



County Hall
Cardiff
CF10 4UW
Tel: (029) 2087 2000

Neuadd y Sir
Caerdydd
CF10 4UW
Ffôn: (029) 2087 2000

AGENDA

Committee CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date and Time of Meeting THURSDAY, 30 JULY 2020, 4.30 PM

Venue REMOTE MEETING VIA MS TEAMS

Membership Councillor Lee Bridgeman (Chair)
Councillors Cunnah, Hopkins, Joyce, Melbourne, Molik, Phillips,
Mia Rees and Singh

Patricia Arlotte (Roman Catholic representative), Carol Cobert (Church in Wales Representative), Karen Dell'Armi (Parent Governor Representative) and Matthew Richards (Parent Governor Representative)

Time approx.

1 Apologies for Absence 4.30 pm

To receive apologies for absence.

2 Declarations of Interest

To be made at the start of the agenda item in question, in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct.

3 Youth Justice Inspection (Pages 3 - 106) 4.35 pm

To enable Members to review and assess the Youth Justice Service's progress following the HMIP Inspection Report, including its official response to inspectors and the 'All Our Futures' Strategy.

4 Education Restart (Pages 107 - 124) 5.20 pm

To enable Members to review and assess plans for the restart of Education from September 2020.

5 Way Forward 5.50 pm

To review the evidence and information gathered during consideration of each agenda item, agree Members comments, observations and

By receiving this Agenda Pack electronically you have saved the Authority approx. £3.53 in printing costs

This document is available in Welsh / Mae'r ddogfen hon ar gael yn Gymraeg

concerns to be passed on to the relevant Cabinet Member by the Chair.

6 Urgent Items (if any)

7 Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee is scheduled for 15th September 2020, at 10.00am via Microsoft Teams.

Davina Fiore

Director Governance & Legal Services

Date: Friday, 24 July 2020

Contact: Mandy Farnham,

02920 872618, Mandy.Farnham@cardiff.gov.uk

This meeting will be recorded for subsequent broadcast on the Council's website. The whole of the meeting will be recorded, except where there are confidential or exempt items. A copy of the recording will also be retained in accordance with the Council's data retention policy.

If you make a representation to the meeting you will be deemed to have consented to being filmed and/or recorded.

If you have any queries regarding the recording of this meeting, please contact Committee Services on 02920 872020 or email [Democratic Services](#)

This document is available in Welsh / Mae'r ddogfen hon ar gael yn Gymraeg

**CYNGOR CAERDYDD
CARDIFF COUNCIL****CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

30 July 2020

**YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE – RESPONSE TO INSPECTORATE
REPORT**

Purpose of the Report

1. In July 2020, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation issued a report following an inspection of Cardiff Youth Offending Service. A copy of the Inspection report is attached at **Appendix A**. A copy of Cardiff Council's response is attached at **Appendix B**, with a copy of the two-year plan to transform youth offending services, called 'All Our Futures', attached at **Appendix C**. An initial response to these from HMI Probation is attached at **Appendix D**.
2. This report provides background information and highlights the main issues in order to assist Members' consideration of the Inspectorate report and the Council's response.

Scope of Scrutiny

3. During this scrutiny, Members have the opportunity to consider both the Inspectorate report and the Council's response to it, including 'All Our Futures'. In particular, Members may wish to explore:
 - The performance issues identified by the Inspection;
 - The Council's response to the Inspectorate report;
 - The resources available to address recommendations and implement improvement actions;
 - The processes for monitoring the implementation of improvement actions;
 - Whether there are further challenges or obstacles that require addressing;
 - How service users will be involved in improving the service;
 - Whether further scrutiny is required.

Background

4. The Cardiff Youth Offending Service (YOS) is a statutory partnership set up under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to work with 10 to 18 year olds and their families, to prevent anti-social behaviour, offending and re-offending. YOS workers provide intervention and support to young people sentenced to a community penalty or custody or those dealt with by an out-of-court disposal, as well as prevention and diversion work to try to steer young people away from entering the youth criminal justice system. They also offer support to victims of youth crime and anti-social behaviour.
5. Youth Offending Service teams are required to have staff from local authority social services, education services, the Police, the National Probation Service and local health services.

Inspectorate Report

6. The inspection, in January 2020, was led by HMI Probation and supported by inspectors from Care Inspectorate Wales, Estyn, Healthcare Inspectorate Wales, and HMI Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS).
7. Overall, Cardiff Youth Offending Service was rated as 'Inadequate' across all areas of work: leadership and staffing; working with partners such as health, education and police; and providing services to children and young people who have offended and to their victims.
8. The inspection found improvement is required across all areas. The report makes 14 recommendations that inspectors believe, if implemented, will improve the lives of the children in contact with youth offending services and better protect the public. The recommendations are listed on **pages 11-12, Appendix A.**

Response to the Report

9. The Council's official response to the Inspectorate report is attached at **Appendix B.** Since the Inspection, a new, experienced independent chairperson, Graham Robb, has been brought in to lead the YOS Management Board, now called the Cardiff Youth Justice Board. Workshops have been held

with those involved in the services, including young people, to develop a two-year plan to transform youth offending services in the city, titled 'All Our Futures', which is attached at **Appendix C**. The Cardiff Youth Justice Board, who will make sure work is kept on track, will oversee the work set out in the plan.

10. The Cardiff Public Services Board¹ has endorsed the strategy and issued the following statement:

"The Cardiff Public Services Board endorses and supports this strategy which sets out our key goals and how we will measure success by 2022. By signing this development strategy, we are making a public declaration of our commitment to transform the services, and to bring about sustained and lasting improvement in youth justice in Cardiff. This will mean better outcomes for the children in the youth justice system. That increased effectiveness is also about reducing offending and is in the interests of victims. As partners, we are using the strategy to state what it is we are going to do together in the next two years, and how we know we're making a difference, to get better outcomes for the young people of Cardiff.... We knew that we had to work hard and quickly to make change happen. This strategy is the outcome of that work."

11. The strategy covers:

- reshaping of governance and leadership to focus on making changes happen;
- improved use of shared data and analysis to improve what is delivered and to assess if it is working
- a workforce development plan including a quality assurance framework
- working with partners to put in place an improved offer to children and families who receive youth justice services.

¹ Cardiff Public Services Board consists of representatives from: Cardiff Council, Cardiff & Vale University Health Board, South Wales Police, South Wales Fire & Rescue Services, National Probation Service, Natural Resources Wales, C3SC, Police and Crime Commissioner and Welsh Government. It seeks to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Cardiff by strengthening joint working across the public services.

12. The key priorities set out in the plan are:
- We will make sure we have all the right data and tools to analyse the needs of the child now, and any future trends
 - We will make sure our shared assessment of needs is accurate and enables better outcomes for the children and the risks to be reduced ... including for victims
 - We will make sure all staff are trained to work in the most effective way to secure the best pathways to good outcomes for children and young people and for the community.
 - We will ensure clear and effective leadership of shared development – reported to the right people.
13. An initial response from HMI Probation to the Council’s response is attached at **Appendix D**.

Previous Scrutiny

14. As part of their work programme for 2019-20, this Committee reviewed the Social Services Directorate Delivery Plan 2019/20. As a result, the Committee requested a briefing report on the proposed service review of the Youth Offending service. A briefing report was provided to Committee at their meeting on 17 December 2019, following which the Chair, Councillor Bridgeman, wrote to Councillor Hinchey, Cabinet Member – Children and Families, stating the committee:
- suggest that in future it may be more useful to compare against Core City across the UK and not just Welsh Local Authorities
 - note that an Adolescent Strategy is being developed and request that a draft of the Strategy be presented to this Committee prior to its consideration by Cabinet.²

Way Forward

15. Councillor Graham Hinchey (Cabinet Member for Children & Families), Sarah McGill (Corporate Director- People & Communities), Claire Marchant (Director

² Letter from Cllr Bridgeman, Chair CYP, to Cllr Hinchey, Cabinet Member Children & Families, dated 7 January 2020

of Social Service), Deborah Driffield, Interim Assistant Director Children's Services and Graham Robb, Chair, Youth Justice Board, will be available to answer any questions Members may have.

16. Members will be able to agree any comments, concerns or recommendations that they wish to pass on to the Cabinet Member for Children & Families and Director of Social Services around the proposed way forward.

Legal Implications

17. The Scrutiny Committee is empowered to enquire, consider, review and recommend but not to make policy decisions. As the recommendations in this report are to consider and review matters there are no direct legal implications. However, legal implications may arise if and when the matters under review are implemented with or without any modifications. Any report with recommendations for decision that goes to Cabinet will set out any legal implications arising from those recommendations. All decisions taken by or on behalf of the Council must (a) be within the legal powers of the Council; (b) comply with any procedural requirement imposed by law; (c) be within the powers of the body or person exercising powers on behalf of the Council; (d) be undertaken in accordance with the procedural requirements imposed by the Council e.g. Scrutiny Procedure Rules; (e) be fully and properly informed; (f) be properly motivated; (g) be taken having regard to the Council's fiduciary duty to its taxpayers; and (h) be reasonable and proper in all the circumstances.

Financial Implications

18. The Scrutiny Committee is empowered to enquire, consider, review and recommend but not to make policy decisions. As the recommendations in this report are to consider and review matters there are no direct financial implications at this stage in relation to any of the work programme. However, financial implications may arise if and when the matters under review are implemented with or without any modifications. Any report with recommendations for decision that goes to Cabinet will set out any financial implications arising from those recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION

That Committee considers the Inspectorate's Report, the Council's response to this, the 'All Our Futures' Strategy and information provided at the meeting and agrees any recommendations, comments or advice it wishes to offer to the Cabinet Member and / or Director of Social Services.

Davina Fiore

Director of Governance and Legal Services

24 July 2020



Her Majesty's
Inspectorate of
Probation

An inspection of youth offending services in

Cardiff

HM Inspectorate of Probation, July 2020



Acknowledgements

This inspection which was undertaken in January 2020 was led by HM Inspector Mike Lane, supported by a team of inspectors and colleagues from across the Inspectorate. HMI Probation was joined by colleague inspectors: Andy Reed (HMICFRS); Bobbie Jones (Care Inspectorate Wales); Alun Connick and Sion Peters-Flynn (Estyn); Tom Stephenson (Healthcare Inspectorate Wales) and Tony Bunday (CQC). 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.

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 report on the effectiveness of probation and youth offending service work with adults and children.

We inspect these services and publish inspection reports. We highlight good and poor practice, and use our data and information to encourage high-quality services. We are independent of government, and speak independently.

Please note that throughout the report the names in the practice examples have been changed to protect the individual's identity.

© Crown copyright 2020

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

Follow us on Twitter [@hmiprobation](https://twitter.com/hmiprobation)

Contents

Foreword	4
Ratings	5
Executive summary	6
Recommendations	11
Background	13
Contextual facts	14
1. Organisational delivery	16
1.1. Governance and leadership	18
1.2. Staff.....	22
1.3. Partnerships and services	25
1.4. Information and facilities.....	28
2. Court disposals	31
2.1. Assessment.....	32
2.2. Planning	34
2.3. Implementation and delivery.....	35
2.4. Reviewing.....	36
3. Out-of-court disposals	38
3.1. Assessment.....	40
3.2. Planning	41
3.3. Implementation and delivery.....	43
3.4. Joint working	44
Annexe 1: Methodology	46
Annexe 2: Inspection results	48
Annexe 3: Glossary	53

Foreword

This inspection is part of our four-year programme of youth offending service (YOS) inspections. We have inspected and rated Cardiff YOS across three broad areas: the arrangements for organisational delivery of the service, the quality of work done with children sentenced by the courts, and the quality of out-of-court disposal work. Overall, Cardiff YOS was rated as 'Inadequate'.

The YOS's governance and leadership, staffing, partnership and services, and information and facilities all failed to meet an acceptable standard. We, therefore, have serious concerns about the effectiveness of organisational delivery in Cardiff YOS.

The YOS's structure did not enable it to provide a quality service. There was limited understanding of the challenges facing children supervised by the YOS. Children's needs were not being addressed, and children were unable to access some services in a timely way or at all. Board members were not effective in holding the YOS or its partners to account and did not set strategic direction or priorities for the YOS. Mitigating actions or improvements that leaders had sought to make had not shown sufficient impact.

The disappointing results for governance and leadership were mirrored in our ratings for post-court and out-of-court disposal work. Across the board, the quality of assessments and planning, implementation and delivery of services and reviewing the progress of cases was poor.

In part, the poor quality of practice was caused by ineffective management supervision of cases, and there were too few operational managers in the YOS to provide consistent support and direction for case managers and other staff. The YOS needs to build in greater management capacity to ensure that there is regular and rigorous oversight of the work that will lead to improved outcomes for the children it supervises.

The findings from this inspection are very disappointing. However, the actions taken since the inspection by senior managers in Cardiff encourage us to believe that they will act on our recommendations to improve the service, but there is a great deal of work to do. We, and our partner inspectorates, will closely monitor their progress to ensure they implement the recommendations in this report.



Justin Russell
Chief Inspector of Probation

Ratings

Cardiff Youth Offending Service **Score** **0/36**

Overall rating **Inadequate** 

1. Organisational delivery

1.1	Governance and leadership	Inadequate	
1.2	Staff	Inadequate	
1.3	Partnerships and services	Inadequate	
1.4	Information and facilities	Inadequate	

2. Court disposals

2.1	Assessment	Inadequate	
2.2	Planning	Inadequate	
2.3	Implementation and delivery	Inadequate	
2.4	Reviewing	Inadequate	

3. Out-of-court disposals

3.1	Assessment	Inadequate	
3.2	Planning	Inadequate	
3.3	Implementation and delivery	Inadequate	
3.4	Joint working	Inadequate	

Executive summary

Overall, Cardiff YOS is rated as: **Inadequate**. This rating has been determined by inspecting the YOS in three areas of its work, referred to as 'domains'. We inspect against 12 'standards', shared between the domains. The standards are based on established models and frameworks, which are grounded in evidence, learning and experience. They are designed to drive improvements in the quality of work with children who have offended.¹ Published scoring rules generate the overall YOS rating.² The findings and subsequent ratings in those domains are described below.

1. Organisational delivery



We have rated organisational delivery as 'Inadequate'. At the time this inspection was undertaken in January 2020, the YOS's arrangements for governance and leadership, staffing, partnership and services, and information and facilities all failed to meet our required standards.

The vision and strategy for the YOS were unclear. The YOS Management Board and leadership had commissioned a process review and undertaken a self-effectiveness review in summer 2019, but there was little evidence of the impact of this work. Staff and key stakeholders were not aware of developments or did not understand them. There was no effective system for identifying, capturing and managing issues and risks, and there was minimal evidence that learning and evidence from previous inspections and audits had been used to drive improvement. Mitigating actions or improvements that leaders had sought to make had not shown sufficient impact. Consequently, leaders were not doing enough to address poor delivery of services.

The YOS's structure did not enable it to provide a quality service. Frameworks and guidance were not sufficiently developed. There were outdated policies and procedures; a lack of adequate management capacity; an absence of effective systems and processes for management oversight of both risk of harm to others and safety and wellbeing; poor quality of staff induction and supervision; and gaps in training.

There was limited understanding of the needs of children within the complex YOS cohort. Profiling lacked sophistication and information was not used sufficiently well. Children's needs were not being addressed, and they were unable to access some services in a timely way or at all.

We interviewed the YOS Manager and the Chair of the Management Board. We held meetings with other members of the board, staff and key stakeholders. Inspectors from the police and health, education and social services were part of our inspection team. They followed up issues that had emerged from the case inspections and interviewed senior leaders and staff across the YOS partnership.

¹ HM Inspectorate of Probation's standards can be found here:

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

² Each of the 12 standards is scored on a 0–3 scale in which 'Inadequate' = 0; 'Requires improvement' = 1; 'Good' = 2; 'Outstanding' = 3. Adding these scores produces a total score ranging from 0–36, which is banded to produce the overall rating, as follows: 0–6 = 'Inadequate', 7–18 = 'Requires improvement', 19–30 = 'Good', 31–36 = 'Outstanding'.

Our key findings about organisational delivery are as follows:

- Partnership agencies' attendance at YOS Management Board meetings was good.
- The YOS was well served by a dedicated information officer, who can extract various performance and monitoring reports from the case management system.
- Staff were working hard and were motivated to meet the needs of the children they supervise, despite the lack of strategic management, structures and processes to support their work.
- The Chief Executive Officer of the local authority has said he will make resources available to ensure progress is made to meet our recommendations.

But:

- Board members did not understand their role and responsibilities, were not sufficiently senior, and did not advocate effectively for the children in the YOS cohort.
- Although attendance at meetings was good, Board members were not effective in holding the YOS or its partners to account and did not set strategic direction or priorities for the YOS.
- There were some concerns regarding communication between agencies across the partnership in their safeguarding and public protection practice, in relation to three specific cases, which led to HM Inspectorate of Probation issuing an organisational alert.
- The YOS Management Board had failed to act swiftly and sufficiently on recommendations from previous inspection and audits.
- There were serious gaps in service provision, particularly health and education services.
- Policies, procedures and guidance were not up to date, which left staff without an effective framework to understand and deliver good-quality practice.
- Managers' oversight of cases was poor, and senior leaders had no clear line of sight to practice.
- Performance information was not used to drive improvement, evidenced by a lack of communication with staff and stakeholders about the findings of internal and externally commissioned audits.
- There was inadequate workforce planning, insufficient training and no proper induction for new staff.

2. Court disposals



We took a detailed look at 16 community sentences and 2 custodial sentences managed by the YOS. We also conducted 18 interviews with the relevant case managers. We examined the quality of assessment; planning; implementation and delivery; and reviewing. Each of these elements was inspected in respect of work done to address desistance, and the safety and wellbeing of the child. For the 18

cases where there were factors related to harm,³ we also inspected work done to keep other people safe. In the 18 cases where there were factors related to safety and wellbeing, we looked at work done to keep the child safe. The quality of work undertaken in relation to each element of case supervision needs to be above a specific threshold for it to be rated as satisfactory.

Fewer than 50 per cent of cases met all our requirements in terms of assessment, planning, delivery and implementation, and reviewing. This led to our judgement of 'Inadequate' for those elements of work. Of particular concern was the quality of assessment for both desistance and safety and wellbeing (33 per cent) and the inadequacy of planning for safety and wellbeing and for risk of harm to others (just 11 per cent and 17 per cent respectively). Reviewing of cases was also extremely poor; only 33 per cent of reviews met our standards for desistance and 22 per cent met them for safety and wellbeing. The quality of reviewing of risk of harm was also very poor, with only 14 per cent meeting our requirements for this standard.

In terms of the quality of implementation and delivery of supervision plans, 75 per cent of the cases inspected met our standards for work to address desistance. However, only 44 per cent met the standard for work to address safety and wellbeing, and 39 per cent met the standard to address risk of harm. Because of the shortfalls in the implementation and delivery of safeguarding and public protection work, the ratings panel judged that there were no grounds for exercising professional discretion about the overall rating, which remained as 'Inadequate'.

Our key findings about court disposals are as follows:

- Implementation and delivery of services effectively supported the child's desistance.
- Staff focused on maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents/carers.
- Planning was proportionate to the court outcome, with interventions capable of being delivered within an appropriate timescale.
- When services were delivered, they were those most likely to support desistance. Staff paid sufficient attention to sequencing and the available timescales.

But:

- The quality of assessment in relation to children's desistance, safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others was inadequate.
- The quality of planning to address safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others was poor.
- Assessment and planning to address the needs and wishes of victims were inadequate.
- Implementation and delivery of work concerning safeguarding and public protection were insufficient.
- There were serious shortfalls in all aspects of case managers' reviewing practice.

³ The number of cases quoted here that relate to harm, or safety and well-being, is based on the inspectors' rather than the YOS's judgement.

- Management oversight of post-court cases was extremely poor.
- Assessment and planning to address the needs and wishes of victims were inadequate.

3. Out-of-court disposals



We inspected 11 cases managed by the YOS that had received an out-of-court disposal (OOCd). These consisted of three youth conditional cautions, two youth cautions, and six community resolutions. We interviewed the case managers in 10 cases.

