



Thematic report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons

# **Resettlement provision for children and young people**

Accommodation and education, training and employment

June 2011





Thematic report by HM Inspectorate of Prisons

Resettlement provision for children and young people:  
Accommodation and education, training and employment

June 2011

Crown copyright 2011

ISBN: 978-1-84099-464-3

Published by:  
HM Inspectorate of Prisons  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Ashley House  
2 Monck Street  
LONDON  
SW1P 2BQ

# Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Glossary	5
Introduction	9
1. Summary and recommendations	13
2. Background to the report	21
3. Scope of this report	25
4. Management of resettlement provision	27
5. Accommodation	41
6. Education, training and employment (ETE)	51
7. Release on temporary licence (ROTL)	61
8. Follow-up findings	67

## Appendices

---

i	Methodology	75
ii	The young people's estate	78
iii	Definitions of a looked after child	80
iv	Overall survey data for sentenced young men, May 2010 to February 2011	82
v	Interview template for children and young people	85
vi	Interview template for case supervisors and follow-up pro forma	96
vii	Interview template for heads of resettlement (and relevant staff)	110
viii	Interview template for heads of learning and skills (and relevant staff)	113

# Acknowledgements

---

**Samantha Booth**  
Senior Research Officer

**Bob Cowdry**  
Ofsted inspector

**Hayley Cripps**  
Research Officer

**Fay Deadman**  
Children and young people's inspection team leader

**Louise Falshaw**  
Head of Research, Development and Thematics

**Angela Johnson**  
Inspector

**Sherrelle Parke**  
Research Officer

**Martyn Rhowbotham**  
Ofsted inspector

**Ian Thomson**  
Inspector

Thank you to the young people, case supervisors, learning and skills teams and resettlement teams who agreed to be interviewed as part of this project and took the time to complete and return our surveys.

# Glossary

---

This glossary explains some of the commonly used terms within the following report.

## **ASSET**

This is the standard assessment tool used by youth offending teams to collate information on a young person who has come into contact with the criminal justice system. It is intended to identify a range of factors that may have contributed to the offending behaviour of the young person.

## **Barnardo's**

Barnardo's is a charity which provides a range of support, counselling, fostering, adoption and training services for more than 100,000 children, young people and their families.

## **Case supervisor**

The case supervisor within an establishment is usually responsible for the delivery and implementation of a young person's training plan by working closely with the young person, youth offending team case manager and other relevant people.

## **Connexions Direct**

Connexions is a government initiative that provides information, advice and support to young people between the ages of 13 and 19 on a range of issues, including career planning, education, training and employment<sup>1</sup>.

## **Detention and training order (DTO)**

A DTO is a custodial sentence. The length of the sentence can be between four months and two years. The first half of the sentence is spent in custody while the second half is spent in the community under the supervision of the youth offending team (YOT)<sup>2</sup>.

## **Early release**

Young people on DTOs lasting between eight and 24 months can be released one or two months early on an electronic tag. Young people convicted of certain offences are excluded but otherwise presumption is in favour of early release unless there are good reasons not to. For those serving determinate sentences of three months and less than four years, other than DTOs, home detention curfew (HDC) may be available<sup>3</sup>.

## **ETE**

Education, training and employment.

## **Family support/liaison worker**

Some YOTs and establishments have a family support/liaison officer whose role is to support and develop family relationships.

## **Information, advice and guidance (IAG)**

Some establishments have IAG workers who will provide young people with advice and guidance on ETE.

**Individual learning plan (ILP)**

Each young person should have an ILP set by the education department that sets out their individual education needs and how these will be met.

**Integrated resettlement support (IRS)**

IRS is a programme run by YOTs. Young people will be allocated an IRS worker who will provide support with their resettlement needs, meeting them while they are in custody and supporting them on release in the community.

**Looked after child**

Looked after children are those in the care of the local authority who will have an allocated social worker. For the purpose of this report, this includes young people subject to a care order, accommodated by voluntary agreement immediately prior to entering custody, or those entitled to leaving care support ('eligible' or 'relevant' children). See Appendix III for a detailed definition.

**Personal officers**

Each young person should have a personal officer, who is based on their residential unit and should assist the young person with any day to day problems or concerns. The personal officer should work closely with the young person's caseworker.

**P-Nomis**

This is the prison service IT system holding personal details of all prisoners.

**Recall**

Young people released with licence conditions can be recalled to custody if they breach their conditions.

**Resettlement broker**

Each young person at the Heron unit at Feltham has an allocated resettlement broker. They work with the young person while in custody to help arrange plans for their release and provide intensive support for at least six months on their release.

**Release on temporary licence (ROTL)**

ROTL is the system allowing a young person to leave the prison temporarily, either for compassionate reasons or to help improve their chances of resettlement.

**Training plan**

All young people in custody should have a training plan outlining the activities they will engage in as they serve their sentence and plans for their release. The activities should be based on targets and objectives drawn from each young person's needs and aspirations. The targets should be discussed, and progress reviewed, at regular meetings.

**Young offender institution (YOI)**

YOIs hold young people aged 15 to 21 years. This report solely refers to YOI places commissioned by the Youth Justice Board which hold young people under the age of 18. In some instances young people aged 18 who are close to their release are kept within the young people's estate until release.



**Youth Justice Board (YJB)**

The YJB oversees the youth justice system, which includes commissioning places within the prison estate for those aged under 18 years. The YJB sets out minimum requirements that youth justice services, including custodial establishments, must meet within its national standards<sup>4</sup>.

**Youth offending team (YOT)**

Every young person in contact with the criminal justice system is supported by a YOT, which helps them to address their needs with the intention of preventing further offending.

**YOT case manager**

The YOT case manager has overall responsibility and accountability for delivering a young person's sentence and ensuring that it achieves its objectives. He/she should assess a young person's risks and needs, and agree targets for the young person's training plan and plans for their release.



# Introduction

Resettlement is one of the main tests against which the Inspectorate judges the health of a prison. This thematic review, commissioned by the Youth Justice Board, examines accommodation and education, training and employment (ETE) resettlement provision for sentenced young men aged 15 to 18 in young offender institutions. It reports on the work carried out in custody to prepare young people for release, using survey data as well as in-depth interviews with 61 sentenced young men, their case supervisors and follow-up information on what happened to them on release. The heads of resettlement and learning and skills in each institution provide an establishment perspective.

Ensuring that young people have suitable and sustainable accommodation and ETE on release from custody is a vital first step to reduce reoffending and enable young people to successfully reintegrate into the community. This is no small task – in our sample of 61 young men more than eight out of 10 (84%) had an accommodation and/or ETE need identified. In our survey almost half of young men said they were under 14 when they were last at school and 86% said they had been excluded at some point.

All establishments had a strategy to drive forward resettlement work but in most cases these did not involve external agencies and had not been informed by a recent needs analysis of the population. The training planning process should be central to coordinating work to address young people's individual needs, with targets set for a young person's time in custody and plans for their release. We found from our fieldwork that several establishment case supervisors, who oversaw the training plan, had a good knowledge of the young people in their caseload. Most young men reported that training plan targets had been discussed with them, although less than two-thirds in our case sample knew what their targets were and only half said they had had a say in the targets set for them – this then had a real impact on whether they tried to achieve them.

In custody, the range and quality of education and training provision was generally satisfactory and it was clear that, where possible, a young person's preferences had been taken into account when allocating them to ETE. Most, although not all, young men said they were involved in some form of ETE at the time of interview and three-quarters said they had received or were working towards a qualification – 62% thought that these would be useful on release. Although it could often have been better tied to resettlement planning, at several establishments the use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) was improving, with some good quality work placements on offer.

Case supervisors realised the importance of accommodation and ETE in resettlement work and reported that these issues were considered from the point of a young person's arrival in custody. However, training planning targets often placed the onus only on the young person and did not specify what resources would be put in place or how they would be helped to achieve them. The main focus was on how they spent their time in custody and there were few long-term targets aimed at those responsible for ensuring plans were in place for their release. Establishments reported that this was the responsibility of youth offending teams (or social workers for looked after children). At the Heron unit at Feltham young people also had a resettlement broker who was involved in resettlement planning while young people were in custody, but who also offered intensive support to them for at least six months following release.

Despite their key role, the attendance of social workers at training planning meetings for looked after children was poor. In contrast, relationships with community-based youth offending teams (YOTs) were well developed and YOT case managers normally attended training planning meetings. However, plans were not always finalised in time for the pre-release meeting which, understandably, worried young people and frustrated case supervisors. Two of the 61 young men interviewed said that not having accommodation had prevented their early release, but no establishments monitored this. It was not evident that discussions were taking place about whether accommodation arrangements set up at the point of release were suitable and sustainable.

In our case sample, 61% of young men said they would be living with family on release and the majority were optimistic about it as they felt their family's support was the key to their successful resettlement. Although establishments realised the importance of young people maintaining contact with family where appropriate and encouraged it, more structured work needed to be done to rebuild or maintain relationships while young people were in custody. This left two-fifths of our sample who required accommodation to be arranged for their release, which was a vital step before other release plans could be put in place. Case supervisors reported a range of barriers to finding suitable accommodation, including a limited supply of local authority housing and issues around the young person's behaviour or offence. They also reported a range of barriers to arranging ETE for release, including limited availability in the community. At the time of interview, only 14 of the 48 young men who said they wanted to continue education had a place arranged. Worryingly, of the 42 young men who said they wanted to work (either full-time or part-time alongside education), only nine reported that they had a job arranged on release – and for seven of these it had been arranged through family, without help from the establishment or the YOT.

Follow-up information was requested from case supervisors on what happened to the young men in our case sample on release and a month later, with information received for 41 and 37 of the young men respectively. Only 13 young men (32%) had both suitable accommodation (as assessed by case supervisors) and ETE on release. Two, including a looked after child, were forced to report as homeless. One in five were placed in accommodation assessed as unsuitable by case supervisors; this included three young men who had had to go into bed and breakfast lodgings – one was still there a month later – and two who were living with family where this was a cause for concern. Only a third of young men had an ETE placement arranged on release, only half of these were still attending a month later and only a fifth of those who had not got a placement on release had one confirmed a month later. Where ETE placements had fallen through, case supervisors felt this was due to unstable accommodation, a lack of family support, the young person's lack of motivation or problems due to the timing of course start dates. A month after release six of the young men were in custody and one was 'on the run' – three of the young people who had returned to custody were looked after children.

This report raises a key question – how effective is the resettlement work conducted in custody in terms of the actual outcomes for young people? This was not monitored by establishments and our follow-up information highlights the need to look beyond the gate in order to evaluate the effectiveness of resettlement work. Overall the outcomes for our sample were very disappointing. The Heron unit, although we can make no conclusions based on our small sample, seemed a promising initiative, as did the resettlement consortia, although the young

offender institutions involved were not visited for this report. These are being formally evaluated and we look forward to seeing the results.

Although our recommendations are to the Ministry of Justice, Youth Justice Board and National Offender Management Service we recognise that, to ensure all young people have suitable accommodation and ETE on release from custody, a joint approach with other government departments and external agencies is required. The starting point should be an acceptance that vulnerable young people released from custody are children in need. This would go some way toward focusing the joint effort that is needed to prevent them from returning to custody and becoming entrenched at an early age in a life of crime.

**Nick Hardwick**  
**Chief Inspector of Prisons**



# 1. Summary and recommendations

- 1.1 This report examines how well young offender institutions (YOIs) holding young men (aged 15 to 18 years) work with youth offending services and other relevant agencies to ensure that the accommodation and education, training and employment (ETE) resettlement needs of sentenced young men are met in custody and on release, including the use of release on temporary licence (ROTL).
- 1.2 The findings in this report come from two main sources: fieldwork at six male YOIs and responses from 770 sentenced young men surveyed across all nine male YOIs. Fieldwork included interviews with the head of resettlement and the head of learning and skills at each establishment; interviews with 61 sentenced young men approaching release; and interviews with the establishment case supervisor and/or analysis of the case files for each of the 61 young men in our case sample. Case supervisors were also asked to complete a questionnaire on what accommodation and ETE the young people in our sample had on their day of release, and a month after release.

## Management of resettlement provision

---

### Strategic management

---

- 1.3 Although most establishments had conducted an assessment to identify the resettlement needs of their population, these varied in quality and were often out of date. Few had consulted young people, and findings rarely fed into establishment resettlement policies or practice.
- 1.4 All establishments had a resettlement policy, but most had not been written in collaboration with relevant external agencies and not all distinguished between the needs of different groups of young men. Likewise, although most establishments had a resettlement committee to drive forward work in this area, only two involved input from external agencies. At four establishments, members of the education department attended multi-agency strategic meetings that aimed to develop learning and skills provision.
- 1.5 Collection of resettlement data was often limited to what was required by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) or Prison Service. However, it was unclear how much data was used to monitor the effectiveness of establishments' resettlement work. Qualitative data, such as the type of accommodation to which young people were released, or follow-up information on the outcome for the young person, was not collected.

### Case management

---

#### Initial information

- 1.6 Although staff felt they received adequate information in most cases, there were still examples where information did not arrive with the young person, was incomplete or out of date. ASSET (YJB assessment documentation) was the main method of identifying a young person's care

status and staff raised concerns about the reliability of this information. Establishments felt confident that they could obtain any missing information but this delay could impact on initial assessments. In our case sample, 84% had an accommodation and/or ETE need identified in the initial information.

### **Training plans**

- 1.7 A training plan sets out targets for a young person's time in custody and plans for release based on their individual needs and aspirations. An establishment case supervisor should oversee the implementation of the plan, in close collaboration with the YOT case manager. Whether the case supervisor had contact with the young person or their youth offending team (YOT) case manager prior to the initial training planning meeting varied by establishment and/or case supervisor. Training plan targets were usually agreed at the initial meeting. Apart from one young man who had not had a formal training planning meeting, most of the young men interviewed said that targets had been discussed with them, although only 59% could say what their targets were. Just over half of the young men felt that they had had a say in the targets. Only half of those who knew what their targets were said staff had provided support to achieve them.
- 1.8 Targets were often broad or generic rather than specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time limited (SMART). This provided young people with little guidance on how to achieve them and made reviewing their progress more difficult. Although case supervisors reported that resettlement was considered from the start, targets were often only for the young person, although the YOT case manager and social workers, where applicable, would have responsibilities to ensure release plans were in place. Consideration of resettlement was sometimes held off until the young person was closer to release and training plan targets rarely related to plans on release.
- 1.9 Pre-release reviews were often not held until within 10 days of release and plans for the young person on release were not always finalised at this stage. Establishment staff did not attend all young people's post-release reviews in the community at any establishments: at half staff did not attend any, while at the others staff prioritised which meetings they attended.

### **Involvement in training planning**

- 1.10 One young man had not had an official training planning meeting, but all other young people in our case sample had attended every meeting with their case supervisors. Several case supervisors had very good knowledge of the young people in their caseload but others lacked this insight. Resettlement managers reported good relationships with YOTs, although there were no joint protocols in place. Likewise, case supervisors reported good relationships with YOTs, although they described some problems, such as varying practices across YOTs or release plans being left until the last minute.
- 1.11 Establishments recognised the importance of facilitating the involvement of YOT case managers and some tried to keep them informed of the services provided in the establishment. Attendance by YOT case managers at training planning meetings was good and there was often contact with case supervisors between meetings to keep each other updated. Most young men surveyed said their YOT case manager had been in touch but less than two-thirds said they knew how to contact them.



- 1.12 Attendance by family/carers at training planning meetings was not monitored by establishments but most estimated it to be about 40–50%. Attendance at initial meetings was poorest, with many establishments relying on the YOT case manager to invite family as they did not feel well enough informed to know if it was appropriate or not. A family support worker had attended meetings for only four young men in our case sample. For looked after children (i.e. those in the care of the local authority), attendance by social workers at training planning meetings was poor and some young men said they had had no contact from their social workers since arriving in custody. Only two-thirds of those surveyed reported daily access to phones and only two-fifths said they usually had at least one visit a week.
- 1.13 At several establishments the input of education and personal officers was poor. This meant that a young person's individual learning plan and their progress on the wing were often not fed into the training planning process or reflected in targets. Other specialists who had attended at least one meeting for some young men in our sample included YOT specialist workers, integrated resettlement support (IRS) workers, resettlement brokers, health care staff and Connexions.

## Accommodation

---

- 1.14 Accommodation on release was explored early in a young person's sentence, but where needs were identified, the work to address them was sometimes delayed until closer to release. Thirteen per cent of those surveyed reported a housing problem on arrival to custody. In our case sample, 59% were living with family prior to custody; others were in a care home or with a carer, in semi-independent living or supported housing, in a hostel, in bed and breakfast accommodation, with friends or 'sofa-hopping'.
- 1.15 At the time of interview 61% (n=37) of young men said they would be living with family on release, including three who had not been living with family prior to custody. The majority of young men felt that they had had a say in this and that the arrangement would work. Several said that support from their family would help them to avoid reoffending and/or to keep to licence conditions. In our view, some young people would be living in unsuitable arrangements with family on release but this was not addressed because of the difficulties in arranging an alternative.
- 1.16 Other than encouraging young people to keep in contact with family, work to maintain or improve relationships varied and seemed underdeveloped. In some instances young men were returning to an area known to be associated with their offending or gang links; it was not clear how this would be managed so they would not reoffend.
- 1.17 The other 24 young men said they would not be living with family. Of these, 17 said they did not know where they would be living, including 13 of the 18 looked after children in our sample, two young men being released within a week, and three within 10 days. These young people were concerned about where they would be living and knew there was a possibility that they would have to report as homeless on release. For those who said they did know, arrangements included semi-independent living accommodation and hostel accommodation. One young person said they would be temporarily accommodated in bed and breakfast lodgings until something more permanent became available.

