and performance.
- Senior leaders set the vision and priorities for the YOS and these are effectively communicated to staff and the partnership.
- Partners are committed to providing responsive and individualised services that meet the needs of children and young people.
- Staff are skilled and motivated and report high levels of satisfaction.
- Management oversight is effective and well received by staff.
- There is a framework for staff development which promotes retention and succession planning.
- Staff have workloads that are manageable, and have the capacity to establish trusting relationships with children and families.
- The out-of-court disposal scheme is an exemplar of good practice.
- The use of criminal behaviour orders needs to be analysed to ensure it is necessary and proportionate in all cases given the serious implications of breach for children and young people.
- The educational provision for children and young people is not always adequate to meet their needs.

	Court disposals
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

Our key findings about court disposals are as follows:

- Assessments are completed to a high standard, with sufficient analyses of desistance needs, safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others.
- Children and young people, and their parents and carers, are meaningfully involved in the work undertaken with them.
- Diversity needs and barriers to engagement are routinely considered and addressed.
- Case managers understand the children and young people they work with and have good relationships with them.

- Work to promote the safety of victims and maximise opportunities for restorative justice is well developed.
- Planning of accommodation placements for young people leaving custody must to be timely and coordinated with other relevant agencies in all cases.
- Exit strategies when court orders are complete are well managed.

	<h2>Out-of-court disposals</h2>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

Our key findings about out-of-court disposals are as follows:

- Assessment and planning to support desistance, to protect others and to support the safety and well-being of the child or young person are outstanding.
- Compliance with out-of-court disposals is good.
- Attention is given to the needs and wishes of victims in assessment, planning and the implementation of out-of-court disposals.
- Children, young people and families can continue to receive support from the Youth and Family Support Service (YFS) after their out-of-court intervention ends.
- Service delivery promotes opportunities for community integration.
- Joint working with the police supports the delivery of high-quality personalised services.

Service: East Riding Youth Offending Service

Fieldwork started: March 2019

Overall rating

Outstanding



1. Organisational delivery

1.1 Governance and leadership

Outstanding



1.2 Staff

Outstanding



1.3 Partnerships and services

Outstanding



1.4 Information and facilities

Outstanding



2. Court disposals

2.1 Assessment

Outstanding



2.2 Planning

Outstanding



2.3 Implementation and delivery

Outstanding



2.4 Reviewing

Outstanding



3. Out-of-court disposals

3.1 Assessment

Outstanding



3.2 Planning

Outstanding



3.3 Implementation and delivery

Outstanding



3.4 Joint working

Outstanding



Recommendations

As a result of our inspection findings, we have made two recommendations that we believe, if implemented, will have a positive impact on the quality of youth offending services in East Riding. This will improve the lives of the children in contact with youth offending services, and better protect the public.

The Youth Board should:

1. ensure that criminal behaviour orders are only used when it is necessary and proportionate, that thresholds are consistently applied and processes between the YOS and Police are established and embedded
2. make sure that children and young people known to the YOS receive the high-quality education or training they are entitled to and that it meets their specific needs.

Introduction

Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) supervise 10–18-year-olds who have been sentenced by a court, or who have come to the attention of the police because of their offending behaviour but have not been charged, and instead are dealt with out of court. HMI Probation inspects both these aspects of youth offending services.

YOTs are statutory partnerships, and they are multi-disciplinary, to deal with the needs of the whole child. They are required to have staff from local authority social care and education services, the police, the National Probation Service and local health services.¹ Most YOTs are based within local authorities, although this can vary.

YOT work is governed and shaped by a range of legislation and guidance specific to the youth justice sector (such as the National Standards for Youth Justice) or else applicable across the criminal justice sector (for example Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements guidance). The Youth Justice Board for England and Wales (YJB) provides some funding to YOTs. It also monitors their performance and issues guidance to them about how things are to be done.

East Riding Youth Offending Service (YOS) has evolved and developed significantly since its introduction in April 2000. In 2011 the YOS moved back into Children's Services from its previous home within community safety into an integrated Youth Support Service. The YOS now forms an integral part of a Youth and Family Support Service (YFS) as part of developments within the Troubled Families agenda, where the focus is on whole family work, rather than on individual presenting issues with young people. The focus has been on maintaining and improving core youth justice activities but the fast-moving landscape has provided the YOS with a number of opportunities to share its expertise and knowledge within a wider early intervention service.

The role of HM Inspectorate of Probation

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation is the independent inspector of youth offending and probation services in England and Wales. We provide assurance on the effectiveness of work with adults and children who have offended to implement orders of the court, reduce reoffending, protect the public and safeguard the vulnerable. We inspect these services and publish inspection reports. We highlight good and poor practice, and use our data and information to encourage good-quality services. We are independent of government, and speak independently.

HM Inspectorate of Probation standards

The standards against which we inspect are based on established models and frameworks, which are grounded in evidence, learning and experience. These standards are designed to drive improvements in the quality of work with people who have offended.²

¹ The *Crime and Disorder Act 1998* set out the arrangements for local YOTs and partnership working.

² HM Inspectorate's standards are available here:

<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/about-our-work/our-standards-and-ratings/>

Contextual facts

First time entrant rate per 100,000 ³

219

East Riding YOS

248

Average for England and Wales

Reoffending rates ⁴

41.7%

East Riding YOS

40.9%

Average for England and Wales

Caseload information ⁵

Age	10-14		15-17	
	East Riding	27%	73%	
National average	24%	76%		

Race/ethnicity	White		Black and minority ethnic		Not known	
	East Riding	89%	1%	10%		
National average	71%	26%	3%			

Gender	Male		Female	
	East Riding	79%	21%	
National average	84%	16%		



Population information

338,061	Total population of East Riding (2017) ⁶
28,695	Total youth population of East Riding ⁶
856	Total black and minority ethnic youth population of East Riding ⁷

³ Youth Justice Board. (2018). *First-time entrants, October to September 2018*.