We examined the quality of assessment, planning, and implementation and delivery of services. We inspected each of these elements in respect of work done to address desistance. For the seven cases where there were factors related to harm,⁴ we also inspected work done to keep other people safe. In the eight cases where there were relevant factors, we looked at work done to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the child. We also looked at the quality of joint working with local police. The quality of work undertaken in relation to each element of case supervision needs to be above a specific threshold for it to be rated as satisfactory.

In this YOS, fewer than 50 per cent of cases met all our requirements in terms of assessment, planning, and implementation and delivery. This led to our judgements of 'Inadequate' for those elements of work. Although assessment and planning for desistance were strong (82 per cent and 73 per cent respectively), this was not the case in relation to both safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others. Assessment met our standards in just 18 per cent of cases for safety and wellbeing, with only 27 per cent of cases being sufficient for risk of harm. There were serious shortfalls in the quality of planning for safety and wellbeing, with none of the eight relevant cases meeting our required standards. In terms of the quality of implementation and delivery of plans to work with these children, the work to address desistance, safeguarding and public protection was inadequate, meeting our standards in just 45 per cent, 14 per cent and 29 per cent of cases respectively.

For joint working with other agencies, while two-thirds of cases met the standard for joint work with the police, only 45 per cent of the cases met our standards for YOS recommendations to be sufficiently well-informed, analytical and personalised to the child. Evidence across domain one revealed shortfalls in the delivery of the OOCd panel and a lack of a suitable framework, procedures and guidance to support quality work with this type of case. Therefore, our judgement for this aspect of work was 'Inadequate'.

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

- Assessment of desistance in OOCd cases was outstanding.
- Planning for desistance was good.
- Staff focused sufficiently on developing and maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents/carers.
- Assessments were strengths-based in that they considered the child's maturity, capacity to change and diversity, and were proportionate to the disposal type.

⁴ See footnote 3.

But:

- There were serious shortfalls in the quality of assessment and planning for a child's safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others.
- Implementation and delivery of work to address desistance, safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others were inadequate.
- Management oversight of OOCs was poor.
- There was no service level agreement between the YOS and Media Academy Cardiff; this meant the YOS did not effectively monitor and evaluate the commissioned arrangements for delivering some OOCs.
- Their framework for delivery of OOCs was underdeveloped and there was a lack of protocols and guidance for key stakeholders within the partnership.
- Inspectors observed the panel and found that it reviewed many cases where the OOC decision had already been made, and for these cases it was therefore more of a case management forum than the decision-making body it should be.
- The rationale for joint decision-making in OOC cases was not recorded clearly.

Recommendations

As a result of our inspection findings, we have made 14 recommendations that we believe, if implemented, will have a positive impact on the quality of youth offending services in Cardiff. This will improve the lives of the children in contact with youth offending services, and better protect the public.

The Cardiff Youth Offending Service Management Board should:

1. ensure it sets the strategic direction for the YOS by having a clear vision that is communicated to staff and key stakeholders
2. review its membership, role and function to make sure that its representatives have the seniority to make decisions and commit necessary resources to the YOS
3. make sure that all members of the YOS partnership and other partner agencies provide appropriate support and services
4. develop members' knowledge and understanding of their role as Board members and the service's work and provide effective challenge to partners
5. provide the management team with the necessary resources and support to manage the service effectively
6. develop robust plans to drive service improvement in response to findings from audits and inspections and communicate these more effectively to staff.

The Cardiff YOS Manager should:

7. ensure that all staff have appropriate induction, training, supervision and management oversight of their work
8. establish a service level agreement, protocols, performance frameworks and guidance in relation to commissioned services for out-of-court disposal work
9. review the management structure, communication and lines of accountability to ensure that the quality of safeguarding and public protection work improves
10. develop and update policies, procedures and guidance that will enable all staff to deliver quality work
11. have oversight of all YOS cases where there are safeguarding and public protection issues, making sure that appropriate referrals are made, and joint work takes place as needed.

Local authority education services should:

12. develop effective strategies to encourage children who speak Welsh to access services in their preferred language, and to use, develop and recognise the value of the language as an employment skill.

Cardiff and Vale Health Board should:

13. ensure that its statutory duty to provide relevant and timely physical, sexual, emotional and mental health services to YOS children is fulfilled.

South Wales Police should:

14. ensure that Public Protection Notice (PPN) forms on YOS children are consistently completed by frontline police officers.

Background

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 – instead, they were dealt with out-of-court. HM Inspectorate of 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.⁵ Most YOTs are based within local authorities; however, 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.

Cardiff is the largest local authority in Wales. It has also experienced the largest population growth in Wales over the last decade and is projected to grow far faster than any other Welsh local authority. Over the next 20 years, in absolute numbers, Cardiff's population is projected to grow more than the rest of Wales combined.

Cardiff has a population of over 360,000 of which 30,714 are aged 10 to 17 (8.4 per cent of the total). Between 2006 and 2016, its population grew by 11.6 per cent. This growth trend is set to continue, with projected growth of just over 20 per cent between 2016 and 2036. Cardiff is also by far the most ethnically diverse local authority in Wales: about a fifth of its population is from an ethnic minority, and over 100 languages are spoken in the city. A third of school children are from an ethnic minority. The current unemployment rate (6.1 per cent) is the second highest across Wales and exceeds both the Welsh and British rates.

Cardiff is one of five cities in the UK to be developing, in partnership with UNICEF UK, as a 'child-friendly city'. This means there is an aspiration to place the rights of children at the heart of its policies and strategies, and to involve children in decision-making and commit to addressing barriers that limit their lives.

Cardiff YOS is located within the local authority's Children's Services Directorate. Of the YOS cohort, 88 per cent are male, 78 per cent are aged over 14, and 24 per cent are black and minority ethnic. In 2018/2019, the most prevalent offence type in the Cardiff YOS caseload was violence against the person, followed by theft and handling stolen goods. The YOS partnership noted that offences related to drugs had also increased. First-time entry and re-offending rates for young people in Cardiff are both higher than the England and Wales average.

⁵ The *Crime and Disorder Act 1998* set out the arrangements for local YOTs and partnership working.

Contextual facts

241	First-time entrant rate per 100,000 in Cardiff ⁶
197	First-time entrant rate per 100,000 in Wales
222	First-time entrant rate per 100,000 in England and Wales
54.4%	Reoffending rate in Cardiff ⁷
38.4%	Reoffending rate in England and Wales

Population information⁸

364,248	Total population Cardiff
30,714	Total youth population (10–17 years) in Cardiff
6,220	Total black and minority ethnic youth population in Cardiff (Census 2011)

Caseload information⁹

Age	10–14	15–17
Cardiff YOS	22%	78%
National average	23%	77%

Race/ethnicity	White	Black and minority ethnic	Unknown
Cardiff YOS	69%	24%	7%
National average	70%	26%	4%

Gender	Male	Female
Cardiff YOS	88%	12%
National average	85%	15%

⁶ Youth Justice Board. (2019). *First Time Entrants, April to March 2019*.

⁷ Ministry of Justice. (2019). *Proven reoffending statistics, April 2017 to March 2018*.

⁸ Office for National Statistics. (2019). *UK population estimates, mid-2018*.

⁹ Youth Justice Board. (2020). *Youth Justice annual statistics: 2018 to 2019*.

Additional caseload data¹⁰

119	Total current caseload, of which:
52 (44%)	court disposals
67 (56%)	out-of-court disposals

Of the 52 court disposals

46 (88%)	Total current caseload on community sentences
4 (8%)	Total current caseload in custody
2 (4%)	Total current caseload on licence

Of the 67 out-of-court disposals

5 (7%)	Total current caseload with youth caution
10 (15%)	Total current caseload with youth conditional caution
52 (78%)	Total current caseload: community resolution or other out-of-court disposal

Education and child protection status of caseload

7%	Current caseload 'Looked After Children' resident in the YOT area
2%	Current caseload 'Looked After Children' placed outside the YOT area
5%	Current caseload with child protection plan
19%	Current caseload with child in need plan
5.35%	Current caseload aged 16 and under not in school/pupil referral unit/alternative education
21.40%	Current caseload aged 16 and under in a pupil referral unit or alternative education
17%	Current caseload aged 17+ not in education, training or employment

For children in the YOS cohort subject to court disposals:

Offence types ¹¹	%
Violence against the person	50%
Burglary	11%
Robbery	6%
Theft and handling stolen goods	17%
Summary motoring offences	6%
Other summary offences	11%

¹⁰ Data supplied by the YOT, reflecting the caseload at the time of the inspection announcement.

¹¹ Data from the cases assessed during this inspection.

1. Organisational delivery



The vision and strategy for the YOS were unclear. The YOS Management Board and leadership had commissioned a process review and undertaken a self-effectiveness review in summer 2019, but there was little evidence of the impact of this work. Staff and key stakeholders were not aware of developments or did not understand them. There was no effective system for identifying, capturing and managing issues and risks. Mitigating actions or improvements that leaders had sought to make had not shown sufficient impact. Consequently, leaders were not doing enough to address poor delivery of services.

There was no clear escalation policy or processes to remove barriers to effective joint working at operational and senior levels. Lessons to be learned and good practice were rarely identified through feedback from other stakeholders, and there were limited discussions about performance with partners and other providers. There is minimal evidence of learning and evidence being used to drive improvement, and action to improve services is not taken when it is required.

The YOS Management Board included all statutory and non-statutory partners, but the Board has too many members, and the majority lacked the seniority or authority to make decisions or commit resources. The participation and contribution of all partners was inconsistent and insufficiently focused on YOS business. Partners did not understand or recognise their own agency's statutory responsibilities and the contribution they should make to the YOS.

The YOS's structure does not enable it to provide a quality service. Frameworks and guidance were not sufficiently developed. There were outdated policies and procedures; a lack of adequate management capacity; and an absence of effective systems and processes for management oversight of both risk of harm to others and safety and wellbeing. Arrangements for staff induction and training were poor, as was the quality of supervision.

The workforce lacked the range of skills, knowledge and expertise required to deliver a high-quality service, and this was not being addressed. There were low levels of staff satisfaction and morale, alongside high levels of anxiety and uncertainty. The culture is one in which staff are not equipped to fulfil their responsibilities or held accountable for their work. Meetings with staff were irregular and there was a lack of quality supervision, guidance and support.

There was limited understanding of the needs of the children supervised by the YOS. Profiling lacked sophistication and information was not used sufficiently well. Children's needs were not being addressed, and they were unable to access some services in a timely way or at all. There was minimal quality assurance or evaluation of the services delivered. Consequently, leaders and managers did not adequately monitor the quality of provision and address shortfalls or deteriorations in services or outcomes achieved by children known to the YOS.

Strengths:


- Partnership agencies' attendance at YOS Management Board meetings was good.
- The YOS was well served by a dedicated information officer, who can extract various performance and monitoring reports from the case management system.
- Staff were working hard and were motivated to meet the needs of the children they supervise, despite the lack of strategic management, structures and processes to support their work.
- The Chief Executive Officer of the local authority has said he will make resources available to ensure progress is made to meet our recommendations.

Areas for improvement:

- Board members did not understand their role and responsibilities, were not sufficiently senior, and did not advocate effectively for the children in the YOS cohort.
- Although attendance at meetings was good, Board members were not effective in holding the YOS or its partners to account and did not set strategic direction or priorities for the YOS.
- There were some concerns regarding communication between agencies across the partnership in their safeguarding and public protection practice, in relation to three specific cases, which led to HMI Probation issuing an organisational alert.
- The YOS Management Board had failed to act swiftly and sufficiently on recommendations from the previous inspection and audits.
- There were serious gaps in service provision, particularly health and education services.
- Policies, procedures and guidance were not up to date, which left staff without an effective framework to understand and deliver good-quality practice.
- Managers' oversight of cases was poor, and senior leaders had no clear line of sight to practice.
- Performance information was not used to drive improvement, evidenced by a lack of communication with staff and stakeholders about the findings of internal and externally commissioned audits.
- There was inadequate workforce planning, insufficient training and no proper induction for new staff.

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



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

Inadequate

Key data¹²

Total spend in previous financial year (2018/2019)	£1,957,105
Total projected budget for the current financial year (2019/2020)	£1,932,140

In making a judgement about governance and leadership, we take into account the answers to the following three questions:

Is there a clear local vision and strategy for the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children?

Inspectors found no clear strategy to set the direction of the YOS. The evidence base used to monitor the quality of the services delivered was inadequate. Strategic leaders and senior officers had recognised that links between the YOS and wider children's services were ineffective. In response, they stated their intention to improve outcomes for children by establishing an adolescent service, which would incorporate both the YOS and wider care and support services for children. They intended to achieve this through delivery of the children's services strategy.

To date, delivery of the children's services strategy has focused primarily on building resilience within the newly established operational management tier and restructuring the main body of children's services into locality teams. Work to establish the adolescent service had not yet progressed beyond appointing an operational manager in September 2019 to replace the interim post-holder who had held this position since July 2018. Arrangements to further implement this service were underdeveloped, leaving YOS staff feeling marginalised. Although leaders recognise the potential long-term benefits of locating the YOS within a broader adolescent service, they are unlikely to realise these benefits without a clear timescale, strategy and implementation plan.

We were not confident that the YOS had accurate assessments or sufficiently robust plans to address and manage the safety and wellbeing and risk of harm issues of the children in the YOS caseload. There were some concerns regarding communication between agencies across the partnership in their safeguarding and public protection practice, in relation to three specific cases, which led to HMI Probation issuing an organisational alert during week one of fieldwork. The immediate response from the Board assured the Inspectorate that all appropriate safeguarding and public protection processes were in place. However, there had been a failure to interrogate

¹² Data supplied by YOS, based on finances at the time of the inspection announcement.

the different IT systems or share case information between relevant partners. This had an adverse effect on the quality of decision-making.

The YOS Management Board includes all statutory and non-statutory partners, such as the Police and Crime Commissioner, Careers Wales, lead member and courts. However, the Board membership is too large, and many Board members lack the seniority or authority to make decisions or commit resources. Agendas are too full, and this distracts from the specific focus needed for the YOS.

There are no clear processes and actions in place for induction or ongoing training of Board members. The draft induction document is from a neighbouring YOS and still refers to that YOS and its Board members, rather than Cardiff. The existing Board membership terms of reference had not been refreshed or revised since 2016 (despite numerous discussions at Board level since March 2019). In June 2019, the YOS Management Board received an input from YJB Cymru on effective governance. This led to a self-assessment exercise with Board members, which demonstrated the knowledge gap of the Board. However, there had been insufficient progress to address the shortfalls at the time of our inspection.

Although the attendance of Board members is good, meetings lack structure and partners' participation and contributions are inconsistent and do not focus sufficiently on YOS business. Partners do not understand or recognise their own agency's statutory responsibilities and contribution to the YOS. The Chair of the YOS Board was appointed in June 2019, and, although engaged, she is still learning about youth justice, the function of the Board, the quality of provision, and statutory partners' responsibilities, and gaining a full understanding of the YOS's work.

The YOS Management Board said that the partnership was 'on a journey', but the inspection team judged that some members were too optimistic about the progress that had been made in recent months, particularly given the findings of the independent audit by the Silver Bullet consultancy (commissioned in July 2019) and the current inspection ratings. Inspectors found that strategic leaders within the YOS partnership had not taken sufficient action in response to the findings of the Silver Bullet audit, which highlighted serious shortfalls in safeguarding and public protection work within the YOS. The local authority CEO accepted that they should have produced a coordinated response and plan more swiftly, given the findings on poor case management practice. Inspectors noted that this report was not shared with staff, and that the action plan was not robust and lacked detail about who 'owned' and was responsible for actions.

Do the partnership arrangements actively support effective service delivery?

There is no consistent advocacy by YOS Board members within their broader roles. Board members should also do more to commit the full range of resources to enable effective service delivery to YOS children. This has led to gaps in service provision and a lack of understanding of the specific needs of the children within the YOS caseload. There is an absence of clear structures, frameworks, policies and pathways to address the risks and needs of children, together with an inability to remove key barriers to the YOS cohort accessing some services.

The YOS has gaps in statutory provision in health and education. Their healthcare post has been vacant for over 18 months, and necessary action to fill the vacancy had been delayed. The YOS and Cardiff and Vale University Health Board (the body responsible for health provision to the service) both acknowledged this and were reviewing the provision to identify what will meet the needs of the YOS. The YOS education, training and employment (ETE) worker had been on maternity leave for around six months before the inspection. The service had failed to provide cover for this post. This has resulted in a lack of communication between the YOS and

education providers and has reduced the service's ability to ensure that learners receive the assessment they need to best plan their future. Overall, inspectors found the YOS's joint working with wider social care was poor.

The YOS partnership did not utilise sufficiently the National Referral Mechanism for protecting children being groomed by adults to take part in 'county lines' drug supply activity. This led to a need to grow knowledge and expertise from the ground up in the absence of robust guidance and management oversight. The consequence of this was that some children were not receiving the right support to keep themselves safe, meet their wellbeing needs or lessen risk to others.

It was further evident from the cases inspected that there was a limited shared understanding of the prevalence and seriousness of criminal exploitation. YOS staff were particularly frustrated by the failure of children's services managers, staff and other partners to fully recognise the extent of child criminal exploitation and its impact on many of those they worked with. Senior managers acknowledged this deficit. However, a partnership approach to improving the quality of work in this area was still some way off, given that the draft child exploitation strategy was not due to be ratified by the partnership until April 2020.

YOS staff broadly welcomed the introduction of the adolescent service and expressed confidence in their newly appointed operational manager. However, they felt that insufficient attention had been paid to addressing 'silo' working and, in particular, poor information-sharing between the YOS and the children's services multi-agency safeguarding hub.

YOS staff reported that they did not feel valued and that other agencies perceived them to be a separate 'stand-alone' service. While staff and managers from wider children's services clearly valued the specialist expertise held by YOS workers, they also reported a widespread separation in terms of service delivery between the YOS and the remainder of children's services.

Although there was a long-standing commissioned arrangement with Media Academy Cardiff (MAC) to deliver some OOCDD interventions, there was no service level agreement to effectively measure performance or outcomes against the service specification.

The Junior Attendance Centre (JAC) has been suspended since September 2019, following issues with staff conduct and health and safety. There were no policies and protocols in place in relation to the JAC and, before the suspension, there was a lack of governance of those arrangements.

Lines of accountability to other strategic boards are confusing and require urgent review. The Deputy Chair of the YOS Board has directed YOS business to the Community Safety Board and views this as the preferred escalation route. However, this doesn't enable the direct access needed to the local authority CEO and the CEOs of the statutory partners (especially considering the serious communication failures in relation to safeguarding and public protection within the YOS cohort).

Inspectors saw no adequate plans or clear accountability for progress against recommendations made after the previous HMIP inspection, in 2016. This inspection highlighted the need for improvement in the governance of the YOS, and in planning and review of work to manage both risk of harm to others and vulnerability (now known as 'safety and wellbeing') and management oversight of practice around public protection and safeguarding.

Does the leadership of the YOT support effective service delivery?

The YOS leadership team did not provide an effective link to the Management Board. There have been changes to the governance arrangements for the Board since 2016, which have led to a lack of communication between the YOS leadership team and senior leaders across the partnership. Within this period, the YOS operational manager post has been held by three people. These changes have largely been reactive, driven by wider issues within children's services and the local authority. As a result, the knowledge of youth justice at this management level has been limited.

The Management Board does not have a sufficient line of sight to practice. However, it has recently established a pattern of themed staff presentations to Board meetings, as one element of engaging with practice. Where audits have revealed areas of concern, the Board has not responded quickly enough to address the issues identified. There is a lack of strategic and operational assessment of business risk.

Since 2016, the removal of three management posts within the YOS team, without sufficient thought to the consequences of this, has resulted in two team managers being given responsibilities and duties far beyond their grade and job descriptions. Most notably, the escalation process for concerns about education, health or other provision has been ineffective, resulting in health and education partners failing to fulfil their statutory duty to the YOS. There has also been a failure to respond to escalations and long-standing concerns (about staffing levels, workload, barriers to partnership working, gaps in services and risks to the service) that have been raised repeatedly by team managers.

