

Transition through detention and custody

Arrangements for learning and skills for young people in custodial or secure settings

The report evaluates the range and effectiveness of the arrangements for education and training for several categories of young people: those identified for their likelihood of offending; young offenders who move into custodial establishments then are transferred between different establishments while in custody; and those who move between custody and the community. The report illustrates good practice and makes recommendations for improvement.

Age group: 12–18

Published: May 2010

Reference no: 090115

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, work-based learning and skills training, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may copy all or parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes, as long as you give details of the source and date of publication and do not alter the information in any way.

To receive regular email alerts about new publications, including survey reports and school inspection reports, please visit our website and go to 'Subscribe'.

Royal Exchange Buildings
St Ann's Square
Manchester
M2 7LA

T: 0300 123 1231
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.ofsted.gov.uk

No. 090115

© Crown copyright 2010



Contents

Executive summary	4
Key findings	6
Recommendations	7
Moving through the youth justice system	8
Secure accommodation	9
Links with and support from external agencies	10
Assessment and support	13
Initial assessment	13
Information, advice and guidance	15
Curriculum and transition	16
Education and training	16
Transition in custody	17
Preparation for release	18
Transition to the community	19
Prevention	24
Strategic management of education, training and employment	25
Notes	26
Further information	28
Publications by Ofsted	28
Other publications	28
Websites	29
Annex A: Asset and Onset	30
Annex B: Providers visited for this survey	31
Secure children's homes	31
Secure training centres	31
Juvenile establishment populations	31
Annex C: Youth offending teams inspected jointly with HMI Probation	32

Executive summary

As children and young people move through the youth justice system, youth offending teams are responsible for supporting them and helping them meet their individual and often complex needs. This includes the children and young people's return to education, training or employment on their release from secure accommodation or custody. The survey evaluated the quality of the support while children and young people were detained in secure accommodation or in custody, moving through the youth justice system or serving their sentence in the community. The survey also considered arrangements for children and young people receiving prevention interventions.

Between May 2008 and June 2009, Ofsted's inspectors visited 12 secure children's homes, four secure training centres and seven juvenile establishments. The report also draws on evidence from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMI Probation) inspections of the 139 youth offending teams in England, which were conducted between September 2003 and July 2008. Ofsted inspects youth offending teams jointly with HMI Probation to evaluate the provision of education, training and employment for children and young people coming into and moving through the youth justice system.

The arrangements for education and training for children and young people at risk of offending, arrangements to support their transition into custody and from custody back to the community, and their education and training provision within custody all varied considerably. A significant barrier to changing the behaviour and expectations of children and young people of all ages who offend or who are likely to offend was the lack of access to education, training and employment and, in particular, the lack of appropriate provision. Many of the schools, colleges, employers and providers of work-based learning visited did not understand the roles and responsibilities of the secure establishments and the youth offending services.¹ This made it harder for children and young people to reintegrate into mainstream provision.

The secure training centres and juvenile establishments visited offered broad and balanced provision for education. All the secure establishments seen placed an appropriate emphasis on improving the children and young people's levels of literacy and numeracy, and most of them made progress in their achievements. However, those who transferred between establishments were often disadvantaged by poor arrangements for sending on information about their earlier study and achievements; this made it difficult for them to pick up where they had left off. In addition, the various secure establishments offered different choices of subjects and had selected different examination boards. This made it difficult for the young people to continue with qualifications such as GCSEs. This lack of continuity and consistency was a barrier to young people reintegrating successfully into mainstream provision.

¹ The term 'secure establishment' in this report includes secure children's homes, secure training centres, and juvenile and young offender institutions.

Information about children and young people entering and leaving secure establishments and those serving community orders was generally not good enough to allow the organisations supporting young people to meet their needs for education, training and employment. All the secure establishments visited relied heavily on the young offender assessment profile (Asset) report for planning, and the introduction of this electronic report had improved the sharing of information across different establishments.² However, the information that arrived with young people varied in accuracy and usefulness, and information was often late, inaccurate and out of date.

To enable young people in custody to move successfully back into mainstream provision, youth justice agencies need to plan for each young person's learning programme and monitor their progress, and young people need to be aware of their targets and what they have to do to achieve them. However, in too many instances, youth offending teams and secure establishment education staff did not attend detention and training order review meetings, so young people were not aware of their targets and what they had to do to achieve them.

Short sentences and the high level of turnover of children and young people across the secure establishments make it difficult to provide appropriately planned information, advice and guidance. The quality and quantity of careers advice and support varied, as did the input from the Connexions service.

Help for children and young people to prepare for release and independent living was inconsistent and often insufficient. Secure children's homes generally made good arrangements. But in the secure training centres and juvenile establishments, 'pre-release' provision for children and young people and help for them to live independently were insufficient. Voluntary organisations provided some support, but did so independently of other services. Funding for such projects was often short-term; when the funding ended, so did the good initiative that it supported. Difficulties in finding accommodation had a detrimental impact on children and young people's opportunities for training, education and employment. Finding accommodation for older children on their return to the community was particularly difficult.

² The Asset assessment tool is used by all youth offending teams in England and Wales to consider a young person's offence or offences and identify factors which may have contributed to their offending behaviour.

Key findings

- Children and young people gained a range of qualifications while in custody, accessing a wide range of subjects in secure training centres and juvenile establishments.
- Young people who were transferred between establishments during custody were often unable to complete programmes or progress to courses at a higher level because the subjects and qualifications offered differed across establishments.
- The courts often did not take sufficient account of the Asset education assessment when considering a supervision order.
- Youth offending teams often did not attend review meetings for children and young people with detention and training orders.
- The Asset assessment has improved the way in which information about a young person is shared between organisations, but it contained insufficient information on learning and attainment and did not record accurately information about children and young people who had additional learning needs.
- The secure children's homes surveyed said that they often received poor information and that many young people did not have a personal education plan when they arrived.
- Some children of school age who were known to youth offending teams did not receive their full entitlement to statutory education.
- Problems in finding suitable accommodation for children and young people on their return to the community from custody had a negative impact on their opportunities for education and training.
- Arrangements for children and young people to continue their education and training when moving from custodial sentences back to their communities were unsatisfactory.
- Victim and restorative justice was insufficient with children and young people who had committed offences.
- Arrangements for quality assurance of the impact of the work of youth offending teams were insufficient. Senior managers did not understand the key issues that affected education, training and employment in their locality and the management boards of youth offending teams did not monitor the performance of the youth offending services.
- Youth Inclusion Programmes were very effective in preventing children and young people behaving anti-socially or offending for the first time.
- Essential to success was the quality of the relationship between a young person and an adviser, teacher or key worker who could provide continuity of support and guidance to help them find a new direction and purpose. Young people who had meetings with one youth offending team worker, rather than many different case workers, valued this situation.