- 1.18 Case supervisors relied on YOT case managers or social workers, where applicable, to make arrangements and were frustrated that plans were often not finalised until close to the young person's release and could affect whether they were released early. However, establishments reported that it was rare for a young person to be released without an address. They reported a range of barriers to ensuring suitable accommodation, including insufficient local authority accommodation and problems placing those who had committed arson or sex offences. Involvement of outside agencies was limited and only a fifth of young men interviewed said they had received financial advice.

## Education, training and employment (ETE)

---

- 1.19 Information arriving with a young person often did not provide a full picture of a young person's educational level or qualifications and some establishments routinely reassessed young people. In our case sample, over half (54%) of the young people had clear ETE resettlement needs, often due to previous poor attendance or a lack of formal qualifications. Nine had special educational needs identified. In our survey 86% said they had been excluded from school and three-quarters said they had truanted from school.
- 1.20 Establishments generally provided satisfactory education and vocational skills training. In our case sample, most young men were involved in education or training and their preferences for courses had been taken into account where possible. However, education staff often did not feed in to the training planning process. Where young people felt that the education or training was useful or they had received support from teachers, they valued this, and it had often influenced their plans for release. However there were problems reported, including long waiting lists for popular courses, classes being disrupted by noise or other young people's behaviour, and young people not feeling challenged. Three-quarters (77%) said they had achieved or were working towards a certificate, qualification, or accreditation; although only 62% of these young men felt that it would be useful on release.
- 1.21 Young people felt that having something to do, such as a job or education place, was key to stopping them reoffending on release. In our sample 79% (n=48) said they wanted to return to education but only two-fifths felt they had studied something in custody that was connected to what they wanted to do on release. Most of these young men said they wanted to attend a course that would help them into their preferred career choice. Only 14 of the 48 young men who reported wanting to continue with education on release had something arranged at the time of interview. Arrangements were viewed as the YOT case managers' responsibility and in many cases work was in progress. However, case supervisors reported several barriers, including the young person not having a confirmed address, insufficient availability, or start dates of courses being prior to or a long time after the young person's release.
- 1.22 Many young men (69%) said they wanted to work on release, including part-time work alongside education. However, little was done to support young people with this. For seven of the nine young men who said they had a job on release this was arranged by family. All fieldwork sites offered careers advice services but at some establishments not all young people were seen. Some establishments held employer events but only two said they offered pre-release courses.

## Release on temporary licence (ROTL)

---

- 1.23 ROTL enables young people to participate in formal work-based activities and structured visits, outside of the prison. This can play a key process in reintegration planning when it is linked to arranging or improving plans on release.
- 1.24 Although all establishments had a ROTL policy many simply duplicated prison rules, although some had rewritten policies to make them establishment-specific. At most sites ROTL had been given priority but there were fears that budget cuts would impact on the positive progress being made.
- 1.25 ROTL was being used to enable young men to participate in community/restorative justice projects or work placements (often set up with local organisations or agencies); have a family day to help maintain relationships; or attend accommodation or school/college interviews to help arrange their plans on release. Most establishments expected case supervisors to explain ROTL to young people and inform them of their eligibility date and how to apply, but practices varied and some case supervisors said they did not inform a young person about ROTL if they did not think it would be granted. At one establishment we were told that only those considered suitable were approached for ROTL, when there should be a transparent system of application, assessment and decision making available to all young people.
- 1.26 In our case sample, 18 young men said they had been offered ROTL and it had been granted to eight. This had been to attend work placements, college interviews, community service, family days or to complete an award. Young men were positive about their experiences.
- 1.27 Establishment figures showed a variation in the use of ROTL across establishments. All but one establishment only monitored the number of times ROTL was used rather than the number of young people involved, so good figures may actually only reflect a small number of young people receiving ROTL to regularly attend a work placement.
- 1.28 ROTL was often seen as a behaviour management tool rather than a core part of resettlement planning, so it could be stopped as a result of poor behaviour even when this did not affect a young person's risk of absconding or misbehaving during ROTL. At most establishments the use of ROTL was not clearly linked to a young person's training plan. The YOT case managers interviewed did not know much about ROTL and, as such, its use was rarely proposed by YOTs to help arrange accommodation or school/college placements.

## What actually happened on release

---

### Accommodation

---

- 1.29 There was no evidence that establishments were working to a set definition of suitable or sustainable accommodation, although it is defined by the YJB, or that discussions about suitability were taking place prior to release.

- 1.30 In the 41 questionnaires returned, when asked about what happened to the young people on release, case supervisors told us that 26 young men went to live with family, nine had accommodation provided by the local authority, three had gone into bed and breakfast lodgings and two had had to report as homeless (including a section 20 looked after child). Details on the type of accommodation for one young person were not provided. Case supervisors felt that a fifth of these places were not suitable and/or sustainable, including two cases where young men were living with family members.
- 1.31 A month later, 22 young men were living with family, six were back in custody, one young person was 'on the run', one young person was in local authority accommodation, two were in bed and breakfast lodgings (one had been in a bed and breakfast since release), two were in hostels and there was no information for the other seven, including the two young men released homeless.

## ETE

---

- 1.32 From follow-up information received, only 13 of the 41 young men had an ETE placement to go to when they were released and case supervisors reported that all of these young men also had suitable accommodation. Of these only half were still attending the placement a month later and three young men were back in custody. Of the 28 young men without something arranged on release, a month later three were back in custody, one young person was 'on the run' and only six had a placement arranged.
- 1.33 Case supervisors attributed successful engagement in ETE to a young person being motivated, engaged in something they wanted to do and having family support. As well as the absence of these elements, unsuccessful placements were often associated with unstable accommodation.
- 1.34 Only 13 of the 41 young men had suitable accommodation (as reported by case supervisors) and an ETE placement arranged on release.

## Recommendations

---

### To the Ministry of Justice

---

- 1.35 **The Ministry of Justice should work with other government departments to ensure that young people leaving custody are treated as children in need and, in accordance with Section 17 of the Children Act 1989, are assessed for the provision of a range and level of services to meet their needs.**

### To the YJB

---

- 1.36 **The YJB should work with the Department for Education to agree a strategy that ensures that resettlement planning for young people leaving custody is effective. The strategy should include arrangements for the collaboration and coordination of all agencies involved in planning and providing services for young people leaving custody,**

in particular with regard to the provision of suitable and sustainable accommodation and education, training or employment placements.

### **To the YJB and NOMS**

---

- 1.37 The YJB should develop procedures to effectively monitor resettlement outcomes for young people following their release from YOIs. NOMS should issue establishments with clear guidance about how to collect the necessary data. In addition NOMS should provide establishments with guidance regarding the application of outcomes data for the ongoing development and improvement of their resettlement strategies.

### **To NOMS**

---

- 1.38 The National Offender Management Service should develop guidance for YOIs to assist them to carry out a comprehensive needs analysis and develop an age appropriate resettlement strategy that is informed by:
- the needs analysis
  - consultation with young people
  - data relating to resettlement outcomes for young people
- and includes:
- the role of ROTL
  - the role of families or carers
  - the role of relevant external agencies.



## 2. Background to the report

### Children and young people in custody

---

- 2.1 During the period in which the fieldwork for this research took place, the population of children and young people (aged 15–18 years) in YOI places commissioned by the YJB was about 1,600–1,700<sup>5</sup>. The custodial population is transient, with a regular throughput of young people entering and leaving custody. In 2009, there were 4,014 receptions into YOIs and 5,859 discharges<sup>6</sup>. In 2009–10 92% of children and young people (aged 10–17) who were sentenced to custody received a Detention and Training Order (DTO)<sup>7</sup>. The average length of time spent in custody by young people serving DTOs was 109 days; for those serving longer or indeterminate sentences the average was 349 days<sup>8</sup>.
- 2.2 Ministry of Justice research from a cohort of young people released from custody in 2008 found that nearly three-quarters reoffended within a year of release, despite reoffending rates having fallen by 24.8% since 2000, from 151.4 to 113.9 offences per 100 offenders<sup>9</sup>. In addition, research has estimated that although persistent offenders make up just 4% of all young offenders, they are responsible for committing a third of all youth crime<sup>10</sup>.

### Resettlement

---

- 2.3 Resettlement is one of HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) four tests of a healthy prison. HMIP expects<sup>11</sup> that establishments demonstrate a commitment to resettlement that ensures children and young people are well prepared for release into the community. The YJB resettlement framework sets out seven key areas (pathways) for effective resettlement of young people<sup>12</sup>. These are:
- case management and transitions
  - accommodation
  - education, training and employment (ETE)
  - health
  - substance misuse
  - families
  - finance, benefits and debt.
- 2.4 This report focuses on two of the pathways – accommodation and ETE – and also examines case management in relation to planning for these two key areas. HMIP expects that planning for a young person's release should begin on their arrival at an establishment and should involve the young person and other relevant people. All young people should have a training plan which is a central part of resettlement planning and is based on their individual needs, including targets while in custody and after they are released<sup>13</sup>. The National Standards<sup>14</sup> and the YJB's 'Case Management Guidance'<sup>15</sup> provide information about which processes should take place and who has responsibility for them.

## Accommodation

---

- 2.5 It is recognised that living in unsuitable and unstable accommodation is a major risk factor in offending behaviour. The Social Exclusion Unit's (2002) report found that suitable and stable accommodation can reduce reoffending for more serious offenders by more than 20%<sup>16</sup>.
- 2.6 HMIP expects that all children and young people have suitable, sustainable and safe accommodation arranged prior to their release from custody. The YJB accommodation strategy states:
- "We use the children's services definition from the Children (Leaving Care) (England) Regulations 2001, which defines suitable accommodation as that:*
- a. which so far as reasonably practicable is suitable for the child in the light of his needs, including his health needs and any needs arising from any disability*
- b. in respect of which the responsible authority has satisfied itself as to the character and suitability of the landlord or other provider; and*
- c. in respect of which the responsible authority has so far as reasonably practicable taken into account the child's –*
- i. wishes and feelings; and*
- ii. education, training or employment needs."*<sup>17</sup>
- 2.7 The most obvious example of unsuitable accommodation is bed and breakfast accommodation, even for emergency accommodation, as no structure or support is provided. There was a cross-government commitment to end the use of bed and breakfast accommodation for 16- and 17-year-olds by 2010.
- 2.8 For young people who are homeless or at risk of being homeless, the children's services or housing authorities have a statutory responsibility to assist them with housing<sup>18</sup>. YJB commissioned research found that 40% of young people who had offended had been homeless at some point<sup>19</sup>. From April 2011 the Sufficiency Duty requires local authorities to secure sufficient accommodation for looked after children, i.e. those in the care of the local authority, in their area.<sup>20</sup>
- 2.9 In June 2010 it was reported that a national indicator (indicator 46), which measured whether suitable accommodation was available to young offenders leaving custody, had been dropped<sup>21</sup>. The YJB had previously required all YOTs to report on how local authorities were meeting their duties under indicator 46 and warned that the decision to stop requiring the collection of this data would make it difficult for YOTs to obtain accurate information and subsequently prioritise and secure funding for resettlement projects from the government's Supporting People Programme<sup>22</sup>.

## ETE

---

- 2.10 Returning to full time education or employment on release is known to prevent reoffending; one study found that of the young people who went straight into full-time education on release, none of them were reconvicted within the first month, compared with a third of those who did not go straight into education.<sup>23</sup>



- 2.11 HMIP expects that children and young people are supported in preparing for their future by making progress in education, learning and skills in custody, are able to continue with their education or training when released and leave with finalised arrangements for when their education, training or employment is to begin once in the community. Similarly, the main objective of the YJB pathway for ETE is to 'provide all young people with suitable and sustainable Education, Training and Employment throughout their sentence and beyond'.<sup>24</sup> It is suggested that this can be achieved by ensuring continuity of ETE provision, improving re-engagement into mainstream ETE on release from custody and ensuring that agencies work together efficiently, with shared goals and clearly defined roles and responsibilities. For establishments and YOTs to achieve this there needs to be strong links with careers advice services, local learning and skills councils, and local education authorities.

## ROTL

---

- 2.12 In addition to accommodation and ETE, this research looked into the use of ROTL. HMIP expects that ROTL should form a key part of an establishment's resettlement strategy and be used to good effect in individual training plans. It allows young people to leave an establishment for a period of time and can be used to enable work placements, school, college or job interviews or accommodation interviews. This is reflected in PSI 28/2009 'Care and Management of young people' which states:

*'Governors must utilise the opportunities under the ROTL arrangements to explore work and accommodation opportunities, and where possible, run pre-release courses to assist in the resettlement of the young person'.*

## Recent initiatives

---

- 2.13 In July 2008 it was announced that £100 million would be invested by the government in the youth crime action plan (YCAP), a targeted effort to stop those under 18 committing crimes, aiming to reduce the level of young offenders entering the criminal justice system by one-fifth (from around 100,000 each year)<sup>25</sup>. In August 2009 further funding was promised to help reduce youth reoffending through improved resettlement and rehabilitation arrangements for children and young people leaving prison. The YJB created a new resettlement programme in 2009 with three main elements.
- The development and implementation of two regional resettlement consortia in the north-west and south-west regions of England. The consortia involve local YOIs (Hindley and Ashfield respectively) and aim to improve resettlement outcomes for young people through better working relationships with YOTs, Children's Services and other local partners. Both consortia went live during 2010 and have been enhanced by strategic partnerships with organisations including the Foyer Federation, Construction Youth Trust, Catch22 and Making the Change<sup>26</sup>.
  - Following an evaluation of Resettlement and Aftercare Provision (RAP)<sup>27</sup>, a programme which focused on substance misuse and mental health problems, the YJB developed a new programme of Integrated Resettlement Support (IRS) which replaced the RAP. IRS aims to address all resettlement issues young people have on

release, from housing to education, training and employment. A key element of the new IRS programme is the notion of effective interagency working and an emphasis on local delivery. In Wales, six resettlement support panels (RSPs) have been established across the nine local authorities with the highest rates of custody. There are currently 107 IRS schemes running in England and Wales. Young people will be allocated an individual IRS worker who should visit them in custody, have a meeting with the young person on their day of release and provide support in the community which can continue for up to six months after the end of the young person's supervision period if needed.

- In support of the Mayor's Time for Action youth crime strategy, the YJB, London YOTs, London Criminal Justice Board, London Development Agencies, the Mayor of London and other partners have worked together to deliver intensive multi-agency resettlement support to young men in London. When the project was launched in November 2009 it was limited to six boroughs but has since expanded to cover all London boroughs. One element of the project was the commissioning of the Heron unit at HMYOI Feltham, a 30-bed dedicated unit which provides enhanced resettlement services. This pilot project is scheduled to run for two and a half years from September 2009. Those allocated to the unit are young men aged 15–17 from London who have been recommended by their YOT worker and who are considered motivated and willing to engage fully in planning and preparing for their resettlement. The unit has a higher staff to young person ratio than other wings at Feltham and has staff dedicated to working just on that unit. In addition to the resettlement support all young people should receive, those on the Heron unit each have a resettlement broker who will actively engage with key agencies in the young person's local community to plan and prepare for their release. Importantly the young person continues to be supported by their resettlement broker in the community after release and, in some cases, also has ongoing contact with their personal officer from the Heron unit.

2.14 The Heron unit was visited as part of the fieldwork of this report and we were able to look at the involvement of IRS workers while young people were in custody, although their key support would continue within the community. The YOIs involved in the regional resettlement consortia were not included within the fieldwork.

## 3. Scope of this report

- 3.1 This report examines how well YOIs holding young men (aged 15 to 18 years) work with youth offending services and other relevant agencies to ensure that the accommodation and ETE resettlement needs of sentenced young men are met in custody and on release, including the use of ROTL. Although this report only looks at sentenced young men, it is likely that many of the findings will also apply to young women and unsentenced young people in custody.
- 3.2 The findings in this report are based on a number of sources<sup>28</sup>, as detailed below (see Appendix I for further detail).

### Fieldwork

---

Fieldwork for this review was conducted at six YOIs holding young men between July and October 2010 and consisted of:

- **Interviews with sentenced young men approaching release**  
These looked at how involved young men had been in the arrangements for accommodation and ETE on release, their knowledge of the plans in place for release and their views on the arrangements (see Appendix V). In total, 61 young men were interviewed.

Eighteen of these young men were identified by the establishment as being currently on a care order (section 31), looked after on a voluntary basis (section 20) immediately prior to entering custody, or meeting the criteria for support as care leavers (eligible or relevant children). For the purpose of this report these young men are referred to as 'looked after children' (see Appendix III for more detail).

Although we aimed to interview those being released within a month of our visit, at some establishments we had to extend this timeframe in order to interview at least 10 young men at each fieldwork site. The average number of days until the 61 young men were to be released was 18.5, ranging from one day to 73 days (see Table 1 for more detail).

**Table 1: The number of days until the young men in our sample were to be released**

Number of days until release	Number of young men
1-7	15
8-14	14
15-30	23
More than 30 days	9

- **Casework information**  
The case supervisor, the member of establishment staff with oversight of the young person's training plan, was interviewed and/or the young person's case file analysed for each of the 61 young people in our sample (see Appendix VI). Where a case

supervisor was responsible for more than one young man in our sample they were interviewed separately about each individual. In total, 32 case supervisors were interviewed about 54 young people in our sample. For seven of our sample only their case files were analysed<sup>29</sup>. Interviews/case file analysis covered how the young person's resettlement needs had been identified; what work had taken place in custody to help address them; and the plans for release, including links with relevant external agencies.