The Management Board had not seen, or signed off, key policy documents about safeguarding and risk management of the YOS cohort. The Board had also not had sight of internal individual management reviews (IMRs) on three recent YOS cases where there had been serious incidents in the last 12 months. The Board accepted this as a failing. Despite requests from inspectors, these IMR documents were not provided to us during the inspection.

Although staff are motivated and committed to working and engaging with children on a day-to-day basis, their morale is low, due to the poor communication from leaders. Staff report that they do not feel listened to (93 per cent of respondents to the staff survey said that their views about working for the YOS are not sought). Although in recent months the Board has received topic-based presentations from some practitioners, the staff survey indicated that 79 per cent of YOS staff were unaware of the activities of the YOS Management Board. There were high levels of staff sickness (810 days in total at the point of inspection – up from 630 days in the financial year 2018/2019). There was also a lack of resilience at all levels of the organisation in relation to cover arrangements for work and duties, which is a risk to service delivery.

The current YOS operational manager only took over responsibility for the YOS in September 2019. Her YOS responsibilities are part of her much wider portfolio within children's services, which includes Edge of Care, the Adolescent Resource Centre and Integrated Family Support Teams. The breadth of this portfolio is challenging, given the time needed to focus on the deficiencies of the YOS partnership at a strategic and operational level. This said, the YOS staff are positive about her vision for the future direction of the service, albeit a detailed plan is needed to achieve this. The YOS operational manager is also still learning about youth justice, the function of the Board, and statutory partners' responsibilities, and needs to gain a full understanding of the specialist nature of criminal justice work.

1.2. Staff



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

Inadequate

Key staffing data¹³

Total staff headcount (full-time equivalent, FTE)	47
Vacancy rate (total unfilled posts as percentage of total staff headcount)	6.4%
Vacancy rate: case managers only (total unfilled case manager posts as percentage of total case manager headcount)	3.2%
Average caseload: case managers (FTE)	11 ¹⁴
Total annual sickness days (all staff)	810
Staff attrition (percentage of all staff leaving in 12-month period)	15%

In making a judgement about staffing, we take into account the answers to the following four questions:

Do staffing and workload levels support the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children?

There was no case allocation policy or process, which led to poorly thought out allocation of cases and no clear mechanisms for reviewing changing demands or case profiles. The workloads of different members of staff vary, and there was no workload management strategy. Managers did not have the capacity to prioritise work effectively, specifically in relation to safeguarding, public protection, staff supervision and quality assurance. The YOS lacked a robust quality assurance framework.

Team managers' spans of control were too wide, and their numbers of direct reports too high. The impact of this was evident in the poor management oversight of practice. In the domain two cases we inspected, we judged 94 per cent of management oversight insufficient, and in the domain three cases, 78 per cent of management oversight was insufficient.

The YOS held some staff vacancies, including a victim officer post, a YOT case manager post, anti-social behaviour case manager posts and an administration post. It was unclear whether and when these posts were to be filled.

¹³ Data is supplied by YOS and reflects staffing at the time of the inspection announcement (December 2019)

¹⁴ Data supplied by YOS, based on staffing and workload at the time of the inspection announcement.

Do the skills of YOT staff support the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children?

There was a lack of ethnic diversity among the staff, which did not reflect the characteristics of the children supervised by the YOS. The staff survey indicated that seven per cent of respondents were BAME, compared with the YOS caseload of 24 per cent BAME.

There is a pool of staff within the YOS who are suitably qualified and experienced. However, the majority of staff have not had specific youth justice training in aspects of practice such as assessing and managing risk of harm and promoting desistance. We were concerned to find that some staff had not received adequate AssetPlus training and did not understand how to use this key assessment tool. These issues were highlighted in the Silver Bullet consultancy report dated July 2019, and no action had been taken (nor had the report been shared with staff).

The lack of clarity around expectations, guidance and direction of the service has impacted on staff morale. Many staff reported feeling anxious and uncertain about the future direction of the service. Inspectors found minimal processes in place for eliciting staff feedback via surveys or regular structured team meetings. Although staff were cautiously optimistic about the new YOS operational manager, many were candid about the resourcing and partnership challenges (internally and externally) that they faced daily. Despite this, staff showed they were motivated to work with and engage with this difficult and complex group of children. We interviewed a small sample of five children, in a focus group. All were complimentary about how their case managers had engaged with them and strived to meet their needs and provide support.

The YOS police officers had not received formal training on their role, merely a hand-over from their predecessor. There was little guidance available to them other than the YJB guidance in relation to the role of a seconded officer. The officers lacked detailed knowledge of safeguarding, child sexual exploitation and Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA). They had only received limited training in these areas, although they had all undertaken adverse childhood experience training, delivered by the police force. This knowledge and skill base is essential to enable the officers to offer the appropriate guidance to case managers, contribute effectively to risk panel meetings, and provide the YOS with specialist support around safeguarding, for both the child and the public. They had not undertaken any joint training with the other YOS staff.

The service had employed several bilingual staff since the last inspection in 2016. There was a Welsh-speaking post within the administration team, specifically for reception and telephone duties. However, overall service arrangements to respond to the needs of Welsh speakers are not good enough. Where children could speak Welsh, the service did not link them systematically to a Welsh-speaking case worker. The availability of bilingual pro forma letters or learning/activity resources in Welsh was poor. Most signage or wall displays are only in English.

The YOS contains a committed group of volunteer staff. These are from various backgrounds, a mix of gender, age, ethnic origin and experience. Volunteers spoke positively about the training and support from the YOS. The range of activities volunteers were engaged in included referral order panel membership, providing appropriate adult support and neighbourhood resolution projects. The referral panel members understood their role and how they linked with case managers and other members of staff in the YOS.

The YOS had no strategy to identify staff potential and support succession planning. There was no evidence that staff are given 'acting up' opportunities or mentoring within the organisation.

Does the oversight of work support high-quality delivery and professional development?

Inspectors judged the quality of management oversight to be poor. Some staff lacked the skills to effectively assess and plan how to manage safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others. However, these shortfalls were not adequately addressed or remedied through effective supervision by line managers. HMI Probation raised individual alerts on three cases during week one of fieldwork because of significant concerns about safeguarding practice in these cases.

Many staff said they had not received a proper induction or regular supervision. The supervision they did receive was not of sufficient quality and the records of such meetings were limited or not present. In the cases inspected during week one of fieldwork, 59 per cent of staff said management oversight was ineffective. HMIP inspectors judged management oversight to be ineffective in 94 per cent of post-court cases and 78 per cent of OOC cases.

Until recently, YOS team managers had not received regular supervision. At one stage, they stated they had gone two months without any contact from the previous YOS operational manager. There is no policy for escalating concerns about the quality of case management or removing barriers to effective working, meaning that all the risk was held at team manager level within the YOS.

Staff from the two substance misuse partner organisations said that they received supervision from their partnership managers, but those managers said that they get limited or no information from YOS managers about the performance of their individual staff members.

In the staff survey, 44 per cent of staff said that their last appraisal was either overdue or had not been valuable. Team managers had not received an updated appraisal and objectives were simply cut and pasted from corporate objectives from the previous year. Staff reported that there are no mechanisms in place to recognise and reward achievement. Positive feedback is sporadic and not meaningful.

There was some response to staffing issues (such as the suspension of the Junior Attendance Centre, the replacing of the previous police officer and suspension of a YOS case manager), but these were when a crisis had emerged rather than a result of any forward planning or analysis of the needs of YOS children.


Are arrangements for learning and development comprehensive and responsive?

We found no workforce development analysis (skills audit) and subsequent training plan, other than a spreadsheet of attendance at training events. These events take place mainly online, through the council systems. Staff reported that they had received minimal AssetPlus training and inspectors found a clear need for basic assessment skills to be delivered to many staff. There is a lack of MAPPA training and only some staff are AIM2 trained. Further training in relation to criminal exploitation and risk of harm is also necessary.

Inspectors found (and staff reported) a lack of team meetings and poor communication within and across the organisation and partnership. There had been a failure to share findings from individual management reviews, the Silver Bullet consultancy audit and previous inspections, and there was no clear plan to review

different aspects of work. There is minimal evidence of a quality assurance framework and insufficient evidence of management feedback within case records.

1.3. Partnerships and services



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

Inadequate

Percentage of current caseload with mental health issues ¹⁵	34%
Percentage of current caseload with substance misuse issues	62%
Percentage of current caseload with an education, health and care plan	14%

In making a judgement about partnerships and services, we take into account the answers to the following three questions:

Is there a sufficiently comprehensive and up-to-date analysis of the profile of children, to ensure that the YOT can deliver well-targeted services?

The YOS has not carried out a clear analysis of the profile of the YOS cohort, which is complex and includes children with multiple risks and needs. As a result, there are gaps in service provision and this impacts negatively on children in terms of their safeguarding, risk of harm to others and likelihood of reoffending.

The healthcare post had been vacant for over 18 months, and necessary action to fill the vacancy had been delayed. The YOS and Cardiff and Vale University Health Board (the body responsible for health provision to the service) both acknowledged this and were reviewing the provision to identify what will meet the needs of the YOS cohort.

YOS staff did not focus sufficiently on the important relationship between improving children's poor basic skills and reducing offending behaviour. There was no analysis of the literacy and numeracy skills of the children who are engaged with the service. Staff were not always clear to whom they could refer young people to help them improve their skills.

Does the YOT partnership have access to the volume, range and quality of services and interventions to meet the needs of all children?

The YOS is well supported by South Wales Police, with two full-time seconded police officers, and a third temporarily attached to the department. The officers are co-located in the YOS building but not in the general office, which hinders the free flow of soft intelligence and information. The officers were supervised by a police sergeant, who is also responsible for the integrated offender management (IOM) unit. In addition, there was support from the detective sergeant in the Management of Sexual and Violent Offenders (MOSOVO) team, who regularly attends the YOS to provide support and advice on safeguarding matters. Links were developing between the seconded police staff and the local policing team, encouraged by the YOS

¹⁵ Data supplied by YOS, based on caseload issues at the time of the inspection announcement.

sergeant. Officers from within the unit were working closer with the organised crime unit and problem-solving teams around children at risk of county lines.

The YOS had no established referral pathway to speech and language therapy via a YOS health professional. Speech and language therapy could be accessed through the YOS education worker, but this post had not been covered since July 2019 due to maternity leave, which had left a gap in service provision.

Addressing harmful sexual behaviour can be a part of a sentence plan. Sexual health promotion was available via a referral to a specialist worker based at YOS, but this resource appeared limited and basic. This YOS staff member also promoted sexual health in schools through a healthy living initiative.

The lack of healthcare professionals among YOS staff has reduced the opportunity for YOS staff to be up-skilled in areas such as mental and emotional wellbeing. The lack of healthcare staff has also resulted in YOS staff becoming reliant on referring children to external services. In some cases, these children would not meet thresholds for more intensive and specialist services, but they still have an identified health need to be addressed.

The YOS ETE worker had been on maternity leave for around six months before the inspection. The service had failed to provide cover for this post, which had resulted in a gap in the YOS's communication with education providers and reduced the service's ability to ensure that learners receive the assessment they need to best plan their future. Information about the educational background and needs of children new to the YOS caseload and the educational progress of existing YOS children was not being gathered effectively to inform case workers' interventions.

The YOS has a full-time seconded probation officer, who is supervised by an NPS senior probation officer. There are quarterly three-way probation and YOS meetings with the YOS link team manager where cases due to transition to adult probation are discussed. The seconded YOS probation officer also attends probation team meetings to ensure that knowledge and information are shared. At the time of the inspection the YOS probation officer's workload was manageable and they received training from their home and host organisation.

Are arrangements with statutory partners, providers and other agencies established, maintained and used effectively to deliver high-quality services?

Partnership arrangements did not actively support effective service delivery or integration with wider services for children. YOS staff broadly welcomed the introduction of the adolescent service and expressed confidence in their newly appointed operational manager. However, they felt that insufficient attention had been paid to addressing 'silo' working and, in particular, poor information-sharing between the YOS and the children's services multi-agency safeguarding hub.

YOS staff reported that they did not feel valued and that other agencies perceived them to be a separate 'stand-alone' service. Similarly, while staff and managers from wider children's services clearly valued the specialist expertise held by YOS workers, they also reported a widespread separation in terms of service delivery between the YOS and the remainder of children's services.

YOS workers and other children's services teams did not understand each other's roles and responsibilities well enough. Some positive examples of working together were evident in respect of homelessness and preventive services. However, eligibility criteria for care and support were not understood or consistently applied, leading to a conflict in expectations between workers. This hindered effective communication and joint work to meet young people's needs, including their safeguarding needs.

Case planning forums (where children deemed the highest risk are discussed) were often ineffective in managing cases where there was a high risk of harm and safety and wellbeing needs. In many of the inspected cases, the right actions were not taken, barriers to effective partnership working were not removed and there was insufficient representation of key stakeholders (aside from YOS and the police) at the required decision-making level. Inspectors observed the planning forum meeting for a child who was due to be released from custody and noted that insufficient plans were made to effectively manage risk of harm to others and safety and wellbeing issues.

There are two substance misuse workers dedicated to the YOS from two partner agencies (Adferiad and CGL – Change Grow Live). One partner agency is funded by the local authority and one is funded by the health board. Both substance misuse workers are committed and enthusiastic about their roles, despite the significant leadership and management issues of the YOS. Both spoke positively about the support from their respective partnership manager, and both partnership managers praised the work of each individual substance misuse worker. However, neither of the YOS team managers could evidence that there was regular communication between the YOS and the partner agencies.

Inspectors judged that a range of appropriate substance misuse interventions, based on young people's individual needs, were provided through the partnership's input to the YOS. Indeed, it was evident that staff acted to address urgent health needs. However, there was a lack of resources at the YOS to help children access support for less acute health needs. The YOS did not have the capacity to fully assess children's health needs beyond the basic AssetPlus health screening tool, and there was a lack of established pathways to meet assessed needs.

The YOS has a strong partnership with Careers Wales. A Careers Wales manager attended YOS Board meetings regularly and supported the careers advisers employed within the YOS appropriately. Careers Wales ensured that its staff who were seconded to the YOS had good access to training opportunities.

The YOS worked with a wide range of partners to enable children to access learning opportunities. Partners included schools, key work-based learning providers, colleges, specialist learning providers and employers. The partnership also worked with MAC (Media Academy Cardiff) to deliver some OOCs. This enabled children to access further ETE courses, support or interventions – both during and beyond their YOS supervision. Staff liaised well with these providers to help children make effective transitions into ETE. Staff used opportunities well for children to have taster sessions before committing to further learning. The local authority's extension of Education Other Than At School (EOTAS) and flexible education provision has improved the range of options available to meet individual learners' needs within the YOS. However, case workers did not always understand the full range of provision available to YOS children.

There was no clear working protocol or agreed processes for the OOC panel. Inspectors observed the panel and found that it reviewed many cases where the OOC decision had already been made, and where the panel was therefore more of a case management forum. In some cases, there was evidence of a delay in the case being assessed and interventions being delivered.

Involvement of children and their parents and carers

Senior leaders acknowledged that they need to undertake more work to ensure they are systematically engaging children and their parents or carers. Inspectors interviewed a small group of five children and, overall, these children felt that the YOS had been helpful. All of the children said that knife crime was a serious issue in Cardiff and getting worse, and that they knew people who had been stabbed. All the

group felt that the expectations of their interventions had been explained to them, and that staff treated them with respect. They all said that they could talk to their case managers and they felt listened to. One child said that it would be helpful if there were more locations to meet YOS staff, as they sometimes had to travel quite far.

Feedback from the children's text survey was more mixed. Some children were complimentary about the work undertaken by their case managers, while others highlighted travelling distance to the YOS and lack of resources as issues. In total, 16 surveys were sent before the inspection fieldwork began, and 6 completed responses were received.

1.4. Information and facilities



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

Inadequate

In making a judgement about staffing, we take into account the answers to the following four questions:

Are the necessary policies and guidance in place to enable staff to deliver a quality service, meeting the needs of all children?

Numerous key policies and guidance were out of date and required review, especially those relating to the management of safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others.

Many protocols were out of date and referred to legislation that is now obsolete (such as final warnings and reprimands). The court protocol had not been reviewed since 2016. The joint children's social care/YOS policy was dated 2011; the disciplinary policy was dated April 2016; and the capability policy was dated March 2014. None of these documents have been revisited or revised to reflect current YOS working practices and arrangements.

There were no clear protocols or frameworks and guidance to inform the delivery of OOCs by key stakeholders within the partnership. There was no service level agreement between the YOS and Media Academy Cardiff. This means that the commissioned arrangements for delivering some OOCs are not monitored and evaluated effectively.

Does the YOT's delivery environment(s) meet the needs of all children and enable staff to deliver a quality service?

The YOS is based solely at the John Kane Centre and staff from partner agencies are co-located within the building. The YOS encourages agile working; however, staff reported that space is often at a premium, and this hampers their ability to work effectively. Court staff are based separately within the youth court in Cardiff.

Staff raised concerns about several aspects of the YOS building. These included no separate entrance for staff and children, a lack of space to undertake effective work, and occasions when there had been confrontation or conflict between children on the premises.

Do the information and communication technology (ICT) systems enable staff to deliver a quality service, meeting the needs of all children?

All staff (including seconded staff from the police, probation and MAC) accessed Childview as the main YOS case management system. The police officers have full access to the YOS and police IT systems, including the Police National Computer, and had a good working knowledge of them. The records management system had an effective flagging system that was used to good effect by the YOS police officers. This enables a child who is managed by the YOS to be brought to the attention of the YOS police officers quickly.

Frontline police officers are required to submit a Public Protection Notice (PPN) whenever they encounter a child where they have concerns around safeguarding or vulnerability. These forms are submitted to the multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH), which in turn disseminates the information to relevant partner agencies where required. The HMICFRS inspector found that there was inconsistency in the completion of these forms by frontline staff, with a number not having been submitted for children managed by the YOS. As a consequence, the YOS police officers were required to complete a PPN retrospectively and submit to the MASH. However, the quality of these submissions is sometimes poor, with much of the information not being available to the YOS officer.

Within children's services, there is no systematic process for social workers to undertake checks on YOS referrals. Checks on the children's services Carefirst system, and subsequent flagging on Childview, depend solely on YOS case managers. Inspectors found that the MASH does not have access to the YOS case management system. Consequently, there is no reliable system in place to ensure all shared work is identified in a timely manner. Positively, YOS staff have access to Carefirst. However, they were concerned about their lack of familiarity with this system and their inability to search for up-to-date, relevant information. Children's services social workers shared their frustration with the inefficiencies in the Carefirst system. For example, they were unable to record significant information chronologically, leading them to request formal notifications from the YOS, which created duplication of work on both sides. The limitations of Carefirst are recognised by senior leaders and plans are in place to replace it.

The local authority has rolled out a management information system for EOTAS providers, which enables them to record pupil attendance and performance. However, the YOS does not have access to this system and so is not able to monitor whether pupils are attending education hubs in the community.

Is analysis, evidence and learning used effectively to drive improvement?

In June 2019, the YOS Management Board received an input from YJB Cymru on effective governance. This led to a self-assessment exercise with Board members, which demonstrated their knowledge gap. However, there had been insufficient progress to address these gaps by the time of our inspection.

The YOS is well served by a dedicated information officer, who can extract various performance and monitoring reports from the case management system – both at an individual officer and a wider organisational level. However, there is limited evidence of this data being used sufficiently well to drive sustained improvement. Since August 2019, reports for the Management Board have been streamlined and revised to include a section on organisational health, which includes issues such as challenges, sickness and vacancies.

There was little evidence of a YOS partnership response to various previous inspections and audits. These include the previous HM Inspectorate of Probation

inspection in 2016, the YOS Management Board self-assessment audit by YJB Cymru in June 2019; the Silver Bullet consultancy case audit in July 2019; learning from three serious incidents over the last 12 months involving YOS cases; and findings from benchmarking exercises against previous HM Inspectorate of Probation reports in Western Bay and Wrexham.

There had also been minimal analysis of the impact of the absence of health and education professionals within the YOS. The Healthcare Inspectorate Wales inspector found that the physical and mental health screening on AssetPlus was not completed in a third of the case sample, leaving a large number of young people unassessed for health needs. Even when full AssetPlus assessments were completed, there were no clear pathways for children to receive specialist physical or mental health services. Education inspectors found that there was no systematic evaluation of whether children's ETE skills improved during their involvement with the YOS.

