

Youth Justice Planning Framework Validation Feedback

YOT: Hammersmith and Fulham

1. Performance against National Indicators	Data (07/08 outturn)
NI 19: Proven rate of re-offending	46% in 2002 32.8% in 2005
NI 111: First Time Entrants	196 in 2005/06 183 in 2007/08
NI 43: Convicted young people sentenced to custody	10.4% in 2007/08 6.9% in 2006/07
NI 44: Ethnic composition of young offenders	26.4% in 2006/07 (Black) 30.9 % in 2007/08 (Black)
NI 45: Engagement in suitable education, training or employment	63% in 2006/07 79.4% in 2007/08
NI 46: Access to suitable accommodation	100% in 2006/07 93.4% in 2007/08
2. Planning Framework Validation Judgement	
Performs poorly	
Performs adequately	
Performs well	✓
Performs excellently	

3. Ladder of Interventions

Level 1: Intensive Monitoring	
Level 2: Standard Monitoring	✓ 3-4 visits during the year
Level 3: Low Monitoring	
Level 4: Capturing Emerging Practice	

4. Summary (To include a summary of the assessment, a list of future monitoring priorities (bullet points), other key areas e.g. scaled approach, 100% pooling and notable and innovative practice).

Hammersmith and Fulham YOS was inspected in September 2007, the report was generally positive with four criteria being judged as good and four criteria adequate. It would appear that good progress has been made against the Post Inspection Action Plan an example of this was evidenced as part of this process; the setting up of the Youth Offending Issues Group (YOIG). The most recent version of the action plan (RAG rated) has been provided to the YJB Regional team.

It is noted from the most up to date YJB Performance Summary (April 07 to March 08) that performance is particularly strong in prevention. Commitment to, and progress in this area was well evidenced as part of this process where good partnership working was also noted. In addition FTE is also a formal LAA target for the borough.

Performance was not as strong in the areas of custody and use of remand where the YOS was higher than all comparator groups. However, it is recognised that the high profile murder of a male teenager in the area and consequent enforcement actions will have had a negative impact on reporting for the year; in recognising the importance of this issue the YOS has plans in place.

Overall the Youth Justice Board Validation process found Hammersmith and Fulham to be a good YOS with a management group and staff team who are committed, informed and engaged. There was evidence of some good systems in place and recognition from the YOS of youth

justice priorities and performance issues. Relationships with the court are particularly strong underpinned by effective and systematic working.

In addition to the priorities listed below the YOS should consider reviewing the central recording of its quality assurance and gatekeeping systems to ensure that what was recognised as a good system is fully documented.

The YJB has identified the following as priority outcomes:

- BME disproportionality - recognised as a recurring theme in London.
- Evaluation of service user feedback
- High use of custody – underlying trends to be monitored
- High use of remands - underlying trends to be monitored

Court Referral Panel as an integral part of court work, noted as an example on notable and innovative practice.

YJB Key Lines of Enquiry

In line with the 4 themes that will form the foundation of the organisational assessment for the CAA, the YJB has identified 5 performance drivers that can inform an understanding of performance and improvement priorities. They are YOT governance, use of resources and value for money, workforce and organisational development, performance and quality systems and citizens and service users. These will be the key lines of enquiry that YJB regional staff will use to validate Youth Justice Self-assessments and improvement plans completed and submitted by YOT partnerships.

Rating System	1	A YOT partnership that does not meet minimum requirements	Performs Poorly
	2	A YOT partnership that meets only minimum requirements	Performs Adequately
	3	A YOT partnership that consistently meets above minimum requirements	Performs Well
	4	A YOT partnership that meets well above minimum requirements	Performs Excellently