⁴ Ministry of Justice. (2019). *Proven reoffending statistics, April 2016 to March 2017*.

⁵ Youth Justice Board. (2019). *Youth justice annual statistics: 2017-2018*.


⁶ Office for National Statistics. (2012). *UK population estimates mid-2017, based on Census 2011 data*.

⁷ Office for National Statistics. (2012). *Census 2011*.

1. Organisational delivery



Organisations that are well led and well managed are more likely to achieve their aims. We inspect against four standards.

1.1 Governance and leadership	Outstanding
The governance and leadership of the YOT supports and promotes the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children and young people.	

We have rated governance and leadership in East Riding as outstanding. Senior leaders demonstrate continuous commitment to improving and developing high-quality services for all children and young people. Preventing young people offending and achieving positive outcomes for those who have offended are priorities for the local authority.

Since 2013, the YOS Management Board has been part of a wider Youth Board. This arrangement reduces duplication, maximises membership, and ensures that the services and agendas relating to vulnerable young people are aligned. The YOS sought guidance and input from the Youth Justice Board (YJB) before it made this change to ensure the emphasis on statutory YOS duties was maintained. The Board has a strong focus on the prevention of offending through the delivery of universal services. Equally, the needs of those at the higher end of statutory YOS involvement are prioritised.

The Youth Board meets bi-monthly. It has clear terms of reference that define the purpose and focus of the meeting. The Board is chaired by the director for children, families and schools, who is also Chair of the Children's Trust Board. This provides the opportunity for issues concerning the YOS to be represented in that forum. The Children's Trust Board is attended by the Chief Executive of the council, which helps ensure they are kept up to date and informed on YOS matters. This has been beneficial, for example, in responding to concerns about the wellbeing of young people who are accommodated out of the local area in emergency situations.

The Chief Executive committed to support the funding of a three-unit property in Beverley. The provision will be used as a short-term placement for children and young people, including those who have been arrested, are awaiting police interview and require overnight accommodation.

Other strategic boards are well connected with the YOS. Representatives of the YOS attend the Community Safety Partnership Board (CSPB), and there are established strategic links to the Health and Wellbeing Board. The Deputy Chair of the Youth Board chairs the vulnerable young people group, which means that the group understands the vulnerability of YOS children and young people. Leaders feel that the Youth Board has influenced the thinking of other of boards, such as the East Riding Safer Children's Board (ERSB), on matters such as child criminal exploitation and county lines, which are emerging issues in East Riding. The multi-agency sexual exploitation (MASE) panel now incorporates these issues, and a contextual safeguarding strategic group, with oversight of MASE, has recently been established.

The Board agrees the annual plan, with input from all members. The needs and profile of the YOS children and young people are understood and data reports are


used to agree priorities. Board members appreciate the role of their respective agencies in supporting the wider integration of the YOS children and young people through access to universal and targeted services. Data reports presented at the Youth Board led to the police and crime commissioner (PCC), funding various third-sector initiatives, half of the children and young people supervised by the YOS are now benefiting from these projects.

The public health representative on the Youth Board has assisted in shaping the remit of the YOS nurse role. Public health data on physical, mental and sexual health suggested that the children and young people needed additional support in these areas. As a result, the YOS nurse post now requires dual registration in both physical and mental health to meet their identified needs and promote better inter-agency working.

There is a partnership performance subgroup, which includes representatives from education and the police and is chaired by a probation lead. The group has analysed areas of practice such as first-time entrants and devised an improvement plan to address a recent rise in numbers. The group reports back to the Youth Board at every meeting to update it on new findings and progress.

The head of service and the YOS youth justice manager attend the Board regularly. Other managers and staff attend to discuss their area of work, when required. This helps the Board to understand emerging themes and challenges for the service. These arrangements provide a good link between strategy and practice.

The vision and strategy of the YOS is effectively operationalised by the YOS management team, including through management meetings, regular team meetings and in the management oversight of practice. Almost all YOS staff reported in our survey that they understood the vision set by the Board and that they all felt sufficiently updated on strategic issues. All case management staff in the YOS are allocated a lead area, such as child sexual exploitation, which fits with the priorities of the YOS strategic plan.

1.2 Staff	Outstanding
Staff within the YOT are empowered to deliver a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children and young people.	

We found a skilled, committed and stable workforce. We were impressed with the quality of the staff we met. Case managers come from a variety of professional backgrounds, which increases the knowledge base and opportunities for learning. Case managers and inspectors felt that workloads were manageable, and that staff have the capacity to undertake meaningful work with children and young people.

All staff have a current appraisal. The majority find the process useful and feel that their training and development needs are met. Staff spoke highly of the quality of the supervision they receive, describing it as 'challenging and supportive'. Newer staff are positive about the standard of the induction they have received.

An established staff progression framework is in place. Good training opportunities are available to support this, including the option to work towards a youth justice degree. All managers are undertaking or have completed management courses, and opportunities for secondment are taken up. Staff development is a consistent theme

in the YOS, and the progression of staff is evident. Staff report that they feel empowered in their roles, stating that they are encouraged to make suggestions and contribute to developing the service. Managers commend good practice and use council recognition schemes to highlight exceptional work.


Effective quality assurance systems are in place. All assessments and reviews are checked against a set of standards, and feedback is given to staff. We noted effective management oversight in the majority of casework.

Managers monitor data on caseloads and allocate work by risk level, workload and the geographical location of children and young people. Allocation processes ensure that work is assigned to appropriately qualified or experienced staff. All cases involving sexually harmful behaviour are allocated to a YOS worker together with a children's services social worker, so that joint assessments and interventions can be delivered. This process follows best practice.