Since July 2019, there has been a reducing reoffending panel to monitor cases of concern. However, this appears to be held at team manager level, with no clear escalation process where issues need to be addressed at a more senior level.



2. Court disposals

We took a detailed look at 16 community sentences and 2 custodial sentences managed by the YOS. We also conducted 18 interviews with the relevant case managers. We examined the quality of assessment; planning; implementation and delivery; and reviewing. Each of these elements was inspected in respect of work done to address desistance and the safety and wellbeing of the child. For the 18 cases where there were factors related to harm, we also inspected work done to keep other people safe. In the 18 cases where there were relevant factors, we looked at work done to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the child. The quality of work undertaken in relation to each element of case supervision needs to be above a specific threshold for it to be rated as satisfactory.

When children are sentenced to a court disposal, we expect to see the YOS maximising the likelihood of successful outcomes by addressing desistance factors, effectively engaging with children and their parents/carers and responding to relevant diversity factors. We also expect to see that children are kept safe and their safety and wellbeing needs are addressed. Finally, we expect that everything reasonable is done to manage the risk of harm posed by children who have offended. This should be through good-quality assessment and planning, with the delivery of appropriate interventions, effective leadership and management and good partnership working across all statutory and voluntary agencies.

In this YOS, the fact that fewer than 50 per cent of cases met all our requirements in terms of assessment, planning, delivery and implementation, and reviewing led to our judgements of 'Inadequate' for those elements of work. Of particular concern was the quality of assessment in relation to both desistance and safety and wellbeing (only a third of cases were satisfactory for each of these) and the inadequacy of planning for safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others (just 11 per cent and 17 per cent respectively were satisfactory). Reviewing was also extremely poor, as only 33 per cent met our standards in relation to desistance, 22 per cent in connection with safety and wellbeing and just 14 per cent for the quality of reviewing of risk of harm.

In terms of the quality of implementation and delivery of supervision plans, 75 per cent of our cases met our standards for work to address desistance. However, only 44 per cent met the standard for work to address safety and wellbeing, while 39 per cent met the standard to address risk of harm. Because of the shortfalls in the implementation and delivery of safeguarding and public protection work, the ratings panel judged that there were no grounds for exercising professional discretion about the overall rating, which remained as 'Inadequate'.

Strengths:

- Implementation and delivery of services effectively supported the child's desistance.
- Staff focused on maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents/carers.
- Planning was proportionate to the court outcome, with interventions capable of being delivered within an appropriate timescale.
- When services were delivered, they were those most likely to support desistance. Staff paid sufficient attention to sequencing and the available timescales.

Areas for improvement:

- The quality of assessment in relation to a child's desistance, safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others was inadequate.
- The quality of planning to address safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others was poor.
- Assessment and planning to address the needs and wishes of victims were inadequate.
- Implementation and delivery of work concerning safeguarding and public protection were insufficient.
- There were serious shortfalls in all aspects of case managers' reviewing practice.
- Management oversight of post-court cases was extremely poor

Work with children 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



Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.

Inadequate

Our rating¹⁶ for assessment is based on the following key questions:

	% yes
Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	33%
Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?	33%
Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?	44%

Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?

Inspectors found the quality of assessment to be inadequate across desistance, safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others. Assessments consistently lacked analysis and did not draw key information from other sources and agencies to inform judgements or risk classification. Previous and current behaviour was not considered systematically, and there was a lack of an investigative approach in many of the inspected cases. Management oversight was very poor and did not address or remedy the shortfalls in practice.

¹⁶ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. See Annexe 2 for a more detailed explanation.

In only 7 out of 18 cases inspected, did the assessment have a sufficient analysis of offending behaviour, including the child's attitudes towards, and motivation for, their offending. In just half of the cases, staff considered the diversity and wider social context of the child, while in two-thirds of cases, the assessment focused on the child's strengths and their protective factors. Assessment of structural barriers to desistance was inadequate, especially given some of the gaps in wider partnership provision for the YOS cohort around health and education, with just one third of cases meeting our required standard. The needs and wishes of the victim were taken into account in just one-fifth of the relevant cases, therefore limiting opportunities for restorative justice.

Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?

Assessments of safety and wellbeing consistently underestimated factors and issues in the cases inspected, and therefore we judged practice as inadequate. In just 6 out of 17 relevant cases, staff sufficiently identified and analysed the risks to a child's safety and wellbeing. In 7 cases, assessments drew appropriately on assessments or information held by other agencies. Just 4 out of 17 relevant cases saw staff giving enough attention to analysing the controls or interventions that best promoted the child's safety and wellbeing.

An inspector noted:

“The child was in constant isolation at school but it is not known why. He left school 18 months early and there is also no exploration of the reason for this within the assessment. There are indicators of criminal exploitation and parental concern around the child's lifestyle and associates. He is not engaging with professionals and presents as vulnerable and younger than his age. The child has an EHCP [education, health and care plan] but this has not been seen by the case manager. He has ADHD and Tourette's and has previously been CIN [a child in need]. All of these factors have not been pulled together and analysed to accurately assess the level of safety and wellbeing”.

Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?

Assessment of a child's risk of harm to others was poor. In just 5 out of 16 relevant cases, assessments identified and analysed any risk of harm to others posed by the child, including identifying who was at risk, and the nature of that risk. Case managers used available sources of information and involved other agencies, where appropriate, in only a quarter of cases. They considered controls and interventions to manage and minimise the risk of harm to others posed by the child in just a quarter of cases. Although inspectors agreed with the actual level of classification of risk of harm to others in 14 out of 18 cases, there was a lack of reasoned analysis, and case managers did not use available sources of information to support their classification decision.

2.2. Planning



Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.

Inadequate

Our rating¹⁷ for planning is based on the following key questions:

	% yes
Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	44%
Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	11%
Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	17%

Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?

Inspectors found the quality of planning for desistance, safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others to be inadequate. Within the cases inspected, plans were often too brief and general, with no clear link to the plans of other agencies where relevant. In particular, the quality of contingency planning was poor and, as with assessment, management oversight was lacking and did not address deficits in practice.

Case managers set out the services most likely to support desistance in 8 out of 18 cases. In 8 out of 18 relevant cases, planning did not take account of the diversity and social context of the child. In the more than half of 18 cases, the planning did not recognise the child's strengths and protective factors, and in just 7 out of 18 of cases, staff thought about their level of maturity and how that affected their motivation. In 11 out of 17 cases, there was insufficient evidence that the child, or their parents/carers, had been involved in the planning and their views taken into account. The needs and wishes of victims were only considered in 3 of the relevant 15 cases.

Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?

The risks to a child's safety and wellbeing were addressed in just 3 out of 18 relevant cases. Only 3 out of 18 cases saw planning adequately involve other agencies. There were serious shortfalls in contingency arrangements to manage issues relating to safety and wellbeing, which were not identified in 16 of the 18 relevant cases. Overall, planning focused on keeping the child safe in just 2 of the 18 cases inspected.

An inspector noted:

"In this case, contingency planning for safety and wellbeing was poor and was far too brief and minimal/unspecific. There was no join-up or reference to either the existing LAC [looked after children] plan, no copy or reference to the ECHP and no link to the CAMHS [child and adolescent mental health service] in-reach plan".

Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

The quality of planning to keep other people safe was inadequate. There was sufficient planning to promote the safety of others in only 4 out of 18 cases inspected,

¹⁷ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. See Annexe 2 for a more detailed explanation.

and just 3 out of 18 of cases involved other agencies, where appropriate. Planning to address any specific concerns and risks related to actual and potential victims was evident in only 3 of the 18 cases inspected.

Planning set out the necessary controls and interventions to promote the safety of other people in 4 of the 18 cases. Effective contingency arrangements to manage those risks that had been identified, however, were not evident in 16 out of the 18 cases inspected.

One inspector highlighted:

“Planning for ROH [risk of harm] was insufficient. The YOS multi-agency case planning forum was ineffective and drifted, whilst there was minimal evidence of joint planning, intelligence sharing and feedback with and from the police. Contingency planning was poor and far too brief and unspecific. It was pulled through into review plans that were inadequately updated with contemporaneous information”.

2.3. Implementation and delivery



High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, engaging and assisting the child.

Inadequate

Our rating¹⁸ for implementation and delivery is based on the following key questions:

	% yes
Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the child's desistance?	75%
Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child safe?	44%
Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?	39%

Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the child's desistance?

In three-quarters of cases we inspected, the services delivered were those most likely to support desistance, and the child's strengths and protective factors were acknowledged and built on in 12 out of 17 relevant cases. In 13 of 17 relevant cases, it was clear that staff focused on maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents/carers. Just over three-quarters of inspected cases evidenced that sufficient attention was given to encouraging and enabling the child's compliance with the work of the YOS.

Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child?

¹⁸ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. See Annexe 2 for a more detailed explanation.

Inspectors rated work to promote the safety and wellbeing of the child as inadequate. The delivery of services to promote the child’s safety and wellbeing was evident in just 7 out of 18 cases, and the case manager had coordinated the involvement of other organisations in just over half of all relevant cases. Overall, the implementation and delivery of services effectively supported the safety of the child in only 8 out of 18 of the cases inspected.

An inspector noted:

“There were significant gaps in access to services from social care, who deemed that the child did not meet the threshold, despite numerous issues such as homelessness, NEET [not in education, employment or training], substance misuse and family breakdown. This was escalated to YOS team managers and discussed with a social care team manager but did not change the decision and this was not escalated further nor followed up. There were gaps in accessing services for mental health need, again with YOS staff undertaking crisis management and support work. The child admitted he needed bereavement counselling via CAMHS, but was rejected and told he needed to be in full-time employment before he was ready for therapeutic work”.

Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?

Services delivered to keep other people safe, by managing and minimising the risk of harm, were evident in just 7 of the 18 cases inspected. Only 6 of the relevant 16 cases saw staff coordinate the involvement of other agencies. The protection of actual and potential victims had been considered in just under half of the cases and, overall, the safety of other people was supported effectively in only 7 of the 18 inspected cases.

2.4. Reviewing



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

Inadequate

Our rating¹⁹ for reviewing is based on the following key questions:

	% yes
Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child’s desistance?	33%
Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	22%
Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	14%

Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child’s desistance?

¹⁹ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. See Annexe 2 for a more detailed explanation.

Children's circumstances can change rapidly, and this can result in an increase, or sometimes decrease, in the likelihood of reoffending, risk of harm to others or risks to their safety and wellbeing. Within the post-court cases inspected, we found that reviews were often late, not undertaken after a significant change, or otherwise minimally updated or cloned from the initial assessments. They were therefore not contemporaneous and did not accurately reflect the current circumstances and issues of the child, nor the work that may have been undertaken to address such issues. Shortfalls in reviewing were not remedied or addressed by adequate management oversight, and there was ineffective joint reviewing and coordination with other agencies.

Reviews resulted in the identification of, and a subsequent response to, changes in the factors linked to desistance in just 7 out of 18 cases inspected. They did not build on the child's strengths and did not adequately consider their motivation and engagement levels in well over half of the cases. The child, and their parents/carers, had been meaningfully involved in the process, and their views had been taken into account, in just 7 out of 18 cases.

Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?

The quality of reviews of children's safety and wellbeing was inadequate. Case managers identified and responded to changes in safety and wellbeing in just a third of relevant cases. Information from other agencies was gathered or considered in only 4 out of 18 cases, and the reviewing process had led to the necessary changes in the ongoing plan in just under a quarter of cases. Overall, reviewing focused sufficiently on keeping the child safe, again in just a quarter of cases we inspected.

An inspector noted:

"There was a seven-month delay between the initial assessment and the review assessment. Review was not undertaken after significant changes and events within that period (which included a National Referral Mechanism form submitted, Section 47 investigation, self-reported disclosures of criminal exploitation, new offences committed, self-disclosed substance misuse). When the review was completed, it was minimally updated and did not sufficiently detail the work undertaken or attempted, nor any changes in situation".

Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

Reviews of risk of harm to others were also poor. In 10 out of 14 relevant cases, the case manager had not identified, or responded to, changes in risk, and only 2 of the 14 relevant cases had taken account of information from other agencies. The child and their parents/carers had not been meaningfully involved in reviewing the risk of harm to others, or had their views considered, in 11 of the relevant 14 cases. In only two out of 14 relevant cases did the reviewing process lead to necessary adjustments to the ongoing plan of work to manage and minimise these risks. Overall, reviewing focused on keeping other people safe in just 2 out of 14 relevant cases.

The issue of poor-quality safeguarding reviews was highlighted by the following case:

"There was no clear direction and reviewing for this case to consider Ryan's increased risk and safety concerns. After six weeks of his ISS, Ryan had disengaged with the YOT, had been arrested for new offences and had refused to attend court for new charges. At that time, the YOT supervised Ryan on a post-release licence but did not consider whether a recall would manage his risk and support keeping others safe".



3. Out-of-court disposals

We inspected 11 cases that had received an out-of-court disposal (OCCD) and were managed by the YOS. These consisted of three youth conditional cautions, two youth cautions, and six community resolutions. We interviewed the case managers in 10 cases; the other was a file read.

We examined the quality of assessment; planning; and implementation and delivery of services. Each of these elements was inspected in respect of work done to address desistance. For the seven cases where there were factors related to risk of harm, we also inspected work done to keep other people safe. In the eight cases where there were relevant factors, we looked at work to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the child. We also looked at the quality of joint working with the local police. The quality of work undertaken in relation to each element of case supervision needs to be above a specific threshold for it to be rated as satisfactory.

When children receive an OCCD, we expect to see the YOS maximising the likelihood of successful outcomes by addressing desistance factors, effectively engaging with children and their parents/carers and responding to relevant diversity factors. We also expect to see children being kept safe and their safety and wellbeing needs being addressed. Finally, we expect everything reasonable to be done to manage the risk of harm posed by children who have offended. This should be through good-quality assessment and planning with the delivery of appropriate interventions, effective leadership and management, and good joint decision-making and partnership working across all statutory and voluntary agencies.

Cardiff YOS operates a model such that some of the OCCD work (specifically community resolutions) are delivered by a third-sector organisation – Media Academy Cardiff (MAC). This is done via a commissioned arrangement, and MAC staff undertaking this work have access to YOS, social care and police case management systems. Although a service specification document was developed before MAC was commissioned, the responsible YOS link managers (and indeed the MAC team manager) confirmed that there was no service level agreement in place to measure and evaluate performance effectively. Decision-making on individual cases took place at a weekly panel, attended by YOS workers, victim workers, MAC staff and seconded police officers. Inspectors observed this panel and found (in some instances) that there was evidence of delay in cases being assessed and interventions being delivered. There was no clear working protocol and guidance for the OCCD panel. Inspectors found that the panel reviewed many cases where the OCCD decision had already been made and for these cases it was therefore more of a case management forum than a decision-making body.

In this YOS, fewer than half of the OCCD cases met all our requirements in terms of assessment, planning, and implementation and delivery; this led to our judgements of 'Inadequate' for those elements of work. Although assessment and planning for desistance were strong (82 per cent and 73 per cent respectively), this was not the case in relation to both safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others. Assessment met our standards in just 18 per cent of cases in relation to safety and wellbeing. Only 27 per cent of assessments were sufficient for risk of harm. There were serious deficits regarding the quality of planning for safety and wellbeing, with none of the eight cases with identified needs meeting our required standards. In terms of the quality of implementation and delivery of OCCD plans, the work to address desistance, safeguarding and public protection was inadequate, meeting our standards in just 45 per cent, 14 per cent and 29 per cent of cases respectively.

In relation to joint working with other agencies, 45 per cent of cases met our standards for YOS recommendations being sufficiently well-informed, analytical and personalised to the child, while 67 per cent of cases met the standard for joint work with the police. However, the latter figure was based on a small sub-sample of just three cases. Looking at evidence across domain one, inspectors found shortfalls in the delivery of the OOC panel and a lack of a suitable framework, procedures and guidance to support quality work. Therefore, our judgement of this joint working standard remained 'Inadequate'.

Strengths:

- Assessment of desistance in OOC cases was outstanding.
- Planning for desistance was good.
- Staff focused sufficiently on developing and maintaining an effective working relationship with the child and their parents/carers.
- Assessments were strengths-based and considered the child's maturity, capacity to change and diversity, and were proportionate to the disposal type.

Areas for improvement:

- There were serious shortfalls in the quality of assessment and planning for a child's safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others in out-of-court cases.
- Implementation and delivery of work to address desistance, safety and wellbeing and risk of harm to others were inadequate.
- Management oversight of OOCs was poor.
- There was no service level agreement between the YOS and Media Academy Cardiff; this meant the YOS did not effectively monitor and evaluate the commissioned arrangements for delivering some OOCs.
- The framework for delivering OOCs was not underdeveloped and there was a lack of protocols and guidance for key stakeholders within the partnership.
- Inspectors observed the panel and found that it reviewed many cases where the OOC decision had already been made, and for these cases it was therefore more of a case management forum than the decision-making body it should be.
- In some OOC cases considered by the panel, that inspectors observed, there was evidence of delay in the case being assessed and interventions being delivered.
- The rationale for joint decision-making in OOC cases was not recorded clearly.

Work with children 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



Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.

Inadequate

Our rating²⁰ for assessment is based on the following key questions:

	% yes
Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	82%
Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?	18%
Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?	27%

Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?

Assessments of desistance and offending-related factors were of sufficient quality in 9 out of the 11 cases we inspected. We found that assessments were strengths-based and considered diversity, maturity and capacity to change. They involved the child and their parents/carers in 10 out of 11 cases.

An inspector noted:

“Brandon was subject to YCC [youth conditional caution] for possession of an offensive weapon, where he took a knife to the park and showed his friends. Brandon had strong family support and this was conveyed in the assessment. His parents had taken a positive approach in working with YOS and police, and assessment had shown that Brandon had demonstrated remorse for his actions and that he had no other criminal associates that would lead him to further offending”.

Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?

Assessment of a child's safety and wellbeing was inadequate, being found to be sufficient in less than a fifth of cases. The main shortfalls of assessment practice were a failure to draw on other sources of information and a lack of analysis of past and current issues and behaviours, which led to underestimations of risks to safety and wellbeing. Inspectors agreed with the safety and wellbeing risk classification in just over a third of relevant cases. Many OOCB assessments did not contain a reasoned judgement or classification of the child's safety and wellbeing.

In one case, an inspector found:

“The assessment did not offer a classification on safety and wellbeing and did not draw together key historical information from social care records. The child had been previously subject to a CP [child protection] plan, but the case manager admitted that he hadn't checked social care records nor spoken to the previous social worker”.

²⁰ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. See Annexe 2 for a more detailed explanation.

Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?

As with safety and wellbeing, assessments of children’s risk of harm to others were found to be inadequate. In less than one-third of the cases inspected had the case manager used available sources of information, including other assessments or documents, to inform their own judgement. Inspectors agreed with the level of risk of harm to others in only 5 out of 11 cases, with YOS case managers consistently underestimating the risks posed by the child. We found a similar pattern of practice to that of safety and wellbeing, whereby assessments failed to draw on other sources of information, lacked a reasoned analysis of past and present behaviours, and, in more than half of cases inspected, lacked an evidenced summary and classification of the risk of harm to others. Overall, assessment of risk of harm to others was sufficient in only 3 out of 11 relevant cases.

An inspector highlighted the following case:

“Freddie had made threats towards his teacher of rape and violence and had been seen outside the staff member’s address. The assessment did not give any detailed context or timescales of these incidents but did consider Freddie’s current behaviour with weapons. However, the assessment posed too many unanswered questions about Freddie’s behaviour and did not give an adequate and full understanding of his propensity for violence”.

3.2. Planning



Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.

Inadequate

Our rating²¹ for planning is based on the following key questions:

	% yes
Does planning focus on supporting the child’s desistance?	73%
Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	0%
Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	44%

Does planning focus on supporting the child’s desistance?

Planning for services to support desistance was sufficient in 9 out of 11 of the OOC cases inspected. Although planning to take account of diversity issues and social context was lower, at 6 out of 11 cases, it was focused on the strengths of the child in nearly three-quarters of cases. Of those five relevant cases where there was a direct victim, planning was sufficient in all of them, while planning took sufficient account of opportunities for community integration, including access to mainstream services following completion of an OOC, in 10 out of 11 cases.