Recommendations

The Youth Justice Board should:

- support and challenge youth offending teams and local authorities to carry out the recommendations of this report
- continue to improve the quality, accuracy and timeliness of information to support children and young people's education as they move through the youth justice system and back into the community
- communicate more positively with employers and stakeholders in education about young people, making greater use of inspiring case studies and good practice awards.

Youth offending teams should:

- attend review meetings for children and young people with detention and training orders
- ensure that information on education and training needs for children and young people who have offended is correctly recorded on Asset to help to plan the young person's education and training
- improve the quality of initial assessments and basic skills assessments for children and young people at risk of offending and those in custody.

Local authorities should:

- improve the quality and speed of information transfer between the 'host' and 'home' local authorities to support children and young people
- ensure that statements of special educational need are reviewed annually when the child or young person is in secure accommodation
- develop a national statutory plan, to be completed for each child and young person as they move through the criminal justice system, that is recognised by all stakeholders in order to ensure integration between services
- work with youth offending teams, other local authorities, local 14 to 19 partners and other providers of education, training and employment to secure and improve the range, appropriateness and quality of provision for: young people at risk of entering custody; those in custody; and those returning to mainstream provision
- ensure that all school-aged children and young people known to a youth offending team receive their entitlement to full-time education and that those aged 16 and over have access to appropriate education, training or employment
- ensure that, as children and young people move through the youth justice system, they can complete qualifications and can progress to higher-level qualifications in their chosen areas.

Moving through the youth justice system

1. This report focuses on five themes:
 - the quality of links with and support from external agencies involved in the youth justice system
 - the effectiveness of information, advice and guidance
 - the extent to which young people's individual education and learning needs were met
 - the effectiveness of the gathering and sharing of information about children and young people
 - the effectiveness of the management of arrangements for young people who are transferred within the youth justice system.
2. As children and young people enter and move through the youth justice system, youth offending teams aim to support them in returning to education, training or employment on their release from custody. These teams are part of local authority structures. Their primary role is to advocate, and negotiate access to education, training and employment, both strategically and for individuals, but they are not responsible for providing these opportunities. Youth offending teams based in the community (known as 'external' teams) work with and support young people under 18 years of age who are at risk of offending or support those within the criminal justice system as they move through the system.³
3. Youth offending teams and youth offending services are partnership organisations made up of representatives from the police, probation service, social services, health, education, drugs and alcohol misuse and housing services. The local authorities commit resources to these services, including additional resources to fund education specialists. This was done either through secondments from existing local authority services or through additional resources that the individual youth offending team could use to recruit new staff.
4. The duties and powers that relate to children and young people in custody and resettlement were governed by a web of legislation, guidance and case law. These lacked clarity. Local authorities did not have specific legal responsibilities in relation to supporting the training and education of young offenders in custody, although education services within local authorities were statutory members of youth offending teams.

³ Youth offending teams may be 'internal', that is, based within an establishment or 'external', based in the community and working with young people.

5. A range of circulars and statutory guidance for local authorities attempted to direct social services departments, custodial institutions and youth offending teams in the treatment of children and young people from the point at which they entered custody until they were released into the community. Despite this guidance, the education and training in establishments continued to differ in quality.
6. Recent changes to the machinery of government and the Youth Crime Action Plan published in 2008 have resulted in accountability for the work of youth offending teams moving from the Youth Justice Board to local authorities, through the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act. Local authorities now have new duties in relation to education and training for young people in juvenile custody.⁴

Secure accommodation

7. Children and young people sentenced to custody may be sent to one of three types of secure accommodation within the youth justice system:
 - a young offender institution
 - a secure training centre
 - a secure children's home.⁵
8. Young offender institutions accommodate boys and men aged from 15 to 21. They are separated into juvenile units for boys aged 15 to 17 years of age with some 18-year-olds who are nearing the end of their sentence, and young offender areas for those aged 18 to 21. Some prisons are juvenile (young people) only sites. Young female offenders are placed in self-contained girls' units and operate as young offender institutions. At the time that the survey was taking place, there were approximately 32 establishments accommodating male and female young offenders in England. No sites accommodate both sexes.
9. The four secure training centres in England are privately run and provide secure accommodation for young offenders up to the age of 17. They provide education, work experience and vocational training, with a strong emphasis on tackling offenders' behaviour.
10. At the time of the survey, the 16 secure children's homes nationally accommodated some of the most vulnerable children and young people. These tend to be younger than those in secure training centres or juvenile

⁴ Further information on the Apprenticeships, Skills, Children and Learning Act (2009) can be found at: www.dcsf.gov.uk/apprenticeshipsskillschildrenandlearningact/.

⁵ Further information about the different types of secure accommodation is available on the website of the Youth Justice Board at: www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/Custody/.

establishments. Some children in secure children's homes are placed there not because they have committed offences but because they have been judged to need secure accommodation for their own safety.⁶

Links with and support from external agencies

11. In the best examples seen, secure establishments and youth offending teams worked productively with many external organisations. These included colleges and training providers, local authorities, primary care trusts, the Connexions service and voluntary agencies that provided additional support for children and young people's learning and resettlement.⁷ Accurate and appropriate information was exchanged and this helped to create a coherent plan for the child or young person. As a result, outcomes for the children and young people on their return to the community were good. The benefits when collaboration is effective are illustrated in this case study.

Y was transferred from a young offender institution to a secure training centre in the South East. Y's youth offending team was in Liverpool. Y had very little spoken English and no family in the United Kingdom. The secure training centre developed good links with Y's young offender institution. Information obtained from the prison established a history of self-harm. Language difficulties frequently frustrated Y. The secure training centre provided an interpreter and English tuition. The youth offending team secured a place on an English for Speakers of other Languages (ESOL) college course for Y in Liverpool on release. The secure training centre used an advocacy service to represent Y who was being classed as a child in need by the local authority. The local authority carried out its duty, which resulted in accommodation being arranged. A positive outcome was achieved by good working relationships between the youth offending team and the secure training centre despite the fact that they were 250 miles apart.

12. However, this positive picture was not typical of the providers visited. Staff in the establishments visited and workers in youth offending teams reported that mainstream education and training organisations did not always understand or fully appreciate the work that took place with children and young people within secure establishments and in the community. Staff in one of the secure training centres visited said that it was difficult to build effective networks because the centre was seen as a private business rather than as an educational organisation.
13. Although the electronic young offender Asset report had improved the way in which information about children and young people was shared, all the secure

⁶ Such placements are made under Section 25 of the Children Act 1989.

⁷ 'Establishment' is the term used by the judicial services sector to refer collectively to secure children's homes, secure training centres, juvenile establishments and young offender institutions.

accommodation and youth offending team areas visited received limited and sometimes incorrect and outdated information about the children and young people who arrived. The Asset reports focused primarily on the young people's offending behaviour and did not give sufficient detail about their past and current learning and attainment. The following illustrates one establishment's good practice in improving the information provided by the young offender Asset report.