YOT Governance		
YJB Key Lines of Enquiry	Rating	3
YOT management board is chaired by a chief officer (ideally the local authority chief executive) and consists of members who have sufficient seniority and authority to commit resources		
The Children and Young Peoples Partnership Board is chaired by a Councillor and comprises of a number of representatives from different agencies who appear to be at a senior level and would have the ability to take significant decisions and commit resources.		
YOT management board assumes corporate ownership of preventing and reducing youth crime and has established a local youth crime strategy that is aligned with other relevant local strategies and plans		
First Time Entrants is an LAA target and BME disproportionality is a local target. Plan notes that there is increasing coherence locally for the boroughs targets. Range of panel meetings every 6 weeks with inclusive membership from a range of agencies.		
YOT management board members have effective strategic links with children's services and criminal justice and the wider crime reduction agenda and actively represent youth justice issues		
Strategic links and partnership working appear to be strong at Hammersmith and Fulham. The YOS has twin track reporting to both CDRP and Children's and Young Peoples Partnership Board, in addition the YOS is represented at the Local Criminal Justice Group, contributed to the development of CAF and is represented at the family support panel.		
YOT management board requires from the YOT management team regular performance reports on national and local youth crime indicators and targets. These reports provide sufficient analysis of management information for management board members to fully understand the story of place and improvement priorities progress		
Concern was noted in the HMIP Inspection (September 2007) of the management board in relation to this area. As a result the Youth Offending Issues Group (YOIG) was set up. YOIG meets on a quarterly basis to provide the management board with effective scrutiny of the partnership. YOIG presents the board with a range of issues and suggested ways forward, evidence of this was provided on the day. YOIG appears to be well embedded into the operation of the YOS and all staff on the day had an awareness of		

its existence and function.

YOT management board actively promotes continuous improvement activities and initiatives and swiftly takes action to address underperformance issues

As noted this area appeared to be weak previously and has been strengthened by the development of the YOIG. Evidence of management board decisions taken in response to issues provided by YOIG was noted on the day.

Use of Resources and Value for Money

YJB Key Lines of Enquiry

Rating

3

YOT financial and staff resources are sufficient to deliver the strategic aims and priorities of the national and local youth justice system

YOS budgets remains stable at £2,040,000. The Youth Justice Planning Framework shows 70% of budget is allocated to statutory provisions and 30% to prevention provisions. No issues were noted on the day in relation to potential negative impact on service provision through the budget allocation. It is recognised that use of secure remands is a drain on resources and this has been placed on the local authority risk register to raise its status.

There is a coherent allocation system in place ensuring effective workload coordination and management oversight and review

A Court and Information Officer is in place to support court and YOS processes. The Court and Information Officer is responsible for allocating PSRs and Referral Orders. Allocation is based on capacity/skill base and development needs of staff. A spreadsheet is in place to show which cases are allocated to which member of staff and to which manager for quality assurance processes. This process allows for fair and planned case allocation whilst also allowing for staff development and specialist areas to be met. On the day an operational manager was able to fully explain the case allocation system; experience, gender, ethnicity and specialisms. This was confirmed by two practitioners and appears to be well embedded into the operation of the YOS (within context of daily pressures and resources).

The YOT directs time and resources to children and young people in accordance with their risk assessment

The YOS is preparing for the Scaled Approach. Preparation includes workshop sessions within the YOS focussing on ASSET and ONSET. Joint training with magistrates is also planned to support the new approach. The plan specifically references a Casework review finding that "unnecessary work being done on lower risk cases." Such findings need to feed into preparations for the Scaled Approach.

An appropriate range of quality offending behaviour programmes and provision are available to meet the diverse needs of the local community

The YOS is able to offer a wide variety of programmes and interventions through both the Prevention arena and statutory YOT interventions. The YOS is also preparing for data to be analysed further in the future to inform service delivery and development. The YOS is aiming to obtain approval to recruit a full time Business Support Manager to conduct this. A good range of programmes are noted in the plan and were further evidenced on the day. Some programmes specifically targeting BME young people.

YOT ICT resources are sufficient and the capacity and capability of the management information systems are utilised

Current capacity within the YOS restricts the extent to which management information is utilised. In response to this, the YOS is aiming to seek approval for a full time Business Support Manager with direct responsibility for information management and analysis (as stated above). The YOS is hopeful to have this post filled by year end 2008. The recruitment of a Business Support Manager will allow for greater evaluation of data to inform service delivery.