²¹ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. See Annexe 2 for a more detailed explanation.

An inspector found in one case:

“Planning for desistance was consistent with issues identified within the assessment, specifically in relation to alcohol, emotional wellbeing and positive activity/ETE. Exit planning for desistance was also evident, with the child having been linked with relevant agencies and counselling beyond the scope of the OOC”.

Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?

In none of the eight relevant cases inspected did planning sufficiently promote the safety and wellbeing of the child. In just one of those eight cases did we see involvement or alignment with other agencies’ plans (such as with social care). Contingency arrangements for any changes to the level of safety and wellbeing were only evident in one case.

One inspector noted:

“Despite the child having high safety and wellbeing needs, the plan does not dovetail with the child protection plan and the child protection plan is not being fully implemented. Information from the police and education is not forthcoming and this is impacting on the planning process. The YOS plan is restricted to the conditions of the YCC, which are limited”.

Another inspector judged a case as follows:

“Planning for safety and wellbeing was poor and minimal, with no link to the LAC plan. Contingency planning was poor and far too brief, with no specific actions stated, should concerns regarding safety and wellbeing increase further”.

Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?

Planning to address the factors related to the risk of harm to others was evident in three out of seven relevant cases and involved other agencies in four out of seven cases. Evidence of contingency planning to manage those risks was identified in only two of these seven cases, and planning to address concerns related to actual and potential victims was evident in less than half of the relevant cases. Overall, planning that focused on keeping people safe was evident in just three out of seven cases.

3.3. Implementation and delivery



High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, engaging and assisting the child.

Inadequate

Our rating²² for implementation and delivery is based on the following key questions:

	% yes
Does service delivery effectively support the child's desistance?	45%
Does service delivery effectively support the safety of the child?	14%
Does service delivery effectively support the safety of other people?	29%

Does service delivery effectively support the child's desistance?

There was sufficient analysis of offending behaviour in almost two-thirds of the cases. The assessment considered the diversity and social context of the child in just over half of the cases inspected. The child's strengths and protective factors, alongside motivation to change, were considered in just under two-thirds of cases, and in the same proportion of cases practitioners had involved the child and their parents/carers in the assessment and taken their views into account. However, some cases demonstrated where gaps in wider service provision had impacted on the work delivered.

In one such case, an inspector found:

"There were concerns that the child has speech, language and communication (and possible SEN) needs but this has not been addressed due to gaps in service provision. The YOS had no speech and language therapist and the education worker was on maternity leave with no cover in place. There has been an obstacle with getting the child into a full-time school placement and he is in an unsuitable part-time provision. The child is resistant to engaging but the case worker has been tenacious and persistent in developing a relationship with him".

Does service delivery effectively support the safety of the child?

Evidence that the safety and wellbeing of the child was promoted through service delivery was found for just one of the seven relevant cases, and only one case saw YOS case managers involve and coordinate other agencies in keeping children safe.

This was highlighted by one inspector:

"At the end of the intervention there was no better understanding of whether Sonny was at risk of criminal exploitation. Delivery did not include addressing the influence of his peers as linked to risk of harm".

²² The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. See Annexe 2 for a more detailed explanation.

Does service delivery effectively support the safety of other people?

As for keeping other people safe, attention had been given to the protection of actual and potential victims in only two of the six relevant cases. The interventions sufficiently managed and minimised the risk of harm in only a third of relevant cases and, overall, the safety of other people was supported effectively in only two out of seven relevant cases.

An inspector noted:

“There was a lack of contact for a two-month period on the OOC. Indeed, the child then ended up reoffending via an alleged theft and assault and there was a lack of checking/information-sharing with police. Case manager had discovered this via checking Carefirst social care system and had not been informed via YOT police officer”.

3.4. Joint working



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

Inadequate

Our rating²³ for joint working is based on the following key questions:

	% yes
Are the YOT’s recommendations sufficiently well-informed, analytical and personalised to the child, supporting joint decision making?	45%
Does the YOT work effectively with the police in implementing the out-of-court disposal?	67%

Are the YOT’s recommendations sufficiently well-informed, analytical and personalised to the child, supporting joint decision-making?

The recommendations made by the YOS were appropriate and proportionate in 9 out of 11 cases. In nearly two-thirds of them, the child’s understanding of the offence and their acknowledgement of responsibility were considered, and in nearly two-thirds of cases the YOS made a positive contribution to determining the OOC.

It is positive that, in 8 out of 11 cases, case managers had ensured that the child and their parents/carers understood the implications of receiving an OOC.

However, there were serious shortfalls in recording the appropriateness and rationale for disposal decisions, with just 2 out of 11 cases meeting our required standards. Overall, only 5 out of 11 cases showed that the YOS’s recommendations had been well informed, analytical and personalised to the child, and therefore supported joint decision-making.

²³ The rating for the standard is driven by the lowest score on each of the key questions, which is placed in a rating band, indicated in bold in the table. See Annexe 2 for a more detailed explanation.

Does the YOT work effectively with the police in implementing the out-of-court disposal?

Of the three cases that required case managers to report on progress to the police, two had been completed in a timely manner. In all three cases, staff had given sufficient attention to compliance with, and enforcement of, the conditions. Overall, in two of the three relevant cases, the YOS worked effectively with the police in implementing the OOC.

Annexe 1: Methodology

HM Inspectorate of Probation standards

The standards against which we inspect youth offending services 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 children who have offended.²⁴

The inspection methodology is summarised below, linked to the three domains in our standards framework. We focused on obtaining evidence against the standards, key questions and prompts in our inspection framework.

Domain one: organisational delivery

The YOS submitted evidence in advance, and the Assistant Director of Children's Services (Chair of Cardiff YOS Management Board) and the Police and Crime Commissioner for South Wales (Deputy Chair of the YOS Management Board) 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 who have offended are improved?
- What are your priorities for further improving these arrangements?

During the main fieldwork phase, we conducted 28 interviews with case managers, asking them about their experiences of training, development, management supervision and leadership. The second fieldwork week is the joint element of the inspection. HMI Probation was joined by colleague inspectors from police, health, social care and education. We followed up issues which had emerged from the case inspections. We held various meetings, which allowed us to triangulate evidence and information. In total, we conducted 46 meetings, which included meetings with managers, partner organisations and staff. The evidence collected under this domain was judged against our published ratings characteristics.²⁵

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 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. In some individual cases, further enquiries were made during the second fieldwork week by colleague inspectors from the police, health, social care or education.

We examined 18 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.

²⁴ HM Inspectorate's standards are available here:

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

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 who had received an OOCd 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. In some individual cases, further enquiries were made during the second fieldwork week by colleague inspectors from police, health, social care or education.

We examined 11 OOCds. 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.

In some areas of this report, data may have been split into smaller sub-samples, for example male/female cases. Where this is the case, the margin of error for the sub-sample findings may be higher than five.

Annexe 2: Inspection results

In this inspection, we conducted a detailed examination of a sample of 18 court disposals and 11 out-of-court disposals. In each of those cases, we inspect against four standards: assessment, planning, and implementation/delivery. For court disposals, we look at reviewing; and in out-of-court disposals, we look at joint working with the police. For each standard, inspectors answer a number of key questions about different aspects of quality, including whether there was sufficient analysis of the factors related to offending; the extent to which children were involved in assessment and planning; and whether enough was done to assess the level of risk of harm posed, and to manage that risk.

To score an 'Outstanding' rating for the sections on court disposals or out-of-court disposals, 80 per cent or more of the cases we analyse have to be assessed as sufficient. If between 65 per cent and 79 per cent are judged to be sufficient, then the rating is 'Good', and if between 50 per cent and 64 per cent are judged to be sufficient, then a rating of 'Requires improvement' is applied. Finally, if less than 50 per cent are sufficient, then we rate this as 'Inadequate'.

The rating at the standard level is aligned to the lowest banding at the key question level, recognising that each key question is an integral part of the standard. Therefore, if we rate three key questions as 'Good' and one as 'Inadequate', the overall rating for that standard is 'Inadequate'.

Lowest banding (key question level)	Rating (standard)
Minority: <50%	Inadequate
Too few: 50-64%	Requires improvement
Reasonable majority: 65-79%	Good
Large majority: 80%+	Outstanding

Additional scoring rules are used to generate the overall YOT rating. Each of the 12 standards are scored on a 0–3 scale in which 'Inadequate' = 0; 'Requires improvement' = 1; 'Good' = 2; and 'Outstanding' = 3. Adding these scores produces a total score ranging from 0–36, which is banded to produce the overall rating, as follows

- 0–6 = Inadequate
- 7–18 = Requires improvement
- 19–30 = Good
- 31–36 = Outstanding.

1. Organisational delivery

Standards and key questions	Rating
<p>1.1. Governance and leadership</p> <p>The governance and leadership of the YOT supports and promotes the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children.</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?</p> <p>1.1.2. Do the partnership arrangements actively support effective service delivery?</p> <p>1.1.3. Does the leadership of the YOT support effective service delivery?</p>	Inadequate
<p>1.2. Staff</p> <p>Staff within the YOT are empowered to deliver a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children.</p> <p>1.2.1. Do staffing and workload levels support the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children?</p> <p>1.2.2. Do the skills of YOT staff support the delivery of a high-quality, personalised and responsive service for all children?</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>	Inadequate
<p>1.3. Partnerships and services</p> <p>A comprehensive range of high-quality services is in place, enabling personalised and responsive provision for all children.</p> <p>1.3.1. Is there a sufficiently comprehensive and up-to-date analysis of the profile of children, to ensure that the YOT can deliver well-targeted services?</p> <p>1.3.2. Does the YOT partnership have access to the volume, range and quality of services and interventions to meet the needs of all children?</p> <p>1.3.3. Are arrangements with statutory partners, providers and other agencies established, maintained and used effectively to deliver high-quality services?</p>	Inadequate

1.4. Information and facilities	Inadequate
Timely and relevant information is available and appropriate facilities are in place to support a high-quality, personalised and responsive approach for all children.	
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?	
1.4.2. Does the YOT's delivery environment(s) meet the needs of all children 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?	
1.4.4. Is analysis, evidence and learning used effectively to drive improvement?	

2. Court disposals

Standards and key questions	Rating and % yes
2.1. Assessment	Inadequate
Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.	
2.1.1. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	33%
2.1.2. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?	33%
2.1.3. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?	44%
2.2. Planning	Inadequate
Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.	
2.2.1. Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	44%
2.2.2. Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	11%
2.2.3. Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	17%

2.3. Implementation and delivery	Inadequate
High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, engaging and assisting the child.	
2.3.1. Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the child's desistance?	75%
2.3.2. Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of the child?	44%
2.3.3. Does the implementation and delivery of services effectively support the safety of other people?	39%
2.4. Reviewing	Inadequate
Reviewing of progress is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.	
2.4.1. Does reviewing focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	33%
2.4.2. Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	22%
2.4.3. Does reviewing focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	14%

3. Out-of-court disposals

Standards and key questions	Rating and % yes
3.1. Assessment	Inadequate
Assessment is well-informed, analytical and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.	
3.1.1. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to support the child's desistance?	82%
3.1.2. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep the child safe?	18%
3.1.3. Does assessment sufficiently analyse how to keep other people safe?	27%

3.2. Planning	Inadequate
Planning is well-informed, holistic and personalised, actively involving the child and their parents/carers.	
3.2.1. Does planning focus sufficiently on supporting the child's desistance?	73%
3.2.2. Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping the child safe?	0%
3.2.3. Does planning focus sufficiently on keeping other people safe?	43%
3.3. Implementation and delivery	Inadequate
High-quality, well-focused, personalised and coordinated services are delivered, engaging and assisting the child.	
3.3.1. Does service delivery support the child's desistance?	45%
3.3.2. Does service delivery effectively support the safety of the child?	14%
3.3.3. Does service delivery effectively support the safety of other people?	29%
3.4. Joint working	Inadequate
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, supporting joint decision-making?	45%
3.4.2. Does the YOT work effectively with the police in implementing the out-of-court disposal?	67%

Annexe 3: Glossary

AssetPlus	Assessment and planning framework tool developed by the Youth Justice Board for work with children 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 a 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.
EOTAS	Education Other Than At School: includes all forms of education that takes place outside of the formal school environment.
Enforcement	Action taken by a case manager in response to a child'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.
FTE	First-time entrants: a child who receives a statutory criminal justice outcome (youth caution, youth conditional caution or conviction) for the first time.
Local authority	YOTs are often a team within a specific local authority.
MOSOVO	Management Of Sexual Offenders and Violent Offenders via a coordinated specialist police team.
NEET	Children not in any form of full- or part-time education, training or employment.
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.

Risk of Serious Harm	Risk of Serious Harm (ROSH) is a term used in AssetPlus. All cases are classified as presenting a low, medium, high or very high risk of serious harm to others. HMI Probation uses this term when referring to the classification system, but uses the broader term 'risk of harm' when referring to the analysis which should take place to determine the classification level. This helps to clarify the distinction between the probability of an event occurring and the impact/severity of the event. The term Risk of Serious Harm only incorporates 'serious' impact, whereas using 'risk of harm' enables the necessary attention to be given to those young offenders for whom lower impact/severity harmful behaviour is probable.
Referral order	A restorative court order which can be imposed when the child appearing before the court pleads guilty, and the threshold for a youth rehabilitation order is not met.
Safeguarding	Safeguarding is a wider term than child protection and involves promoting a child'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 on a child's safety and wellbeing 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" (AssetPlus Guidance, 2016).
Youth caution	A caution accepted by a child following admission to an offence where it is not considered to be in the public interest to prosecute the offender.
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 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/YOS Management Board	The YOT Management Board holds the YOT to account to ensure it achieves the primary aim of preventing offending by children.
Youth rehabilitation order	Overarching community sentence to which the court applies requirements (e.g. supervision requirement or unpaid work).
Youth Justice Board	A government body responsible for monitoring and advising ministers on the effectiveness of the youth

justice system. The YJB provider grants and guidance to the youth offending teams.



Her Majesty's
Inspectorate of
Probation

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

ISBN: 978-1-84099-909-9

My ref: PO/RJ

16 July 2020

Justin Russell
HMI Probation

Dear Mr Russell

HMIP inspection of the Cardiff Youth Justice services 2020

Please find attached documents which set out our response to the fourteen specific recommendations in the HMIP Joint Inspection of Cardiff Youth Justice Services published on 2 July 2020.

The HMIP action plan is included within an overall Development Plan (with the HMIP recommendations identified).

1) The overall Development Plan is divided into four themes incorporating the HMIP recommendations:

- Governance
- Management
- Workforce
- Service/practice Improvement

The first theme was developed by the newly constituted Cardiff Youth Justice Board; themes two to four have been developed by the Board's improvement subcommittee. A Youth Justice Board representative has been engaged in all these discussions to provide external challenge.

The HMIP action plan elements were reviewed and signed off by the Cardiff Youth Justice Board on 14 July to inform this response.

2) The first HMIP recommendation is that the Cardiff Youth Justice Board should "ensure it sets the strategic direction for the YOS by having a clear vision". We recognised this as a fundamental first step so I attach our new two year Development Strategy (Ein dyfodol ni l gyd / All our futures) which was created by the Cardiff Youth Justice Board through staff and partnership workshops, and includes - and is informed by - the views of children.

GWEITHIO DROS GAERDYDD, GWEITHIO DROSOCH CHI

Mae'r Cyngor yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg, Saesneg neu'n ddwyieithog. Byddwn yn cyfathrebu â chi yn ôl eich dewis, dim ond i chi roi gwybod i ni pa un sydd well gennych. Ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.

WORKING FOR CARDIFF, WORKING FOR YOU

The Council welcomes correspondence in Welsh, English or bilingually. We will ensure that we communicate with you in the language of your choice, as long as you let us know which you prefer. Corresponding in Welsh will not lead to delay.

The strategy was launched by the Leader of Cardiff Council on 30 June in his role as Chair of the statutory Public Services Board. The audience was youth justice staff, partner staff and councillors. The strategy also has active support from Cardiff Council, the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Chief Executive of Cardiff and Vale University Health Board (who has taken it to the organisation's Board and secured support for the strategy) and the National Probation Service.

For your information I also note that Cardiff Youth Justice Board received a case review report on 30 June arising from HMIP's Organisational Alert. The Board was assured to hear that all the cases had been reviewed by new managers and any necessary adjustments made. The system learning from this has been incorporated into the Action Plan.

The work of Youth Justice Services, the HMIP inspection, developments since the inspection, and the planned developments for the next nine months, have been the subject of a workshop held on 8 July which was open to all Cardiff councillors. The workshop input was from Children's Services, the Cardiff and Vale University Health Board, the PCC, Probation, a YJS staff member and the Independent Chair of the Board. This session was welcomed by councillors as a detailed and helpful session and a further workshop has been requested in due course to track progress. I have also commissioned a workshop for senior leaders to ensure multi-agency understanding at a senior executive level of the youth justice system, the journey of the child, data and risks.

We are committed to ensuring that the youth justice system in Cardiff continues to have a high profile among partners and the wider community so that children in contact with youth justice services have the best possible outcomes.

Yours sincerely,



Paul Orders
Chief Executive
Cardiff Council

Cc Alan MacDonald – HMIP Head of Youth Offending Services
Mike Lane - HMIP Lead inspector
Colin Allars - Chief Executive, YJB
Rt Hon Alun Michael - South Wales Police and Crime Commissioner
Deborah Driffield Assistant Director Children's Services
Graham Robb - Independent Chair, Cardiff Youth Justice Services Management Board
Finn Madell – Operations Manager – Cardiff Council
Darrell Gregoire, Cardiff Youth Offending Service Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

Cardiff Youth Justice Board Development Plan 2020 - 2021

This is developed to deliver the goals set by the Cardiff Youth Justice Strategy 20-22 " All Our Futures "

The elements have been drawn from Consultancy and self assessment work in 2019 , HMIP Inspection outcomes (2020) and best practice advice

The delivery of the development plan is the responsibility of the Cardiff Youth Justice Board who delegate to a sub committee the responsibility of detailed scrutiny and actions

The Framework for the Development Plan was approved at the Cardiff Youth Justice Board on 9th June 2020

This plan was approved at the Extraordinary Meeting of the Cardiff Youth Justice Board on Tuesday 14th July 2020.