The YOS has a seconded police officer who has assisted in developing the out-of-court disposal scheme and led on training local police officers to improve their understanding of out-of-court disposal work. The seconded probation officer post is currently vacant and recruitment is underway. Effective contingency arrangements are in place. Transition planning is done well by a named probation officer and information-sharing is timely. The probation service has committed to more intensive supervision of young people post-transition in recognition of their need for additional support. YOS case managers have access to specialist services to support children and young people, such as a YOS nurse and substance misuse practitioners.

For the past two years, four YOS staff have been deployed to the Youth and Family Support Service (YFS). This is a response to falling caseloads in the YOS and an opportunity to align the two services and share knowledge. If YOS workloads increase, these workers will return to the YOS. General service continuity is assured through duty systems for office, court and weekend cover.

All volunteers who completed our survey reported that their ongoing training needs are met. There are quarterly meetings for all reparation workers, mentors and volunteers. This provides an opportunity to network, deliver training and share best practice. 'Making it right' panel members who reach the end of their three-year tenure are offered a role on the out-of-court disposal panel, where they can continue to offer a community perspective. A trained volunteer mentor works with young people to engage them in positive activities.

1.3 Partnerships and services	Outstanding
A comprehensive range of high-quality services is in place, enabling personalised and responsive provision for all children and young people.	

YOS leaders carry out a comprehensive analysis of current offending patterns, profiles of children and young people and their desistance needs. They use this information to develop and deliver voluntary and statutory services.

Addressing offending behaviour at the earliest opportunity is a priority for the partnership. This has led to the development of projects such as a police early intervention project. Officers provide voluntary interventions in the community to children and young people and families where a risk of offending has been identified. The 'Night Challenge' is another police initiative. This involves a 13-mile night walk and promotes education and team work. The theme of the last project was child exploitation. A number of YOS children participated, with one being offered a residential trip when his strong leadership skills were identified. A YOS priority offender scheme has been devised in partnership with the Police. This supports a more robust approach to the management of young people whose risk is of concern but who do not meet the Integrated Offender Manager (IOM) criteria. The police also oversee serious offender panel (SOP) meetings, which are attended by the YOS.

In our staff survey, staff reported that they had sufficient access to partnership resources. We mostly agreed with this view, but we did note a small number of cases where the Education, Training and Employment (ETE) provision was not sufficient. This primarily related to a small number of children and young people receiving home tuition rather than attending school full-time. Joint working within children's social care (CSC) is generally effective, managers from both services are well-engaged. Referral pathways from the YOS to CSC are streamlined to enable a swift response to safeguarding concerns. In two cases we assessed, we felt that work with children's social care could have been more responsive to the needs of children leaving custody.

Overall, in most cases, case managers have access to the required statutory and voluntary services needed to support desistance, safety and wellbeing and to manage risk of harm to others. YFS were involved with many of the cases we inspected. All YOS children, young people and their families are offered support from YFS when their involvement with the YOS ends and where on-going support may be required.


The process for making decisions on out-of-court disposals has been established with reference to HMI Probation's thematic report and its inspection framework, and takes account of this guidance on best practice. The YOS management team and police visited other YOTs to gather information when they were developing out-of-court disposal processes. They have devised an assessment tool that ensures all factors affecting the child or young person, such as risks to their safety and wellbeing and risks they may pose to others, are considered. It incorporates the AssetPlus desistance matrix and Signs of Safety, the casework model used by children's social care in East Riding. Thorough assessments are completed before panels meet to inform the decision-making process. Victims' views are obtained before the meeting in most cases.

Assessments undertaken and interventions offered by the YOS victim/restorative worker assist case managers to effectively manage the of risk of harm to others. Victims are represented at out-of-court disposal panels and 'Making it Right' panels. The YOS victim worker has devised a victim matrix, which guides staff on the interventions available. The levels of contact with victims and the focus on restorative justice were impressive. There is a creative approach to reparation. Many projects are delivered in conjunction with local and national organisations. A system has been established where young people can gain accreditation for projects they complete.

Managers analyse the numbers of YOS young people with special educational needs and disability (SEND). This has led to better information-sharing between the YOS and education teams and revisions of YOS documents so that they are child-friendly and in an easy to read format. The YOS and the education team have set a joint target to achieve the SEND Quality Mark.

Access to child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) and substance misuse services is swift, and there are no waiting lists. There is also a forensic health practitioner within the CAMHS service, who can assist with the most complex cases. Case managers can access a speech, language and communication provision for young people who need it.

Sentencers spoke positively about the work of the YOS in court and the quality of service that they received. There was a high level of confidence in recommendations made by the YOS in pre-sentence reports and in the subsequent interventions delivered.

1.4 Information and facilities	Outstanding
Timely and relevant information is available and appropriate facilities are in place to support a high-quality, personalised and responsive approach for all children and young people.	

The YOS has a full suite of up-to-date policies and procedures to guide practice. Policies and procedures are reviewed regularly and understood by all relevant staff. There are clear and established referral pathways to services for children and young people, and staff follow them. Escalation processes are in place should they be needed.

Staff use a combination of offices, community facilities and home visits for their work. This addresses the geographical challenges of the area and ensures equal access for all children and young people. In line with best practice and guidance, 'Making it Right' panels take place in three community venues. All staff and volunteers report that they feel safe at work. There is a lone working policy and clear guidance to staff should they find themselves in a threatening situation.

Staff spoke positively about the main case management system, One Youth. Staff have direct access to the local children's services database, which supports effective joint working. The dual registration of the YOS nurse means that CAMHS and general health records can be accessed. Police officers have access to the police national computer and processes for sharing information with the probation service are in place.

Information and communication technology arrangements effectively support agile working arrangements. Staff have access to laptops and smart phones, which enables them to plan, deliver and record their work in a timely way. The use of ICT and Information is supported by an effective information manager post.