- **Follow-up information from case supervisors**  
Case supervisors were also asked to complete and return two questionnaires about the young men in our sample: one on the young person's day of release and one a month later (see Appendix VI). The former asked about the accommodation and ETE arranged for the young person on their day of release and the latter looked at the accommodation and ETE the young person was in a month after release. Forty-one questionnaires were completed and returned on the young person's day of release, a response rate of 67%; and 37 questionnaires were completed and returned a month after the young person's release, a response rate of 61%.
- **Interviews with the head of resettlement (and other relevant staff)**  
These looked at the strategic management and provision for the accommodation and ETE resettlement pathways, as well as the use of ROTL and links with youth offending services and other external agencies (see Appendix VII).
- **Interviews with the head of learning and skills (and other relevant staff)**  
These asked how young people's educational needs were assessed and met during custody and on release (see Appendix VIII).

## Surveys of young people

---

- 3.3 As part of a service level agreement with the YJB, researchers from HMIP survey a representative sample of young people at each young person's establishment on an annual basis<sup>30</sup>.
- 3.4 Survey responses collected from 770 sentenced young men at all nine<sup>31</sup> male YOIs between May 2010 and February 2011<sup>32</sup> were analysed. Information about the roles and functions of these establishments is detailed in Appendix II.

# 4. Management of resettlement provision

## Strategic management

---

### **Our expectations:**

**In order to provide strategic direction and coordination of resettlement work HM Inspectorate of Prisons expects each establishment to have a resettlement policy that outlines how the resettlement needs of the establishment's population will be met, including the needs of different groups of young people. This should be informed by consultation with young people and an up to date resettlement needs assessment. A multidisciplinary/multi-agency resettlement committee, with the involvement of voluntary, statutory and community organisations, should monitor and evaluate the implementation of the policy.**

### **Our findings:**

Although all establishments had a resettlement policy, these were rarely based on a recent needs assessment of the population involving consultation with young people, or written in collaboration with relevant external agencies. Most establishments had a committee to drive work forward but often this did not involve input from external agencies.

The collection of resettlement data needed developing, including follow-up information on the outcomes for young people, to help monitor and develop the effectiveness of resettlement work.

- 4.1 A good quality, regular resettlement needs assessment is an important first step in identifying the needs of young people, as these will vary across and within establishment populations, as well as over time. Although the majority of fieldwork sites had completed a resettlement needs analysis of young people at some point, the format and information collected differed significantly across establishments and young people had not always been consulted. Needs analyses were usually out of date and apart from at two of the establishments, where links had been made, they did not inform the establishment's resettlement policy. Many resettlement managers seemed unclear about how to construct and effectively use an ongoing resettlement needs analysis and had received little guidance.
- 4.2 Although all establishments had a resettlement policy, it was evident that only one had been written with the necessary input from external agencies such as YOTs, local authorities, or voluntary or community agencies that were involved in, or could advise on, core resettlement activities like finding accommodation. Not all policies made specific mention of the distinct resettlement needs of different groups of young people such as those serving long sentences, looked after children, or those involved in gangs.
- 4.3 All but one establishment had a resettlement committee tasked with ensuring that the policy was implemented. With the exception of two establishments, where the resettlement committee was regularly attended by at least local YOTs, none of the establishments had regular attendance at meetings from any external agencies. Not all resettlement committees gave their work direction.

- 4.4 Four of the six learning and skills teams described links with local authorities in order to monitor and manage the development of learning and skills provision. Some of these relationships were in the early stages while others were more established. At these four sites, staff reported attending the regular partnership meetings designed to monitor and develop the 14–19 agenda, a national drive to engage all young people in learning<sup>33</sup>, and to discuss best practice, strategies and policies. These meetings were attended by various partners including Connexions, contracted education providers, local head teachers, the local education authority and the Young People’s Learning Agency (YPLA).
- 4.5 The collection of resettlement data to evaluate the implementation and impact of policies was erratic. All establishments collected data on the numbers of young people released with or without accommodation and whether external YOTs attended training planning meetings, as required by the YJB and/or Prison Service, but the collection of other data was inconsistent. Some establishments collected no other data, but others gathered details such as sentence type and length, home location and ethnicity, although this was not monitored against outcomes. The attendance of relevant staff and agencies at training planning meetings was not routinely collected, except for external YOTs, so any issues with attendance were not noted or addressed. No establishment collected qualitative data such as whether the accommodation to which young people were returning was suitable and sustainable or followed up the outcomes for young people following release. It was unclear how much of the data collected was able, or used, to inform establishments of whether or not the activities/interventions they were delivering would increase the likelihood of good resettlement outcomes for young people.

## Case management

---

### Initial information

---

#### **Our expectations:**

**When a young person is received into an establishment all essential documentation should be sent in advance or arrive with them. This should include all relevant information such as a pre-sentence report, a post-court report and a full ASSET, which is an assessment tool used by YOTs. This documentation includes details of a young person’s offence, offending history, any vulnerability and their circumstances such as their living arrangements and education/employment history. The quality of information should be adequate to inform initial assessments.**

#### **Our findings:**

In most cases establishments reported that they received adequate information to inform initial assessments but there were examples where information was incomplete or out of date. Case supervisors were not confident that a young person’s care status was always accurately identified.

In our case sample, 84% of young men had an accommodation and/or ETE need identified in the initial information received.

- 4.6 Heads of resettlement and case supervisors reported that, in most cases, they received adequate information on young people from the YOT prior to their arrival at the establishment. However there were instances where information, including the ASSET, had not arrived with the young person, was incomplete or was out of date and did not relate to the young person's most recent offence or circumstances. One case supervisor said:

*'The accuracy of ASSET data has improved but can still sometimes be out of date. They vary in quality but about 80% are alright now.'*

- 4.7 In our survey 29% of sentenced young men reported that they had spent time in the care of the local authority before coming into custody. Case supervisors said that the ASSET was the key method of finding out a young person's care status although concerns over the reliability of information were again reported. In our case sample, one case supervisor did not know that the young person they were supervising was a looked after child; yet the young person and the data provided to us by the prison both identified the young person's looked after status.
- 4.8 Although there were no joint protocols between YOTs and establishments, heads of resettlement and case supervisors said they were confident that they could adequately fill any gaps in the initial information and that YOTs responded quickly to requests for updated information. However, there was a need to ensure that the information received before the arrival of a young person to an establishment was good enough for staff to undertake effective initial assessments on key aspects of a young person's care, including risk to themselves or others, and resettlement planning while in custody. This is highlighted by the fact that 84% of the young people in our case sample had an accommodation and/or ETE need identified in their initial information.

## Training plans

---

### **Our expectations:**

**Planning for a young person's release should begin on their arrival to custody. The training plan is central to this process as it is used to set targets for a young person's time in custody and to set out plans for their release. The first training plan review should be used to set the initial targets, including the young person's resettlement needs and how these will be addressed. Targets and release plans should be developed based on a young person's individual risks, needs and aspirations, and after consultation with the young person. Targets should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time limited (SMART). The training plan should be reviewed regularly with a young person's progress noted and targets revised as appropriate, and a pre-release meeting should take place at least 10 days before release to agree a clear post-release plan. A member of establishment staff who knows the young person should attend their first post-release meeting in the community.**

### **Our findings:**

Whether there was contact with the young person and YOT case manager prior to the initial training planning meeting varied. Most young men said targets had been discussed with them but not all could say what they were. Only half felt they had had a say in what the targets were.

Targets were often broad rather than SMART, which made reviewing them more difficult. Targets were often only aimed at the young person although YOT case managers and social workers, where

applicable, would have responsibilities to ensure that release plans were in place. Although case supervisors said that resettlement was considered from the start, targets rarely related to plans for release and sometimes resettlement plans were delayed until nearer to the young person's release date.

Release plans were not always finalised in time for the pre-release meeting and these meetings were often not held until within 10 days of release. At some establishments staff attended the prioritised post-release meetings in the community but at others staff did not attend any.

### **Contact prior to the first review meeting**

---

- 4.9 Case supervisors should meet with young people prior to their initial review meeting in order to explain the process to them, to prepare them for the meeting and to begin work on their training plan and resettlement needs. However, contact between case supervisors and young people before initial training planning meetings varied. In some establishments, it was happening with most, if not all, young people and at one establishment within 24 hours of their arrival. Examples of case supervisors' comments included:

*'I introduce myself the day after the young person's arrival to explain my role and responsibilities. Then I get their views on housing, education and work and try to understand any current vulnerability they may have.'*

*'I see young people within the first few days of their arrival to discuss their views. I always discuss accommodation at the very outset: two key areas are accommodation and ETE.'*

- 4.10 In some cases, case supervisors reported that they could not remember if they had seen the young person prior to the initial training planning meeting, implying that it was not standard practice to do so. Where young people were spoken to prior to the first meeting this was often also used to ensure information provided in the ASSET was up to date. One case supervisor said:

*'I get information from ASSET on arrival and once I've spoken to the young person I will update the YOT with any updates. If there are any issues these are discussed at the initial meeting so that all are aware.'*

- 4.11 Contact with YOT case managers prior to the initial training planning meeting also varied. For about half the young people in our sample, case supervisors said they had made contact with the YOT prior to the initial meeting to discuss the young person's needs, yet others had merely spoken to them to arrange the meeting. This varied by case supervisor, rather than establishment. Where case supervisors said they contacted YOTs prior to the initial meeting, it was because they wanted to ensure they had all the information about a young person.

### **Targets and release planning**

---

- 4.12 In our survey, 57% of sentenced young men said that they had a training plan. Our training planning thematic<sup>34</sup> reported a similar proportion, but highlighted that this low figure was not



supported by inspection findings and may have been due to inadequate involvement of young people in the process or because they referred to the plan by a different name.

- 4.13 Training plans set out targets to manage the young person's time in custody and plans for release. Practice varied as to when training plan targets were written. Some case supervisors said they waited until the initial training planning meeting; some wrote them after meeting the young person and talking to YOTs but before the initial meeting; and others wrote them before they had met the young person, although in some cases they had spoken to the YOT. However, most case supervisors reported that targets would be discussed with the young person during the initial meeting. For example, one case supervisor said:

*'I discussed issues with the YOT first and some plans were suggested; these were then discussed and confirmed during the initial planning meeting where we set specific targets.'*

- 4.14 In our case sample all bar one young man had had at least an initial training planning meeting, which, as set out by the YJB national standards<sup>35</sup>, should be held within 10 working days of a young person's arrival to custody. For the young person who said they had not had an initial meeting, an unofficial review had taken place which had been held by residential staff without the case worker or YOT case manager. This was due to the case supervisor being on sick leave and the case not being picked up by another member of the team.

- 4.15 According to interviews with case supervisors and case files, targets had been set for the majority of young people during their initial meeting. Although most (87%, n=53) of the young people interviewed said that targets had been discussed in their training planning meetings only 59% (n=36) knew what they actually were. Some young men said they could not remember their targets and others reported that no targets had been set. Statements from these young people included:

*'I don't have any particular targets. We have another meeting next month, so I might get some then.'*

*'They set some targets but I can't remember what they were. The first meeting I had, I was clueless. It was alongside my final review, as they told me they are doing it all in one.'*

*'I can't remember what they are – I missed the last DTO review [training planning meeting] as it was cancelled.'*

- 4.16 Only half (54%, n=33) of the young people said that they had had a say in the targets that were set for them – similar to our survey, where 58% felt they had been involved in the development of their plan – and 56% (n=34) said that they tried to achieve their targets. Examples of comments were:

*'I can say if I'm not happy and they would adjust them/take it into consideration.'*

*'The case supervisor and YOT set them, then we sat and discussed them together. If I didn't have a say in them I wouldn't try to achieve them.'*

*'Some you have a say in but most of them the YOT case manager just picks for you.'*

*'I had no choice. I was told in the meeting and not given a chance to say anything.'*

- 4.17 Of note, 81% of those who felt they had had a say in their targets said they tried to achieve them, compared with only 37% of those who said they had not had a say. Young people were also asked if they had received any help to meet their targets and, if so, from whom. Of the 36 young people who knew what their targets were, just over half (58%) said that they had been given enough help to achieve them. Young people listed wing staff, case supervisors, education staff, personal officers, social workers and YOT case managers as helping them to achieve their targets. Comments included:

*'Education staff here are always pushing to see if you're ready to go on to the next level or do a test. They're quite good here.'*

*'Certain things are hard to improve on and meet your targets but in a way they help you – the officers on the wing.'*

- 4.18 Statements from the half who felt they had not been given support included:

*'I had a warning from the education teacher over something silly. She gave me work to do that I had already done the week before – she told me to do it again anyway.'*

*'They tell you what you need to do, then it's up to you.'*

*'It takes two days to get to see your case supervisor so you don't see them that often. I ask quite a bit to see them but I don't see them that often.'*

- 4.19 Targets should be SMART, yet analysis of case files and the interviews with young people found that targets were often broad, vague and non-specific and did not provide clear direction for the young person. For example, several of the broad targets were along the lines of:

- maintain family contact
- attend education or work towards individual learning plan
- good behaviour on the wing to get or stay on Gold (the top level of the rewards and sanctions scheme).

- 4.20 These generic targets provided little direction for the young person in terms of the steps needed to achieve them. Although case supervisors said that targets were reviewed at meetings, where targets were broad it was often unclear as to how progress was being assessed with targets usually noted as 'ongoing' rather than being updated and changed. However at two establishments more specific ETE targets were set, based on the young person's individual learning plan. Targets were broken down into achievable goals, for example, *'attend the tiling and plastering course full-time and complete the following units...'* These were then updated when the young person completed each module and a new target was set.

- 4.21 Case supervisors told us that resettlement plans were usually considered from an early stage in a young person's sentence. Targets, however, often focused on the young person's time in custody rather than plans for release and were aimed at the young person, despite the likelihood that the YOT case manager and social worker, where applicable, would have action points to ensure arrangements were in place for the young person on release. Resettlement

issues were not always a focus for training plan meetings until the young person was nearing release. For example, case supervisors said:

*'Early meetings are more concerned with behaviour and how to settle the boy in.'*

*'I've spoken to him about resettlement but have only really focused on it in the last few weeks.'*

- 4.22 However, there were examples where attempts had clearly been made to link a young person's resettlement needs to their targets for their time in custody.

### **Case study 1**

One young person (aged 16) was serving a four month DTO, which included a two month period in custody. He had a range of identified resettlement needs: prior to custody he had been living in bed and breakfast accommodation after relationships had broken down with his parents; he was diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD); he had a history of drug and alcohol abuse; and he had been excluded from education on 12 separate occasions. Targets in his training plan were based on these needs and what could realistically be achieved during his short sentence. Targets included applying for and attending the establishment gym course, applying for an army preparation course to start on release and attempting to maintain links with family, with help from staff as required and a family liaison worker working with the young person and his family. It was not clear if there were specific targets for substance misuse but the case supervisor explained that this would be one of the aims during his short sentence and that a member of staff from Young Person Substance Misuse Services was attending training planning meetings. In addition, a referral had been made to try to arrange suitable accommodation for him on release.

### **Case study 2**

One young person (aged 16) was serving a six month DTO and had spent one month in custody at the time of interview. He was not due to be released early as his behaviour had been too poor while in custody. He had applied for independent living but as he was serving a short sentence it was agreed at his first training planning meeting that he would return to his mother's house until an independent living placement could be arranged. He and his mother were happy with this arrangement and one of his targets was to apply for ROTL for a family day to try to improve relations with his mother as they had broken down in the past. He had previously been expelled from education and so had targets to achieve Level 3 in English and maths so that he could apply for a college course he wanted to do.

- 4.23 HMIP and YJB national standards<sup>36</sup> set out that a pre-release meeting (their final review) should take place at least 10 days prior to the young person's release from custody. This should be held with the young person and all relevant third parties, to ensure that the post release needs of a young person are catered for and to agree a clear post-release plan. In our sample there were 24 young people who had less than 10 days before their release. Of these, only six had had their final review meeting. One young person, who was waiting to find out where he would be living, had been due to have his review seven days prior to his release but this had been cancelled at short notice. At the time of fieldwork the case supervisor was unsure when this meeting would take place.

- 4.24 Although these meetings are to discuss plans for release, case supervisors said plans were not always finalised by the time of the reviews and YOT case managers would attend still not having confirmed accommodation or ETE placements.

### **Post-release involvement**

---

- 4.25 Our training plan thematic<sup>37</sup> reported that the attendance of establishment staff at young people's first reviews in the community after release were usually prioritised according to risk, although at some establishments staff needed to attend more first reviews. Half of the fieldwork site establishments reported that case supervisors did not provide any post-release support for young people, and at two of these that case supervisors used to attend post-release training planning reviews in the community but no longer did so. At one establishment we were told case supervisors attended post-release training planning meetings where it was felt there was a need or it would have the most impact.

### **Example of good practice**

#### **Heron unit, HMYOI Feltham**

Each young person was allocated a resettlement broker and personal officer and a needs-led resettlement plan was developed. Resettlement brokers and personal officers ensured that reintegration arrangements were assured prior to release and brokers offered intensive support to young people for at least six months after they had returned to the community. Some personal officers also remained in contact with young people during the community phase of their sentence.

## **Involvement in training planning**

---

### **Our expectations:**

**The training plan should be the product of collaboration between all those involved in ensuring the young person's wellbeing in custody and plans for their release. Review meetings should include the young person, their parents or carers, where appropriate, all relevant internal staff (for example, case supervisors, education staff and personal officers) and external staff (such as YOT case managers, and, where applicable, social workers). There should be open communication between all those involved, including the young person.**

### **Our findings:**

Young people and case supervisors in our sample had attended all training planning meetings. Case supervisor's knowledge of young people in their caseload varied. Attendance by YOT case managers at training planning meetings was good and, overall, establishments reported positive working relationships with YOTs. Less than two-thirds of young men said they knew how to contact their YOT case manager. Specialist YOT workers and IRS workers had attended meetings for some of the young men in our case sample.

Attendance at meetings by family/carers was estimated to be around 40–50%. Attendance of social workers, where applicable, was poor and some looked after children reported no contact with them since entering custody. Within several establishments, input from education and personal officers was

inadequate. Other specialists who had attended meetings for some of our case sample included resettlement brokers and Connexions.