Graham Robb
Independent Chair
Cardiff Youth Justice Board

GOVERNANCE : Responsible lead : Chair of Cardiff YJB

NUMBER	HMP Recommendation	ACTION	Deliverables	Deadline for delivery	Task Completed	Impact measures	COMMENTS
G1	1. The Cardiff Youth Offending Service Management Board should ensure it sets the strategic direction for the YOS by having a clear vision that is communicated to staff and key stakeholders	Establish and communicate vision for the YJS working with staff partners and children	"All Our Futures" Development strategy.	Jun-20	Launched by Leader June 30 2020	1) Process feedback b) Self evaluation winter 20/21	Survey of staff , Board and partners by March 2021
G2	2. The Cardiff Youth Offending Service Management Board should review its membership, role and function to make sure that its representatives have the seniority to make decisions and commit necessary resources to the YOS	Define membership of Advocacy Panel , Board and Sub committee, ToR and roles of members	New Governance processes. i) Cardiff Youth justice Board ii) sub committee oversight of development plan. iii) YJ advocacy Panel of senior strategic leaders	Jun-20	Agreed at Board 14 June 2020 New structure implemented at Board 30 June 2020	a) clarity about roles and recruitment of right statutory leaders b) Board minutes show attendance, engagement and decision making impact.	Board self evaluation winter 20/21
G3	3. The Cardiff Youth Offending Service Management Board should make sure that all members of the YOS partnership and other partner agencies provide appropriate support and services	Ensure all relevant Partner Contributions are made	Clear YJS annual business plan process and partner contributions. Financial reporting to Board	Process outlined 30 June Board meeting. Completion Sept 2020 Board meeting. Dec 2020 Business Plan process starts for 21/22	Board agreed Finance reporting 30 June 2020 and how annual business plan recommendations will go to CEx and Partners	In 20/21 Board Confidence in planning and budget processes. In 21/22 Board confidence that business plan responds to needs of the children and that all partner contributions are made	
G4	4. The Cardiff Youth Offending Service Management Board should develop members' knowledge and understanding of their role as Board members and the service's work and provide effective challenge to partners	Board training plan. Wider training sessions for strategic and civic leads	Strategic Partner YJ Workshop inc Cabinet members summer 2020. Annual outline workplan including training adopted. Detailed workplan	Annual Training Plan completed 30 July 2020	Councillor Briefing session 08 07 20	Board confidence in knowledge and skills to support and challenge practice and partners. a) Board annual Training plan meets Members needs b) Minuted evidence of challenge	Board commits to Training at all levels to build a learning culture. Hence Councillor training. Board 09 06 20 committed to bi monthly training/focus sessions. Board 30 6 20 invited proposals for training needs
G5	5. The Cardiff Youth Justice Board should provide the management team with the necessary resources and support to manage the service effectively	a)Strengthened service leadership. Recruit dedicated Operational manager b) Subsequent management development – autumn 2020	a) Appoint new OM. b) Board oversee strengthened management oversight plans.	OM Appointment autumn 2020			Board has, through Chair action, advised on OM recruitment process and reported to Board.
G6	6. The Cardiff Youth Justice Board should develop robust plans to drive service improvement in response to findings from audits and inspections and communicate these more effectively to staff.	Develop robust plans to drive service improvement and communicate	Development Plan overseen by sub committee of partners	Jul-20		summer 2022 _ indicators of improvement on all strands	
G7	7 Board also exercises oversight of workforce indicators	Monitoring workforce indicators for recruitment, retention and well being are in routine Board meeting agendas	Routine workforce report to Cardiff YJB	Jun-20			

G8	8 Board exercises oversight of strategic policies as identified by YJB National Standards guidance	Policies Sign Off by Board	Phase 1 Eight Policies required by YJB National Standards guidance sign off by Sept 30 2020	Sept 2020 Governance policies audit completed. Phase 1 policies signed off by the Board Mar 2021 Phase 2 operational policies as needed signed off by the Board		Board approved process 30 June 2020	
----	--	-----------------------------------	---	---	--	-------------------------------------	--

Cardiff Youth Justice Services - Development Plan

STAFF							
NUMBER	HMIP Recommendation (if applicable)	OUTCOME (The end result we're aiming for)	DELIVERABLE (What we will do)	TIMESCALE (When we will do it by)	LEAD MANAGER (Who has overall responsibility)	PARTNER ROLES	Comment
S1	7. The Cardiff YOS Manager should ensure that all staff have appropriate induction, training, supervision and management oversight of their work	All staff will have appropriate training and development to support their work	All staff to undertake Mandatory Safeguarding Training	Jul-20	Service Manager		
			MAPPA training in place for all staff	Jun-20	Service Manager		
			MASH deliver MARF referral training to All YJS staff	Aug-20	Children's Services - Wellbeing, Support & Protection OM		
			A Skills Audit of all staff completed that identifies training needs	Oct-20	Service Manager		
			Staff Development Strategy Launched	Dec-20	Service Manager		
			All staff complete CareFirst and AssetPlus training	Dec-20	Service Manager		
			A Staff Reward and Recognition Scheme rolled out	Jun-21	Service Manager		
			Commence deliver a continuous programme of staff briefing sessions	Dec-20	Service Manager	CS Family Gateway & Early Help Manager (SM)	
S2		All staff will have appropriate induction	All new starters to Cardiff YJS will receive a full induction	Sep-20	Service Manager		
			All new starters to Cardiff YJS will be allocated a buddy for support	Sep-20	Service Manager		
S3		All staff will have appropriate supervision and management oversight of their work	Supervision policy updated and approved	Sep-20	Service Manager		
			All YJS managers to complete Supervision training	Nov-20	Service Manager		
			Monitor all staff receiving regular monthly supervision and assess the impact of supervision with both soft and hard data sets.	Jul-20	Service Manager		
			All staff complete their bi- annual and annual reviews	Sep-20	Service Manager	Health / Education / Probation / SWP	
			All YJS staff receive monthly access to a clinical consultation from Health	Dec-20	Service Manager	Health	

Cardiff Youth Justice Services - Development Plan

MANAGEMENT

NUMBER	HMIP Recommendation (if applicable)	OUTCOME (The end result we're aiming for)	DELIVERABLE (What we will do)	TIMESCALE (When we will do it by)	LEAD MANAGER (Who has overall responsibility)	PARTNER ROLES	Comment
M1		Implement new Management Structure and Support Arrangements	Establish a programme of regular meetings with all YJS/ Team Managers/ Partnership	Sep-20	Service Manager	Key partner agencies review the arrangements	This relates to operational management arrangements
			Complete Operational Restructure of YJS service	Feb-21	AD Children's Services	Health / Probation / Police	Incremental changes: new SM / TM employed, recruit OM, then Operational restructure commence
			Review partnership arrangement and systems and establish MoUs with the following: SWP, Probation and Cardiff and Vale Health Board in support of YJS vision	Dec-20	Service Manager	Health / Probation / Police	
M2	<p>9. The Cardiff YOS Manager should review the management structure, communication and lines of accountability to ensure that the quality of safeguarding and public protection work improves.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>11. The Cardiff YOS Manager should have oversight of all YOS cases where there are safeguarding and public protection issues, making sure that appropriate referrals are made, and joint work takes place as needed.</p>	Strengthen Arrangements for Safeguarding and Public Protection	MAPPA model implemented	Sep-20	Service Manager	Health / Probation / Police	
			Joint training for MAPPA/NRM National Referral Model for responding to High risk CCE cases	Dec-20	Service Manager	Health / Probation / Police	
			All cases CE/CSE/HSB reviewed and risk assessed	Sep-20	Service Manager	Children's Services	
			Create joint MASH/YJS screening process to 'YJS Daily Flag Reports' of Overnight arrests, Missing young people, CCE cases and other critical episodes reported by Police, in order to identify and prioritise timely action by YJS and CS to Safeguard individual cases	Sep-20	Children's Services - Wellbeing, Support & Protection OM	Health / Probation / Police	
			MoU agreed with Childrens Social Care, including:	Sep-20	Service Manager	Children's Services	
			Nominate YJS Safeguarding lead worker to work (virtually) within MASH service	Dec-20	Service Manager		
			Monitor attendance at CPF-CE-MASM for all partners to be held to account	Aug-20	YJS Team Manager (SY)	CS / Health / Education / Probation / SWP	
			Establish mechanism to Register reports by exception, supplied prior to risk management meets by C.S./Health/Education/School where lead worker unable to attend	Aug-20	YJS Team Manager (SY)	CS / Health / Education / Probation / SWP	
			Log of attendance by YJ case worker to CPR/CLA Reviews	Aug-20			
			Assess and implement CE Assessment model for use in Cardiff	Dec-20	YJS Team Manager	CS MASH & Intake and Assessment teams, AFC, MAC, St Giles	
			Create CE Task and Finish Group and develop integrated processes and flowchart to CE casework between partner agencies, Enhanced mechanism to ensure CE/CSE risks are being managed through: improved analysis of safeguarding audits: and regular meetings between YJS Safeguarding and CS Safeguarding	Dec-20	Service Manager	Side Step / MAC / St. Giles / C.S. (I&A)	
			TRM Trauma training adopted and delivered to all staff	Sep-21	PCC		
YJS & CS Performance Report Card will track CSC and YJS joint work be scrutinised by CS Performance Board	Jul-20	Head of Service					

			Establish a process by which we can integrate the learning from High risk cases (appreciative enquiry)	Sep-21	Service Manager		
			Establish a process by which we can integrate the learning from the Thematic Reviews by national bodies	Sep-21	Service Manager		
M3		Improve the quality of assessment	Develop and implement CS Quality Assurance Framework and make specific to YJS	Mar-21	Service Manager		
			External independent audit repeated annually to show YJS improvement (distance travelled) on the Findings of original SilverBullet audit 2019 to management of cases (not governance)	Sep-20	Service Manager		
			Review all QA Tools for Gatekeeping Reports and Assessments	Sep-20	Service Manager	TM Kirstie Davies	
M4	10. The Cardiff YOS Manager should develop and update policies, procedures and guidance that will enable all staff to deliver quality work	A comprehensive range of policies and procedures, centrally available to staff and partners, will be developed	Board scrutiny of 8 National Standards Policies	Sep-20	Chair of Board		
			Stage 1 - Policies updated and approved including: - CS-YJS Protocol - Management of Risk Policy - Management Oversight Policy - Induction Policy - Compliance and Re-engagement policy	Sep-20	Service Manager		
			Stage 2 - Policies updated and approved including: Breach Policy - Victim work - Volunteer process/policy - Health and Safety policy - Safeguarding referral log - Policy configuration - Resettlement Policy	Mar-21	Service Manager		
			Redesign the policy storage area (SharePoint)	Jul-20	YJS Business Support Manager		
M5		Improving management of OoCD	Review and update OoCD assessment tool	Sep-20	YJS Team Manager (ASC)	SWP Lead	
			Review and update timeliness and joint decision making process to establish new OoCD 'Out of Court Disposals' management provision with new Bureau Model	Dec-20	YJS Team Manager (ASC)	SWP Lead	
			Establish and launch External OoCD Scrutiny Panel to audit cases to HMIP standard	Dec-20	YJS Team Manager (ASC)	PCC	
			External OoCD Scrutiny Panel report on findings to YJS management Board on a quarter year basis	Mar-21	Service Manager	PCC	
M6		Improving management of Appropriate Adult Service	Review and rearrange Appropriate Adult service to operate within budget	Dec-20	YJS Team Manager (KD)		

Cardiff Youth Justice Services - Development Plan							
SERVICE IMPROVEMENT							
NUMBER	HMIP Recommendation (if applicable)	OUTCOME (The end result we're aiming for)	DELIVERABLE (What we will do)	TIMESCALE (When we will do it by)	LEAD MANAGER (Who has overall responsibility)	PARTNER ROLES	Comment
SI 1		We will make sure we have all the right data and tools to analyse the needs of the child now, and any future trends.	Complete a joint strategic assessment to inform service delivery	Sep-21	Service Manager		
			Undertake a cohort analysis to inform the service offer	Sep-21	Service Manager		
			Have a process in place to track progress of the children and remove any blockages to that delivery: a. priority work with children b. what data is needed to track progress c. quality assurance processes d. escalation processes if blockages occur	Sep-21	Service Manager		
			develop analytic tools to identify susceptibility based on early indicators and key vulnerabilities enabling targeted prevention work including the highest risk children and those exhibiting sexually harmful behaviour	Sep-21	Service Manager		
			Develop effective performance management of staff based on key performance indicators	Sep-20	Service Manager		
SI 2		Pathways - Education , and Health and Children's Services	Create/Review MoU process to referral pathways Education and Universal and Specialist services	Sep-20	Service Manager		
SI 3	8. The Cardiff YOS Manager should establish a service level agreement, protocols, performance frameworks and guidance in relation to commissioned services for out-of-court disposal work	Ensure business control on commissioned services	SLA for Media Academy Wales to be put in place	Sep-20	Service Manager	MAC	
			SLA for Side Step to be put in place	Sep-20		Side Step	
			Performance dashboard to SLAs for Side Step and MAC to be developed	Dec-20		MAC / Side Step	
			Governance of MAC / Side Step at Monthly YJS	Dec-20		MAC / Side Step	
SI 4		Prevention and Out of Court disposals	Launch new OoCD Bureau model to manage Pre Court disposals and ensure joint decision making YJS/Police	Dec-20	Service Manager	Execution SWP (JL)	
			Create Task and Finish Group to work alongside residential and fostering placements to achieve the objectives of the 3-Year Children's Service Strategy	Jun-21	YJS Team Manager (ASC)	CS / SWP	Links to 3 year Childrens Strategy Delivering Excellence
SI 5		Court Disposals	Ensure Case audit meets Good standard and that recording to ChildView follows the case management system guidance	End Sept 2020	YJS Team Manager (KD)	CS, Police, Education, Multi agency peer review CS/YJS joint cases exercise	
			All Assessment and Plans countersigned with 5 working days	Sep-20	YJS Team Manager (KD)		
			Create efficiency around the court by introducing Oral/Stand-Down reports	Mar-21	YJS Team Manager (KD)	Probation	
SI 6		Resettlement	Ensure Case audit meets good standard	Mar-21	YJS Team Manager (SY)	Housing. Steering Group court team and TM	
			Gateway arrangements for homeless 16/17 year olds applied effectively to YJS children	Dec-20	YJS Team Manager (SY)	Housing. Steering Group court team and TM	
			Review and improve how support is provided to those in custody and continued post release	Mar-21	OM Adolescent Service		
SI 7		Ensure all youth justice work is informed and improved by engagement with the children, their families and	Undertake Voice of Child User survey	Dec-20	Service Manager	MAC	
			Approve Voice of Child Young Peoples Participation Plan	Dec-20	Service Manager	MAC	
			Establish YJS Young Persons Focus Group	Mar-21	Service Manager	MAC	

		communities	Establish YJS Parent / Carer user survey / consultation mechanism	Jun-21	Service Manager	YJS Staff (WP)	
			Establish Steering Group to oversee joint agency Targeted Outreach Activity to ASB and deliver targeted activity to hotspot locations	Sep-20	YJS Team Manager (KD)	Community Safety (SS)	
			Governance to join up workstream between these agencies to deliver targeted anti social behaviour activity and build relationships	Dec-20	YJS Team Manager (KD)	Community Safety (SS) / Youth Service	
			Develop support in communities and develop support options for this	Mar-21	YJS Team Manager (KD)	MAC	
SI 8	13. Cardiff and Vale Health Board should ensure that its statutory duty to provide relevant and timely physical, sexual, emotional and mental health services to YOS children is fulfilled.	UHB ensure relevant and timely physical, sexual emotional and mental health services	Recruit new Health worker	Sep-20	Service Manager	Health	
			Use Needs Analysis to agree pathway for access to health	Oct-20	Service Manager	Health	
			Dissemination of agreed pathway	Oct-20	Service Manager	Health	
SI 9	14. South Wales Police should ensure that Public Protection Notice (PPN) forms on YOS children are consistently completed by frontline police officers.	SWP- ensure that Public Protection notices are completed consistently by Frontline Police Officers	Complete an audit of PPN submissions for the YJS cohort	Sep-20	Service Manager	SWP	
			Agree pathway for information sharing between MASH and YJS	Sep-20	Service Manager	SWP / MASH	
SI 10	12. Local authority education services should develop effective strategies to encourage children who speak Welsh to access services in their preferred language, and to use, develop and recognise the value of the language as an employment skill.	Young people are supported to develop employment and entrepreneurship skills	Launch YJS Pilot Entrepreneurship programme	Dec-20	Schools programme project	Education	
			Phase 1 Pilot Entrepreneurship programme completed,	Mar-21	Carly Davies - Schools	Education	
			LA Education to improve approach to encourage children who speak Welsh to develop the language as an employment skill	Jun-21	Education	Education	
SI 11		Children who speak Welsh are encouraged to access the service in their preferred language	Establish arrangement to access free translation service	Jul-20	Education	Bilingual Cardiff	
			Offer of allocating Welsh speaking children to Welsh speaking YJS staff	Jul-20	YJS Senior Practitioner (GN)		
			Create English and Welsh signs, notices and displays and YJS to record language preference of children at first interview.	Sep-20	YJS Senior Practitioner YJS		
				Aug-20	Service Manager		
SI 12		Assessment and planning to address the needs and wishes of victims.	Establish Victim group to review QA templates and participate in satisfaction survey and to review victim uptake of services	Jun-21	YJS Team Manager (ASC)	YJS Police, Victim Support. YJS RJ worker, YJS Victim workers. YJS Information Officer	
			Establish advocacy support arrangements for victims of crime	Sep-21	YJS Team Manager (ASC)		
			Improve victim resources for victim sessions	Sep-20	YJS Team Manager (ASC)		
SI 13		Relaunch fit for purpose junior attendance centre	Create new Junior Attendance Centre	Dec-20	YJS Team Manager (ASC)		
			Launch new Junior Attendance Centre	Mar-21	YJS Team Manager (ASC)		

EIN DYFODOL NI I GYD ALL OUR FUTURES



YOUTH JUSTICE SERVICES DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2020 - 2022



Gwasanaeth Prawf
Cenedlaethol
National Probation
Service



GIG
CYMRU
NHS
WALES
Bwrdd Iechyd Prifysgol
Caerdydd a'r Fro
Cardiff and Vale
University Health Board



Cardiff
Caerdydd



De Cymru
Comisiynydd yr Heddlu a Throseddau
Police and Crime Commissioner
South Wales



GWASANAETHAU
CYFIAWNDER IEUENGTID
CAERDYDD
CARDIFF
YOUTH JUSTICE
SERVICES

EIN DYFODOL NI I GYD

ALL OUR FUTURES

The Cardiff Public Services Board (PSB), which brings together all the strategic public service partners working in Cardiff, endorses and supports this strategy which sets out our key goals and how we will measure success by 2022.

This document sets out what the partners, who are responsible for providing youth justice services in Cardiff, will do by working together. It has been developed during May 2020 in a series of workshops with those involved in the services, including young people.

To make this strategy happen it is supported by a detailed development plan, also agreed by the partner services, which sets out who will do what, how and by when.

This work will be overseen by the Cardiff Youth Justice Board, with an Independent Chair, to make sure the development is on track.

This work fits within other relevant strategies for young people in Cardiff which aim to give the best and safest futures to all young people in Cardiff.



1. CARDIFF YOUTH JUSTICE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2020 – 2022

We are committed to making sure that Cardiff is a great place to grow up for all children and young people.

Most children in Cardiff thrive within their home, family, community and school. For a small number of children, the risks in their lives, their poor choices, or the actions of adults putting them in harm's way, may bring them close to or into the youth justice system as they come to the attention of police or are arrested. These children can do harm to others, their families and their futures. Our focus is on both these groups – the children causing the harm and those harmed or at risk of harm. At the heart of our work is the knowledge that these are first of all children and only secondly are they children in the youth justice system.

As the partners responsible in law for providing Youth Justice Services in Cardiff we are determined to do the best we can for these children by:

- a. Hearing the child
- b. Setting high aspirations for the children in all aspects of their life
- c. Working with partners in prevention and early intervention to keep children safe and protect the public
- d. Diverting young people into alternatives from the criminal justice system when that is the right thing to do
- e. Ensuring that work with young people ordered by courts is effective at diverting the child from crime
- f. Building the resilience of young people to refrain from crime

- g. Working with the victims of the crimes of young people to help them make sense of what happened and deal with the harm they experienced
- h. Ensuring that if a child is sentenced to custody we do the best we can to help them make positive steps when they are released from custody

This will happen when:

- » There are common approaches when working with children
- » The staff teams are highly skilled, motivated and supported
- » We have a focus on improving performance of all parts of the system
- » The range of services we offer is right for the needs of the young people
- » The system leadership is tightly focused on making sure we are doing the right things now – and the right things for the future

As partners we are using this Development Strategy to state what it is we are going to do together in the next two years, and how we know we are making a difference, to get better outcomes for the young people of Cardiff.



Cllr Huw Thomas
Chair Cardiff Public Services Board.
Leader of the Council.



Charles Janczewski
Vice Chair, Cardiff Public Services Board.
Chair, University Health Board.



Alun Michael
South Wales Police and Crime Commissioner.

Youth Justice Services: the Cardiff story

The Cardiff Public Services Board is committed to improving our city's youth justice services.

In order to drive this improvement, in 2019 we reshaped the leadership structure and, to help assess what we needed to do to improve, we brought in consultants to assess practice and assessed our approach against national advice. In January 2020 the national Inspectorate (HMI Probation) undertook a three-week inspection and gave us challenging analysis and feedback. Although there were aspects to praise there were too many aspects of leadership and organisation, Court work, out-of-court work and resettlement which were not adequate. Immediately we decided that we had to work hard and quickly to make changes happen. This strategy is the outcome of that work and covers:

- a. A reshaping of governance and leadership to focus on making changes happen
- b. Improved use of shared data and analysis both to improve what we deliver and assess if it is working
- c. A workforce development plan including a quality assurance framework
- d. Working with partners to put in place an improved offer to children and families who receive our services

Where does Youth Justice fit into wider Cardiff plans?