The YOS can demonstrate how it has learned and developed from previous inspection reports. Findings from peer audits have been used to support improvements. One audit identified intervention planning as an area that required improvement. Managers responded by holding a workshop with staff to address this. Reports such as the HMI Probation's thematic studies on out-of-court disposals and

desistance and *Transforming children and young people's mental health provision: a green paper* have been considered in developing and delivering services.

The YOS has processes in place for serious incidents to be referred to the Local Safeguarding Children Board and the MAPPA strategic Management Board. There are processes for obtaining the views of parents and young people, and these views could be better used to shape service delivery. Developing this area of work through the establishment of online surveys is a priority for the YOS. A young person is due to talk to youth offending staff and volunteers about his recent experience of YOS services at an upcoming practice event.

Summary

Strengths:

- Senior leaders set the vision and priorities for the YOS and these are understood by YOS staff and partners.
- Partners understand and are committed to providing a responsive service that meets the needs of children and young people.
- Staff are skilled and highly motivated to achieve the best outcomes for children and young people.
- Management oversight is effective and well received well by staff.
- There is a framework for staff development, which promotes retention and succession-planning.
- The out-of-court disposals scheme is an exemplar of good practice.

Areas for improvement:

- A considerable number of children are subject to criminal behaviour orders and thresholds and processes for consultation between Police and the YOS need to be in place.
- The educational provision for children and young people is not always adequate for their needs, particularly in relation to home tutoring arrangements.

2. Court disposals



Work with children and young people sentenced by the courts will be more effective if it is well targeted, planned and implemented. In our inspections, we look at a sample of cases. In each of those cases, we inspect against four standards.

2.1 Assessment	Outstanding
Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.	A green outline star icon.

Overall, we judged the quality of assessment to be outstanding. Staff gained a thorough understanding of children and young people, their diversity needs and the wider familial and social context. They achieved this by liaising effectively with partner agencies to access information and previous assessments, and by making sure that children and young people, and their parents and carers, were central to the assessment process.

In almost every case, assessments sufficiently analysed offending behaviour, including the child or young person's attitude towards and motivation for their offending. Equally, there was a clear focus on identifying strengths and protective factors. In all but one case, key structural barriers facing the child or young person were sufficiently analysed. In most cases, attention was given to understanding the child or young person's levels of maturity, ability and motivation to change, and the likelihood of engaging with the court disposal.

There was a clear written record of desistance in all cases. The most common issues that staff identified as affecting desistance were ETE, living arrangements, lifestyle and self-identity. In all but two cases, there was sufficient analysis of how desistance would be supported. In most cases, staff and inspectors felt that the right services had been available to meet the desistance needs of children and young people.

An inspector noted:

"A detailed analytical assessment of desistance which meaningfully involved the young person and parents throughout. The case manager has clearly invested time in getting to know the young person and parents and this has enabled assessments to reflect the underpinning reasons behind the offence. There is a clear focus on desistance and protective factors".

In 35 per cent of the cases inspected, there had been involvement from children's social care during the time of the YOS intervention. Staff understood and considered the child or young person's vulnerability. In 87 per cent of cases, we found that assessments clearly identified and analysed any risks to the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person. In most cases, staff analysed the controls and interventions to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person.

We did not agree with classification of risk in three cases where we felt that the risks to safety and wellbeing had been under-estimated. Overall, in the majority of cases there was evidence that staff considered, not just the immediate risks to safety, but

also the more longstanding, less obvious issues that affect development and wellbeing.

An inspector noted:

“The initial assessment includes a chronology from children’s services of their historical involvement with the family. This indicates a pattern of domestic abuse between parents, which was witnessed by the young person. The assessment considers the dynamic of the relationship with both parents and the impact this has upon safety and wellbeing. The longer-term impact of trauma is considered in addition to concerns linked to the index offence involving alcohol misuse.”

In almost every case, relevant factors that indicated any risk of harm to others posed by the child or young person were identified. Assessments routinely drew on available sources of information, including past behaviour and convictions. Other agencies were involved where appropriate. Controls and interventions to manage and minimise the risk of harm presented by the child or young person were almost always considered. In most cases, the assessment gave attention to the needs and wishes of victims and opportunities for restorative justice. In two cases, inspectors thought the risk of harm had been under-estimated.

MAPPA processes were understood and used appropriately, with management oversight. In most cases, there was evidence of effective management input, which offered clear direction and challenge where required.

2.2 Planning	Outstanding
Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.	

In almost every case, planning set out the services most likely to support desistance, paying sufficient attention to the available timescales and the need for sequencing interventions. Diversity and the wider familial and social context of the child or young person was routinely considered in the planning process. In all inspected cases, the child or young person and their parents/carers, were meaningfully involved and their views were considered. The commitment to working with and supporting families was evident in the casework we inspected.

An inspector noted:

“The case manager discussed how the self-assessment completed by the young person and their parent was embedded in planning. Furthermore, planning was reflective of the main factors linked to the risk of re-offending which are substance misuse and self-identity. The plan discussed at the referral order (‘Making it right’) panel is transferred into a child friendly plan during a subsequent supervision session. The plan is clearly written in the young person’s own words as a means of promoting understanding and ownership”.

Overall, in 91 per cent of cases, planning focused sufficiently on supporting the child or young person’s desistance. In one case, planning was hindered by delays in

securing suitable accommodation ahead of a young person's release from custody. This was resolved during the inspection fieldwork.

Planning promoted the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person, sufficiently addressing risks in 82 per cent of cases. In all but two relevant cases, planning for safety and wellbeing involved other agencies and there was sufficient alignment with other plans (e.g. child protection or care plans) concerning the child or young person. In 86 per cent of cases, planning set out the necessary controls and interventions to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person, as well as contingency arrangements to manage risks should there be an escalation of concern. A considerable number of the cases were also open to children's social care at points during the YOS intervention, and in most of the cases we saw effective joint planning.