Staff had identified that the information on the Asset report about young people needed to be improved. They set up a group to ensure that youth offending team workers understood the need for the form to be completed accurately. This had considerably improved the information that was received.

Staff also provided training for the youth offending teams about the education and training that the establishment provided, explaining, for example what was meant by courses at level 1 and level 2. A regional group comprising youth offending team members, Connexions and education managers was also working to improve communications and the sharing of information.

14. The views of those working in secure accommodation and agencies involved in the youth justice system suggested that the quality of information, support and communication from the children's or young people's 'home' local authorities when they were in the youth justice system varied considerably. The staff frequently had to contact the home local authority to have access to children's and young people's statements of special educational need and it took a long time for the statements to be sent. Many of these were only in printed form and were not sent electronically. Information on the most recent statements of special educational need was good and was used well to organise support for a child or young person, but some of the statements were four or five years old. Some schools and colleges also forwarded pupils' records and work to the secure accommodation establishments, but this depended on the foresight and commitment of individual teachers rather than on systems having been established for this to happen.
15. Of the 171 education case files reviewed by Ofsted inspectors in 2007/08 as part of Ofsted's joint inspection of youth offending teams with the lead inspectorate HMI Probation, 46 of the files were from custodial cases. In 36 of these cases, the views of the education representative from the youth offending team of the child or young person's home area were not represented at the initial planning meetings. Of the 46 cases, only 17 recorded that children and young people had received relevant educational plans within 24 hours of their arrival at secure establishments.
16. The lack of information on previous education often led to duplication of initial assessment, reassessment of a child's or young person's additional needs and repetition of earlier learning. The quality of the information often delayed the

start of each child's or young person's education programme. The secure children's homes surveyed reported that the information that they received was often poor and that many children and young people did not have a personal education plan when they arrived.

17. Staff in the secure establishments visited received little useful information for children and young people on remand as they were held only for a very short time. This made it difficult to plan and manage education and training for them.
18. Identification of what education and skills provision was needed in sentence planning was poor. In all 57 supervision case files reviewed, the Asset information about a child or young person's educational history was insufficient to inform sentence planning and to help workers in youth offending teams to plan for a child or young person's learning. In three cases seen, the courts had not considered the education information sufficiently when proposing a supervision order. The children or young people's records already showed poor attendance in education for long periods of time. There was little effort from youth offending team workers and the courts to encourage children and young people to engage with education or training and avoid breaching their order.
19. Detention and training order review meetings (usually referred to as training planning meetings) are held to review a child's or young person's performance against their sentence plan. Parents, carers, social workers and youth offending team representatives, appropriate residential staff and education staff are invited and expected to attend. However, youth offending team workers from an individual's home location did not always attend these meetings at the establishments. When they did attend, in too many cases the youth offending team workers had not established an effective working relationship with the child or young person and did not have the knowledge they needed to inform the process. Although their attendance increased and their involvement was more effective as the sentences continued, the children and young people did not receive a consistent service. Data from the 2007/08 inspections showed that youth offending team's 'home' education practitioners attended only 10 out of 19 detention and training order review meetings held at the beginning of each young person's sentence.
20. Some young people experienced several changes of youth offending team workers. Young people who had meetings with just one youth offending team worker said that seeing the same person who understood their background and aims for the future was useful. Positive outcomes are illustrated in this case study.

A boy aged 15 had benefited from a highly effective assessment of his needs and the actions that needed to be taken to help him achieve his aspirations of working in the construction industry on his release from a secure children's home. Work towards resettlement was happening from the early stages of his sentence. His time in the secure children's home

was used to enable him to gain useful work experience as well as appropriate qualifications.

When he began the community-based part of his sentence, he joined a construction company and undertook further training and qualifications. The youth offending team and the secure children's home remained in contact with him and provided support when needed. The boy was recently the subject of a very positive newspaper article about his achievements.

Assessment and support

Initial assessment

21. The quality of initial assessments for children and young people in custody was generally good, but it was poor for those who had been sentenced with community rehabilitation orders.⁸ Initial assessments of those arriving into custody were completed at an early stage. Staff kept appropriate records and used these well to inform further assessments of individuals' basic skills and to plan for their education and training.
22. For children and young people in the community, however, basic skills assessments were inadequate. They were rarely completed when the young people first had contact with the youth offending team and this hindered the placement process.
23. In 17 of the 46 custody case files reviewed by inspectors, the youth offending team had not completed a basic skills assessment before the young person arrived in custody. Such completion, although not statutory, is expected by the Youth Justice Board. Inspection data from 2007 and 2008 showed that only two of the 139 youth offending teams inspected were using the Youth Justice Board's PLUS literacy and numeracy learning materials. The seconded youth offending team education specialists were seldom contacted to support this. In an example of good practice taken from an inspection report, one team of education specialists undertook a number of assessments as part of induction, including basic skills assessments and questionnaires, and the team was working towards an award for the quality of its screening for dyslexia.
24. Only four of the 16 youth offending teams who said that they were confident in completing basic skills assessments ensured that all children and young people completed an early initial assessment. Youth offending teams used the Youth Justice Board's Asset assessment tool effectively to identify needs when a child

⁸ A community rehabilitation order is supervised by a youth offending team and can include activities such as repairing the harm caused by the offence committed. Courts would make such an order for young people only for those aged between 16 and 17. For further information, see: www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/SentencesOrdersandAgreements/CommunityRehabilitationOrder/.

or young person was first referred to them.⁹ However, of the 55 preventative case files reviewed, 12 of them did not include assessment information, and the learning and skills data available in order to plan for the needs of the children and young people were limited. Interventions were not sufficiently well matched to the young person's educational needs, and support for children and young people who had learning difficulties and/or disabilities was weak.

25. The completion of the mandatory Asset form for all children and young people at the initial point of contact with the youth offending team was inadequate. In 33 of the 46 custody case files reviewed, the working arrangements for joint interventions were good and initial intervention plans were completed within the appropriate timescales. Generally, however, the case files lacked reference to the child or young person's educational background, individual learning plans and education targets. Weaker examples showed that the information recorded had been based only on what the young person had said or on information from the parent or carer. No checks had been carried out with the local authority or education providers. The task of completing the Asset form was also made difficult because of the long-term absence of this group of children and young people from school. The transfer of information from a local authority to the youth offending team about a child or young person's educational history was generally slow. Many education practitioners in youth offending teams failed to find timely and appropriate placements.
26. The Asset documentation recorded incorrect information about children and young people with additional learning needs and who had not received appropriate diagnostic testing. They did not receive the correct diagnostic assessment or a statement of special educational needs until education, training or employment provision was allocated or, if they had been given a custodial sentence, once provision for education had been allocated within the secure accommodation.
27. For children and young people who had been given an Intensive Surveillance and Supervision Programme as part of their sentence, the basic skills assessments and recording of progress were good.¹⁰ The highly structured programme, which required regular daily attendance for several weeks or months, was designed specifically to meet the educational, vocational and

⁹ Onset is the Youth Justice Board's assessment tool used for children and young people at risk of offending and who were allocated to a local Youth Inclusion Programme. It is designed to help to identify risk factors that should be reduced, and protective factors that should be enhanced. It also provides information which might be helpful in selecting interventions for those in need of them. See Annex A. For further details, see: www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/Assessment/Onset.htm.