Cardiff Well-being Plan

The Cardiff Well-being Plan 2018-2023 is a statutory plan that is required to be produced by the Cardiff PSB in accordance with the Well-being of Future Generations Act

(Wales) 2015. It sets out the PSB's priorities for action, focussing on the areas of public service delivery which fundamentally require partnership working between the city's public and community services, and with the citizens of Cardiff. The Plan contains various Well-being Objectives, high-level priorities that the PSB has identified as being most important. It includes a specific commitment to *'reduce offending and improve life opportunities for the 18-25 age group by developing an integrated, locally focussed, approach to offender management'*. The Cardiff PSB has also identified a series of outcome indicators by which the progress of the Wellbeing Plan will be measured, including the *'proportion of offenders who reoffend (adults and juveniles) overall in the previous 12 months.'*

Capital Ambition

Capital Ambition, updated in January 2020, sets out the administration's 5-year plan and policy commitments for Cardiff. It outlines the Council's vision for Cardiff to become a leading city on the world stage and includes details of each Cabinet Member's key aims and ambitions for their term of office. It also includes a specific commitment to "ensure the Youth Offending Service continues to work with partners to reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour".

Corporate Plan 2020-23

'Delivering Capital Ambition', the Council's Corporate Plan 2020-23, sets out how the administration's priorities for Cardiff will be achieved, providing clarity on what will be delivered, and by when. It includes a specific commitment to "create safe and cohesive communities...by strengthening governance and delivery arrangements in

the Youth Offending Service by May 2020, and implementing new approaches to reduce offending and reoffending rates by January 2021". It also includes the following key performance indicators:

Support young people at risk of falling into crime

Indicator	Target
The number of first time entrants into the Youth Justice System.	120
The percentage of children re-offending within six months of their previous offence.	50%

Tackling Exploitation strategy (Cardiff and Vale Regional Safeguarding Boards)

A robust multi-agency response to prevent and address exploitation, developing effective services to support victims of exploitation and improve the identification of victims of exploitation across Cardiff & the Vale. It is the responsibility of all partner agencies to identify children and adults at risk of exploitation in order to prevent them from becoming victims, and it is the responsibility of all partner agencies to protect and safeguard those who are experiencing exploitation from further harm.

Cardiff 2030 (Cardiff Education Services)

Cardiff 2030 was launched in November 2019 and provides a 10-year vision for a Capital City of Learning and Opportunity. The strategy has a broad scope and ambition for learning in Cardiff for the future, embracing learning beyond formal statutory schooling. It also puts the welfare of children at the heart of the city, recognising that the outcomes for children are also shaped outside of school.

Child Friendly Cardiff Strategy

The Child Friendly Cardiff Strategy was published in November 2018 and is a key programme of work being undertaken by the Council and Unicef UK for Cardiff to be recognised internationally as one of the UK's first Unicef Child Friendly Cities. The strategy sets out a shared vision and approach to building a Child Friendly Cardiff. It includes specific focus on the city's most vulnerable children and young people to ensure that child rights are made a reality for all. There are specific principles set out in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) for work with children in the justice system.

Youth Justice Blueprint for Wales

The Youth Justice Blueprint for Wales was published in May 2019 and provides guidance on effective approaches to youth justice in Wales. It was developed jointly by the Welsh Government, HM Prison and Probation Service and the Youth Justice Board Cymru, and sets out the key aspirations and guiding principles for young people in or at risk of entering the criminal justice system, focusing on early

intervention and prevention. The Blueprint recommends a holistic and rehabilitative approach to diverting young people away from crime and supporting those who find themselves in the criminal justice system.

Police and Crime Plan (Police and Crime Commissioner)

Early intervention and prompt, positive action to help prevent problems before they escalate is at the heart of a five year plan for policing in South Wales. The strategy sets out its aim to understand and respond to the needs of all our communities. Our work with partners is fundamental to people getting the response they need, when they need it. The plan sets out a number of priorities in its journey towards a safer South Wales and identifies the need to work with youth justice partners to make the local criminal justice system efficient and effective to meet the

needs of victims and reduce re-offending; reduce and prevent crime and anti-social behaviour to keep people safe and confident in their homes and communities, and protect the most vulnerable in our communities, understanding the causes and taking prompt positive action as issues arise.

Violence Prevention Unit

The Violence Prevention Unit brings together South Wales Police, Public Health Wales, local authorities, youth offending teams, education groups and the voluntary sector to tackle violent crime by understanding its root causes and taking opportunities to divert people away from serious violence through early intervention and prompt, positive action. The unit is also responsible for identifying what is driving violent crime in South Wales in order to develop a co-ordinated response by South Wales Police and its partners.



2. THE YOUNG PEOPLE WE WORK WITH

A CARDIFF CHILD SAID “I HAVEN’T BEEN RIGHT SINCE A BUNCH OF BOYS BEAT ME UP. NOW I FIND IT HARD TO FEEL SAFE”. THE BACKSTORY OF A NUMBER OF CHILDREN IS THAT THEY WERE VICTIMS FIRST THEN STARTED OFFENDING.

We need to be clear about the children and their needs and how well we are doing in our work with them.

The following gives a snapshot of the children in contact with the Cardiff Youth Justice Service in December 2019 as follows:

Number of cases	
Prevention	52
Diversion	45
Out of Court	17
Court cases	20
Early Intervention	43

And the reasons they are in the youth justice system:

Offence types	%
Violence against the person	50
Burglary	11
Robbery	6
Theft and handling stolen goods	17
Others	12


We need to know the trends of how our service is performing compared to others as it helps us plan developments.

And in March 2020:

- » 14% of children are Looked after
- » 8% are children on the Child Protection Register
- » 27% are identified as Children in Need
- » 30% of children under 16 are not in full time mainstream school
- » 38 % of children age 17 are not in Education, Training or Employment

National Measure 1: First Time Entrants (FTEs) to the youth justice system. We aim to reduce this.


Rate of FTEs per 100,000 under 18's - Oct 18 - Sep 19



Region	Oct 16- Sep 17	Oct 17- Sep 18	Oct 18- Sep 19
Cardiff	205	260	253
Wales	258	212	189
South Wales PCC Area	181	185	164
England & Wales	306	251	219

National Measure 2: Reoffending rate - this shows the percentage of the cohort who reoffended in a two year period after completing their order. We aim to reduce this.

Quarterly cohort - year on year comparison




Period	Cardiff	Wales	South Wales PCC Area	England & Wales
Jan 17- Mar 17	51.4%	45.5%	48.5%	39.9%
Jan 18- Mar 18	50%	40.2%	49.1%	39.3%

National measure 3: Use of Custody by children from Cardiff.

In winter 2019 this meant 8 young people from Cardiff were serving a custodial sentence and 7 young people were remanded in custody.

Custody Rate per 1,000 Young People



Cardiff	0.71	0.47	0.33	0.03
Wales	0.32	0.25	0.14	0.23
South Wales PCC Area	0.27	0.24	0.14	0.17
England & Wales	0.43	0.37	0.30	0.23



How we will use data and analysis:

To deliver this strategy, and ultimately to do the best for the children who need our support, we depend on good data, good joint working and good analysis.

Cardiff youth justice services can be most effective when there is shared understanding across services of the current and emerging risks, threats and trends, and at a locality level.

Case workers need data which is meaningful to the child's life. This should be holistic, reliable, timely and manageable to enable case work which produces better outcomes. Central to this is enabling the voice of the child to inform plans and evaluate services. It also enables us to commission services precisely and to evaluate their delivery.

The youth justice service needs tools and processes which identify vulnerability and risk to children across partners and then tracks progression in all aspects of a child's life, including into post-18 services.

Key priority: We will make sure we have all the right data and tools to analyse the needs of the child now, and any future trends.



	What is needed?	We will...
Voice of the child and family	Data from case records to enable strategic overview must, at all stages, be informed by the views of children – and their families. This is their right but also will lead to better decision making and commissioning.	...have routine feedback from children and families to inform decisions.
Strategic needs assessment	An assessment of the needs of children at risk and in the Youth Justice system from all partners - Early help, Education, health, police, Social care and probation. Specific elements must cover a. criminal exploitation b. disproportionality c. gender specific services d. serious youth violence	...develop a joint strategic needs assessment to 1. commission the right services in the right places at the right time 2. identify gaps in services 3. plan for future needs
Specific partner data	Education – achievement and progression, Health including mental health – family focused assessment of needs and journey travelled Social care – coordinating work round children in categories of need including Looked After Crown Prosecution Service – assuring court processes Accommodation – securing appropriate accommodation Secure estate – effective resettlement Probation – effective transition to post 18 serviceshave partnership agreement on a. priority work with children b. what data is needed to track progress c. quality assurance processes d. escalation processes if blockages occur
Tools for assessment of risk and vulnerability	Analytic tools drawing data from across the partnership will identify susceptibility based on early indicators and key vulnerabilities enabling targeted prevention work including the highest risk children and those exhibiting sexually harmful behaviour	...have a shared approach to vulnerability which enables more effective early intervention work

3. A VISION: WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

The highest aspirations for the children, supported by the right team doing the right work.

For the children

We work with children on the cusp of or in the youth justice system, their families and partner agencies to understand and minimise the risks in their lives, including those linked to crime and exploitation. We shape the right services for the individual in youth justice, health and wellbeing, education, safeguarding and public protection. This also applies to those who are the victims of youth crime. Our goal is that the child leaves youth justice with the best chance for better outcomes, with support to attain their ambitions and aspirations to lead a positive life.

At the heart of our approach is that these are children first and offenders second and that we aspire to the standards of the Unicef 'Cardiff Child Friendly City'.

For the service we offer

We know that a key factor in changing a child's life for the better is in building and sustaining a relationship of trust with an adult. In Cardiff Youth Justice Services, the role of that adult is to advocate for the child and make sure we know how the best services (across all Cardiff services) can be brought together to meet the needs of the child. This applies at all stages along the youth justice journey, from prevention through enforcement to resettlement if on occasion a child has a custodial sentence. This means making sure we know children's views, making sure we

are clear what 'best' looks like (including for the most complex sets of needs) and how to assure children, ourselves and partners that we are doing the best. However we also know that the trusted adult for a young person may be in the family, community, school, or other services and so we will see ourselves as part of a team working to support and challenge the child.

For the staff in Youth Justice Services

Whether they come from social work, probation, police, health, youth work or other specialisms in the team, our goal is a common approach to the work. That means staff understanding and living trauma informed practice and safeguarding (be it about the individual or the context of the area in which they live). We have to have data about current and future needs so we can secure the pathways needed for the children.

Above all this must be a learning culture where staff, strategic leaders and boards are continually reflecting on the work and refining it.

For the Cardiff Community

We understand the fear and anxiety which can come with youth crime. We have a duty to be transparent and honest about that and build confidence in the capacity of children to change for the better. So we also want to

tell the positive story of hope and change so that rather than communities feel the children are someone else's problem that "they are all our children". We also know there are many resources in the community which could

support children and families in the work of prevention and reducing reoffending as well as promoting the wider health and wellbeing of families and communities.

THE VOICE OF A CHILD IN THE CARDIFF YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM

“ALL YOUNG PEOPLE SHOULD FACE WHAT THEY DID, AND UNDERSTAND THAT THERE ARE VICTIMS”



4. HOW WE WILL WORK WITH YOUNG PEOPLE

We know that many of the young people we work with have been shaped by trauma of one sort or another, that the risks in their lives are sometimes down to them and sometimes to others in family or community. We know that helping them change their lives for the better, keeping them safe, and helping them repair harm they have caused, means tenaciously building positive trusted relationships and shaping what we do to their individual needs in ways they understand. We want them to understand that we will work fairly and transparently with them so that youth justice work can succeed be it in prevention, diversion, enforcement or resettlement. We also want

them to know we have high aspirations for their future, whatever their past and that we work across services in Cardiff to get the best pathways for the future once the youth justice work is done.

We are clear that Cardiff's commitment to be a Unicef Child Friendly City will mean we have to examine carefully how we work with children, drawing on what children tell us.

Key priority: We will make sure our shared assessment of needs is accurate and enables better outcomes for the children and the risks to be reduced ... including for victims

A QUOTE FROM A CHILD IN THE YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM.

“WHEN DO I GET MY CHANCE TO SPEAK?!”



<p>We will work with children and their families ...</p>	<p>We will ...</p>
<p>...understanding the locality and family context to keep them safe</p>	<p>...work with agencies and partners to minimise the risks in family and locality</p>
<p>...in ways which respect the age and understanding of the children</p>	<p>...work with, and secure feedback from, children and families so we know we are working in the right way</p>
<p>...meet the needs of the children and reduce harm to them or others</p>	<p>...have consistently high-quality shared assessments showing children getting better outcomes after the youth justice work is completed.</p>
<p>...to safeguard them from harm and reduce risks of offending</p>	<p>...our assessments will test that assessed risk is reduced by the end of the youth justice work</p>
<p>...to enable them to achieve accredited qualifications which support progression in learning – from basic skills to advanced studies</p>	<p>...enable more children to reach personal achievement and progression goals</p>
<p>...and as part of a team with other agencies to find ways to meet their needs in Education, Training and Employment, and health, housing, housing or other ways</p>	<p>...use assessments at the start and end of youth justice work showing improved outcomes and work to ensure sustained support after the youth justice work is finished</p>
<p>...in schools and other services in ways which help prevent children coming into the youth justice system.</p>	<p>...seek feedback from services about the impact of prevention work and ways to improve it.</p>



CASE STUDY

Child D was first involved with the Youth Offending Service in 2015 when aged 11: the prevention referral was regarding anti-social behaviour in the community. This programme was successfully completed in early 2016. The next contact was in late 2018 when D was referred for an Out of Court Disposal. Due to non-engagement with the Youth Justice System and non-attendance at Court D was remanded into a Secure Training Centre in early 2019. Concerns had continued to be raised about the non-engagement of D and an escalation in the types of offences being committed i.e. Possession of knives/weapons, Robbery and Possession of illegal substances. At aged 14 this was very concerning behaviour - professionals were concerned that they had a lack of understanding about what was happening for D. When D was released from custody, D started to attend appointments albeit in new expensive


clothing when the family were reliant on state benefits. D was also not attending school and parents often did not know D's whereabouts and provided limited boundaries and control at the time, so concerns were raised regarding potential criminal exploitation.

Partner involved

The case was referred to the criminal exploitation Multi Agency Strategy Meetings in order for key partners to discuss the concerns and to enable an appropriate intervention plan to safeguard and protect D.

Risks

D began to engage with Youth Offending Service support and began to discuss his thoughts and feelings and made disclosures to professionals about what was going on for him and his family. D reported that he was threatened by individuals with knives, he was involved in dealing drugs for adults and these



individuals had been to his house to threaten and intimidate. D stated this was because he owed a debt due to drugs that were taken from D's person by the Police and the adults controlling him were making sure he was going to pay this back by working for them selling Class A drugs. As a result of these disclosures, a Section 47 Child Protection investigation was instigated and the Youth Offending Service submitted a National Referral Mechanism to the Home Office under the auspices of the Modern Slavery Act 2015. This was to ensure D was not unfairly being convicted of criminal offences when there was a decision to be made by the Home Office whether they believed D was a victim of exploitation.

Impact

The Home Office returned a positive indication of exploitation, and so once conclusive grounds have been determined the course of action will be for the offences

committed by D, whilst he was being exploited, to be taken into account by the Court with full knowledge the young person was exploited. This ensures victims are not criminalised and appropriate action taken against offenders of exploitation under the Modern Slavery Act 2015. The Youth Justice Service are continuing to support D to engage him in constructive activities such as music workshops, knife crime awareness and education.



5. HOW WE WILL WORK WITH PARTNERS

The delivery of this strategy will be a shared endeavour across all Public Service Board partners, bringing the commitment of each organisation – not simply the individuals attending the Board meetings – working alongside partners in the communities of Cardiff, including schools, Colleges and community groups.

We will share, recognise and value expertise, resource and take joint responsibility for good outcomes for children and young people.

We are clear that Cardiff Youth justice services will be most effective when there is long term trust, transparency and a sense of clarity with our partners about what is working and what is not.

We will achieve this by:

- » commitment to our shared goals of safeguarding, in the locality and in the home as well as child protection practice

- » commitment to both well-being and public protection
- » a shared commitment to helping children and young people achieve the best for themselves
- » a shared understanding of how we assess the needs of children
- » a shared approach to prevention, diversion, enforcement and resettlement work
- » a shared approach to quality assurance
- » shared responsibility for the outcomes of our work

Key priority: We will make sure all staff are trained to work in the most effective way to secure the best pathways to good outcomes for children and young people and for the community.

We will get the best for the children when ...

We will ...

...all youth justice work by partners is informed and improved by the engagement with the children

... ensure routine feedback from children is evidenced to improve youth justice work

...there is a shared approach to workforce development covering working approaches

Contextual Safeguarding and public protection

Trauma informed practice

Restorative justice work

Building the capacity to desist from crime

..and specific issues such as

Child criminal exploitation

Harmful sexual behaviour

Serious youth violence

... gather measures of staff satisfaction and confidence including in induction, progression and promotion.

... track successful completion of appropriate professional qualifications by staff and the impact on the services we offer.

... key points in the process work both to prevent crime and further reoffending:

At police custody suite and beyond including community resolution

During prison sentence and on resettlement

On transition to post 18 justice services

... ensure casework scrutiny processes judge the quality of decision making, and support in accessing services and pathways.

... improve risk management and reduce reoffending

...and pathways give the best possible outcome

1. Education Training and Employment progression and achievement

2. Access to Health including Mental health provision to meet needs

3. Access to accommodation

... ensure that assessment at the start and end of youth justice work shows reduced risks, improved outcomes and reduced risk of reoffending

... services work closely with community partners to identify support and local pathways for children

... build wider network engagement between youth justice services and community groups to achieve shared goals

... we help build family and local resilience to reducing the risk of crime

.. build on work with family and locality services to develop locality practice for safeguarding and youth crime prevention

THE VOICES OF CHILDREN IN THE CARDIFF YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM


THE YOUTH JUSTICE WORK GAVE ME ...

“A BETTER RELATIONSHIP WITH MY MUM”

“THE CHANCE TO STAY AT MY SCHOOL”

“WAYS TO UNDERSTAND MY EMOTIONS”

“THE CHANCE TO IMPROVE MY MENTAL HEALTH.”



CASE STUDY

Child Criminal Exploitation

May 2020

Case worker notes

I was working with child H on his Referral Order. I became very concerned that he was a victim of Child criminal exploitation. Other services were sceptical but in my advocacy role of 'banging the drum' for him I was not going to give up. I took a decision to submit a NRM (National Referral Mechanism) to the national clearing house... and I am glad that I did, as the following day H was found to be in possession of quantities of heroin and crack/cocaine. The NRM concluded H to be a victim of

exploitation but because of the NRM decision the drugs offences were not brought against him by South Wales Police – as he is a victim of exploitation.

Impact

Since then, H has gone from High to Medium risk and has successfully completed his Referral Order. He secured employment which was only temporary/casual and has been supported by Careers Wales to obtain a CSCS (Construction) card to secure further employment in a field that he is interested in (this will continue with Career Wales, even though his Order has expired). I just feel that he could have been in a much worse situation - if not in custody- if we had not proceeded with the NRM submission.



THE VOICE OF A CHILD IN THE
CARDIFF YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM

Q “WHAT SHOULD
CARDIFF YOUTH
JUSTICE SERVICES
DO TO IMPROVE”

A “ COMMUNICATING”

6. MAKING IT HAPPEN (GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP).

Leadership is exercised at different levels

The work of the Cardiff Youth Justice Services is reported to the Cardiff Public Services Board, as the city's strategic public service leadership board and statutory Community Safety Partnership, and also to the Regional Partnership Board for Safeguarding. (NB This also includes coverage of safeguarding for children in the secure estate). The Youth Justice Board for England and Wales (Ministry of Justice) and HM Inspectorate of Probation will be monitoring progress against the development plan.

Youth offending teams (YOTs) were established by the Crime & Disorder Act 1998 with the statutory duty to prevent offending and re-offending by young people and to provide 'youth justice services' via multi-agency YOT teams.