An inspector noted:

“There was a strong focus on the high level of safety and wellbeing concerns affecting the child. There was appropriate planning alongside CAMHS and substance misuse services. A safety plan was completed with the family, and there is ongoing planning throughout, clearly focusing on keeping the young person safe”.

Planning promoted the safety of other people, sufficiently addressing risk of harm factors in 86 per cent of cases. Other agencies were involved in planning in 81 per cent of cases. Planning set out the necessary controls and interventions to promote the safety of other people in most cases and in 85 per cent of cases set out necessary and effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that had been identified. Planning addressed specific victim concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims in three-quarters of cases.

An inspector noted:

“Pre-release and post-release planning is good in this custodial case. The integration of the forensic assessment enhances plans to keep others safe. Monthly internal risk management meetings are held to assist the overall planning process. Objectives on the custody and release plans are appropriate and include knife crime awareness, substance misuse, education and family integration”.

2.3 Implementation and delivery	Outstanding
High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, engaging and assisting the child or young person.	

In every case we inspected, sufficient focus was given to developing and maintaining an effective working relationship with the child or young person and their parents/carers. Equally, service delivery reflected the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child or young person in all cases. The child or young person's strengths and enhancing protective factors had been considered in 95 per cent of cases.

It was evident that children and young people were listened to and their goals and aspirations were taken seriously and acted upon. Relationships with case managers were consistent and supportive.

One young person, responding to our survey about the service they received from the YOS, told us:

“People are very nice and always treat me with respect. Help me to look forward to my future. Their guidance is invaluable”.


In most of the cases inspected, the services most likely to support desistance were delivered and staff considered the individual needs and circumstances of children and young people when sequencing interventions. Staff encouraged and enabled the child or young person’s compliance with the work of the YOS in every case. When engagement could not be achieved, enforcement action was taken appropriately.

In relation to the quality of interventions delivered, an inspector noted:

“The young person and parents were actively engaged from assessment through to planning, and this enabled interventions to be tailored to suit the young person’s needs and risks. The young person completed AQA accredited sessions in knife crime, healthy relationships and restorative justice. Substance misuse sessions and CAMHS interventions were delivered alongside offending behaviour work, and improvements to well-being reinforced by the delivery of constructive leisure activities of boxing, gym and rugby. Reparation is tailored to meet the young person’s enjoyment of art (graffiti project). An indirect restorative justice intervention was undertaken with the elderly victim of the robbery. A powerful outcome for both the young person and victim”.

The YOS delivered services to manage and minimise the risk of harm to others in most cases. The management of risk involved other agencies appropriately in all but two of the relevant cases. MAPPAs were applied and there was evidence that high-risk cases were discussed at YOS internal risk management meetings. Sufficient attention was given to the protection of actual and potential victims in most cases.

Work to support the safety and wellbeing of young people was undertaken to a similarly high standard. In 91 per cent of cases service delivery promoted the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person. The coordination and involvement of other agencies in promoting safety and wellbeing was done well in almost every case.

2.4 Reviewing	Outstanding
Reviewing of progress is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.	

In every relevant case, a written review of desistance was completed and it led to necessary adjustments in the plan of work. This responsiveness to changing

circumstances helps to maintain children and young people's engagement and ensures that the work delivered is effective and meaningful. Assessment reviews continued to focus sufficiently on building on the child or young person's strengths, enhancing protective factors and assessing motivation and engagement levels. At the review stage, there was meaningful involvement in the process from children and young people, and their parents and carers.

An inspector made the following observation:

“Formal AssetPlus reviews were complemented by ongoing reviewing with the young person and their parents. Furthermore, there is a formal review meeting with all organisations, the young person and their parents as a means of promoting desistance and reaffirming positive progress made”.

Overall, reviewing focused sufficiently on keeping the child or young person safe in most cases. A written review of safety and well-being was completed in almost every case. Reviewing identified and responded to changes in factors relating to safety and wellbeing in just under three-quarters of cases. Refreshed assessments led to the necessary adjustments in the ongoing plan of work to promote safety and wellbeing in most relevant cases. In 84 per cent of cases, reviewing was informed by the necessary input from other agencies to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person.

An inspector noted:

“Reviewing is constant, given the imminent concerns regarding the young person's physical safety and well-being. There are monthly AssetPlus reviews in addition to frequent internal risk management meetings and consultation with other agencies”.

Updated written assessments identified and responded to changes in factors related to risk of harm to others in all but two cases. There was necessary input from other agencies involved in managing the risk of harm in all relevant cases. The child or young person and their parent or carer was involved in the reviewing process in almost every case. Reviewing led to the necessary adjustments in the ongoing plan of work to manage and minimise the risk of harm in all but two cases. Overall, reviewing focused sufficiently on keeping other people safe in 84 per cent of cases.

Summary

Strengths:

- Assessments are completed to a high standard, with sufficient analyses of desistance needs, safety and wellbeing and risk to others.
- Children and young people, their parents/carers, are meaningfully involved in all aspects of work undertaken with them.
- Diversity needs and barriers to engagement are routinely considered and addressed.
- Case managers understand the children and young people they work with and have good relationships with them.


- Work to promote the safety of victims and maximise opportunities for restorative justice is well developed.

Areas for improvement:

- Planning accommodation placements for young people leaving custody needs to be timely and coordinated with other relevant agencies in every case.

3. Out-of-court disposals

Work with children and young people receiving out-of-court disposals will be more effective if it is well targeted, planned and implemented. In our inspections we look at a sample of cases. In each of those cases we inspect against four standards.

3.1 Assessment	Outstanding
Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.	

Work with children receiving out-of-court disposals was exceptional overall in East Riding. Assessments routinely drew on information from multiple sources to gain the best understanding of circumstances and history. Full and detailed assessments are completed before the joint decision-making panel meets to assist not only decision-making but in consideration of the support and intervention required.