Workforce and Organisational Development		
YJB Key Lines of Enquiry	Rating	3
YOT organisational structure supports the delivery of the local youth crime strategy.		
The current organisational structure is due to be reorganised in Autumn 2008 due to centralisation of LA funding and improvements to management information and operational responsibilities. Some posts have been hard to fill e.g. Parenting, Probation. Trainee social work posts exist, currently one held by a former volunteer.		
YOT partnership workforce development strategy effectively enables the YOT partnership to overcome risks to future delivery		
Partner agencies contribute financially and in kind e.g. staffing and training and therefore enable delivery of services and interventions more effectively. Police and Connexions have increased their contribution recently.		
Timely, structured and quality induction programmes for all new staff and volunteers		
There is a thorough and structured induction programme (checklist and pack) in operation. This includes an individualised work plan for all new employed starters which includes shadowing, on line tasks, observation and supervision. Corporate (on line) induction is also included. Inclusion of London INSET training provision and website will be added.		
Staff and volunteer training needs identified and analysed and plans in place to meet learning and development needs together with YOT partner agencies		
Staff training needs are identified at appraisal stage and managers meet quarterly to review needs. Fortnightly staff seminars are delivered on a variety of current topics and refresher training. Training is also organised and delivered on a cluster basis with other Yots. An audit of youth justice skills and qualifications has been established although this needs updating. A formal Workforce Development plan does not exist however the key elements and systems of a WD plan are in existence. Funding to maintain the YJB's current level of funding in NQF/Open University courses is planned.		
Staff performance and development is actively managed through regular and quality appraisal and supervision with outcomes acted upon to ensure YOT staff and volunteers are confident, competent, skilled and accountable		

Staff and volunteers are regularly supervised and appraised. Both HMIP inspection and this process confirmed that supervision meets LA requirements. Staff have promotional opportunities within current structure.

Performance and Quality systems		
YJB Key Lines of Enquiry	Rating	3
National and local youth justice strategic aims and priorities drive the work of the YOT partnership and the activity of staff and volunteers		
This is well covered in the YOS submission. LAA targets are noted and were discussed on the day. A clear emphasis on prevention work. Discussion with the prevention manager gave a good awareness and oversight of activity in this area. Youth Justice Board Performance Summary information (2007/08) shows performance reporting for FTE to have been exceeded.		
Management information is stored and gathered securely, accurately and consistently in line with YJB and local rules, guidance and procedures		
This has been checked with the Data Co-ordination Officer. The YOS should ensure case file cabinets are stored securely each evening with cabinets being locked.		
Management information is effectively analysed and proactively used to help YOT staff and the YOT management board to fully understand the story of place in terms of success factors and priority improvement activities		
This is an area the YOS has recognised as requiring improvement and has a plan in place through which to facilitate improvement, with the creation of a new post to work on data and analysis (to be filled at the end of the 2008). Currently quarterly performance is reported to the team, there is quarterly reporting to the Children's Fund (this does warrant a bigger piece of evaluation) and the YOS manager is confident in his ability to evaluate information and present findings. It is acknowledged that it is early days for feeding information from gate keeping of PSR and ASSET upwards, the last example being the Race Action Plan. Further work could be identified in this area.		
Effective quality assurance systems drive the highest quality of Assessment, Planning Interventions and Supervision as defined in the Key Elements of Effective Practice (KEEPs) and YJB guidance (See APIS questions below)		

ASSETS and PSRs are gate kept by a manager. Weekly Court Review Panel appears to be integral to the operation of the YOS and an example of good practice. It considers the throughput of court work and PSR gatekeepers are allocated as part of its remit. Minutes are kept of the CRP and decisions transferred to case files. There is quality assurance of ASSETS that are at risk of custody. A system of monthly peer/management oversight of ASSET has commenced which is positive. A PSR gate keeping pro forma and completed example was noted on the day. QA systems form part of induction and ASSET training is undertaken on an annual basis. It was apparent that there is a gate keeping and quality assurance system in place; however the central recording system was not completed on all occasions. YOS manager was invited to provide the evidence if it could be located, and subsequently the quality assurance tool that was used has been provided.