¹⁰ The Intensive Surveillance and Supervision Programme combines community-based surveillance of offenders with a focus on tackling the factors that contribute to a young person's offending behaviour, with a particular emphasis on education and training. The programme focuses on the most active repeat young offenders and those who commit the most serious crimes. For further information, see: www.yjb.gov.uk/engb/yjs/SentencesOrdersandAgreements/IntensiveSupervisionAndSurveillanceProgramme.

social needs of this group of children and young people, and particularly those who had longer sentences or who were prolific offenders.

Information, advice and guidance

28. Children's and young people's individual learning and support needs had often not been accurately diagnosed before they arrived in custody. The support for young people of 16 years and over who needed help with their poor literacy and numeracy skills was inadequate. Only six of the 139 youth offending teams inspected used learning mentors. These were highly successful but this good practice was not sufficiently widespread.
29. All the agencies and establishments interviewed felt that the information that was collected about children and young people was not always shared effectively, such as information about health problems that might have an impact on planning for individual learners. Many of the children and young people had significant additional learning needs, in particular dyslexia and behavioural difficulties. For instance, in 45 of the 171 individual education case files reviewed in 2007 and 2008, more than half the children were identified as having special educational needs and/or disabilities. More than a quarter of these also had mental health difficulties and problems of emotional well-being. Staff in the establishments visited quickly identified individual learning and support needs using their own initial assessment and diagnostic assessment processes and established effective learning support teams to provide individual support for the young people.
30. Establishments provided good information, advice and guidance to young people serving longer sentences, but it was difficult to provide these for young people in secure establishments when they had short sentences and there was a high turnover of young people.
31. The quality of the work of the Connexions services that gave information, advice and guidance to young people in custody and within the youth offending teams was satisfactory; but it often depended on the commitment of individual advisers rather than on established procedures.
32. Young people with poor literacy and numeracy skills struggled to meet the requirements of the training programme on which they were placed, often dropping out well before completing it. Too often, the young people were not supported enough when they transferred between different centres, and schools were not sufficiently involved in supporting the young people's individual learning needs.

Curriculum and transition

Education and training

33. For the purposes of inspection, entitlement to education was determined as 25 hours a week of appropriate provision for children and young people up to the age of 16. For those aged 16 and over, inspectors used the equivalent of a full-time further education college course of a minimum of 16 guided learning hours a week to determine whether provision was sufficient for this older age group.
34. During the 2007 and 2008 inspections of youth offending teams, inspectors reviewed 171 education case files. Of the 105 young people aged 16 and over identified in the files, 57 were engaged in full-time education or training; three were in employment; 45 were unemployed and not engaged in any form of training or further education.
35. The children's secure establishments and secure training centres visited offered a good range of education and accredited vocational training opportunities. The larger establishments offered a wider range of provision than the smaller ones. In the latter, the low numbers of young people and the need to make viable teaching groups limited the provision. The juvenile establishments and secure training centres placed an emphasis on providing vocational training. The learners recognised the opportunities that this offered them to move into employment or further training on their release from custody and they responded well to what was provided. The secure children's homes, however, did not provide sufficient access to 'introduction to work' programmes.
36. Through a range of short courses juvenile establishments adapted the curriculum well to meet the needs of young people on short stays. However, in one of the juvenile establishments, the curriculum was designed for those with at least 12 weeks there, making it difficult for young people to gain accreditation for their learning if they stayed for less time than this. Some children and young people interviewed by inspectors in juvenile establishments felt that the literacy and numeracy sessions were not made relevant to their lives and were at a very low level compared to what they had already attained. Inspectors agreed with their comments when they saw examples of work they had done. Generally, much accreditation was at a relatively low level, although some learners in juvenile establishments developed their skills to higher levels than were actually accredited.
37. Literacy and numeracy had a high profile in the secure establishments visited, and inspectors found good examples where young people had made marked progress in their reading, as measured by improved scores in reading tests. Children and young people achieved a range of qualifications while in custody, in subject areas that typically included literacy, numeracy and information and communication technology.

38. Custody case files reviewed during the children and youth offending joint inspections with HMI Probation showed that in 46 current files reviewed, 36 children and young people had engaged well in education during their custodial sentence. This had informed reintegration planning for their move to further education or training on release.
39. Enrichment activities were better in the secure children's homes and training centres than in the juvenile establishments visited. However, one juvenile establishment planned activities very well to keep children and young people occupied outside the main education timetable. The activities supported the children and young people in maintaining existing hobbies and interests or developing new ones which they could continue on their release. The following example from a secure training centre illustrates good practice in enriching the curriculum.

The officer responsible for enrichment activities had strong community links from which the young people benefited. For example, a significant number of those who started the Duke of Edinburgh award while at the centre continued with it after their release. The fire service gave useful and well-received talks on fire safety. MAMA's, a local group supporting the victims of knife crime, gave valuable advice to young people on the consequences of such crime.

40. Children and young people known to youth offending teams were often not receiving an education or training programme appropriate to their needs. Young people with placements were often receiving well below the recommended 16 guided learning hours at college or in a training placement. Further, of the children and young people known to youth offending teams, the proportion of children of school age receiving full-time education and the proportion of young people aged 16 and over in a locality with an education, employment or training placement were unsatisfactory. Although participation rates increased from 69% in 2006/07 to 73% in 2007/08, these failed to meet the Youth Justice Board's national annual target of 90% participation. There was an improvement in the engagement of young people on custodial sentences. Engagement of post-16 young people serving custodial sentences increased from 49% in the first quarter in 2006/07 to 56% in the fourth quarter in 2008/09.

Transition in custody

41. Young people were often moved between different secure establishments during their stay in custody and far away from their home area. Information on previous courses undertaken by young people and the accreditation gained while in custody generally lacked detail and frequently failed to identify what level of accreditation had been achieved. Where the young person had been transferred between establishments, having spent time at several, the problem became worse. The effective transfer of information often depended too heavily on strong commitment from individuals rather than on a clear, well-planned

system. Frequently, both tutors and offenders were frustrated and demotivated when learning lacked this basic continuity.