In every inspected case, we found that assessments sufficiently analysed how to support the desistance and safety and wellbeing of children and young people. Equal attention was paid to analysing and understanding any risk of harm to others and the protection of victims. Staff considered opportunities for restorative justice in every relevant case.

In all cases, the assessment was completed with meaningful input from children and young people and their parents/carers. Their views were considered and were central to the assessment process. There was a focus on understanding the offending behaviour from the perspective of the child or young person so that their motivation, attitude and sense of responsibility could be analysed. Diversity factors were considered, as were any structural barriers that might impact on engagement and progress. It was evident that strengths and protective factors were considered and balanced with presenting indicators of risk. Sufficient attention was paid to levels of maturity, ability and motivation to change in every case.


Inspectors agreed with the assessed levels of risk of harm to others and the assessed level of risk to safety and wellbeing in all cases.

Some examples of good practice noted by inspectors:

“Assessment is clear and concise. Young person’s and parent’s views have been gathered and interwoven in the assessment. There is an acknowledgement and understanding of diversity needs, for example the impact of potential autism and dyslexia. Victim’s views have been obtained and impact of the offence explored in in the assessment”.

In relation to risk of harm to others:

“An holistic assessment containing information from relevant agencies as a means of identifying all harmful behaviours. In addition to identifying risks linked to the index offence of assault on a peer, assessments appropriately include potential risks to siblings. The quality of the out-of-court disposal assessment is exceptional”.

3.2 Planning	Outstanding
Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.	

In all cases, planning was appropriate to the disposal, and objectives were realistic and achievable given the relatively short timeframe. In almost all cases the plans reflected the desistance factors that had been identified in the assessment. The main desistance factors identified included ETE, mental health, substance misuse, living arrangements and self-identity.

The children and young people's diversity, and wider familial and social context, were considered and they, along with their parent/carer, were actively and meaningfully involved in the planning process. Planning incorporated all of the young person's needs and did not focus solely on the offence. In all but one case, planning considered strengths and protective factors, and relevant objectives were included in the plan. Levels of maturity and motivation to engage were always considered to assess capacity and ability to change.

Assessments focused on supporting access to universal services to promote community integration in every case and this supported effective exit planning and on-going support.


An inspector noted:

“A really good piece of work completed, which included transferring the youth conditional caution (YCC) conditions to a meaningful plan for the young person. This involves the case manager meeting with the young person and Mum to create ‘My Plan’. Each participant contributes in writing to the plan, outlining their actions and what they can do to support the young person’s desistance, safety and wellbeing and risk to others. The expectations of the YCC are clearly set, and this enables the young person to take ownership of their plan”.

In all cases, planning paid attention to the safety and wellbeing of children and young people, addressed risk appropriately and involved other agencies. This was also the case in planning to promote the safety of other people. In 100 per cent of relevant cases, planning set out necessary contingency arrangements to manage the risks identified. Victims needs and wishes were taken into account.

An example of planning for safety and wellbeing:

“Planning acknowledged the importance of addressing emotional wellbeing and mental health. Consideration was given to referrals to CAMHS and Mind. The case manager completed a separate safety plan for the child and parent should immediate support be needed, for example emergency contact numbers, support websites, organising a GP appointment and attending A&E”.

3.3 Implementation and delivery	Outstanding
High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, engaging and assisting the child or young person.	

We observed a high level of engagement from young people, including those who were subject to voluntary interventions. This was a testament to the proactive approach of staff and their capacity to develop and maintain meaningful relationships with children and young people. We found that staff focused sufficiently on developing and maintaining effective working relationships. Staff encouraged and enabled the child or young person's compliance with the work of the YOS. In every case, interventions promoted opportunities for community integration, including access to mainstream services.


We found that, in almost all cases, the services most likely to support desistance were delivered, and that staff paid sufficient attention to sequencing and the available timescales. Service delivery reflected the diversity and wider familial and social context of the child or young person, involving parents/carers or significant others in 93 per cent of cases.

Service delivery promoted the safety and wellbeing of the child or young person in 92 per cent of cases. Other organisations were involved in delivering interventions to keep the child or young person safe in all but one case. Multi-agency work was well coordinated in promoting safety and protection. Work to protect the public was done to an equally high standard, we assessed that the implementation and delivery of services effectively supported the safety of others in every case.

Staff gave attention to the protection of actual and potential victims in all relevant cases. The services delivered were sufficient to manage and minimise the risk of harm in 89 per cent of cases. Overall, we found that the implementation and delivery of services effectively supported the safety of other people in every case.

An example of good practice:

“The case manager has been innovative and creative in developing interventions. The case manager created a gingerbread man intervention to support the child’s understanding of impact of their offence on victim. The child was provided with a ‘fidget spinner’ and visual aids are consistently used in the completion of work. Work has been very responsive to child’s educational needs (SEN). The case manager has been proactive in addressing child’s SEN, for example liaising with the school, SENCO and referring to 0–25 team. An exit plan is in place before the case is closed. This involved a team around the family meeting. The exit plan includes additional support for family, constructive activities for the child and sibling and a further review of SEN”.

3.4 Joint working	Outstanding
Joint working with the police supports the delivery of high-quality, personalised and coordinated services.	

All elements of work undertaken on out-of-court disposal cases were outstanding. Current evaluation by the YOS indicates that out-of-court disposal processes have been highly effective in the first 12 months of delivery.

Decision-making was informed by detailed, timely, holistic assessments that supported effective joint decision-making in every case. The out-of-court-disposal panel is jointly chaired by the YOS police officer and a YOS manager. The YOS victim worker is a standing panel member, as is the CAMHS worker. The panel also includes a community volunteer. Where appropriate, other agencies working with the child or young person are invited to the panel to offer their input and to agree plans.

In every case, the rationale for joint disposal decisions were clearly recorded. In one case, inspectors felt that the YOT's recommendation for an out-of-court disposal outcome, conditions and interventions were not appropriate and/or proportionate. Overall, however, we agreed with the decisions made.