The Chief Executive of Cardiff Council has the statutory responsibility to establish a partnership to maintain youth justice services in Cardiff.

The Youth Justice Board includes all the statutory partners set down by law including Local Authority services such as social care, youth and education services plus Police, Probation and Health who are together responsible for working to provide services.

Other key partners, including community groups, the Courts, accommodation providers and secure estate, will work with statutory agencies and Service leaders in the Youth Justice Service and partner agencies on

prevention, early intervention, diversion, enforcement and resettlement from custody.

The Independent Chair of the Cardiff Youth Justice Board, appointed by the Chief Executive of the Council, is responsible for delivery of the Strategy – and the Board members representing the partners are collectively responsible for delivering the services.

Together we will achieve the principal aims of the youth justice system.

This includes:

- » reducing the number of young people who enter the Youth Justice System
- » reducing the likelihood of reoffending by young people and the risk of harm that they can cause to other people and themselves
- » reducing the number of young people receiving custodial disposals

We are also clear:

- a. That reduction of first time entrants is based on a whole system approach involving health, early help, education, youth services, accommodation and community partners
- b. That it has a collective aim of promoting safeguarding, community safety and public protection

Together we accept our joint responsibility to enable the best futures for children in Cardiff on the cusp of or in the youth justice system.

Key Actions Cardiff Youth Justice Board 2020-22

We will;

- a. Lead the development of a shared vision, Development Strategy and Development Plan for Cardiff Youth Justice Services
- b. Define Board membership and functions to ensure the partnership members deliver the benefits of the Strategy
- c. Ensure Board members have the right seniority, induction, training and support to fulfil their duties

- d. Ensure that the business plan developed for each year sets out partner contributions to governance, service capacity or provision
- e. Promotes comprehensive communications about progress towards achieving the vision of the Development Strategy

Key Priority: We will ensure clear and effective leadership of shared development - reported to the right people.



We will explore whether a Higher Education institution with relevant expertise would assist in evaluation of the implementation of the Development Strategy. This would

give further assurance to Cardiff of the commitment by partners to rigorous learning and development.

Focus	We will	How will we report on the outcome of this and judge effectiveness?
<p>Vision, Strategy and Development Plan co-produced with staff, partners and young people input</p>	<p>Publish a two year Development Strategy in June 2020</p>	<p>To</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cardiff Public Services Board (PSB) and Partnership Boards ii. Youth Justice Board for England and Wales iii. HMI Probation Inspectors <p>In February 2021 we will evaluate progress of the development strategy</p>
<p>Cardiff Youth Justice Board Membership and Functions</p>	<p>New Terms of Reference to be adopted June 2020 to enable the outcomes of the Development Strategy and development Plan to be achieved and measured.</p>	<p>To the Cardiff Public Services Board</p> <p>Review and update Spring 2021</p>
<p>Board members</p>	<p>Establish membership, Induction, and a training programme by July 2020 so all are clear on their roles and responsibilities.</p>	<p>Self assessment by board members will test for improvement in practice, confidence and outcomes.</p> <p>Reviewed and updated Spring 2021</p>
<p>Board Business Plan</p>	<p>Develop a format and process in July 2020 which defines partnership contributions to meet the goals of the Development Plan</p> <p>Partnership Business Plan adopted Spring 2021</p>	<p>Chair will report Board recommendations to Chief Executive / PSB</p> <p>Feedback will inform business planning 2021-2022</p>
<p>Communications</p>	<p>The communication plan will ensure clear messages about what the Cardiff Youth Justice Service aims to achieve.</p>	<p>Board will gather views to judge effectiveness from staff, young people and partners and review</p>

CASE STUDY

I am an Anti-social Behaviour Prevention Case Manager, one of two Case Managers working with two siblings who are on the Child Protection Register,

The Intervention Plan for the young person A, consists of early intervention work to understand offending behaviour and the implications on their future, working with a Substance Misuse Worker to address their cannabis use and working with a Harmful Sexual Behaviour worker to support A until they their work with Better Futures.

Partners

The original intervention plan was to address anti-social behaviour in the community attending regular Multi Agency meetings with our partner services including Core Groups and Child Protection conferences. During Covid 19 these are being undertaken via Skype which is working extremely positively.

Risks

Since the start of Covid 19, they have been self isolating at home whilst A went to live with Grandmother. I regularly speak with A and the Paternal Grandmother using video calls, I also regularly speak with A's mother on the telephone where I will update her on progress and we discuss the ongoing situation of the family being temporarily separated.

Impact

Due to the Youth Justice Service working with more than one young person in the family unit we have an email group for 'open communication to enable comprehensive information sharing' between school, college, Social Workers, Family Intervention Support Services and Case Managers enabling us all to be kept in 'the loop' regarding any updates relevant to the siblings. This ensures all agencies are updated in real time on any current issues and dynamics to A. The good communication and information sharing through the email group has been pivotal in ensuring a positive outcome for the siblings.



Key roles and responsibilities of Partners

Partner	Role in Governance	Key focus
Cardiff Council Children's services	Board member	Safeguarding, Exploitation Line management of Youth Justice Services
Cardiff Council education and youth services	Board member	Working to improve achievement and secure pathways into education, training and employment.
Cardiff & Vale University Health Board	Board member	Working to secure pathways into health, including mental health services, to secure better health outcomes for children
South Wales Police	Board member	Joint work on prevention, early intervention, first time entrants, enforcement and reducing reoffending
National Probation Service	Board member	Transition to post 18 services in community and secure estate
The Judicial System (Courts)	Attendance at theme Board sessions	Duty of Youth Justice services to provide assessment and pre sentence services to judiciary and support for implementation of court orders

7. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY 2020-22

Cardiff Youth Justice services will work hard to ensure that community, parents, children and staff know what we aim to achieve with young people, what we achieve and how we work hard to overcome barriers.

Audience	Actions	When
Children and families	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised leaflet for current and new clients to explain the service Establish young people's user reference group Work with youth participation team to secure wider dissemination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sept 2020 Autumn 2020 Autumn 2020
Youth Justice Service staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement in development workshops Monthly briefings Joint Board / staff engagement in joint problem solving sessions Briefings for youth justice volunteers (referral order panels) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May/June 2020 Routines
Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly Board meetings agree communications to be shared Agree communications about Youth Justice Service Development Strategy through partner networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly July 2020
Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint service meetings Partnership briefings Focused sessions eg with HMCTS on Courts work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As planned to achieve development work Within annual Board plan
Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through Cardiff Council publications and events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 2020 Development Strategy and subsequent updates.

FURTHER INFORMATION

1. Do you want to know how to get help for a child or young person you are worried about?

Multi agency safeguarding team

029 2053 649

Out of hours emergency duty team

029 2078 8570

2. Are you part of a community which wants to work more closely with the Youth Justice Service?

Youth Justice Service manager

029 2233 0355

3. Do you want to discuss volunteering opportunities in the Youth Justice Service?

Youth Justice Service manager

029 2233 0355



Paul Orders
Chief Executive
Cardiff Council
[By Email]

20 July 2020

Dear Mr Orders

Cardiff Youth Offending Services: Response to HMIP Joint Inspection

Now that HMIP have published their findings following inspection of Cardiff Youth Offending Services and you have published your response I thought it might be helpful to acknowledge the early progress and commitment that we have seen.

YJB Cymru has been involved in all planning meetings, providing challenge and support where we can. You have redesigned your local Governance structure to develop a tight grip on practice improvement and strategic partners are contributing actively to address the gaps identified. We have been particularly pleased the partnership approach involving young people, staff and strategic leaders. Your approach aligns fully with our shared focus with the Welsh Government on Child First.

I was pleased to hear of the workshop for your councillors, intended to ensure transparency and to build confidence in the service and to draw on wider resources to support the children.

We are in no doubt of the major transformation work Cardiff needs to do and will continue to offer challenge and support in future, recognising that some developments will take time.

With best regards

Yours sincerely



Colin Allars
Chief Executive
Youth Justice Board for England and Wales

T: 020 3334 0811

E: colin.allars@yjb.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**CYNGOR CAERDYDD
CARDIFF COUNCIL**

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

30 July 2020

Restart of Education

Purpose of the Report

1. To provide Members of the Scrutiny Committee with a briefing on:
 - i. Schools provision for summer 2020
 - ii. The restart of education in Cardiff following the Minister for Education's announcement that all children and young people can return to full time school in September.

Structure of the papers

2. To facilitate the scrutiny the following appendix is attached to this report:

Appendix A: Presentation: Provision – Summer 2020 & School Restart.

Scope of Scrutiny

3. Members will be able to review, assess and comment on the Council's plans for summer schools provision and for the full time restart of Education in September, specifically examining:
 - i. Youth Service provision over summer
 - ii. The safe operational management of schools from September 2020;
 - iii. Catering arrangements; and
 - iv. School transport.
4. The presentation attached at **Appendix A** sets the context (slide 2) for delivering education services at present, covers arrangements for the provision of youth services over the summer 2020 (slides 3-8), reports on lockdown arrangements, and on planning for the full school September restart (slides 9-12).

Background

4. At Council on 23rd July 2020 Members were advised that all schools in the city reopened on 29th June 2020 for a three-week period prior to the end of the summer term.
5. Robust health & safety procedures, including space-capacity assessments and risk assessments to establish volume, appropriate furniture lay-out, movement flows and use of external spaces were all considered prior to opening, using best practice from the Council's Hubs.
6. The report indicates strict hygiene and cleaning regimes have been implemented, ensuring good hand-washing practices, contact point cleaning and the thorough cleaning of school spaces.
7. Schools have reopened with a much reduced capacity, but all pupils have had several opportunities to attend school during this period. Initial feedback from schools has reported a high level of take up and growing confidence among staff pupils and parents about being back at school. All children have had the opportunity to attend school to 'check in, catch up and prepare' for the summer break and the new school year in September 2020. This period of opening has focused on making sure that pupils, staff and parents are prepared – mentally, emotionally and practically – for a 'new normal' in September.
8. All schools have used this time to help plan for the full return to school for the new academic year in September 2020 following the recent announcement on this, and publication of relevant guidance, by the Welsh Government.
9. In announcing the re-opening of schools on 29 June 2020 the Welsh Government Minister for Education proposed that the summer term be extended by one week, ending on 27 July 2020. She also proposed that in the next academic year beginning in September 2020, the intention was to expand the autumn half-term break to two weeks.
10. The Minister stressed that the physical reopening of schools should involve a rigorous three stage approach:
 - firstly, the school building must be inherently safe with any lapsed statutory inspections completed and water systems tested and treated;

- secondly, the implementation of safety measures for school staff to return and,
- thirdly, additional safety controls to permit children to return to lessons. Particular attention will be paid to infection prevention/control including enhanced building and personal hygiene, provision of PPE and arrangements for monitoring symptoms of the virus in staff and children. .

11. The Council's approach to date has reflected the Welsh Government's announcements, guidance and national framework for decisions relating to the operations of schools and other providers over time in response to Covid-19.
12. Restarting schools holds a number of education specific considerations requiring detailed planning, decision making and communication, including the development and confirmation of operational policies; adaptation of the curriculum and development of support for school staff.

Previous Scrutiny

13. Scrutiny of all Council decision making during the Covid19 emergency has been undertaken remotely by the Covid-19 Scrutiny Panel, established by full Council on 21 May 2020. It required measured and proportionate scrutiny, tailored to meet the emergency situation. To ensure all previous scrutiny informed the internal challenge, the Covid-19 Scrutiny Panel consulted with all Members of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee where the matter was an education item. Panel members then followed up any concerns, in line with the Panel's Terms of Reference.
14. At its meeting on 23rd June 2020 the Covid-19 Scrutiny Panel considered a report to Cabinet, *Restart, Recover, Renew: Next steps for Cardiff during the Covid-19 crisis*. CYP Scrutiny Committee Members fed their enquiries into the Covid-19 Scrutiny Panel, which subsequently commented to the Cabinet that the Panel:
- a. Welcomed measures to prioritise health and safety when pupils returned to school, but stressed the importance of priority in testing for Covid-19 symptoms, in antibody testing and in tracing contacts, be given to teaching and support staff;

- b. Was reassured that the Council has a positive experience in respect of testing and is at the heart of the Track Trace Protect (TTP) effort in Cardiff as a result of its positive working relationship with the Cardiff and Vale University Health Board. We note that TTP is already in place and a significant amount of work has been undertaken over the last 3 weeks leading to the opening of the service. We note also that 150 Council staff have already been redeployed to the service and 300 staff in total will be deployed to support this service over a 12 month period. This gives us reassurance that the Council will be prepared by the time schools re-open.

Way Forward

15. To provide a briefing and present the Council's plans for re-starting full-time education in Cardiff, and to answer Members questions, the following witnesses will be in attendance:
 - a. Councillor Sarah Merry, Cabinet Member Education, Employment & Skills;
 - b. Mike Tate, Assistant Director Education and Lifelong Learning; and
 - c. Neil Hardee, Head of Services to Schools.
16. The Panel will meet remotely and be accessible to the public.

Legal Implications

17. The Scrutiny Committee is empowered to enquire, consider, review and recommend but not making policy decisions. As the recommendations in this report are to consider and review matters there are no direct legal implications. However, legal implications may arise if and when the matters under review are implemented with or without any modifications. Any report with recommendations for decision that goes to the Cabinet/Council will set out any legal implications arising from those recommendations. All decisions taken by or on behalf of the Council must (a) be within the legal powers of the Council; (b) comply with any procedural requirement imposed by law; (c) be within the powers of the body or person exercising powers on behalf of the Council; (d) be undertaken in accordance with the procedural requirements imposed by the Council e.g.

Scrutiny Procedure Rules; (e) be fully and properly informed; (f) be properly motivated; (g) be taken having regard to the Council's fiduciary duty to its taxpayers; and (h) be reasonable and proper in all the circumstances.

Financial Implications

18. The Scrutiny Committee is empowered to enquire, consider, review and recommend but not making policy decisions. As the recommendations in this report are to consider and review matters there are no direct financial implications at this stage in relation to any of the work programme. However, financial implications may arise if and when the matters under review are implemented with or without any modifications. Any report with recommendations for decision that goes to Cabinet/Council will set out any financial implications arising from those recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is recommended to:

- i. Note the Council's arrangements for youth service provision over summer 2020 and proposals for the restart of full time school in September for all children and young people;
- ii. Consider whether it wishes to convey any comments, observations or concerns to the Cabinet Member Education, Employment & Skills.

Davina Fiore

Director of Governance and Legal Services

24 July 2020

This page is intentionally left blank



Provision – Summer 2020 – and School Restart

Page 113



Gweithio dros Gaerdydd, gweithio gyda'n gilydd
Working for Cardiff, working together



Current Context

- Schools Closed since March 23rd 2020
- Schools reopened June 29th 2020 for three weeks for 'check in, catch up and prepare'
- Welsh Government have stopped Summer Holiday Enrichment Project (SHEP) funding for 2020 (2019, 16 schools supported 663 pupils, £137k of WG grant)
- Confirmed continuation of Free School Meal funding for summer holidays until end of August 2020 – 12,500 pupils eligible for FSM in Cardiff schools.
- Confirmed continuation of Corona Virus Childcare Assistance Scheme for vulnerable pre-school children until end of August 2020



Youth Service Provision

Council's Youth Service will run provision throughout the summer;

- Youth mentors
- Post 16 team
- Street based team
- Senior Youth Officers working with partner organisations through the Youth Innovation Grant to increase provision
- Link with Youth Justice and Sport Cardiff to increase resilience support



Youth Service and other providers

Council's Youth Service will work with partners to provide;

Page 116

Area	Team	Activity
Gabalfa/Llandaff North/Taff Trail/Blackweir	Youth Service & Ministry of Life	Outreach team from the Youth Activity Centre (YAC) and Street based team
City Centre	Youth Service (Street based and Grassroots Outreach)	Outreach team from Grassroots and Street based team
Radyr	Youth Service (Street based and StaySafe)	Request for assistance by police- tbc in partnership with StaySafe
Roath/Plasnewydd/City road	YMCA	Safe engagement in new youth centre plus specific support e.g. sexual health
Caerau	Action for Caerau and Ely	Continued street based support for young people. Food parcels plus outdoor activities in the park e.g dance fit and bike rides.
Fairwater	Action for Caerau and Ely	As above
Pentwyn	Ministry of Life	Play centre limited group engagement. Food parcels.
Cathays	Cathays and central youth community project	Community activities plus inclusive groups.
Riverside and Grangetown	South Riverside Community Development Centre.	TBC
Welsh medium	Urdd	On-line activities plus joint work with Llamau



Resources

Available resources

Welsh Government have released two additional grants;

- Support for vulnerable learners - £1.6m – Cardiff will receive £175k
- Support for summer provision - £1.0 m – still to be confirmed

Page 117

Repurpose existing Council budgets;

- Support for LAC - £50k
- Support for holiday provision - £80k

External support from First Campus – funding and resource packs



School based provision

	Primary Schools	Comments
1	Baden Powell Primary School	3 weeks from 20.07.20 - 07.08.20
2	Bryn Celyn Primary School	
3	Coed Glas Primary School	3 weeks from 03.08.20 - 21.08.20
4	Mount Stuart Primary School	
5	Pencaerau Primary School	
6	Pentrebane Primary School	
7	St. John Lloyd R.C Primary School	
8	Ysgol Gymraeg Coed-Y-Gof	
9	Ysgol Glan Morfa	
	Secondary Schools	
1	Cardiff West Community High School	
2	Eastern High School	
3	St Teilo's C.W High School	Running their own provision
	Special Schools	
1	PIP – some provision from Youth Services	Smaller pupil numbers
2	Greenhill School – bespoke provision	Smaller pupil numbers



What the school based settings will provide

Building on the format of the previous SHEP projects;

- **A part time – morning and afternoon session provision on school sites offering a range of activities.**
- **Part time to enhance opportunity for an increased number of pupils and to avoid a lunch provision**
- **Based on a staff to child ratio of 1:8 – 40 places morning and afternoon**
- **Based on expressions of interest from schools and staff (non teaching)**
- **Staff to be paid additional hours on existing role profiles (SHEP roles) through Cardiff Works**
- **Enhanced and enriched with support from other organisations;**
 - Cardiff Play Services , First Campus (Cardiff Met), Cardiff Music Service , Glamorgan Cricket, South Wales Fire Service, RNLI, Cardiff Youth Service, Network Rail, Sport Cardiff , Storey Arms Outdoor Education Centre, Grow Cardiff, WRU, Kier Construction, Cardiff and Vale UHB Nutrition and Dietetics department.



Other provision

Menter Caerdydd will run provision throughout the summer;

- Deliver a full and varied digital summer workshops programme for people of all ages across the city – all of these sessions will be available free of charge – there is a draft timetable, but this is subject to change – until confirmation of all tutors;
- Supporting the Council to celebrate National Play Day on the 5th of August with a varied programme of bilingual digital workshops/videos for children to enjoy;
- Delivering an open access play scheme – Bwrlwm – towards the end of the holidays – looking to provide up to 3 weeks of fun, open access play opportunities in Welsh for primary aged children – working with parks and rugby clubs to act as our base (as our usual schools are not available).



School Restart – Lockdown to Restart

- Hubs open during lockdown period for Key Worker and Vulnerable Pupil childcare
- Jun 29th move from hub provision to all schools open
- Check-in, catch-up and prepare
- Reduced capacities
- Sessional attendance
- Wellbeing focus
- Continue provision for KW childcare
- Mon 20th July end of term for schools and summer provision opens



Preparation for September

- WG Operational Guidance for Schools and Settings from the Autumn Term
- WG Guidance on learning in settings from the Autumn Term
- Cardiff Restart Guidance: scope and consultation
- A Level and GCSE summer results: process and implications



School September Restart

- All schools open from Tues Sept 1st
- Opportunity to take two planning days additional to usual INSET days
- Two week period to increase operation
- Focus on key groups eg. Transition, exam groups
- Compulsory attendance for all pupils from Monday 14th Sept – although earlier if schools can
- H&S Risk Assessments in place, adult SD, reducing movement and contact between groups of pupils, PPE available
- No central catering provision for first two weeks. Direct payment continues
- Transport available – although challenges continue



School September Restart

- Additional Catch up funding
- Challenges
- Opportunities

Page 124