42. Education contractors for the juvenile establishment had developed effective individual learning plans that were used to record children and young people's targets and progress. Electronic individual learning plans had recently been introduced and, for the few contractors and prisons that used this system, timely and correct information was exchanged to help monitor the young person's progress in education and training.
43. Information transfer between establishments with different education contractors, however, was poor. One juvenile establishment had received only four files for the 70 children and young people it had received in a two-month period. Individual learning plans and certificates achieved were sent to the youth offending teams when it was time for the child or young person to leave the establishment. Staff in the juvenile establishment commented that if children and young people returned to the same establishment on another sentence, information that had left the establishment with the child or young person did not return with them. This lack of information often led to the duplication of initial assessment, the need to reassess special needs and children and young people repeating previous learning.
44. As well as the problems with the transfer of information about them, the children and young people surveyed who were moved between juvenile establishments during their sentence were often disadvantaged by variations in what was provided. In the secure establishments visited for the survey, the children and young people had often had to repeat work they had completed elsewhere and found themselves unable to progress to higher accreditation levels. It was difficult for them to continue with and complete more time consuming courses such as GCSEs. Different combinations of subjects were available in different establishments and the requirements of the various examination boards used by individual institutions also differed. Quite often, children and young people were in custody for a short time and the establishments were unable to provide the full range of GCSE subjects.

Preparation for release

45. In all the secure children's homes visited, care staff and education staff worked together well to provide good-quality support and information for children and young people who were about to be released into the community. The following, taken from an inspection report, illustrates how information, advice and guidance were provided at a secure children's home.

The Connexions team had established a Connexions surgery and a jobs board. The children and young people were able to make appointments or just drop in to receive help and support from the Connexions service and its partners. They were able to discuss their progress, options for moving on, and how to develop their skills and career choices. They were

supported to prepare a curriculum vitae, search for jobs using information technology and prepare for interviews.

46. However, in the secure training centres and juvenile establishments, pre-release provision for children and young people and help for them to live independently were insufficient. Although around half of the establishments surveyed had developed pre-release and prevention of re-offending programmes to help young people return to the community, inspectors found that such support was usually not available to everybody who needed it. In juvenile establishments, pre-release programmes were provided by voluntary agencies who received only short-term funding for this work or who had only a small number of staff. Consequently, there were often unacceptably long periods of time when the provision was not offered. In one juvenile establishment, only 30% of those about to be released attended such a programme.
47. Young people who had spent a length of time in custody and who had come to rely on the support and care they received from the staff reported that these programmes did not prepare them adequately for release; they did not enable them to develop the skills to become gradually less dependent on the institution. For instance, a young person interviewed in a juvenile establishment, who had been in custody twice before, said he had received no help with interview techniques. He had not been on an independent living course, but felt he needed one. He said, 'It's hard. The last time I got out I couldn't really survive'.
48. Some young people leaving custody would be going to live on their own, often for the first time. One juvenile establishment was developing a simulated house to develop independent living skills. Other establishments taught about healthy eating, budgeting and finance as part of the overall curriculum. However, planning was insufficient for developing young people's independent living skills, such as shopping and cooking.

Transition to the community

49. Successful transition reflected largely the efforts of the staff of an individual youth offending team in planning realistically for the release of the young person for whom they were responsible, rather than a national statutory plan recognised by all stakeholders. Staff in the establishments visited felt frustrated at the lack of integration between services and by the planning of agencies in the young people's home area.
50. Increasingly, in the establishments visited, resettlement was discussed at the first review meeting and used well to plan the child or young person's time in custody. In the best practice the child or young person and the youth offending team worker met and agreed realistic targets to enable the child or young person to reintegrate into the community through school, college or work-based

provision. However, where the youth offending team and education staff did not attend the review meetings, children and young people were either not aware of their targets or did not understand them and what they had to do to achieve them.

51. One juvenile establishment visited began preparing for resettlement within one month of a young person's arrival. The young people completed applications for college or training programmes, opened building society accounts, discussed options for accommodation and applied for education maintenance allowances.
52. The management of arrangements for transition from custody back to the young person's community or to the community on licence for this minority group of young people was often underdeveloped and ineffective.¹¹ Despite agencies and establishments identifying that release on temporary licence helped children and young people to settle back into their communities, it was generally underdeveloped in the establishments visited. However, young children in secure children's homes often benefited from some innovative placements, including partnerships with local colleges and, in one instance, a girls' training scheme with the Football Association.
53. Access to appropriate provision for children and young people on their leaving custody was inadequate and the youth offending teams struggled to broker suitable provision for young people. Staff in most of the 22 establishments visited found it hard to establish links with work-based learning providers and colleges, and to reintegrate young people into mainstream schools. The following case study shows how different partners and services worked well together to help a young man stay in education and achieve well.

A young man aged 15 had been in care for most of his life. He had been in a secure children's home for about five months and was due for release. He had previously attended a pupil referral unit but acknowledged that his attendance there had been very poor. He had settled into education at the home very quickly and was proud of his achievements, including his reading and numeracy. Care staff had helped him to develop life skills and he was confident about the arrangements for his release, at which point he would return to his old school. The school's deputy headteacher had attended his last review and the young man was very pleased that the school had not given up on him. A visit to the school had also been arranged for him. He felt that he had been very well cared for in the unit and had been given opportunities to develop new skills. He was keen not to disappoint the people who had supported him.

¹¹ A young person who is released from custody will be subject to a supervisory licence until the sentence expires if the sentence was 12 months or more, or a Notice of Supervision for a minimum of three months, if the sentence was for less than 12 months. For further details, see: www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/SentencesOrdersandAgreements/Section90-91/.

54. Children and young people in secure training centres who had been attending a mainstream school at the time of the offence were more likely to be accepted back into the school. However, this was far more difficult for children and young people who had been attending a pupil referral unit or some form of part-time education at the time of the offence. Establishments reported to inspectors that they experienced some reluctance from local mainstream schools and training providers to accept children and young people who had been in custody because of their multiple and complex needs.
55. The timing of release also created difficulties because Entry to Employment programmes and college courses often had fixed rather than flexible start dates. This meant that, depending on the date of their release, many young people were not able to begin courses soon afterwards. Some young people leaving custody who had college places had a gap before the course began. Youth offending teams managed this in very different ways. In one good example, a young person was given activities for five days a week for 10 weeks to bridge the gap before her college course began.
56. For those aged 16 and above, the range of opportunities for vocational training was narrow. One juvenile establishment visited had developed good links with local and national employers. Staff worked hard to try to confirm opportunities for young people to move into employment. Some notable links were made with retail establishments, hotels and local authorities. Staff had also developed links with smaller businesses such as local restaurants. These initiatives had some success in securing long-term employment for the young people.
57. Increasing numbers of appropriate and targeted programmes were being arranged to provide better support for children and young people when they were released from custody. In eight of the youth offending teams observed, arrangements were good for children and young people leaving custody. The 'home' education youth offending teams worked well with young people during their custodial sentences. In 12 of the youth offending teams, relationships between the home area of the young person and the host area and organisations where the young person was staying were very strong. One youth offending team used its 'It's going to work' project to build on activity that had already started in custody. The team gave priority to the children and young people who were being released to their home area and who had an Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme condition to their supervision notice.
58. For young people who were released from secure establishments, the 'Keeping Young People Engaged' project had been used effectively to improve access to education and training programmes. This increased the numbers of those engaged in learning after they were released from custody and improved the retention rates on training schemes and courses. The following two examples of good practice are taken from inspection reports.