In every case, we found that the YOS made a positive contribution to determining the out-of-court disposal. Recommendations made by the YOS considered the degree of the child or young person's understanding of the offence and their acknowledgement of responsibility. Proper attention was given to the child or young person's and their parents'/carers' understanding, of the implications of receiving an out-of-court disposal in all cases.

In every required case, the YOS worked effectively with the police in implementing the out-of-court disposal. Sufficient attention was given to compliance with and enforcement of the conditions in 92 per cent of relevant cases.

Some examples of good practice noted by inspectors:

"YOS recommendations are based on a comprehensive assessment which is mindful of the young person's personal circumstances, his risks, and positives achieved. Recommendations are appropriate, and this results in a youth conditional caution, which is commensurate with a group assault on a peer"

"Joint working in this case was positive, with clear achievement of the aim of the community resolution. Feedback was given to the police, detailing the work undertaken and when. Intervention was swift and consistent with what was required for the circumstances of the case. Feedback to the police was clearly recorded on the case management system".

Summary

Strengths:

- Assessment and planning to support desistance, to protect others and to support the safety and well-being of the child or young person are outstanding.
- Compliance with out-of-court disposals is good.
- Attention is given to the needs and wishes of victims in assessment, planning and the implementation of out-of-court disposals.
- Children and young people can continue to receive support from the YFS after their out-of-court intervention had concluded.
- Joint working with the police supports the delivery of high-quality personalised services.

Annex 1 – Methodology

The inspection methodology is summarised below, linked to the three domains within our standards framework. Our focus was on obtaining evidence against the standards, key questions and prompts within the framework.

Domain one: organisational delivery

The youth offending service submitted evidence in advance and the director of children's services delivered a presentation covering the following areas:

- How do organisational delivery arrangements in this area make sure that the work of your YOS is as effective as it can be, and that the life chances of children and young people who have offended are improved?
- What are your priorities for further improving these arrangements?

During the main fieldwork phase, we surveyed eight individual case managers, asking them about their experiences of training, development, management supervision and leadership. We then held various meetings and focus groups, which allowed us to triangulate evidence and information. In total, we conducted 10 meetings.

Domain two: court disposals

We completed case assessments over a one-week period, examining case files and interviewing case managers. Sixty per cent of the cases selected were those of children and young people who had received court disposals six to nine months earlier, enabling us to examine work in relation to assessing, planning, implementing and reviewing. Where necessary, interviews with other people significantly involved in the case also took place.

We examined 23 post-court cases. The sample size was set to achieve a confidence level of 80 per cent (with a margin of error of 5), and we ensured that the ratios in relation to gender, sentence or disposal type, risk of serious harm, and risk to safety and wellbeing classifications matched those in the eligible population.

Domain three: out-of-court disposals

We completed case assessments over a one-week period, examining case files and interviewing case managers. Forty per cent of cases selected were those of children and young people who had received out-of-court disposals three to five months earlier. This enabled us to examine work in relation to assessing, planning, implementing and joint working. Where necessary, interviews with other people significantly involved in the case also took place.

We examined 14 out-of-court disposals. The sample size was set to achieve a confidence level of 80 per cent (with a margin of error of 5), and we ensured that the ratios in relation to gender, sentence or disposal type, risk of serious harm, and risk to safety and wellbeing classifications matched those in the eligible population.

Annex 2 – Inspection results

1. Organisational delivery

Standards and key questions	Rating
<p>1.1. Governance and leadership</p> <p>The governance and leadership of the YOS supports and promotes the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children and young people.</p> <p>1.1.1. Is there a clear local vision and strategy for the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children and young people?</p> <p>1.1.2. Do the partnership arrangements actively support effective service delivery?</p> <p>1.1.3. Does the leadership of the YOS support effective service delivery?</p>	Outstanding
<p>1.2. Staff</p> <p>Staff within the YOS are empowered to deliver a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children and young people.</p> <p>1.2.1. Do staffing and workload levels support the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children and young people?</p> <p>1.2.2. Do the skills of YOS staff support the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children and young people?</p> <p>1.2.3. Does the oversight of work support high-quality delivery and professional development?</p> <p>1.2.4. Are arrangements for learning and development comprehensive and responsive?</p>	Outstanding

1.3. Partnerships and services **Outstanding**

A comprehensive range of high-quality services is in place, enabling personalised and responsive provision for all children and young people.

- 1.3.1. Is there a sufficiently comprehensive and up-to-date analysis of the profile of children and young people, to ensure that the YOS can deliver well-targeted services?
- 1.3.2. Does the YOS partnership have access to the volume, range and quality of services and interventions to meet the needs of all children and young people?
- 1.3.3. Are arrangements with statutory partners, providers and other agencies established, maintained and used effectively to deliver high-quality services?

1.4. Information and facilities **Outstanding**

Timely and relevant information is available and appropriate facilities are in place to support a high-quality, personalised and responsive approach for all children and young people.

- 1.4.1. Are the necessary policies and guidance in place to enable staff to deliver a quality service, meeting the needs of all children and young people?
- 1.4.2. Does the YOS's delivery environment(s) meet the needs of all children and young people and enable staff to deliver a quality service?
- 1.4.3. Do the information and communication technology (ICT) systems enable staff to deliver a quality service, meeting the needs of all children and young people?
- 1.4.4. Is analysis, evidence and learning used effectively to drive improvement?

