

Safer, Stronger Select Committee			
Report Title	Full Joint Inspection into Youth Offending Work in Lewisham		
Key Decision	No		Item No. 4
Ward	All		
Contributors	Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People.		
Class	Part 1	Date: January 2017	

1. **Purpose of the Report**

HMIP undertook a Full Joint Inspection of Youth Offending Work in Lewisham in September 2016. The final report was published in Dec 16:

<https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/>

This report outlines the findings and provides a draft improvement plan for consideration.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended to note the report
- To receive updates on the progress every 6 months

2. **Background**

- The Full Joint Inspection is part of a programme of risk proportionate Inspection of Youth Offending Work agreed by Ministers. This document outlines the framework adopted by HMI Probation and partner inspectorates for this inspection in both England and Wales. It has been developed following consultation with YOTs, partner inspectorates and other interested parties.
- The Full Joint Inspection (FJI) is undertaken in six local authority areas per year, five of which are normally in England and one in Wales. It focuses primarily on those areas where there is cause for concern about performance. This is determined following analysis of information received from the Youth Justice Board (YJB), intelligence gained from other inspections and publicly available data, and through consultation with other inspectorates via quarterly 'Information Bank' meetings.

- Government policy requires inspections to be undertaken as unannounced or with very short notice. Work should be inspected ‘as is’ and with the minimum of preparatory overheads, rather than as the inspected body ‘would like it to be’
- **The first fieldwork week** focuses on the inspection of practice. This is undertaken by staff from HMI Probation together with a local assessor(s) from another YOT area, who has been trained in the FJI methodology. HMIP spend a week away from the office to review their findings. Inspectors from partner inspectorates join the inspection for the **second fieldwork week**. Informed by the findings of the first fieldwork week, partner inspectors apply their specialist skills, for example in safeguarding and child protection, learning and skills and health to further inspect the quality of practice, together with leadership, management and partnership contributions to this.

3. Lewisham’s Inspection

Lewisham’s Inspection took place from 12th September to 30th September led by HM Inspector Helen Mercer

Full information about the methodology used can be found via the following links:

- <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2014/02/FJI-Inspection-Framework-v4-England-and-Wales-230216.pdf>
- <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2014/02/FJI-Criteria-v7-1-England-and-Wales-011014-final.pdf>

3.1. Findings

The draft report has judged that Lewisham Youth Justice Services are Unsatisfactory. The judgements are as follows:

- 1 star = Poor
- 2 stars = Unsatisfactory
- 3 stars = Satisfactory
- 4 starts = Good

Reducing reoffending



Protecting the public



Protecting children and young people



Making sure the sentence is served



Governance and partnerships



Interventions



3.2. The following scores are worth noting for comparative purposes.
The threshold to achieve Satisfactory is 65%

London YOT	Reducing Reoffending	Public Protection	Protecting C & YP	Sentence Served	Interventions
Lewisham (Oct 16)	60%	60%	62%	76%	64%
Croydon (July 13)	55%	49%	55%	73%	N/a
Lambeth (Jan 15)	58%	56%	62%	82%	63%
Islington Re-inspection (Jan 16)	44%	38%	47%	78%	54%
Islington	35%	34%	44%	70%	40%
Greenwich Re-inspection (Nov 15)	71%	69%	67%	79%	73%
Bromley YOT (May 15)	39%	51%	55%	65%	43%

3.3. The following headlines were noted by HMIP :

- Work to reduce reoffending was unsatisfactory. Although most initial assessments of the reasons why children had offended were sufficient, the plans to address those risks and the frequency with which those plans were reviewed were unsatisfactory, so the impact on reoffending was limited;
- Work to protect the public and actual or potential victims was unsatisfactory. There was some good work by case managers to protect the public, but plans lacked measurable objectives, which meant interventions to address the risk of harm did not always address the specific risks children posed;

- Work to protect children and reduce their vulnerability was unsatisfactory. There was some good safeguarding work undertaken by individual case managers. The immediate sharing of information between the YOS and children's social care services about missing children was not sufficiently robust;
- Governance and partnership arrangements were ineffective. There was a lot of partnership activity in Lewisham and a sense of energy around the delivery of services, but this was not always cohesive and the impact for children and young people was inconsistent; and
- Work to deliver interventions to reduce reoffending was unsatisfactory. A range of interventions was available for case managers and partners but further work needed to be done to engage with young people better. Interventions were not evaluated routinely, so it was difficult for the YOS to understand what was effective.
- Inspectors were pleased to find that work to ensure the sentence was served was good. The YOS made consistently good efforts to understand and respond to things stopping children or their parents/carers from engaging. Work to ensure young people complied with their sentence was effective

3.4. **HMIP Recommendations**

The local authority Chief Executive should make sure that:

- The Youth Justice Management Board focuses on improving outcomes for children and young people with all partners being accountable for a reduction in reoffending rates, better management of risk of harm to others and the more effective protection of vulnerable children and young people who have offended.