- 4.26 Young people in our case sample had attended each of their training planning meetings. The attendance and involvement of other relevant internal and external staff was more varied. Apart from our sample of cases, we were not able to ascertain the overall attendance at training planning meetings of relevant people as the majority of establishments did not collect this information. The only figure consistently collected was attendance by external YOT case managers.

### **Case supervisors**

---

- 4.27 All fieldwork sites had teams of dedicated case supervisors or offender supervisors whose task was to oversee individual young people's training and resettlement plans. They were the main link with external YOTs and other external providers and were responsible for arranging training planning reviews and coordinating the setting and delivery of young people's targets. There were significant inconsistencies in how case supervisors were managed and supervised internally, particularly in teams which consisted partly of seconded YOT staff and partly of prison service staff. These groups were often managed separately by their own organisations, making consistent and agreed good practice difficult to achieve. These issues may help to explain the variance in practice we observed across establishments and case supervisors.

- 4.28 Case supervisors attended all training planning meetings, but outside of these meetings engagement with young people varied by establishment and supervisor. Several supervisors had very good knowledge of the young people and their resettlement needs and saw them regularly. In some cases young people saw case supervisors on a daily basis, but this was only when they were vulnerable or had a behavioural problem or where case supervisors saw young people around the prison. For example, case supervisors said:

*'I see him during training planning review meetings. I also see him around the prison and if he had issues I would meet with him but he is well behaved.'*

*'I have seen him every other day as he has struggled in custody and been bullied.'*

- 4.29 There were some worrying examples where case supervisors knew little about the young person and had had minimal contact with them. At one establishment this was said to be due to staff shortages. This was particularly true where case supervisors had changed throughout a young person's sentence. At one establishment case supervisors had less contact with the young people on that unit; resettlement brokers had effectively taken over the role of liaison between the young person and the YOTs. Although case supervisors were less engaged, young people were receiving a good service from their resettlement broker.

- 4.30 Working practices vary across the 157 YOTs and by establishment. Despite this, all heads of resettlement reported that they had developed good links with YOTs, usually through their casework teams working closely with YOT case managers on individual cases. However there were no joint protocols specifically addressing how different establishments and their group of core YOTs could work most effectively together.

- 4.31 Overall case supervisors were generally positive about YOTs and felt that, in many cases, effective working relationships had been established due to regular communication and a good rapport with the individual YOT case managers. Relationships were enhanced by information sharing, a commitment by YOTs to ensure that a representative attended all training planning meetings and a shared goal of working to meet the needs of the young person. However, case supervisors did describe a number of problems they experienced with YOTs. Sometimes they found it difficult to get a representative from the YOT to attend training planning review meetings, particularly interim meetings, with delays often caused by YOT case managers being on annual leave/sick leave. Paperwork was often not completed until the last moment, meaning that case supervisors spent time chasing YOT case managers and young people were left unaware of what would happen in terms of their accommodation and ETE on release. One case supervisor said that difficulties sometimes arose as all YOT areas had their own ways of working, and case supervisors dealing with several different YOTs had to constantly adapt.

### **YOT staff**

---

- 4.32 All establishments accepted that they must make it as easy as possible for external YOT case managers to access young people, and we came across a number of good examples of casework teams assisting YOT case managers by facilitating telephone calls and meetings, over and above the mandatory reviews. Importantly some establishments had allowed YOT case managers to have establishment keys after the appropriate training, which gave them better access to young people. There was some evidence of planned approaches to keeping YOTs informed of the services provided by the establishments: for example staff from one establishment had visited all of their core YOTs and had regular dialogue with them. However, we spoke to some external YOT case managers who said that they were not clear about what services establishments were delivering to young people and that they sometimes had difficulty finding out what individual young people were doing, particularly with regard to their educational achievements and how they were coping and behaving on the residential units.

### **Example of good practice**

#### **Heron unit, HMYOI Feltham**

The London Criminal Justice Partnership coordinated and managed a quarterly multi-agency 'Champions' meeting that included representatives from the London YOTs, the resettlement brokers, Heron unit, the London Development Unit and the Youth Justice Board. The meeting reviewed lessons learned and endeavoured to ensure that all agencies were fulfilling their responsibilities to the young people on the unit.

- 4.33 Recorded attendance by YOT case managers at training planning meetings was good across the fieldwork sites and heads of resettlement and casework managers also said that the involvement of YOTs in training planning was effective. All establishments had arrangements to ensure that initial training planning meetings were set up with the young person's YOT case manager. Of our case sample, 92% (n=55) reported that YOT case managers had attended at least one training planning meeting (see Table 2). There was one positive example of a YOT case manager joining a meeting via video link as they were unable to physically attend.

However, there was also a worrying example where a young person who had been in his establishment for two months said:

*'I've not had any DTO reviews [training planning meetings], not seen my YOT. My YOT case manager left before I came in – they were supposed to replace them but I've not heard anything.'*

- 4.34 Outside of training planning meetings, the level of engagement between case supervisors and YOT case managers throughout a young person's time in custody varied, from daily contact between some to no contact between others. Case supervisors said that they would generally contact YOT case managers if there had been an incident or problem with the young person between meetings, but that they would mostly contact YOT case managers to keep up to date with plans for release, including accommodation and ETE plans. Although case supervisors said that plans were often not confirmed until near to the end of the sentence, they were generally positive about YOT case managers' contribution in review meetings and felt that resettlement plans were discussed openly and realistically with the young person. In our survey 87% of young men reported that their YOT case manager had been in touch since they had arrived at their current establishment, and 62% said they knew how to get in touch with their YOT case manager if they wanted to.
- 4.35 There were also examples of specialist YOT workers (such as those specialising in accommodation, education or careers; see Table 2) attending training planning meetings. IRS workers had attended at least one meeting for 10 young people (17%) in our sample. However, it was not always clear from the paperwork if a specialist YOT worker had attended as they were sometimes just noted as 'YOT'. Interviews with heads of learning and skills said that education staff did not always have links with the specialist YOT education workers and, where there were links, these were because the case supervisors, Connexions personal advisors or resettlement brokers had established them.

### **Family or carers**

---

- 4.36 Many young people return to live with their families or carers on release, and even if they do not, families/carers can often play a key role in supporting young people in custody and on release, where appropriate. However it was not clear whether families and carers always received invitations to initial training planning meetings. The majority of establishments told us they left it to the YOT case manager to invite families/carers to initial meetings and often this relied on the case manager's more detailed knowledge of the young person and their circumstances. However, attendance by families/carers at initial meetings was inconsistent, even though this was when targets should have been agreed and plans for release first discussed. Where families/carers did not attend the initial meeting, case supervisors said they often took on the responsibility for inviting them to subsequent meetings. For our sample, families/carers were generally invited to these meetings, although case supervisors and young people said they could not always attend due to the distance involved or the timing of the meeting. Although figures on the attendance of families/carers were not collected, case supervisors across the establishments reported that overall attendance by families/carers at review meetings was only 40–50%. In our case sample, family/carers had attended at least one training planning meeting for 52% (n=31) of young people, but a family support worker or a family liaison officer, whose role it was to support and develop family relationships, had only attended four young people's meetings (7%).

- 4.37 The social worker of looked after children should be invited to all training planning meetings and encouraged to attend. Where a child will be returning to local authority care, the social worker will lead on arranging resettlement plans and therefore needs to be involved throughout a young person's time in custody. However, we found that responsible home local authorities were only occasionally represented at initial training planning meetings and attendance at later meetings was inconsistent, with social workers rarely attending every time. This was detrimental to the planning for the care and resettlement of looked after children. Case supervisors reported that they invited social workers to all meetings but that often they did not attend. Some of the looked after children in our sample said that they had not seen their social worker at all while in custody.
- 4.38 Outside of training planning meetings, young people can receive visits, letters and should have daily access to telephones to make calls, although having enough phone credit to do so can be a problem. In our survey, two-thirds (68%) of young men said they could use the telephone every day. Only two-fifths (38%) said they usually had at least one visit from family or friends a week. Less than half (46%) of young men said it was easy for people to visit them.

### **Education/training staff**

---

- 4.39 Learning and skills activities undertaken by young people in custody should be allocated according to their individual needs and linked to ETE plans for their release. However at most establishments, case supervisors reported little contact with education staff, and they were only consistently attending training planning meetings at one establishment.

### **Example of good practice**

#### **HMYOI Parc**

There was a learning coach role within the education team who provided help to ensure that young people with poor literacy received targeted support. They also attended initial training planning meetings and ensured that information regarding a young person's learning was shared between the education department and case supervisors.

- 4.40 Where education staff did not attend training planning meetings, written contributions were sometimes submitted, but case supervisors reported that this was rare. This meant that a young person's individual learning plan (ILP), set by education, often did not feed into the training planning process and case supervisors did not always know what activities the young person was doing, how they were progressing and what, if any, certificates or qualifications they had achieved. Many case supervisors said they relied either on P-Nomis<sup>38</sup> records, if they were up to date, or the young person. One case supervisor said:

*'Education had cuts in staff so only attend about 15% of meetings. We rely on entries on P-Nomis to see what young people have done in education, any qualifications etc, and it is a bit hit and miss as to how up to date they are. Often when it's discussed with the young person they list others they have done.'*

- 4.41 There was some discrepancy between what case supervisors and case files suggested and what was reported by the heads of learning and skills. Several heads acknowledged that



education staff were not attending all training planning meetings, and in fact were only required to do so by one establishment. One head of learning and skills reported that information and guidance (IAG) workers were attending every initial training planning meeting but the IAG worker had only attended the initial meeting for three young people in our sample. We were told by case supervisors that this was due to staff shortages (having recently been reduced from five IAG workers to one due to the loss of YJB funding). One establishment mentioned that a special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) attended some meetings; another reported that a new SENCO was due to start who would be responsible for improving education input to training planning.

### Other staff

- 4.42 Residential staff are responsible for the day to day care of young people and, in particular, the allocated personal officer should have a detailed knowledge of the young person. Therefore personal officers should be able to comment on how the young person is faring in custody and be involved in training planning meetings so that they can support them to achieve their training plan targets and to prepare for release. Three establishments showed good attendance from personal officers at meetings but at the others, attendance or even written input was rare. Overall personal officers had attended at least one training planning meeting for 40% (n=24) of young people in our sample.
- 4.43 As shown in Table 2, other internal or external staff or agencies who had attended training planning meetings for those in our case sample included substance misuse workers, nurses, advocacy services and the police, where the young person was subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPP). At one establishment all young people had an allocated resettlement broker who would also provide them with support in the community on release: for the majority of young men in our case sample their resettlement broker had attended at least one training planning meeting.

**Table 2: The number of young men who had had at least one training planning meeting attended by the following professionals**

Specialist worker/professional	Number of young people <sup>39</sup>
Case supervisor	60 (100%)
YOT case manager	55 (92%)
Parent/family member	31 (52%)
Personal officer	24 (40%)
YOT specialist worker (careers, resettlement, education, manager, intensive supervision and surveillance programme (ISSP))	15 (25%)
Substance misuse worker (internal or external)	14 (23%)
Social worker	11 (18%)
IRS worker	10 (17%)
Education worker	9 (15%)
Nurse	5 (8%)
Connexions	5 (8%)
Family liaison/support worker	4 (7%)
IAG worker	3 (5%)

Police	2 (3%)
Advocacy	2 (3%)

## 5. Accommodation

### **Our expectations:**

**Accommodation needs should be assessed when a young person first arrives into custody and work to resolve accommodation issues initiated from the start and routinely discussed. This should involve collaboration between the establishment, the young person, their parents or carers (where appropriate), the YOT, social worker, where applicable, and any other relevant external agencies. Work to enhance the sustainability of arrangements, such as support to restore and/or build family relationships, or money management courses, should take place in custody as required with sufficient support arranged for release.**

### **Our findings:**

Accommodation was considered from the start but, where there were difficulties, work to address them was sometimes held off until closer to release. Three-fifths of young men in our sample said they would be living with family on release and were optimistic about these arrangements. In our opinion, in some instances this did not appear suitable for the young person. Other than encouraging contact, work to build or maintain family relationships was underdeveloped.

Seventeen of the 24 young men who would not be living with family on release did not know where they would be living at the time of interview, including 13 of the 18 looked after children in our sample and five young men due to be released in the following 10 days. For the other seven, the arrangements reported included local authority accommodation, bed and breakfast lodgings and hostel accommodation. Case supervisors relied on YOTs or, where applicable, social workers to make arrangements and were frustrated that plans were often not confirmed until the last minute. Case supervisors reported a range of barriers to ensuring suitable accommodation and two young men said they had not got early release as they did not have a suitable address.

Involvement of outside agencies and provision of financial advice to young people was limited.

- 5.1 All heads of resettlement commented on the importance of talking to young people about accommodation as early in their sentence as possible. As well as ensuring that young people had somewhere suitable to live, they felt having an actual address to which the young person was returning was vital to making other resettlement plans, such as arranging a place at school or college. From our survey of young men, 13% reported that they had housing problems when they first arrived into custody, although this ranged from 4% at Parc to 30% at the Heron unit. Interviews with case supervisors found that accommodation issues were being discussed at most initial training planning meetings. If a young person was known to be returning to family, it would be verified by the YOT and the family, then discussed and viewed as settled. In contrast, for those who needed accommodation arranged, this was not always covered at the initial meeting, with discussions held off until later in the young person's sentence. Most (84%, n=51) young people in our case sample said that their accommodation on release had been discussed with them during at least one training planning meeting.
- 5.2 ASSET, the assessment tool used by YOTs, includes a section on accommodation and should describe where the young person was living before they came into custody – although this does depend on how recently the ASSET has been written or updated (see Section 4).

Information from ASSET for our case sample revealed that, prior to custody, the young men's living arrangements were as follows:

**Table 3: Where the young men in our case sample were living prior to custody**

Type of accommodation	Number of young people
Living with family	36 (59%)
Care home	6 (10%)
Living with foster carers	3 (5%)
Semi-independent living	2 (3%)
Living with friends	2 (3%)
Hostel accommodation	1 (2%)
Supported housing	1 (2%)
Bed and breakfast lodging	1 (2%)
Unclear	9 (15%)

- 5.3 It was not clear where nine of the young people (15%) had been living prior to custody; some described 'sofa hopping' between family and friends' houses.
- 5.4 In terms of accommodation on release, children and young people from our case sample fell into two distinct categories:
- those who would be living with family members
  - those without an address to return to who would have to report to the local authority on release as homeless, unless accommodation was arranged for them.
- 5.5 These categories are discussed separately below. By interviewing young people and their case supervisors we were able to cross reference what they told us, and some inconsistencies were identified. Case supervisors reported that accommodation had not been arranged for 19 young people in the sample at the time of interview, ranging from two to four at each establishment. However, three of these young people told us that accommodation was arranged. In these cases either the young person reported that they were returning home but the case supervisor reported that the family or YOT had decided they were not happy with this arrangement, or the young person thought that they were going into local authority accommodation but the case supervisor said this had not been confirmed and there was still a possibility that they might have to report as homeless on release.

## Young people living with family

---

- 5.6 Of the 61 young people interviewed, 37 (61%) reported that they would be living with a family member such as parents, siblings, or grandparents on release. This included one looked after child (who had been living with family prior to custody) and three young men who had not been living with family prior to custody. For the latter, family members had either been encouraged to accommodate the young person due to the difficulties of providing alternative accommodation or family members had volunteered to accommodate them in the hope of preventing further offending. For example, one young person said:

*'It's been suggested in meetings that I go to live with my aunty – she has suggested it. I've spoken to her a couple of times on the phone and she is coming to my final review next week.'*

- 5.7 All except one young person said that they had had a choice about returning to live with family and the majority (95%, n=35) felt that this arrangement would work. Comments from young people demonstrated that several felt that family support would help them to stop offending or to keep to licence conditions, for example:

*'I could go and live by myself but I want the support of my family to stop me reoffending.'*

*'I trust myself to keep my curfew arrangements if I live with my mum. I wouldn't if I was on my own.'*

*'They asked me if I was going back to live with my mum. They gave me the option of living in my own flat but I think I would breach my tag again.'*

- 5.8 All young people thought they would be able to stay indefinitely with family members or at least until they had a job and could afford to get a place of their own.

- 5.9 In most cases it was known from a young person's arrival into custody that they would be returning to live with family. Once confirmed with the YOT as suitable and agreed by the family, accommodation arrangements were viewed as settled. Although the young people in our sample said they were optimistic about arrangements, it was clear in some cases that family members would struggle to provide them with a suitable, stable and safe environment to live without support. The reasons for this included:

- living in households which appeared to lack the capacity to support them
- living with family members who had offended/been in custody themselves
- problematic relationships with family members, often due to the young person's offending behaviour.

- 5.10 It was our assessment that, in some instances, living with family members would not be in the young person's best interests, but that this was either being overlooked or an alternative arrangement was not possible due to the difficulties in obtaining local authority accommodation.

### **Case study 3**

One young person (aged 17) had been living with his sister (who was herself 17 years old at the time he was living with her) and her two children prior to entering custody. At the time his sister had relied entirely on benefits and had received no extra financial help to look after her brother. The accommodation had not been stable: his sister had often locked him out of the house and he had occasionally stayed at another house where he had regularly smoked cannabis. The accommodation plans for him on release were to return to live with his sister, although this was dependent on local authority agreement as it would mean him living in close proximity to his victim. His sister had been unable to attend any of the training planning meetings but had confirmed she was happy with the arrangement. One of the young person's targets was to maintain contact with his sister but the training planning meetings were the only arrangement that had been made to try to continue this contact. It was

unclear what support, including financial, was in place to address the suitability and stability of this arrangement.