Systems are in place to manage and review the effectiveness and efficiency of the processes that underpin operational partnership working relationships with key agencies and specialist provide

As noted partnership working appears to be positive at this YOS. In relation to prevention, good partnership working was evidenced with five different panels/meetings all taking place on the same day which allowed for good attendance from a range of agencies and themes to become apparent throughout the day. As previously noted a more extensive piece of work on the reporting to the Children’s Fund could be undertaken. Examples of protocols with Looked After social worker and complex needs service were noted as part of the visit.

Citizens and Service Users		
YJB Key Lines of Enquiry	Rating	2
YOT partnership has an effective community engagement and communications strategy that directly informs the development of local youth justice services		
The YOS operates various means of communicating with parents, young people, courts and victims. The YOS would benefit from consolidating the methods of good practice already in existence with a view to being able to demonstrate a purposeful strategy in relation to how the YOS further develops its services to meet need.		

YOT partnership proactively engages with and seeks feedback about the quality of YOT services from children and young people

The YOS recognises the value and need for service user feedback and operates various methods of obtaining feedback from young people, which for example include discussion during a 3 monthly order review, discussions at the end of an intervention, completion of 'What do you think forms', which were evidenced on the day, although it is noted that information from this process is not fully utilised as a piece of management information. The YOS would benefit from having in place a consolidated approach through which to seek and evaluate the views of young people specifically in relation to service development. The YOS also provides opportunity for young people to engage and express a view in relation to the staff recruitment process which is noted as an example of good practice.

YOT partnership proactively engages with and seeks feedback about the quality of YOT services from parents, carers and corporate parents

The YOS recognises the importance of obtaining feedback to improve service delivery. Parents are met with during the 3 month Order Review and feedback is obtained. The YOS would benefit from developing a more structured and specific system to obtain feedback from parents in relation to quality of service provision.

YOT partnership proactively engages with and seeks feedback about the quality of YOT services from victims of youth crime and the wider community

The YOS has a dedicated VLO in place and has achieved 100% performance in relation to victim satisfaction. The YOS recognises the need to ensure the victim work of the YOS and the Police are cohesive to ensure victims receive a consistent service. The YOS recognises public may not always hear of action taken in relation to criminal activity within the borough and is keen to ensure consistent feedback from public in borough survey is fed into the YOS. YOS partnership has established a Borough Crime Summit and a 'Youth Ward' event, both of which bring public and Criminal Justice Agencies together. It is noted that the number of victims expressing views, whilst increasing was insignificant.

YOT partnership proactively engages with and seeks feedback about the quality of YOT services from sentencers and other partner agencies

The YOS demonstrates a good level of engagement with courts and sentencers. Strategically the YOS is aiming to obtain court membership to the YOIG to support partnership working and communication. The YOS undertakes a Youth Court Users Meetings and a Youth Court Sentencing forum. Both forums provide opportunity for partnership building and open dialogue between magistrates and YOS in relation to performance. These forums are supported by a 'Cusp Case' feedback system which allows for feedback to be given to sentencers in relation to progression of community disposals. This level of engagement with the courts is excellent.

Overall Driver Rating	14
-----------------------	----

APIS Quality Management Key Lines of Enquiry

Rating System	1	A YOT partnership that does not meet minimum requirements	Performs Poorly
	2	A YOT partnership that meets only minimum requirements	Performs Adequately
	3	A YOT partnership that consistently meets above minimum requirements	Performs Well
	4	A YOT partnership that meets well above minimum requirements	Performs Excellently

APIS Quality Management Key Lines of Enquiry

To what extent do the YOT have a clearly established system for case-management supervision?

To what extent is management oversight clearly recorded in case files/case recording systems?

To what extent is there a clear and consistently followed process of induction for new staff in case-file QA systems?

YJB Comments

Case sampling of five cases was carried out. Findings were as follows:

- Evidence of case managerial oversight in most cases
- System of identifying quality assurance of PSR/Referral Order Panel Reports not consistently applied.
- Discussions with staff demonstrate knowledge of quality assurance processes and methods management oversight through formal

supervision of case holders. There was evidence to support this in the case file sample.