2. Court disposals

Standards and key questions	Rating and % yes
<p>2.1. Assessment</p> <p>Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.</p>	Outstanding
<p>2.1.1. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child or young person's desistance?</p>	91%
<p>2.1.2. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child or young person safe?</p>	87%
<p>2.1.3. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?</p>	87%
<p>2.2. Planning</p> <p>Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.</p>	Outstanding
<p>2.2.1. Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child or young person's desistance?</p>	91%
<p>2.2.2. Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child or young person safe?</p>	81%
<p>2.2.3. Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?</p>	80%
<p>2.3. Implementation and delivery</p> <p>High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, engaging and assisting the child or young person.</p>	Outstanding
<p>2.3.1. Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the child or young person's desistance?</p>	91%
<p>2.3.2. Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child or young person?</p>	82%
<p>2.3.3. Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?</p>	95%

2.4. Reviewing	Outstanding
Reviewing of progress is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.	
2.4.1. Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child or young person's desistance?	87%
2.4.2. Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child or young person safe?	89%
2.4.3. Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	84%

3. Out-of-court disposals

Standards and key questions	Rating and % yes
3.1. Assessment	Outstanding
Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.	
3.1.1. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child or young person's desistance?	100%
3.1.2. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child or young person safe?	100%
3.1.3. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?	100%
3.2. Planning	Outstanding
Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, actively involving the child or young person and their parents/carers.	
3.2.1. Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child or young person's desistance?	100%
3.2.2. Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child or young person safe?	100%
3.2.3. Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	100%

3.3. Implementation and delivery	Outstanding
High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, engaging and assisting the child or young person.	
3.3.1. Does service delivery support the child or young person's desistance?	92%
3.3.2. Does service delivery effectively support the safety of the child or young person?	92%
3.3.3. Does service delivery effectively support the safety of other people?	100%

3.4. Joint working	Outstanding
Joint working with the police supports the delivery of high-quality, personalised and coordinated services.	
3.4.1. Are the YOT's recommendations sufficiently well-informed, analytical and personalised to the child or young person, supporting joint decision-making?	100%
3.4.2. Does the YOT work effectively with the police in implementing the out-of-court disposal?	100%

Annex 3 – Glossary

AssetPlus	Assessment and planning framework tool developed by the Youth Justice Board for work with children and young people who have offended, or are at risk of offending, that reflects current research and understanding of what works with children.
Community resolution	Used in low-level, often first-time, offences where there is informal agreement, often also involving the victim, about how the offence should be resolved. Community resolution is generic term. In practice, many different local terms are used to mean the same thing.
Court disposals	The sentence imposed by the court. Examples of youth court disposals are referral orders, youth rehabilitation orders and detention and training orders.
Child protection	Work to make sure that all reasonable action has been taken to keep to a minimum the risk of a child experiencing significant harm.
Criminal Behaviour Order (CBO)	A CBO is an order designed to tackle the most serious and persistent anti-social individuals where their behaviour has brought them before a criminal court. The anti-social behaviour to be addressed does not need to be connected to the criminal behaviour, or activity which led to the conviction.
Child sexual exploitation	Child sexual exploitation is a type of child abuse, occurring when a child or young person is encouraged, forced and manipulated to take part in sexual activity for something in return, for example presents, drugs, alcohol or emotional attention.
Desistance	The cessation of offending or other antisocial behaviour.
Desistance Matrix	A section of AssetPlus which considers what needs to be done to challenge a young person's attitudes towards their offending and behaviour.
Enforcement	Action taken by a case manager in response to a child or young person's failure to comply with the actions specified as part of a community sentence or licence. Enforcement can be punitive or motivational.
ETE	Education, training and employment: work to improve learning, and to increase future employment prospects.
First-time entrants	A child or young person who receives a statutory criminal justice outcome (youth caution, youth conditional caution or conviction) for the first time.

MAPPA	Multi-agency public protection arrangements: where probation, police, prison and other agencies work together locally to manage offenders who pose the highest risk of harm to others. Level 1 is single agency management where the risks posed by the offender can be managed by the agency responsible for the supervision or case management of the offender. Levels 2 and 3 require active multi-agency management.
Making it right panels	Initial youth offender panel meeting (panel meeting) – the first meeting between the child and the two volunteer panel members to consider and agree the content of the Referral Order. Panel meetings are intended to be less formal than court, to encourage the child to engage more fully in discussion around their offending and take an active part in negotiating a contract.
Out-of-court disposal	The resolution of a normally low-level offence, where it is not in the public interest to prosecute, through a community resolution, youth caution or youth conditional caution.
Personalised	A personalised approach is one in which services are tailored to meet the needs of individuals, giving people as much choice and control as possible over the support they receive. We use this term to include diversity factors.
Referral order	A restorative court order which can be imposed when the child or young person appearing before the court pleads guilty, and whereby the threshold does not meet a youth rehabilitation order.
Safeguarding	Safeguarding is a wider term than child protection. It involves promoting a child or young person's health and development and ensuring that their overall welfare needs are met.
Safety and wellbeing	AssetPlus replaced the assessment of vulnerability with a holistic outlook of a child or young person's safety and well-being concerns. It is defined as "...those outcomes where the young person's safety and well-being may be compromised through their own behaviour, personal circumstances or because of the acts/omissions of others" (<i>AssetPlus Guidance</i> , 2016).
YCC	Youth conditional caution: as for a youth caution, but with conditions attached that the child is required to comply with for up to the next three months. Non-compliance may result in the child being prosecuted for the original offence.
YOT/YOS	Youth Offending Team/Service is the term used in the <i>Crime and Disorder Act 1998</i> to describe a

	multi-agency team that aims to reduce youth offending. YOTs are known locally by many titles, such as youth justice service (YJS), youth offending service (YOS), and other generic titles that may illustrate their wider role in the local area in delivering services for children.
YOT Management Board	The YOT Management Board holds the YOT to account to ensure it achieves the primary aim of preventing offending by children and young people.
YJB	Youth Justice Board: government body responsible for monitoring and advising ministers on the effectiveness of the youth justice system. Providers of grants and guidance to the youth offending teams.



HM Inspectorate of Probation
1 Bridge Street West
Civil Justice Centre
Manchester
M3 3FX

ISBN: 978-1-84099-861-0