#### **Case study 4**

One young person (aged 16) had been living with his father and four brothers prior to custody. His father and three of his brothers had been in custody previously and one of them was currently in the establishment with him. His mother had left the family a few years before and ceased contact with all except the youngest brother. This circumstance was thought to have triggered his offending behaviour. The young person was returning to live with his father, which was his preference. His father had maintained contact – he had been to visit and had attended training planning meetings. The address the young person would be returning to was not yet confirmed as his father was in the process of being evicted from his current address. Again it was unclear if anything was being done to make this a suitable and stable place for the young person to live.

#### **Case study 5**

One young person (aged 16) was returning to live with his mother and cousin. However, his mother lived in a two bedroom house and this meant that he would have to share a room with his female cousin. There were also financial and location issues: his mother was in rent arrears and he had gang problems in the area to which he was returning. Although his mother was beginning to sort out her financial difficulties, the case supervisor had explained to the young person that they might have to involve social services at his next review regarding his accommodation on release.

- 5.11 While the young person is in custody it is important that work is undertaken with them and their family members to ensure that accommodation plans do not fall through, and to address any potential issues required to improve the likelihood of their successful resettlement. There was evidence at all establishments of young people being encouraged to maintain contact with and/or improve relationships with their family and this was often a target in training plans. Of the 37 young people returning to live with family, 21 had family members who had attended at least one training planning meeting so that they were involved with the planning for the young person's time in custody and release.
- 5.12 Some YOTs and establishments had family intervention or liaison officers who provided support to families. This included working to address difficult relationships, often caused by the young person's behaviour and offending, or to build relationships where a young person was moving in with a family member with whom they had not previously lived. In our sample, family liaison or support workers had attended training planning meetings for only four of the young people. Case supervisors were, on occasion, also trying themselves to rebuild links between young people and their families. For example, some case supervisors explained that where relationships between a young person and his family were strained, they would encourage regular contact between them. They would also contact the family regularly to keep them involved in the young person's care and/or to encourage family members to attend training planning meetings. However, in several cases the quality of work to maintain or enhance family relationships while young people were in custody could have been improved.

### **Case study 6**

In one young person's ASSET the family household was described as chaotic: his parents struggled with his behaviour and had previously threatened to throw him out as a result of it. The young person, aged 17, was returning to live with his parents. Although they disapproved of his offending they had remained supportive and had agreed to have him back to the family home on his release. His training planning targets included maintaining contact with his family, and he and his family were also attending a course designed to improve their relationship with each other.

### **Case study 7**

One young person (aged 18) was unable to return to his parent's house: his offence had been against his father and therefore, although his mother had maintained contact with him and attended his training planning meetings, they did not want him to return to live with them. He was therefore without accommodation. The young person wanted to live on his own but his YOT case manager and case supervisor felt he needed more support on release. They worked together with a family liaison officer to arrange for him to live with his grandparents and the YOT case manager had assessed this accommodation as suitable. An IRS worker was assigned to provide the young person with independent living skills in the month following his release so that if he still wanted to live on his own he would be better prepared for it. The young person did not achieve early release as accommodation was not arranged: in the interim he turned 18 so the case had passed from the YOT to probation.

- 5.13 Returning to live with family members also meant that, in several cases, young people were going back to an area that was known to have contributed to their offending. This needs to be considered and addressed in release planning. Thirty-two young people returning to live with family members said that they felt the area they would be living in was safe, but five young people did not. Where safety was a concern, this was due to problems the young people said they had with people or gangs; one young person also explained that there were a lot of drugs in the neighbourhood which he was concerned about.

### **Case study 8**

One young person (aged 16) needed to be relocated because of concerns for his safety, linked to gang issues. His family were being relocated with him and his YOT case manager and the YOT housing officer were leading on arrangements. They had a good relationship with the young person's mother and were assisting her with the situation but were struggling to arrange his family's relocation in time for the young person's early release. The YOT had also arranged 48-hour emergency accommodation for the young person in case they were not able to relocate his family in time. However, the case supervisor did not think the young person would be granted early release if he had to go to the emergency accommodation as it would not be a stable address.

## Young people not living with family members

---

- 5.14 Twenty-four (39%) of the young people interviewed said they were not returning to live with family members. This included three who had been living with their family prior to custody but were unable to return there, and 17 of the 18 looked after children.
- 5.15 Seventeen young people said they did not yet know where they would be living. This included 13 of the 18 looked after children in our sample. Although most of the 17 young people had some time before their release (ranging up to 60 days), two were due to be released within a week and an additional three within the next 10 days. Only one of these young men had had their final review meeting, which HMIP expects to take place at least 10 days prior to release. The review meeting should confirm a young person's release plan but for this young person his accommodation had not been finalised in time. The notes for the meeting stated '*X potentially has no accommodation for release, Action by YOT... there is a possibility of X having to present at the Homeless Persons Unit on day of release*'. One looked after child had been due to have his final review, with his YOT case manager and social worker attending, seven days prior to his release, which was supposed to include an explanation about where he would be living. This meeting had been cancelled at short notice and, at the time of interview, his case supervisor was unsure of the rescheduled date.
- 5.16 Young people who had no accommodation arranged spoke about the realistic possibility that they may have to report as homeless on the day of their release. Examples of comments included:

*'Don't know [where I'll be living]. I've had four different YOT case managers in two years and no one has sorted out accommodation after the last one quit. I will be taken to a homeless centre (hostel) on the day I leave.'* [Due to be released in four days.]

*'Not sure yet, I've told my YOT case manager where I want to live. I was meant to have my final review yesterday but the YOT and my social worker did not turn up.'* [Due to be released in seven days.]

*'I don't know [where I'll be living], and I don't know how I'm getting there.'*

- 5.17 All young men interviewed were asked whether they felt the accommodation and the area in which they would be living would be safe. Unsurprisingly, those who did not know where they would be living on release felt unable to comment and were often concerned about where they would be living.
- 5.18 Ten of the 17 young men felt that their views on where they would be living had been taken into account while others said they had had little choice:

*'I've spoken to my resettlement broker about it, I told them I want to move out of area as I have too many problems there.'*

*'I do have a say but really it's where my social worker puts me.'*



*'Someone else may have taken my place in X [area wants to live in], so she [social worker] said I may have to live out of the county, but I want to stay in X. I don't feel like I have a choice; I get put where there is a space.'*

- 5.19 Five said they were going into local authority-provided accommodation such as semi-independent living. Young people said this had been arranged by YOT case managers, social workers (for the three looked after children who had local authority accommodation arranged), or resettlement brokers. Three of these five young people said they had been given a say in the accommodation. Four felt that it was suitable and that they would feel safe in the area to which they were returning; this was linked to it being close to family or where they would be attending education. For example, one of these young people said:

*'I am very happy with the accommodation that has been provided – it's just round the corner from my Mum's.'*

### **Case study 9**

One looked after child, aged 17, described how he had lived in around 15 different care homes in the previous four years, being removed from each due to his poor behaviour. He had expressed a wish to live by himself and notes in his records described how he had been anxious about his accommodation throughout his stay at the establishment. As a looked after child the local authority was responsible for arranging his accommodation and referred him to The Leaving Care Company, which provides community and outreach services for vulnerable children and young people. The young person had had a one to one meeting with a personal advisor and a placement officer from The Leaving Care Company and a place was arranged. The young person was happy with this placement as it was in an area in which he felt safe and was close to his mother and college. He would receive support and a weekly allowance from his social worker, with whom he had had regular contact while he had been in custody.

- 5.20 One looked after child told us he was going into hostel accommodation. He explained that it would be a *'semi-independent hostel so there will be workers there and a 24 hour reception.'*
- 5.21 Another young person said he had been told that he would be accommodated in a bed and breakfast until more permanent supported accommodation could be arranged, although he had not been given the actual address. However, his case supervisor reported that there was nothing officially arranged for him as he had *'burnt bridges'* at his previous accommodation and also with his parents. He had 35 days until release and his case supervisor reported that the YOT case manager was working to arrange supported housing for his release. A family liaison worker was also trying to encourage contact between the young person and his family.
- 5.22 These two young men said they did not know whether they would feel safe where they would be living as they did not know much about the accommodation.
- 5.23 Where young people did not have an address to go to most case supervisors tended to rely on YOTs or, for looked after children, social workers to arrange accommodation and had little involvement other than checking that work was being done and keeping the young person updated. This was reflected in the training plans of those young people not returning to live with family; very few targets regarding accommodation were found in the files of the young people in our sample. One case supervisor explained:

*'I can't help with accommodation so it has not formed part of the young person's training plan.'*

- 5.24 Case supervisors said it was important to have YOT representatives and, where applicable, social workers at training planning meetings and several said they would wait until these meetings to find out the latest situation. In many cases accommodation arrangements were not confirmed until the final review, and sometimes not even by then, although case supervisors reported finding this frustrating. For example, one case supervisor of a looked after child said:

*'The social worker was tasked with finding accommodation in the initial meeting. I presume [the social worker] has done this as it's close to his release. It will be discussed at his final meeting on Thursday – it is the social worker's responsibility.'*

- 5.25 This therefore meant that young people were often very close to their release date before finding out where they would be living. Other case supervisors were more engaged in the process, contacting YOT case managers or social workers frequently to obtain information about how plans were progressing. One looked after child said:

*'There has been a lot of discussion about finding me accommodation as I am a looked after child and I know that my social worker has to find me something.'*

- 5.26 Assistance from outside agencies was limited and dependent on the links establishments had established. Fourteen young people reported that they had received assistance from outside agencies, such as Barnado's, Connexions and Voice, to assist with accommodation needs, although their views varied about how helpful the agencies had been:

*'Connexions were good – explained about money and flats and stuff. Barnardo's were not as useful as they did not explain enough – they were talking about living in a hostel.'*

*'I spoke to them about accommodation. They wrote some stuff down... nothing happened.'*

- 5.27 Despite the age of our case sample, only two young men who would not be living with family said they had attended a course to help them prepare for living independently.

## Barriers to arranging suitable accommodation

---

- 5.28 Across establishments case supervisors described a range of barriers they experienced when trying to arrange suitable accommodation. One of these concerned ensuring that arrangements were in place for a young person's early release. Several case supervisors felt that YOTs and social workers did not understand this process and often left accommodation arrangements until the last moment, not realising that this would have an impact on whether the young person was granted early release. One looked after child told us:

*'One minute they are telling me I'm getting my own house, the next I'm going to my Mum's, next back in to care. This is the only thing stopping me getting early release.'*

- 5.29 No establishments kept figures on whether young people missed their early release because suitable accommodation had not been found, although anecdotally heads of resettlement and case supervisors said that this happened on rare occasions. Two young people in our sample reported that they had not got early release for this reason; the case supervisor for another young person confirmed that his early release application was going to be refused as no suitable address could be provided.
- 5.30 Case supervisors also said that there was limited local authority accommodation available, and described particular problems in findings places for young people released from custody. This included:
- insufficient availability and a lack of support from specialist YOT housing officers
  - local authorities not taking responsibility for arranging accommodation for looked after children until their actual release
  - young people turning 18 while in custody who transferred from YOT support to probation services, who were often unable to visit young people in custody and to give time and resources to finding accommodation for them
  - young people having previously exhausted all supported accommodation options, so facing limited alternatives in their local area
  - accommodation options being limited due to the nature of a young person's offence and their time in custody (those who had been sentenced for arson or sex offences were noted as being particularly hard to place)
  - young people's behaviour, including disruptive behaviour and self-harming, which made them difficult to place
  - young people changing their minds and plans being altered to take into account their views.

### **Good practice: HMYOI Werrington**

Some case supervisors had been assigned as 'leads' in different resettlement areas, such as accommodation, enabling them to focus on establishing specialist knowledge in their particular area. The case supervisor with a lead for accommodation had set up arrangements with a number of supported housing schemes, to which he was able to refer young people from the establishment. When other case supervisors were having difficulties arranging accommodation for young people in their caseload, they were able to ask his advice or use the links he had established.

## **Financial assistance**

---

- 5.31 HMIP expects young people to be given advice and support on how to manage their money. This is an important life skill for all young people, particularly for those who will be required to pay rent or to support themselves on release. In our survey, 39% of young men said they would need help with finances on release, a quarter (24%) said they would need help to claim benefits and nearly a fifth (16%) to open a bank account. In our case sample, 15 young people thought that they would be expected to pay rent and this included some who would be expected to or wanted to give their parents or other family members money towards their keep. Although several young people hoped to be able to pay by working, those who wanted to do full-time education or who did not have a job arranged immediately for their release would be, at least initially, reliant on family members, benefits or grants to support them. Young people

we spoke to were often unclear about what financial support they were entitled to or how to arrange this prior to release, although some looked after children said that social services would provide them with financial support. No young people said they had attended a money management course. Only 12 (20%) in our sample said they had been offered financial advice or assistance in custody, which included being told about bank accounts and the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) scheme, which closed in January 2011 and will be replaced by a bursary scheme. Comments included:

*'They told me about EMA and Jobseekers Allowance, but it's difficult for me to arrange all that.'*

*'Money is my main concern – not sure what I'm entitled to. I will raise it at my DTO review [training planning meeting] but that is only four days before release.'*

*'I don't know my entitlements. I've not got any money from social services since I've been here.'*

*'I got a form from an officer for a community grant – I saw my friend with one and asked about it.'*

*'I've been trying to get in touch with Connexions here to sort out a release grant but have been told I have to wait until I'm released before I can get in touch with them.'*

*'My YOT case manager has told me about EMA and clothing grants that I can claim and told me how to do it.'*

## 6. Education, training and employment (ETE)

### **Our expectations:**

Each young person should be allocated to education or training in custody according to their individual needs and preferences and linked to plans on release. They should be supported to make good progress in education, learning and skills and have access to careers advice to prepare them for their future in the community. Young people should be able to continue their education or training programme on release.

### **Our findings:**

Information arriving with young men was not always detailed enough and some establishments were routinely reassessing young people. In our case sample half had a clear ETE need often linked to poor attendance or a lack of formal qualifications, and nine had special educational needs identified.

Establishments generally provided satisfactory ETE provision and young people's preferences were taken into account when possible. Most young men in our sample were attending education or training and three-quarters said they had achieved or were working towards a qualification. However, education links to training plans were often poor.

Many young people felt that having something to do was vital to stop them reoffending on release. However, only 14 of the 48 young men who said they wanted to continue with education on release said, at the time of interview, that they had something arranged. Many young men said they wanted to work, including alongside education, but little was done to help them with this. At some establishments not all young men were seen by career advice services. ETE plans were viewed as the YOT's responsibility and case supervisors reported several barriers to ensuring young people had a placement to go to on release.

### Initial assessments

---

- 6.1 ASSET, the assessment tool used by YOTs, includes a section on education and employment that should detail a young person's educational and/or employment history prior to custody, including any needs they may have in this area. Heads of learning and skills said that the quality of information they received, if any, varied depending on the particular YOT area, previous establishment or outside organisation, which matched what case supervisors reported. Some felt that the quality and therefore usefulness of ASSET was improving but that it was still essentially a summary rather than a full picture. Information did not always arrive at the same time as the young person, was not always up to date and, for education, the details did not always list the courses a young person had attended or what, if any, qualifications they had achieved.
- 6.2 Two heads of learning and skills reported that their establishment routinely contacted young people's previous schools or colleges to request information about educational achievements; one said that the schools were cooperative, the other reported a mixed reaction – some were willing to cooperate, particularly local schools, whereas other schools or colleges were difficult

to engage with. Other establishments reported that they very rarely contacted schools or colleges.

- 6.3 Due to insufficient information, and/or doubts about the accuracy of information received, some establishments routinely reassessed young people to determine their educational capabilities. One case supervisor commented:

*'Basic skills need to be reassessed, although the information is in the ASSET, we would redo it to ensure the correct level when young people are allocated to education.'*

- 6.4 Establishments carried out literacy and numeracy assessments, as well as interview-based assessments, and full diagnostic tests were conducted. At one establishment young people were also screened for speech and language difficulties through a one to one interview with a specialist.
- 6.5 Information about what the young people in our case sample had been doing prior to custody was variable – for some there was a clear record but for others there was not. When case supervisors were asked about whether any resettlement needs were highlighted from documentation received or from early assessments, they tended to focus on the problems to do with accommodation. However, from case supervisors or files, there were clear indications in 33 (54%) cases that the young person would have ETE difficulties on release. The most common problems identified for these young people were their lack of regular attendance in formal education and their lack of formal qualifications. Some young people had previously gained formal qualifications at college or school, for example, GCSEs or vocational qualifications, but very few were attending formal education at the time they entered custody. Many had been excluded from school at an early age and/or had struggled to engage with education opportunities provided. Nine (15%) young people were identified in the ASSET as having special educational needs, although only two were known to have special educational needs statements.
- 6.6 It was difficult to assess the exact number of young people in the sample who had been excluded from formal education as the quality of information in their files was so variable. From the survey across the young people's estate, 46% of young men reported that they were aged 14 or under when they were last at school, 86% said they had been excluded from school and 74% had truanted from school at some point. This highlights the level of need in the area of ETE and the importance of support in custody, and its continuation on release, in helping young people to successfully resettle.

## Meeting ETE needs while in custody

---

- 6.7 Based on feedback from heads of learning and skills and findings from previous inspections conducted with Ofsted, establishments provided generally satisfactory education and vocational training courses. Some establishments offered GCSE and A-level courses and others were providing outreach support for numeracy and literacy to enable young people to take part in vocational workshops. There was a wide range of vocational courses available across the estate including industrial cleaning, motor vehicle mechanics, brickwork, painting and decorating and carpentry. From our survey, most young men were involved in some form

of activity but only two thirds or less felt that the activity they had been involved in would be helpful on release (see Table 4).