During the custodial phase, youth offending team workers liaised with the worker from the Connexions service's 'Keeping Young People Engaged'

programme and the Resettlement and Aftercare Provision scheme to ensure that education, training and employment needs were assessed and support identified. Both schemes operated during custody and on release.¹²

The staff of a youth offending team gave priority to the education, training and employment needs of children and young people receiving custodial sentences. The education worker negotiated with schools to keep school places available where appropriate. For young people leaving custody who were over the age of 16, the local authority's Schools and Learning Directorate guaranteed them a place at the authority's 16+ pupil referral unit. Suitable placements were arranged quickly.

59. Key local performance targets were set for arranging rather than sustaining training and employment and around 95% of young people leaving juvenile establishments had an interview for training or work when they left custody. Once the young people were released, however, the establishments found it difficult to monitor their progress and they rarely received any feedback from young people or from local youth offending teams. They were therefore unable to assess the impact of the work done while the young people had been with them.
60. Establishments did not always attend the first meeting in the community. However, at one juvenile establishment, inspectors found good practice where internal youth offending team workers and personal officers attended community-based reviews and shared relevant and timely information about the child or young person to build appropriate support.¹³ These helped the young people to link their past, present and future. The following case illustrates good follow-up arrangements.

At a secure training centre, the youth offending team followed young people's progress well beyond the minimum requirement. The young people kept in touch with both the youth offending team and the education team to let them know about the progress they were making or to seek help and support. A community review, attended by staff from the youth offending team, was held within 10 working days of the young person's return to the community. A progress record was maintained of how well any problems about education, accommodation and health had been tackled. The youth offending team continued to monitor the arrangements for education, training and employment for at least four weeks into the new community phase of the licence and carried out

¹² Resettlement and Aftercare Provision schemes have now been replaced by Integrated Resettlement Support, targeted at all young people serving a custodial sentence.

¹³ All young offender institutions have personal officer schemes. For further details, see: www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk/adviceandsupport/prison_life/personal_officer/.

monthly follow-ups until the end of the licence. Any problems were highlighted and dealt with.

61. Two juvenile establishments, through the seconded internal youth offending team workers, had a good understanding of what happened to offenders from the point of release to their arrival back in their communities, and the impact of this change on their attitudes and behaviour. They used their specialist knowledge well to organise a realistic and appropriate plan for offenders on release.
62. Each local authority had a different way of dealing with young people being released back into the community on licence. The resettlement plan, which should be in place for all young people being released into the community, was frequently late. Insufficient visits were made to the young person in custody by the youth offending team case manager or education practitioner to plan for transition back to the community. Of the 46 custody case files examined, 10 showed no evidence of any visits. In six of the 139 youth offending team areas, young people in custody were not provided for appropriately by the local authority until they arrived back into the area.
63. All too often, the lack of a clear plan by the local authority for the young person on their release and the surrounding uncertainty meant that the young person's behaviour deteriorated. Links between social care staff in local authorities and youth offending teams were unclear and the case managers in youth offending teams frequently had to intervene to ensure that responses were received. In some cases, advocates were used to make legal representation to the local authority on behalf of a young person to ensure that they received the appropriate services.
64. Young people experienced a lack of consistency in services. Voluntary organisations provided some support, but did so independently of other services. Funding for projects was often short-term; when the funding ended, so did the good initiative that it supported, leaving the young people confused. One juvenile establishment described the work of a voluntary organisation with young offenders who left the establishment as excellent, but it had ended when the funding finished.
65. Relationships between the secure establishment and the young person's home area were not always productive and there were delays by the local authorities in arranging accommodation on the young person's release. Finding accommodation for older children was often problematic. There were frequently too many changes of care placement plans by the different agencies, led by the local authority in the final weeks before transition and resettlement. This was unsettling and demotivating for the young people involved, who increasingly felt unwanted.
66. Providing an address and helping young people to set up bank accounts were particularly important factors to enable them to have access to education

maintenance allowances. Without a home address it was very difficult for a young person or the education practitioner to make any plans, irrespective of the personal support that the young person might be receiving; yet finding accommodation had sometimes been left to the day of release. Such difficulties had a detrimental impact on training and education.

67. The quality of services provided by Connexions was insufficient. Relationships with the Connexions services that were local to the establishments were usually good but arrangements for dealing with children and young people who were from outside the local area, although theoretically in place, were often underdeveloped and insufficient resources were available to support the necessary links. One juvenile establishment reported during the survey that Jobcentre Plus would not take information about young people from outside the local area who were about to return to their communities. This delayed financial support for them when they left custody.
68. Establishments and youth offending teams recognised the importance of planned and coordinated transition arrangements for the young people but these were the most difficult part of the role. Young people who needed support when they were released from custody often went to a situation where there was no support in the community. Many of the young people had no significant adult in their lives. Two of the juvenile establishments visited had developed mentoring arrangements to support young people in their transition and resettlement in the community. One of these establishments recognised high-quality mentoring as the most important factor in helping young people to stop re-offending.
69. There was not enough victim and restorative justice work with children and young people who had offended. The documentation seen did not identify previous education and training; and records of the impact of a child or young person's educational background or any contribution from the education practitioner were insufficiently detailed.

Prevention

70. Partnership working between the local Youth Inclusion Programmes and Youth Inclusion Support Panels to prevent children and young people from behaving anti-socially or from offending for the first time was effective.¹⁴ Youth Inclusion Programmes focused attention on strengthening links with education providers. The best programmes made contact with local schools and key workers were identified to tackle any specific learning needs shown by a child or young person considered to be at risk of offending. Swift action was taken to ensure

¹⁴ Youth Inclusion Programmes are bespoke programmes for 8–17-year-olds who are identified as being at high risk of involving themselves in offending or anti-social behaviour. Youth inclusion Support Panels aim to prevent offending or anti-social behaviour by identifying programmes for children and young people in local youth offending team areas.

that support was tailored to meet their needs and provision was found that would best encourage positive engagement and involvement. In these circumstances, the outcomes for children and young people were good.