The YOS Head of Service should make sure that:

- The Youth Justice Management Board considers a broader range of performance information to enable a consistent focus on outcomes for children and young people
- Planning for work with children and young people is carried out in all cases and is regularly and meaningfully reviewed
- Interventions are planned, address the areas identified in assessment, delivered with integrity and evaluated
- Quality assurance and management oversight in all case management work is conducted to a good standard, including the delivery of interventions and review of work
- The risk and vulnerability management panel is functioning effectively given the pace of work and volume of cases that it deals with

- Education, training and employment providers have sufficient information about the circumstances of children and young people before placements begin
- The delivery of health services to YOS children and young people reflects the needs identified in The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2014: Young People In Contact With The Criminal Justice System including physical health, and speech, language and communication needs
- Information sharing with health, substance misuse and social care partners is improved.

3.5. **Next Steps**

- The report was published on Thursday 8th December 2016. It is now published on the HMIP website and has been shared with key partners by HMIP.
- Lewisham Youth Justice Management Board is required to provide an Improvement Plan by 23rd January 2017.
- This Improvement Plan will be agreed by HMIP by 6th February 2017 and then the Youth Justice Board will be required to oversee the implementation of the plan.

3.6. **Action to Date**

- Appointment of an independent Chair of the Partnership Youth Justice Management Board for a year
- Review of interventions delivered
- Review of other Boroughs post inspection approach and implementation of aspects of these
- Review of staffing and deliverability with options for change
- Case audits by external expert
- Implementation of an in-depth Performance management partnership group to ensure performance is linked to outcomes with detailed analysis of root cause to drive activity.

The detailed Improvement Plan outlines the whole scope of actions required to make improvements and will be signed off at the end of Jan by HMIP and the YJB.

4. **Financial Implications**

- 4.1. In delivering against some aspects of the Improvement plan immediately there have been financial implications which will be managed through the Division. Through the reviews and findings there may be further financial implications where decisions will need to be taken. Over the last 5 years the external grant from the MOJ has been reduced, there are no indications about any further reductions at this stage. Any resource reductions has an impact on deliverability of the core service requirements.

5. Legal & Human Rights Implications

- 5.1. The Council is under a number of statutory obligations to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires the Council to formulate and implement a strategy for the reduction of crime and disorder; the Anti Social Behaviour 2003 requires the Council as a local housing authority to have policies and procedures for dealing with anti-social behaviour and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 places the Council under a duty to have, when carrying out its functions, due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between persons of different racial groups.
- 5.2. The Local Government Act 1999 places a duty on the local authorities to secure continuous improvement in the way its functions are exercised having regard to the combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.
- 5.3. Section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 empowers the local authority to do anything which it considers likely to achieve the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of all or any persons within the local authority's area.
- 5.4. These statutory duties amongst others feed into the Council's Safer Lewisham Strategy.

6. Equalities Implications

- 6.1. Developing safe and secure communities is central to the work of the Council as a whole and in particular to the Community Services directorate. Reducing and preventing crime, reducing fear of crime and supporting vulnerable communities is critical to the well-being of all our citizens.

7. Crime and Disorder Implications

- 7.1. Section 17 places a duty on partners to do all they can to reasonably prevent crime and disorder in their area. The level of crime and its impact is influenced by the decisions and activities taken in the day-to-day of local bodies and organisations. The responsible authorities are required to provide a range of services in their community from policing, fire protection, planning, consumer and environmental protection, transport and highways. They each have a key statutory role in providing these services and, in carrying out their core activities, can significantly contribute to reducing crime and improving the quality of life in their area.

8. Environmental Implications

- 8.1. Key decisions made which may have environmental implications. Environmental services are consulted about all agreed activity before proceeding.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1. The outcome of the inspection is disappointing. Actions taken to date along with delivery against the *Draft* Improvement plan and Partnership commitment to making these improvements is now critical. Focus on this is a priority across all key partners and agencies.

*For further information on this report please contact Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney
Head of Crime Reduction & Supporting People, Directorate for Community Services on
020 8 314 9569*