**Table 4: Young people survey results – activities**

Do you currently take part in any of the following?	
Education	73%
A job in this establishment	36%
Vocational or skills training	20%
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison, do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?	
Education	65%
A job in this establishment	60%
Vocational or skills training	57%

- 6.8 Case supervisors generally knew what ETE the young person was taking part in, either from speaking to the young person or referring to computer records. However, links between case supervisors and education staff were poor at most fieldwork sites. Education staff rarely fed into training planning meetings, and this explained why education-related training plan targets were often generic, such as ‘attend education’ rather than referring to specific courses or modules (see Section 4). Case supervisors often did not know how young people were progressing in education or what certificates/accreditations the young person had achieved.
- 6.9 Most young people in our case sample said they were taking part in some form of education or training: 54 (89%) said they were/had been involved in education and 22 (36%) said they were/had been involved in training at their establishment. All 10 15-year-olds in our sample, i.e. those below the school leaving age, reported that they were taking part in some form of education. Often they were involved in a number of different classes or activities, ranging from English and maths to cooking and life skills classes. Some were involved in vocational training such as painting and tiling workshops, motor mechanics and catering.
- 6.10 It was evident that young people’s preferences and plans for education or training on release were taken into account when assigning them to classes while in custody. For example, case supervisors said:

*‘He had nearly finished his OCN Sports level 1 when he came here, and he was able to continue and complete this here.’*

*‘He has completed a painting and decorating course. This fits in with his desire to be a builder and is the course he said he wanted to do when he first came into the establishment.’*

*‘His IRS worker spoke with him about doing a football coaching course, she’s trying to set it up and his YOT will talk with him about it at his next review. He’s been on the Charlton football programme here.’*

- 6.11 However, this was not always possible due to waiting lists for courses, a particular issue for those serving a short sentence, or the establishment not offering the relevant courses. Case supervisors said:

*'I didn't refer him to Connexions because they would not have had time to see him. He is currently on the motor mechanics course as he prefers hands-on work. He wants to do sports and fitness and applied for the course here, but I think the waiting list was quite long.'*

*'He wanted to do Business Studies, but we don't offer it. He is not working towards qualifications as we have nothing at or above GCSE level.'*

- 6.12 Young people also described these difficulties and some mentioned the need for more vocational courses or places:

*'I've got my GCSEs already. The only courses that would've helped me are driving theory and cookery but they didn't put me on those.'*

*'They need a different variety of classes, more that are hands on.'*

- 6.13 There were also examples of young people whose behaviour at education had affected what classes or training they could attend. Young people's comments included:

*'I do the BICS [British Institute of Cleaning Science] course. I don't go to education because I always get into fights; it's too crowded and loud.'*

*'I go to the gym in the afternoons three times a week; I did key skills for a month before I got kicked out.'*

*'I was on the mess but got into trouble so was doing painting and decorating but got annoyed and smashed up. Now I'm a cleaner.'*

- 6.14 In some cases, where a young person was unable to attend classes, one to one tuition was arranged on the wing for them, although this was rare.

- 6.15 How much young people valued the activities they were involved in was often connected to how useful they thought they would be on release. Young people also mentioned support from teachers which had really helped them, and gave examples of where the education they had undertaken in custody had inspired them and fed into their plans for release. Comments from young people included:

*'I have learned IT skills from nothing and am now able to do web design. I have a course on web design to go to when I leave. The cleaning course may help me and the cooking will be useful for myself.'*

*'They are helping me as I wasn't very good at reading and it's improved since I've been here.'*

*'I was kicked out of school year 9, but here I've had a lot of support.'*

*'I want to study business [on release...I am] doing business in education now.'*

*'... art and cooking... will help on release as getting a GCSE for art and got a qualification in cooking. Also gym to keep fit.'*



*'IT. I have a really good teacher and I have learned a lot and enjoy it. I hope to work in web design.'*

*'Health and safety is useful to get a job; education is useful in general. I'm dyslexic so could not read or write, but education has helped me with this. I've enjoyed cooking, art, all of education.'*

6.16 Other activities several young people said they enjoyed were the gym as they could *'work out and lose lots of anger'* and cooking.

6.17 Comments from young people who did not feel they had benefited from education in the establishment were often related to the quality of the lessons or workshops. Some young people described classes as being noisy or disrupted and said they struggled to learn anything. Others said they did not feel challenged and reported being bored in class:

*'Teachers do not get the boys to pay attention to their work and so we don't learn anything.'*

*'Its goal, nothing is really exciting or challenging. It's difficult to concentrate when the classrooms are out of control and distracting.'*

*'I think the workshops [are helpful] but education I don't think would help anyone due to the stuff they teach you and you're in class with people who don't take education seriously.'*

6.18 Forty-seven (77%) young people reported that they had achieved or were working towards a certificate, qualification or accreditation in custody at the time of being interviewed. These included GCSEs, levels 1–4 in various subjects, health and safety certificates, NVQs such as catering or cleaning (BICS), diplomas such as horticulture or IT and Duke of Edinburgh Awards. Of the 47, 29 (62%) felt that the certificates, qualifications or accreditations they had achieved would help them get a job or college placement on release. For example, one young person said:

*'I was a gym orderly, I taught people how to use the equipment properly. I gained an AQA, NOCN and did a fitness instruction course.'*

6.19 According to heads of learning and skills nearly all young people were leaving custody with at least one accreditation, which they felt were useful and relevant and linked to realistic employment opportunities.

## Careers advice/pre-release courses

---

6.20 Careers advice services, Connexions, Prospects or Careers Wales were available at all fieldwork sites. Staffing levels varied, with one head of learning and skills reporting they had two full-time Connexions advisors, while another only had one for 3.5 days a week. One establishment had an information and guidance (IAG) worker and eight learning support assistants who had been trained to Level 2 IAG status. Three heads of resettlement reported that they delivered careers advice during a young person's induction period via, for example,

one on one interviews or booklets. Some case supervisors knew that a young person had seen someone for careers advice but the records did not generally show when.

- 6.21 While in their establishment, 38 (62%) young people said that they had received some form of careers advice or guidance about ETE on release. This ranged from four to 10 young people at each establishment. They reported that this advice came from Connexions, IRS workers, YOT case managers, prison staff, resettlement brokers or local businesses (either when they were invited to visit the establishment to talk to young people about work opportunities, or when a young person had been out on ROTL to a local business for work experience). Advice covered help with CV and application writing, information about the best companies to apply to for particular jobs and information about types of careers which young people might not have considered. Feelings about the advice were generally positive: the majority of young people felt that it was very or somewhat useful, but four said they had not found the advice at all helpful. Where they had found the advice useful, young people said that it had helped them to decide on something they were interested in, or they had been assisted with applications for college placements; those who were less positive about the guidance often already knew what they wanted to do or had not found it relevant. Twenty-three young people said that they had received no careers advice in their establishment or from outside agencies.
- 6.22 At some establishments employers would visit to provide advice and talk to young people about how they could use the skills they had acquired. Two heads of learning and skills reported that they offered pre-release courses, focusing on subjects such as money management, personal and social development, and CV or personal statement development.

### Example of good practice

#### HMYOI Werrington

HMYOI Werrington held an annual resettlement fair attended by a significant number of housing, training and employment advisors and providers and local YOTS. The events were attended by the vast majority of the young people in the establishment, who were able to make links with appropriate services.

## Plans on release

---

- 6.23 When asked what would help them to stop offending, 62% of young men in our survey said having a job, although 48% thought that they would have problems getting one; 43% said having something to do that was not crime; and 33% said going to school/college, although 24% thought that they would have problems getting a place. Sixty per cent reported that they were planning to return to school or college and 22% said they had a job to go to. A few young people interviewed in our case sample also highlighted the importance of having something productive to do on release, for example:

*'I've got the option of doing key skills – don't know what that is but I would rather wait until next year to start a college course. I know though that if I don't do something I will come back to jail but I want to do something worthwhile.'*

- 6.24 Forty-three young people (70%) reported that plans for ETE on release had been discussed at review meetings and 37 of these (86%) said they had had a say in the plans being discussed. For example, one young person said:

*'We discussed my college placement... I agreed that I wanted to do the bricklaying course.'*

- 6.25 Examples of comments from the 18 young people who said plans had not been discussed included:

*'No, they said we will talk about it at my final meeting.'*

*'I made plans to go to college before I got here but I've not spoken about it in here.'*

- 6.26 Forty-eight young people (79%) said they were planning to go back into education or training once they left custody, but of these only 19 (40%) said that they had been able to study something in custody directly related to what they wanted to study on release. The education or training young people said they were hoping to undertake included courses in, for example, plastering, bricklaying, carpentry, engineering, mechanics, web design, maths, English, business studies, art and music production. Many of these courses were related to the career that the young person was hoping to follow. Half of all young people interviewed (52%, n=32) felt that the activities they had taken part in while in custody would help them once they were released.

- 6.27 At the time of being interviewed only 14 (29%) of the 48 young people who said they planned to return to education reported that they had a college or school place confirmed for them on release. Worryingly, case supervisors reported that actually only nine young people had a confirmed education or training course to attend on release and in only four cases did both the case supervisor and the young person report that there was a place organised. Sixteen of the young people who reported that they had not got a place were due to be released in less than two weeks.

- 6.28 Forty-two young people (69%) said that they would like to get a job once they left custody, including young men who wanted to work part-time alongside education to help support themselves or to fill their time. However, young people and case supervisors reported that little, if anything, was done to help young people arrange employment, with establishments focusing on education or vocational training. Only nine young people (15%) said they had a job arranged on release, and this had been arranged through family for seven of them. Only two of the respective case supervisors, however, were aware of the job to which the young person had referred and only one had been confirmed by the case supervisor.

- 6.29 Overall, case supervisors said there were ETE arrangements in place for 10 young people. Where ETE was not yet arranged, case supervisors explained that this was due to a number of different reasons.

- YOT, Connexions, IRS or resettlement brokers had an idea of what 26 of the young people wanted to do and were hoping to arrange courses for them.
- Five young people had had their arrangements for ETE affected by not having accommodation. Without an address or home area plans could not be made.

- Five young people were due to report to their YOT or IRS worker on release who would then try to arrange a placement. This meant that they had no ETE arranged for when they were released.
- Eleven young people had no plans in place and case supervisors were not sure what they would do on release.
- It was not clear from the case files if any plans were in place for four young people, and case supervisors were not available to interview. One young person said that he hoped to return to education and that his YOT case manager was working to set up a place; another said he already had a place confirmed at college; and one wanted to get a job rather than return to education.

6.30 Case supervisors reported that YOT case managers generally led on making ETE arrangements. As with accommodation, some case supervisors sought regular updates on the progress being made in ETE arrangements, while others said that they would wait until the young person's final review in order to find out what arrangements were in place.

6.31 Heads of learning and skills and case supervisors were both asked whether they felt there were any barriers to meeting the ETE needs of young people in custody and on release. Across establishments they cited barriers such as:

- a lack of employment, vocational training and apprenticeship opportunities both within establishments and in the community
- difficulties establishing and maintaining links with external employers
- uncertainty surrounding the IAG service due to the loss of funding – one establishment relied on these workers to contact colleges and to arrange placements, and felt that they would not be able to maintain this work without them
- difficulties in recruiting and retaining education staff
- insufficient time for young people on short sentences to gain any accreditation or to plan adequately for placements on release
- often having to wait until accommodation was sorted out (which could be very close to release) before being able to make ETE plans
- gaps between when young people were released and the start date of courses they wanted to attend
- difficulties in getting young people out on ROTL (see Section 7) in time to attend course or work interviews.

6.32 Even when arrangements were in place they did not always start immediately on release and, in several cases, it was likely that young people would be attending courses offered by YOTs to fill the gap before their preferred course began.

*'I leave prison on Friday and start my course on the Monday. My YOT case manager arranged a place for me.'*

*'I have to wait 2/3 weeks as the course starts in August. The course will be for five days a week, but I'm not sure how long it will last for. I also wanted to do plumbing, but that was not available and I'm happy to do bricks.'*

6.33 On release, most establishments reported that they provided young people with the certificates they had gained while in custody. One establishment also gave young people their individual learning plans, and another created a work diary for young people who took part in ROTL work

experience placements which listed the work they had done, and the skills demonstrated and gained.



## 7. Release on temporary licence (ROTL)

### **Our expectations:**

The use of ROTL should be included in the resettlement strategy and viewed as a key part of reintegration planning. ROTL should be considered for a variety of purposes including accommodation interviews, training and employment, education, and family contact and there should be a range of good quality training placements and employment opportunities available. All young people eligible to apply should be informed of their eligibility and helped to apply. ROTL decisions should be made based on a risk assessment and adequate reasons provided if it is refused. ROTL should be used to good effect in individual training plans, in collaboration with YOTs.

### **Our findings:**

All establishments had a ROTL policy and at most ROTL had been given greater priority. ROTL was used for a variety of opportunities but it needed to be better used to enable young people to attend accommodation and/or school or college interviews to help them to arrange plans for their release.

Practices to inform young people of their eligibility and support to apply for ROTL varied, and there was variation across establishments in how it was used. In our case sample a third of young people said they had been offered ROTL and eight had been granted it. These young men were positive about their experiences.

ROTL was often seen as a behaviour management tool rather than a core part of resettlement planning and was often not clearly linked to training plans. The YOT case managers interviewed did not know much about ROTL.

- 7.1 ROTL enables young people to participate in formal work-based activities and structured visits, outside of the prison. All ROTL applications by young people must be approved by the governor of the establishment, with decisions based on a risk assessment. This process can play a key part in helping a young person to successfully resettle into the community when it is linked to arranging or improving their release plans, particularly in terms of accommodation arrangements, ETE opportunities, and maintaining or developing family relationships.
- 7.2 All fieldwork sites had a ROTL policy, but the majority of these merely duplicated prison service rules and described the process of how a young person could apply for ROTL and how the establishment would decide whether it was appropriate. Staff in establishments which were clearly committed to developing ROTL as a core part of their resettlement strategy reviewed and rewrote their policies to give them more of a local focus. Despite the lack of establishment-specific policies and protocols the managers we spoke to were keen to offer successful ROTL opportunities and were enthusiastic about developing more potentially useful placements. At the majority of establishments ROTL had been prioritised by governors and specific resources had been dedicated for community projects that would enhance young people's development opportunities. However heads of resettlement were concerned that these resource-intensive activities could be wound up if, as they feared, resources were cut.

## ROTL opportunities

---

- 7.3 The greatest number of ROTL placements on offer involved community or restorative justice projects where young people were able to undertake unpaid work in the local community. All but one of the establishments had arranged these placements with local organisations, which included practical work to help local elderly people, support for disabled people to access the countryside, clearing litter and graffiti, and working to improve a number of local conservation areas. Projects were often planned in partnership with other organisations and agencies. For example, we were told of projects working with the local police, fire services and city parish councils, as well as other local community organisations, to help to organise demanding physical work for the benefit of communities and individuals.
- 7.4 Establishments used community or restorative justice projects as an opportunity for young people to show that they were motivated to use ROTL productively. It was also considered important to reassure the public that young people released on temporary licence had made a contribution to local communities, prior to them using ROTL for other purposes.
- 7.5 All but one of the establishments also had a number of good quality work placement opportunities. These included catering at local hotels, working in charity shops, car valeting, working at a riding school, working in garden nurseries, or helping with conservation projects. Young people on many of these placements were able to treat it as a normal working day by making their own way to and from the establishment on public transport.
- 7.6 Some establishments were exploring ways to use ROTL to achieve clear targets which could have a positive impact on young people's lives. One had developed a series of progression routes in areas such as 'sports leisure and fitness', 'landscaping or grounds men', and 'catering and hospitality'. Having identified an area of interest young people would begin relevant training and learning within the establishment, progress to using the skill internally and then, when eligible for ROTL, move to a community-based work placement. For example, young people who showed an interest in sports and leisure would initially take part in regular gym sessions, with the view to participating and gaining a formal qualification in a 12-week full-time gym course run by the PE department. Those who successfully completed the course would, after interview, gain further experience in a small gym in the offices of a local international networking company. The company helped young people to complete a CV and gave them work references. Those who wanted to continue with the experience could then move to another work placement at one of three local health clubs which were willing to offer the young men regular work placements while they were in custody.
- 7.7 Projects such as these also created personal development opportunities that enabled young people to learn to work alongside each other and staff, and to behave appropriately in public places. Significantly, many staff who worked on such projects spoke of the benefits of being able to work alongside young people and to speak informally about personal matters, which they said was difficult to do when working on the residential units.
- 7.8 In addition to offering young people the valuable chance to be involved in community or restorative projects or work placements, ROTL was used to help make or maintain arrangements for them on release. This included young people spending a day outside the establishment with their family or carers. This enabled young people to maintain or rebuild relationships, where appropriate, particularly as many would be returning to live with family



members or carers, and even if they did not, family or carers could offer valuable support while the young person was in custody and on release. ROTL was also used to enable young people to visit potential accommodation, or to attend interviews or open days to help put in place accommodation, education, training or employment plans on release.