71. In 28 of the 55 prevention cases reviewed during inspection, the interventions for young people were timely and well planned. The partnerships were effective in securing additional funding from government sources and from extended schools programmes for this purpose, which were often short-term and difficult to sustain. In nine of the 139 youth offending teams inspected, voluntary sector organisations worked well with the Children's Trust and the local youth offending team.
72. Data showed that of 15 children of school age whose case files in 2007 or 2008 identified that they had been permanently excluded from school, five did not have education placements. Data from a further 32 prevention case files showed that children of school age were out of school but not recorded as formally excluded. Failure to identify children as permanently excluded made it difficult for education practitioners to plan appropriate provision.
73. In 35 of 55 prevention cases reviewed by inspectors, work undertaken to ensure that the child or young person had access to local services was good. Their individual learning needs were identified well through the Onset process and, in 29 of the 55 cases, the interventions were matched well to meet the needs that had been identified. However, two cases where additional learning needs were identified had not been referred for specialist help.

Strategic management of education, training and employment

74. By the end of the five-year (2003–08) cycle of inspection of youth offending teams, changes within local authorities and the establishment of Children's Trusts had raised the profile of the work of youth offending teams, but considerable variability and inconsistency remained between different areas.
75. By 2008, membership of local Youth Offending Team Management Boards and attendance by appropriate local authority officers had improved across the five-year inspection cycle and were satisfactory. Management information was improving. It was analysed to inform management decisions and to help to improve outcomes for children and young people. More generally, however, performance data such as the Youth Justice Board's quarterly reports on children and young people participating in education, training and employment activities were not scrutinised sufficiently. This lack of sufficient scrutiny contributed to the youth offending teams' difficulties in brokering appropriate provision.
76. Insufficient links existed between the local 14 to 19 partnerships and youth offending team areas, and those that did exist lacked the support of protocols

or service level agreements. In two of the 139 areas inspected, these links were good and ensured that local training and further education providers were well informed about the needs of this vulnerable group. In one case, the education coordinator of the youth offending team regularly attended the 'Children missing from education' steering group, which was organised across two neighbouring local authorities. Similar arrangements were in place in five other youth offending services.

77. There was insufficient involvement with the main training and employment providers and such involvement that did exist relied too much on informal arrangements. The 44 youth offending teams inspected in 2007–08 worked diligently to secure education and skills provision, but much reliance was placed on informal arrangements with partner agencies. Only eight youth offending teams had evidence of formal protocols or service level agreements. Arrangements for management boards to review and refresh protocols were insufficiently systematic, particularly in relation to training providers and colleges, to ensure the best outcomes for young people. Exceptions to this were the service level agreements drawn up between 36 of the 44 youth offending teams inspected in 2007–08 and Connexions services, which were reviewed annually and amended. Joint working was effective in tackling gaps in provision and increased the range of placement opportunities, particularly for the post-16 age group.
78. The quality of the operational management of education, training and employment issues was variable across youth offending teams, which was a picture that did not change throughout the five-year inspection cycle. Education plans, if they were in place, lacked specific and measurable targets. In a third of the youth offending teams inspected in 2007 and 2008, arrangements for quality assurance, including the monitoring and recording of impact and outcomes, were inadequate. Senior managers generally lacked knowledge, skills and understanding of the key issues affecting education, training and employment in the locality. Education practitioners were often expected to undertake their education responsibilities and more generic work with little or no managerial direction or guidance.

Notes

During the survey, inspectors evaluated the quality of the support for education and training that children and young people received while they were in custody, moving through the youth justice system or serving their sentence in the community. Inspectors also considered arrangements for children and young people receiving prevention interventions.

Before the survey took place, the 16 secure children's homes, the four secure training centres and eight juvenile establishments nationally were invited to take part in the survey. All but two of the secure children's homes confirmed their willingness to participate. Between May 2008 and June 2009, inspectors selected 12 of the

secure children's homes, the four secure training centres and seven of the juvenile establishments for survey visits to gather evidence to support their judgements.

Inspectors visited the establishments having gained permission from Her Majesty's Prison Service National Research Committee. Inspectors interviewed children and young people, directors, managers and heads of learning and skills. They also held meetings with six partner agencies involved in the youth justice system: the Coventry and Warwickshire Connexions service; the Youth Justice Board, the (then) Department for Children, Schools and Families; Estyn; the Ministry of Justice; the National Offender Management Service; and the Offenders' Learning and Skills Service. Inspectors visited seven juvenile establishments to track young people convicted of offences.

Between September 2003 and July 2008 Ofsted inspected the 139 youth offending teams in England with the lead inspectorate, HMI Probation, to evaluate the provision of education, training and employment for children and young people coming into and moving through the youth justice system. Findings from the 2007 and 2008 inspections contributed to the joint area reviews and sequentially into the area Annual Performance Assessments and these have been considered in this report.

Ofsted inspected the processes that ensured that children and young people were provided with and supported in education, training or an employment placement when they first entered the youth justice system; and, if they did not have access to provision beforehand, that they were swiftly and effectively re-engaged.

Inspection activities included analyses of case files, including final warnings, prevention interventions, community orders, custodial sentences; and an investigation of strategic planning and protocols in order to measure the effectiveness of the youth offending teams and partner agencies in the provision of education, training and employment placements.¹⁵

Inspectors considered documentary and inspection evidence that was provided before their visits, and supplementary information, as well as meeting case managers of youth offending teams, specialist education staff, operational managers, and a range of partner agencies. These included the local authority, the Connexions service, the youth service, and further education and training providers. Inspection activities included case file assessments of prevention cases pre- and post-court. This included prevention interventions, final warnings, community orders and custodial sentences.

All children of school age should receive their statutory entitlement to full-time education. For the purposes of inspection, this entitlement was interpreted as 25

¹⁵ For Phase 1 to 3 (2004–07), inspectors undertook 2,776 combined file reads of community and custody cases, and for Phase 4 (2007–08), 3,370, of which 171 captured education, training and employment statistics on the data system. More, however, were reviewed by inspectors.

hours a week of appropriate education. To determine whether there was sufficient provision for young people aged 16 and over, inspectors used the equivalent full-time further education college course of approximately 16 hours a week as a baseline.

Further information

Publications by Ofsted

Pupil referral units: establishing successful practice in pupil referral units and local authorities (070019), Ofsted, 2007; www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/070019.

Day six of exclusion: the extent and quality of provision for pupils (080255), Ofsted, 2009; www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/080255.

Other publications

Inter-departmental guidance on establishing youth offending teams, Home Office, Welsh Office, Department of Health and Department for Education and Employment, 1998; www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ERORecords/HO/421/2/cdact/yotcirc.htm.

Sustaining the success: extending the guidance – establishing youth offending teams, Youth Justice Board, 2004; www.yjb.gov.uk/Publications/Scripts/prodView.asp?idproduct=196&eP=.

Joint Inspection of Youth Offending Teams The First Phase Annual Report 2004, HMI Probation, 2004; www.justice.gov.uk/inspectories/hmi-probation/docs/yotannualreport04-english.pdf.