## Young people's experience of ROTL

---

- 7.9 Although, in some cases, arrangements were very recent, all managers could explain how they made sure young people were aware of what ROTL was and the types of opportunities it offered. All said that there was an expectation that case supervisors would tell young people about ROTL opportunities, and some establishments also displayed information about the opportunities on information boards on residential units. However, not all establishments had systems in place to ensure that young people knew when they had reached their ROTL eligibility date. At one establishment we observed that ROTL eligibility dates were included on the unit information boards for all young people to access.
- 7.10 Apart from at one fieldwork site, it was difficult to ascertain whether all young people had equal access to ROTL opportunities. In our case sample 40 young people (66%) said someone had explained and discussed ROTL with them; this was either on induction, at a training planning meeting, with an officer on the wing or with their case supervisor. Some knew about it from other sources, for example, other young people, posters or leaflets. There was no establishment where every young person interviewed knew what ROTL was. Case supervisors were also asked how and when young people were informed about ROTL. Reported practices varied; some said young people were told about it during induction, some discussed it at the initial training planning meeting, and others said ROTL was discussed once the young person was eligible. Some case supervisors explained that they would often not talk about ROTL if they thought the young person would not be granted it: for example, if their sentence was too short, their behaviour was poor or the establishment was not in the practice of granting ROTL. One establishment admitted that only young people who were considered suitable for ROTL were approached by staff to see if they were interested in a placement, rather than everyone being able to apply when there should be a transparent system of application, assessment and decision making available to all young people.
- 7.11 Eighteen young people (30%) said they had been offered the opportunity to apply for ROTL. Five said they had decided they did not want to apply and in some cases this was due to being near to their release date. Five young men had applied but had not received ROTL due to their behaviour in the prison, such as having dropped from gold to the silver level of the rewards and sanctions scheme. All five said they had been given the reason for the refusal. In total, eight (13%) had applied and been granted ROTL for a range of reasons, including:
- five to attend community service
  - three to gain work experience
  - one to attend a college interview
  - one for a family day
  - one to complete the Prince's Trust bronze award.
- 7.12 At one establishment, no one in our sample had been granted ROTL, and the highest number at one establishment was three (out of a possible 10). For those who had received ROTL, many said they had received it several times. For example, one young person reported

working outside the establishment five days a week for three weeks doing painting and gardening. Another had attended work experience at a local company for one or two days at a time over a number of weeks. Feelings about ROTL were generally positive: many of those who had been granted it said they had enjoyed the experience, although two of the eight young people did not feel that it would be specifically helpful in terms of their resettlement. Comments included:

*'The man I do it with has got loads of contacts and will be a good reference for me.'*  
(Local business placement)

*'I found it interesting but not useful.'* (Gardening placement)

*'Barnardo's was very helpful – I learnt to work on the tills and helped sort out clothing.'*  
(Work placement in Barnardo's shop)

- 7.13 Establishments did not all collect overall data on ROTL in the same way: some did not monitor the use of ROTL and of those that did, all bar one only monitored the number of ROTL movements rather than the number of young people involved. We were therefore unable to collect data that was accurate for a specific period of time or about the number of young people involved in ROTL across the six establishments. However, the figures we obtained indicated a huge disparity in the ROTL opportunities within the young people's estate. The greatest number of ROTL movements over a period of 12 months was 772 at an establishment with a population of over 300 young men and the lowest number was 20, despite the latter establishment having a population of about 150. At the one site able to provide an accurate figure of the number of placements and the number of young people involved, there had been 103 placements, involving 64 young people, which was a good level for the size of the population. Although the other establishments were not monitoring the number of young people obtaining ROTL, it was apparent from some figures that where some establishments had a good number of movements they involved only a small number of young people. This was due to some young people benefitting from good quality work placements which they attended on a regular basis over a long period.
- 7.14 A common theme that emerged was the use of ROTL as a behaviour management tool, rather than a core aspect of resettlement planning and reintegration. Consequently young people could have their ROTL stopped because of an incidence of poor behaviour within the establishment, even though there was no suggestion that it had increased the risk of them absconding or misbehaving on the project. One young person, who was on a community restoration project, told us that his ROTL had been stopped for arguing with a member of staff at the wing servery. Managers at the same establishment said that it was common for young people to be prevented from attending a project as late as the morning of the ROTL, because of a reasonably minor misdemeanour. Some young people reported that other young men would sometimes aggravate them in the hope that they would react and lose their ROTL.
- 7.15 Importantly, the ROTL progression routes in one establishment were closely linked with the young people's training plans, and it also used ROTL to build on the work undertaken by the resettlement brokers and personal officers. In other establishments links with training planning and ROTL were not as clear. In one we found an instance where the targets linked to the training plan and the decisions made by the ROTL board conflicted, resulting in confusion and upset for the young person. This could have been avoided if there had been a more coherent approach to the complex set of decisions.

- 7.16 The majority of establishments did not engage effectively with YOTs about the potential use of ROTL and only used them for making a contribution to risk assessments. YOT case managers we spoke to said that they were largely ignorant of ROTL and the ways it could be used for the benefit of young people. There was no evidence of YOTs proposing temporary release to help young people to secure accommodation, a college placement, employment or a family visit outside of the establishment. A possible consequence of this was that few young people were able to address their accommodation or education issues. Larger numbers were able to go out with their families or carers to improve relationships, but these were all instigated by prison staff.



## 8. Follow-up findings

### Our expectations:

**HM Inspectorate of Prisons expects all children and young people to have suitable, sustainable and safe accommodation arranged prior to their release. All young people should also leave custody with finalised arrangements for their education, work and/or training, which will begin on return to the community.**

### Our findings:

There was no evidence that establishments were working to a set definition of suitable and sustainable accommodation. In our case sample two young men, including one looked after child, had to report as homeless on release and three had gone into bed and breakfast accommodation. Case supervisors felt that a fifth of accommodation arrangements were not suitable or sustainable, including for two young men who were living with family. A month later six young people were back in custody and one was 'on the run'. Two young men were in bed and breakfast lodgings, including one who had been living there since release.

Only a third of young men had ETE arrangements in place for release and only half of these were still attending a month later. For the 28 without a placement arranged on release, four had been recalled to custody and only six had a placement arranged a month later. Case supervisors linked successful engagement with young people being motivated, engaged in something they wanted to do and with family support.

Only 13 of the 41 young men had suitable accommodation (as reported by case supervisors) and an ETE placement arranged on release.

- 8.1 Case supervisors were asked to complete two questionnaires on the young men in our sample: one on the day of the young person's release and one about a month later. This was to examine the accommodation and ETE to which these young men were released and whether arrangements lasted. Forty-one questionnaires were returned for the young people's day of release and 37 for a month later, although not all the information requested was provided in every response. In addition, we were told that three young people in our case sample were not released as they had been convicted of another offence.

### Accommodation

---

- 8.2 During fieldwork, establishments reported that it was extremely rare that a young person left custody without a known address and had to report to the local authority as homeless. Where this did happen, this was linked to young people not being viewed as homeless by local authority housing departments until their actual release, even though the young person's release date was known. Establishments said that on the rare occasions young people had to report as homeless their YOT case manager would go with them to the local authority and support them through the process.
- 8.3 All case supervisors realised the importance of providing suitable accommodation for young people on release and were frustrated by the barriers to ensuring it. However, no

establishments were monitoring the type of accommodation to which young people were released and whether it was suitable and sustainable. There was no evidence that establishments were working to a set definition of suitable and sustainable accommodation and some casework managers asked if such a definition had been published. The YJB has defined what is meant by 'suitable accommodation' (see Section 2) but there was no evidence in any of the records we scrutinised that discussions had taken place about whether the accommodation found for a young person could be described as suitable against this definition. Resettlement and casework managers reported that they were occasionally in disagreement with YOTs about the appropriateness of accommodation, but arrangements were difficult to change because of the lack of suitable accommodation in local areas.

- 8.4 Performance data collected from YOTs for 2009–10 showed that in England at the end of a community intervention or release from custody, 96% of young people had suitable accommodation in place.<sup>40</sup> In Wales 75% of young people had suitable accommodation prior to entering custody and 90% on release.
- 8.5 For our case sample, 39 (95%) of the 41 young men had an address to go to on release, of which case supervisors felt four-fifths (82%, n=32) were suitable and sustainable. Two young men did not have an address on release and had had to report to the local authority as homeless, one of whom was a 16-year-old Section 20 looked after child.
- 8.6 Twenty-six young men went to live with their family, including three looked after children (at the time of the fieldwork interview, two had not known where they would be living on release). For those going to live with family, case supervisors consistently reported that a suitable and sustainable address was somewhere where the family were 'supportive'. In two cases, the family accommodation was not considered suitable and sustainable by case supervisors.

### **Case study 10**

One young person, aged 16, explained that he would be returning to live with his mother once released. This house was described in the ASSET as being a five-bedroom house, though 13 people were living there. Though his parents were supportive and wanted him to return home, he often stayed out late at night and had not been in education since he was 13. At his first training planning meeting, the YOT manager had agreed to look into arranging a hostel place, though the case supervisor did not have any information about this at the time of our interview and reported that the young person was returning home. The young person's home was described as chaotic and overcrowded, and he would lack parental guidance and was likely to be undernourished. The young person did return to live at home on his release and he was still living there one month after release but was not involved in any ETE.

### **Case study 11**

One young person, aged 18, had previously been living with his parents but his offence was against his father so he was unable to return home. The case manager and probation worker (due to his age) had been working to try to arrange accommodation but had problems finding a placement due to the nature of the offence and the young person's refusal of help from an external agency. His grandparents stepped in and agreed to let the young person live with them, though initially the YOT had concerns about possible firearms at the address. The YOT and police assessed the address and allowed the young person to return there on release.

- 8.7 Three young people were released into bed and breakfast accommodation (one was a looked after child) and their case supervisors recognised that this was unsuitable. The case supervisor for the looked after child explained that his social worker had struggled to find accommodation as, in the past, the young man had committed arson and had challenging and disruptive behaviour.
- 8.8 Nine young people were released into accommodation provided by the local authority – case supervisors reported that for six (including five looked after children) this was supported housing, and for three (including two looked after children) no details about the nature of the accommodation were provided, although it had been arranged by the local authority. All case supervisors, including one who did not describe the type of accommodation the young person was released to, reported that it was suitable and sustainable.
- 8.9 The follow-up information provided by case supervisors showed that 30 of the 41 young people were released to the address they gave at the time we interviewed them. Eleven young people had either not known where they would be living on release or had different accommodation to that which they had reported at the time of the interview. Eight had not known their accommodation at the time of the interview: of these four were released into supported accommodation, two to family, one to a bed and breakfast and one had had to report as homeless. Two had thought that they were returning to live with family (their case supervisors had thought the same, although one explained that this might only be temporary), but on release one had gone into local authority accommodation and one to a bed and breakfast. One thought he was going to supported accommodation but had actually had to report as homeless on release (at the time of interview his case supervisor had thought this might be the case).

**Table 5: Type of accommodation to which young men were released and were in a month after release**

Type of accommodation on release	Number of young men	Type of accommodation a month after release
With family members	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 were still living with family</li> <li>• Three had been recalled to custody</li> <li>• One was 'on the run'.</li> <li>• Information was not provided for two</li> </ul>
Bed and breakfast	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One was still in bed and breakfast lodgings</li> <li>• One was living with his brother</li> <li>• Information was not provided for one</li> </ul>
Supported housing provided by local authority	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two had been recalled to custody</li> <li>• One had been arrested at the gate</li> <li>• One was in bed and breakfast lodgings</li> <li>• One was in a hostel after a series of moves due to gang</li> </ul>

		<p>issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One was living with his mother and had lived there since his day of release</li> </ul>
Provided by local authority but not clear on nature of it	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One was still residing there</li> <li>One was in a hostel following a series of unsuccessful moves</li> <li>Information was not provided for one</li> </ul>
Type of accommodation not described	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information was not provided</li> </ul>
No address	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information was not provided for either</li> </ul>

- 8.10 A month after their release, 23 young people were still living in the same accommodation to which they were released. Six young people were back in custody and one was 'on the run', and this included four who had been living with family and three looked after children who had been released to supported housing (one of these young people had been arrested at the gate). Disappointingly information was not received on where the two young people released without accommodation were living a month later.

## ETE

---

- 8.11 In the 41 questionnaires returned, case supervisors reported that 13 young people (32%) had a pre-arranged ETE placement for when they left custody. This comprised:
- one young person who was returning to school
  - four who were attending training (for example, in construction or web design)
  - one who would receive education in his supported housing
  - six who were starting courses at college or with another education provider
  - one who was starting an employment-style placement.

**Table 6: Type of ETE to which young men were released and were in a month after release**

Had ETE arranged on release?	Number of young men	Type of ETE a month after release
Yes	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Six were in the same ETE</li> <li>Three were back in custody</li> <li>Three had either never attended or had stopped attending</li> <li>Information was not provided for one</li> </ul>
No	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Six young people had an ETE placement and were attending</li> <li>One young man had an ETE placement finalised and was</li> </ul>



		<p>awaiting a start date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ten young men were still engaging with Connexions, YOTs and other services but had been unsuccessful so far in finding a placement</li> <li>• Four young people were not engaging with Connexions, YOTs and other services and were not attending a placement</li> <li>• Three young men were back in custody and one was 'on the run'</li> <li>• Information was not provided for three</li> </ul>
--	--	---

8.12 One month later, 12 young men were attending ETE. Six of the 13 young people released with ETE arranged were still in the same placement: four had studied something related to their course while in custody and had mentioned in their interview that it was something they would like to pursue. Where an ETE placement had been successful, case supervisors described a number of different factors that had contributed to the success:

- the young person was engaged, interested and enjoying the placement
- they were motivated to succeed
- they had family support.

8.13 Where an ETE placement was unsuccessful, case supervisors described a number of different factors that had contributed to the lack of success:

- lack of motivation from the young person
- lack of support from family
- unstable accommodation
- being released after colleges had already enrolled so being unable to find a suitable course.

## Overall

---

8.14 From the information provided by case supervisors only 13 of the 41 young men (32%) had both suitable accommodation and an ETE placement arranged on release. Therefore all the young men who had ETE arranged on release also had suitable accommodation in place. Six were still attending the same ETE a month later and all these young people were still living at the same address to which they had been released. One young man had had to move several times due to gang related issues, which meant that he had lost his ETE placement, although he was still engaging with Connexions. Three were back in custody: this included one young man who had been arrested at the gate and one who had been staying at his friend's house rather than his family home, to which he had been released.

### **Case study 12**

One looked after child, aged 16, had not known where he would be living at the time of our interview. He assumed it would be at a bed and breakfast but had been told that he would find out 10 days before release. Accommodation was noted in his training plan as an issue: he had been living with his sister prior to custody but had broken his curfew arrangements so would not be able to live there again. His mother and sister were attending his training planning meetings and he had been given free calls to his sister to maintain contact. He had been on a fixed-term exclusion from mainstream schooling and had an education statement for emotional and behavioural difficulties. He had been attending education in custody and had wanted to continue this on release. He also wanted to work with his uncle, who was a bricklayer, but there were no formal plans in place at the time of interview. The case supervisor reported that he had been released homeless and with no ETE arranged. Follow-up information on where he was living a month later was not provided.

### **Case study 13**

One young person, aged 17, had no accommodation or ETE plans at the time of interview. He said accommodation had been discussed at training planning meetings: his offence had been against his mother so he was unable to live with her but independent living was discussed and he was happy with that. The YOT case manager was the lead on arranging accommodation. The case supervisor noted that, as the young person was serving a short sentence (four month DTO), accommodation plans would not be finalised until his pre-release meeting. The young person was not sure what ETE he wanted to do on release but was thinking about scaffolding. He had had to report as homeless on release and had no ETE arranged. A month later the case supervisor reported that he was on a 'business in the community' course. Information on where he was living was not provided.

### **Case study 14**

One young person, aged 18, had been living with his mother prior to custody and, although it was originally thought he would return there, this was not possible as his offence had been against her. The young person wanted to live with his sister on release but this was unconfirmed at the time of interview – it was dependent on the local authority approving it as one of his victims lived in the area. This was confirmed at his pre-release meeting. While in custody he had been attending education and had passed Catering NVQ Level 1 and Food Safety Level 2, which had been set as targets in his training plan. Plans for his release were that he attend college to do Catering NVQ Level 2 and the YOT had arranged a college interview for him. He hoped to have a career in catering in the army. A month after release he was still living with his sister and attending the catering course.