Joint inspection of youth offending teams annual report 2004/2005, HMI Probation, 2005; www.justice.gov.uk/inspectories/hmi-probation/docs/annualreport.pdf.

Joint inspection of youth offending teams annual report 2005/2006, HMI Probation, 2006; www.justice.gov.uk/inspectories/hmi-probation/docs/joint_inspection_of_youth_o1.pdf.

Joint inspection of youth offending teams annual report 2006/2007, (Ref. 274095), HMI Probation, 2007; member.lgiu.org.uk/whatwedo/cst/projects/Documents/APPG%20evidence/HMI%20Probation%20-%202007%20YOT.pdf.

HM inspectorate of probation annual report 2007–08 (ref. 288215), HMI Probation, 2008; www.justice.gov.uk/inspectories/hmi-probation/docs/annual-report-2007-08-eng.pdf.

Joint inspection of youth offending teams end of programme report 2003–08, HMI Probation, 2009; www.justice.gov.uk/inspectories/hmi-probation/annual-reports.htm.

Key elements of effective practice, Youth Justice Board, 2002, updated 2008;
www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/ImprovingPractice/EffectivePractice/KEEPS/

Youth crime action plan (CSDS-15), HM Government, 2008;
www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/youth/youth080.htm.

Every Child Matters website, relevant publications;
[http://publications.everychildmatters.gov.uk/default.aspx?PageFunction=browse&PageMode=publications&CategoryName=ECM_YouthJustice\(DfES+Online+Store\)&Type=Browse&BrowseState=&BrowsePath=Youth+justice&CategoryDisplayName=Youth+justice&CategoryIndexField=12&CategoryLevelField=0&CategoryClicked=YES&BrowseSelectionLocation=Default&Contributor=ECM_YouthJustice&SortOption=0&PageNumber=1&](http://publications.everychildmatters.gov.uk/default.aspx?PageFunction=browse&PageMode=publications&CategoryName=ECM_YouthJustice(DfES+Online+Store)&Type=Browse&BrowseState=&BrowsePath=Youth+justice&CategoryDisplayName=Youth+justice&CategoryIndexField=12&CategoryLevelField=0&CategoryClicked=YES&BrowseSelectionLocation=Default&Contributor=ECM_YouthJustice&SortOption=0&PageNumber=1&)

Websites

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/youth%2Dcrime%2Daction%2Dplan/
The sets out the Government's action plan for reducing the number of crimes committed by young people.

www.dcsf.gov.uk/publications
Consultation on and responses to government proposals for education for young people supervised by the youth justice system

publications.everychildmatters.gov.uk/eOrderingDownload/1092-2004PDF-EN-01.pdf
Every Child Matters: Change for Children in the criminal justice system

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/cons-youth-justice-next-steps/
Youth Justice: the Next Steps

www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/
The website of the Youth Justice Board gives information on the youth justice system, youth offending teams, assessment, prevention, sentences, orders and remand, custody, at the end of a sentence.

www.secureaccommodation.org.uk/
The Secure Accommodation Network represents and promotes the work of secure children's homes in England and Wales.

Annex A: Asset and Onset

Asset provides a common, structured framework for the assessment of all young people involved in the criminal justice system. It is a standard assessment of the factors contributing to a young person's offending. Asset should be completed by the youth offending team at the beginning and end of all interventions, and at the mid-point of Detention and Training Orders and should inform assessment and planning documentation within the secure estate.

The Onset referral and assessment framework is completed by the youth offending team workers. It promotes the Youth Justice Board's prevention strategy by helping to identify risk factors to be reduced and protective factors to be enhanced. It also provides information which might be helpful in selecting appropriate interventions for children and young people who have been identified as needing early intervention. All prevention programmes funded by the Youth Justice Board require this documentation to be completed as the basis for the referral and assessment mechanisms.

Annex B: Providers visited for this survey

Secure children's homes

Aldine House Secure Children's Centre

Aycliffe Secure Services

Barton Moss Secure Care Centre

Clayfields House Secure Unit

East Moor Secure Children's Home

Kyloe House Secure Children's Home

Lincolnshire Secure Unit

Orchard Lodge Secure Unit

Red Bank Community Home

St Catherine's Secure Centre

Sutton Place

Swanwick Lodge

Secure training centres

Hassockfield Secure Training Centre

Medway Secure Training Centre

Oakhill Secure Training Centre

Rainsbrook Secure Training Centre

Juvenile establishment populations

HMYOI and Remand Centre Brinsford

HMP and YOI Castington

HMP Foston Hall

HMP and YOI New Hall

HMYOI Stoke Heath

Werrington Juvenile Centre

HMYOI Wetherby

Annex C: Youth offending teams inspected jointly with HMI Probation

Barking and Dagenham	Manchester
Barnet	Medway
Barnsley	Merton
Bath and North East Somerset	Milton Keynes
Bedfordshire	Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Bexley	Newham
Birmingham	Norfolk
Blackburn with Darwen	North East Lincolnshire
Blackpool	North Lincolnshire
Bolton	North Somerset
Bournemouth and Poole	North Tyneside
Bracknell Forest	North Yorkshire
Bradford	Northamptonshire
Brent	Northumberland
Brighton and Hove	Nottingham
Bristol	Nottinghamshire
Bromley	Oldham
Buckinghamshire	Oxfordshire
Bury	Peterborough
Calderdale	Plymouth
Cambridgeshire	Reading
Camden	Redbridge
Cheshire	Richmond-upon-Thames
Cornwall	Rochdale
County Durham	Rotherham
Coventry	St Helens
Croydon	Salford
Cumbria	Sandwell
Darlington	Sefton

Derby	Shropshire, Telford and Wrekin
Derbyshire	Slough
Devon	Solihull
Doncaster	Somerset
Dorset	South Gloucestershire
Dudley	South Tees
Ealing	South Tyneside
East Riding of Yorkshire	Southend-on-Sea
East Sussex	Southwark
Enfield	Staffordshire
Essex	Stockport
Gateshead	Stockton-on-Tees
Gloucestershire	Stoke-on-Trent
Greenwich	Suffolk
Hackney	Sunderland
Halton and Warrington	Surrey
Hammersmith and Fulham	Sutton
Haringey	Swindon
Harrow	Tameside
Hartlepool	Thurrock
Havering	Torbay
Hertfordshire	Tower Hamlets and City of London
Hillingdon	Trafford
Hounslow	Wakefield
Islington	Walsall
Kensington and Chelsea	Waltham Forest
Kent	Wandsworth
Kingston-upon-Hull	Warwickshire
Kingston-upon-Thames	Wessex
Kirklees	West Berkshire
Knowsley	Westminster
Lambeth	Wigan

Leeds

Leicester

Leicestershire

Lewisham

Lincolnshire

Liverpool

Luton

Wiltshire

Windsor and Maidenhead

Wirral

Wokingham

Wolverhampton

Worcestershire and Herefordshire

York