### **Case study 15**

One young person had been living with a foster carer prior to custody but had since turned 18 so was unable to return there. He was entitled to leaving care services and his social worker had been visiting to talk to him about accommodation. There was no accommodation arranged at the time of the interview, but his social worker and YOT case manager were trying to arrange it. In custody he had received one to one support for ADHD and had been studying computer music for which he had achieved a Level 1 qualification. He wanted to continue studying music production on release but this

could not be arranged until his accommodation was confirmed. On release he had local authority accommodation arranged and an appointment with a Connexions worker to explore college courses. The YOT employment scheme was investigating paying a music provider to give him individual training with his computer music. A month later he was living in a hostel – his initial accommodation was noted to have not been permanent – and was attending a computer music course arranged by the YOT.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> [http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/D11/Directories/DG\\_10011904](http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/D11/Directories/DG_10011904)
- <sup>2</sup> <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/yjs/SentencesOrdersandAgreements/DTO/>
- <sup>3</sup> [www.howardleague.org/early-release/](http://www.howardleague.org/early-release/)
- <sup>4</sup> [www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/Monitoringperformance/Nationalstandards](http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/Monitoringperformance/Nationalstandards)
- <sup>5</sup> [www.yjb.gov.uk/NR/rdoonlyres/4A94744E-48CB-43C2-9E04-F19A808D2248/0/SecureMonthlyReportJanuary2011.xls](http://www.yjb.gov.uk/NR/rdoonlyres/4A94744E-48CB-43C2-9E04-F19A808D2248/0/SecureMonthlyReportJanuary2011.xls)
- <sup>6</sup> Prison Statistics Team, Justice Statistics Analytical Services, Ministry of Justice
- <sup>7</sup> A DTO can be four, six, eight, 10, 12, 18 or 24 months and includes a period spent in custody followed by a period of supervision in the community.
- <sup>8</sup> <http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/populationincustody.htm>. As young people will transfer to the young adult prison estate when they reach 18 these figures do not represent the total time spent in custody.
- <sup>9</sup> Ministry of Justice (2010) *Reoffending of Juveniles: Results from the 2008 cohort*, London: MoJ
- <sup>10</sup> Hales, J., Nevill, C., Pudney, S. and Tipping, S. (2009) *Longitudinal analysis of the Offending, Crime and Justice Survey 2003–06*, Home Office report 19
- <sup>11</sup> HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2009) *Expectations for children and young people in prison custody*, London: HMIP
- <sup>12</sup> Youth Justice Board (2006) *Youth Resettlement – A Framework for Action*
- <sup>13</sup> HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2010) *Training planning for children and young people*, London: HMIP
- <sup>14</sup> Youth Justice Board (2009), *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*
- <sup>15</sup> Youth Justice Board, Case Management Guidance, Section 7
- <sup>16</sup> Social Exclusion Unit (2002) *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners*
- <sup>17</sup> Youth Justice Board (2006) *Suitable, sustainable, supported: A strategy to ensure provision of accommodation for children and young people who offend*, page 11
- <sup>18</sup> Department for children, schools and families (2010) 'Provision of Accommodation for 16 and 17 year old young people who may be homeless and/or require accommodation'
- <sup>19</sup> Youth Justice Board (2007) *Accommodation needs and experiences*. YJB, London
- <sup>20</sup> Department for children, schools and families (2010) 'Sufficiency: Statutory guidance on securing sufficient accommodation for looked after children'
- <sup>21</sup> <http://www.cypnow.co.uk/bulletins/Youth-Justice/news/1011095/?DCMP=EMC-YouthJustice>
- <sup>22</sup> <http://www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingolderpeople/>
- <sup>23</sup> Audit Commission (2004) *Youth Justice 2004: A review of the reformed youth justice system*
- <sup>24</sup> Youth Justice Board (2006) *Youth Resettlement – A Framework for Action*, page 15
- <sup>25</sup> <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/about-us/news/youth-crime-action-plan>
- <sup>26</sup> <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/en-gb/practitioners/Reducingreoffending/Resettlement/>
- <sup>27</sup> Youth Justice Board (2010) *Evaluation of Resettlement and Aftercare Provision*
- <sup>28</sup> For all analysis missing data have been excluded. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
- <sup>29</sup> This was where case supervisors were unavailable to interview during our fieldwork visit due to leave or work commitments.
- <sup>30</sup> In some instances these surveys also form part of the evidence base for individual establishment inspections.
- <sup>31</sup> At the time of the analysis Stoke Heath held young people and young adults but in 2011 was re-roled to hold young adults only.
- <sup>32</sup> This included 13 separate survey samples, as specialist units within an establishment are sampled separately.
- <sup>33</sup> 14–19 Education and Skills White paper, 2005
- <sup>34</sup> HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2010) *Training planning for children and young people*, London: HMIP
- <sup>35</sup> Youth Justice Board (2009) *National standards for Youth Justice Services*
- <sup>36</sup> Youth Justice Board (2009) *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*
- <sup>37</sup> HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2010) *Training planning for children and young people*, London: HMIP
- <sup>38</sup> The prison service IT system holding personal details of all prisoners. It can also be known as C-Nomis.
- <sup>39</sup> These figures exclude the one young person who had not had an official training planning meeting.
- <sup>40</sup> Youth Justice Board (2011) *Youth Justice Annual Statistics 2009/10*, England and Wales, Youth Justice Board/Ministry of Justice Statistics Bulletin

# Appendix I

## Methodology

---

### Fieldwork

Fieldwork was conducted at the following six male young offender institutions (YOIs) holding those aged 15 to 18 years old between July and October 2010.

Establishments	Date of fieldwork
Parc	w/c 5 July 2010
Warren Hill	w/c 12 July 2010
Wetherby	w/c 9 August 2010
Werrington	w/c 6 September 2010
Cookham Wood	w/c 4 October 2010
Heron unit (Feltham)	w/c 18 October 2010

At each fieldwork site the following was conducted.

### Interviews with sentenced young men approaching release

These interviews (see Appendix V) looked at how involved sentenced young men had been in the arrangements for accommodation and ETE on their release, their knowledge of the plans in place for their release and their views on the arrangements.

In total 61 young men were interviewed. Of these:

- 18 were identified by the establishment as a looked after child (either Section 31, Section 20, or relevant or eligible children, see Appendix III for further detail)
- 18 were from a black or ethnic minority background
- seven were 15 years old, 21 were 16 years old, 25 were 17 years old and eight were 18 years old at the time of interview.

The average length of time that the young men reported that they had spent in their current establishment or unit was 4.2 months. This ranged from two weeks to two years.

Although we aimed to interview those being released within a month of our visit, at some establishments we had to extend this timeframe in order to interview at least 10 young men at each fieldwork site. The average number of days until the 61 young men were to be released was 18.5, ranging from one day to 73 days (see table below).

Number of days until release	Number of young men
1–7	15
8–14	14
15–30	23
More than 30 days	9

### **Casework information**

The case supervisor, the member of staff with oversight of the young person's training plan, was interviewed and/or the young person's case file analysed for each of the 61 young people in our sample (see Appendix VI). Where a case supervisor was responsible for more than one young person in our sample they were interviewed separately about each individual. In total, 32 case supervisors were interviewed about 54 young people in our sample. For seven of our sample we were only able to look at their case files. Interviews and case file analysis covered how the young person's resettlement needs had been identified; what work had taken place in custody to help address them; and the plans for release, including links with relevant external agencies.

Case supervisors were also asked to complete and return two questionnaires about the young men in our sample: one on the young person's day of release and one a month later. The former asked about the accommodation and ETE arranged for the young person on their day of release and the latter looked at what accommodation and ETE the young person was in a month after release. Forty-one questionnaires were completed and returned on the young person's day of release, a response rate of 67%; and 37 questionnaires were completed and returned a month after the young person's release, a response rate of 61%.

### **Interviews with heads of resettlement (and other relevant staff)**

These looked at the strategic management and provision for the accommodation and ETE pathways, as well as the use of release on temporary licence (ROTL) and links with youth offending services and other external agencies (see Appendix VII).

### **Interviews with heads of learning and skills (and other relevant staff)**

These asked how young people's educational needs were assessed and met during custody and on release (see Appendix VIII).

### **Children and young people survey data**

As part of a service level agreement with the Youth Justice Board, researchers from HM Inspectorate of Prisons survey a representative sample of young people at each young people's establishment on an annual basis. These surveys also form part of the evidence base for individual establishment inspections when this coincides with the inspection timetable. Findings from 770 sentenced young men surveyed at nine establishments between May 2010 and February 2011 were used for this report (see Appendix IV). This included 13 separate surveys as specialist units within establishments were sampled separately. The dates that these surveys were carried out are outlined in the table below. Details on each establishment are contained in Appendix II.

Establishment	Date of survey
Ashfield	4 May 2010
Wetherby	28 June 2010
Keppel unit (Wetherby)	28 June 2010
Anson unit (Wetherby)	28 June 2010
Parc	6 July 2010
Warren Hill	14 July 2010
Carlford unit (Warren Hill)	14 July 2010
Cookham Wood	28 September 2010
Feltham	18 October 2010
Heron unit (Feltham)	18 October 2010
Stoke Heath	23 November 2010
Hindley	24 January 2011
Werrington	7 February 2011

## Appendix II

### The young people's estate

---

#### Male establishments

---

##### **Anson unit – specialist unit**

Located within HMYOI Wetherby (see below), the Anson unit holds a population of long-term determinate and life-sentenced young people. The specialist unit manages these young people towards release or transition to other establishments to serve their sentence.

##### **Ashfield – dedicated site**

Ashfield, in Bristol, opened in November 1999 and changed from a split site to a dedicated site in 2004. It is privately run by Serco Ltd. It holds both sentenced and unsentenced young men.

##### **Carlford unit – specialist unit**

The Carlford unit is a specialist unit attached to HMYOI Warren Hill (see below) and holds long-term sentenced young people.

##### **Cookham Wood – dedicated site**

Cookham Wood, in Rochester, Kent, was built in the 1970s and was re-roled from a women's establishment to accommodate young men in July 2007.

##### **Feltham – split site**

Feltham, in Middlesex, serves mainly the London area. It opened in 1983 and began holding young people from 1988. It holds sentenced, but mainly unsentenced, young people and young adults and has the largest population of unsentenced young men.

##### **Heron unit – specialist unit**

The Heron unit is a 30-bed enhanced resettlement unit within HMYOI Feltham which opened in November 2009. Young people allocated to the unit are those from London who have been recommended by their YOT worker and who are considered motivated and willing to engage fully in planning and preparing for their resettlement. In addition to the resettlement support all young people should receive, those on the Heron unit each have a resettlement broker who will actively engage with key agencies in the young person's local community to plan and prepare for their release. The resettlement broker will also support them in the community on release.

##### **Hindley – dedicated site**

Hindley, near Wigan, opened in 1961. Previously a split site, it became a dedicated site for unsentenced and sentenced children and young people in April 2009 and is now the largest establishment in the country holding 15–18-year-olds. Hindley has a complex needs unit for young people requiring more intensive interventions.

##### **Keppel unit – specialist unit**

The Keppel unit at HMYOI Wetherby opened in 2008 and is a national resource for very vulnerable young people and those who find it difficult to engage in the regime in larger establishments.



**Parc – mixed site**

Parc is the only male establishment to hold young people, young adults and adults on the same site. The only private prison in Wales, it opened in 1997 and is run by Group 4 Securicor (G4S). The young people's unit holds sentenced and unsentenced young men.

**Stoke Heath – split site**

Stoke Heath, in Shropshire, opened in 1964 and became a YOI in 1988. It holds sentenced and unsentenced young people and young adults. It has since been announced that it will no longer hold young people.

**Warren Hill – dedicated site**

Warren Hill, in Suffolk, opened in 1982. It became an establishment exclusively for young people in October 2000 and holds sentenced and unsentenced young men.

**Werrington – dedicated site**

Werrington, near Stoke-on-Trent, opened in 1895 and has held young people since 1988. It is one of the oldest establishments for young people and holds sentenced young men.

**Wetherby – dedicated site**

Wetherby, in North Yorkshire, opened in 1958, but only began holding young people in 1983. In April 2000 it became a dedicated establishment for sentenced and unsentenced young people.

# Appendix III

## Definitions of a looked after child

---

The term 'looked after child' was introduced by the Children Act 1989<sup>1</sup> and refers to children who are subject to care orders and those who are accommodated by the local authority by voluntary agreement.

There are two main routes by which a child can become looked after.

- The first is when children are subject to a care order in which a court places a child compulsorily into the care of a designated local authority under section 31 of the 1989 Act. The court may only make a care order if it is satisfied that the child is suffering, or likely to suffer, significant harm attributable to the care given or likely to be given. Under a care order, the local authority assumes parental responsibility for the child and will provide him/her with accommodation and care. The local authority is responsible for the child's welfare while the care order is in place.<sup>2</sup> A child subject to a care order under section 31 of the 1989 Act remains a looked after child while in custody. There is no change to their legal status so the local authority continues to be responsible for their care as a 'corporate parent' and must fulfil statutory responsibilities to this end.<sup>3</sup>
- The second route refers to section 20 of the 1989 Act in which a child is provided with accommodation by the local authority on a voluntary basis as a result of parental, or if over 16, the young person's agreement. Although the local authority will undertake day to day care duties for the child, parental responsibility remains with the child's parents who can remove the child from care at any time.<sup>4</sup> The local authority must work with the child and their parents to make joint decisions about the child's care.<sup>5</sup> Children who are voluntarily accommodated under section 20 of the 1989 Act lose their looked after status when they are remanded into custody or are serving a custodial sentence<sup>6</sup> (unless they meet the criteria for 'relevant' children entitled to leaving care support; see section below). From April 2011 where a child ceases to be looked after as a result of entering custody, the local authority previously responsible for their care must appoint a representative to visit them to assess their needs. This assessment should include where they will live on release and whether they will need to become looked after again.<sup>7</sup> If the assessment deems that the child should become looked after again on their release, the local authority must be involved in their release plans.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Children Act 1989, hereafter referred to as the 1989 Act.

<sup>2</sup> House of Commons Children, Schools and Families Committee (2009), *Looked-after Children Third Report of Session 2008–09*. Volume 1, London: The Stationery Office.

<sup>3</sup> Department for Education and Skills (2004a), *Safeguarding and Promoting the Welfare of Children and Young People in Custody, LAC (2004)26*. London: DfES.

<sup>4</sup> House of Commons Children, Schools and Families Committee (2009), *Looked-after Children Third Report of Session 2008–09*. Volume 1, London: The Stationery Office.

<sup>5</sup> Great Britain (1989) *Children Act 1989: Elizabeth II*. London: The Stationery Office.

<sup>6</sup> Department for Education and Skills (2004) *Independent Reviewing Officers Guidance: Adoption and Children Act 2002*. London: DfES.

<sup>7</sup> Great Britain (2008), *Children and Young Persons Act 2008: Elizabeth II*. London: The Stationery Office.

## Eligible or relevant children

---

Looked after children, either subject to a care order or under voluntary agreement and aged 16 or 17, may be entitled to additional support from local authorities to prepare them for leaving care. This entitlement applies to 'eligible children', defined as those who have spent 13 weeks looked after since the age of 14 and who remain looked after at the age of 16, and to 'relevant children' who are those aged 16 or 17 who were looked after for 13 weeks since the age of 14 and who have ceased to be looked after since their sixteenth birthday. Some children will achieve this entitlement to support while in custody on turning 16.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Great Britain (2000), *Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000: Elizabeth II*. London: The Stationery Office.

## Appendix IV: Overall survey data for sentenced young men May 2010 to February 2011

Survey responses (missing data has been excluded for each question).

Number of completed questionnaires returned		770
<b>SECTION 1: ABOUT YOU</b>		
1.1	Are you 18 years of age?	18%
1.2	Are you a foreign national?	5%
1.3	Is English your first language?	92%
1.4	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other category)?	34%
1.5	Are you Muslim?	15%
1.6	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	7%
1.7	Do you have any children?	12%
1.8	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%
1.9	Have you ever been in local authority care?	29%
<b>SECTION 2: ABOUT YOUR SENTENCE</b>		
2.2	Is your sentence 12 months or less?	46%
2.4	Is this your first time in custody in a YOI, secure children's home or secure training centre?	52%
<b>SECTION 4: YOUR FIRST FEW DAYS HERE</b>		
When you first arrived, did staff ask if you needed help or support with any of the following:		
4.4c	Housing problems?	20%
4.4e	Letting family know where you were?	62%
4.4f	Money worries?	18%
4.4i	Getting phone numbers?	46%
4.5	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	76%
When you first arrived, did you have problems with any of the following:		
4.5c	Housing problems?	13%
4.5e	Letting family know where you were?	22%
4.5f	Money worries?	14%
4.5i	Getting phone numbers?	30%

Number of completed questionnaires returned		770
<b>SECTION 10: ACTIVITIES</b>		
<b>10.1</b>	Were you 14 or younger when you were last at school?	<b>46%</b>
<b>10.2a</b>	Have you ever been excluded from school?	<b>86%</b>
<b>10.2b</b>	Have you ever truanted from school?	<b>74%</b>
Do you currently take part in any of the following:		
<b>10.3a</b>	Education?	<b>73%</b>
<b>10.3b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>36%</b>
<b>10.3c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>20%</b>
<b>10.3d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>26%</b>
For those who have taken part in the following activities while in this prison: do you think that they will help you when you leave prison?		
<b>10.4a</b>	Education?	<b>65%</b>
<b>10.4b</b>	A job in this establishment?	<b>60%</b>
<b>10.4c</b>	Vocational or skills training?	<b>57%</b>
<b>10.4d</b>	Offending behaviour programmes?	<b>55%</b>
<b>SECTION 11: KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS</b>		
<b>11.1</b>	Are you able to use the telephone every day?	<b>68%</b>
<b>11.3</b>	Is it easy/very easy for your family and friends to visit you here?	<b>46%</b>
<b>11.4</b>	Do you usually have one or more visits per week from family and friends?	<b>38%</b>
<b>SECTION 12: PREPARATION FOR RELEASE</b>		
For those who have met their personal officer:		
<b>12.1</b>	Did you meet your personal officer within the first week?	<b>51%</b>
<b>12.2</b>	Do you see your personal officer at least once a week?	<b>63%</b>
<b>12.3</b>	Do you feel your personal officer has helped you?	<b>59%</b>
<b>12.4</b>	Do you have a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan?	<b>57%</b>

<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>770</b>
For those with a training plan, sentence plan or remand plan:		
<b>12.5a</b>	Were you involved in the development of your plan?	<b>58%</b>
<b>12.5b</b>	Do you understand the targets set in your plan?	<b>72%</b>
<b>12.6</b>	Has your YOT worker been in touch with you since your arrival here?	<b>87%</b>
<b>12.7</b>	Do you know how to get in touch with your YOT worker?	<b>62%</b>
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
<b>12.8</b>	Have you had a say in what will happen to you when you are released?	<b>50%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Are you going to school or college on release?	<b>60%</b>
<b>12.8</b>	Do you have a job to go to on release?	<b>22%</b>
Do you know who to contact for help with the following in preparation for your release:		
<b>12.9</b>	Finding accommodation?	<b>39%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Getting into school or college?	<b>47%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Getting a job?	<b>47%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Help with money/finances?	<b>36%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Help with claiming benefits?	<b>30%</b>
<b>12.9</b>	Opening a bank account?	<b>34%</b>
Do you think you will have a problem with the following, when you are released:		
<b>12.10</b>	Finding accommodation?	<b>26%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Getting into school or college?	<b>24%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Getting a job?	<b>48%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Help with money/finances?	<b>39%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Help with claiming benefits?	<b>24%</b>
<b>12.10</b>	Opening a bank account?	<b>16%</b>
<b>12.12</b>	Do you want to stop offending?	<b>92%</b>
<b>12.13</b>	Have you done anything or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	<b>47%</b>

# Appendix V

## Interview template for children and young people

---

### **Semi structured interview: young people**

This interview focuses on the issues around young people leaving custody with regard to their accommodation, education, training and employment needs. There are set questions to ensure we ask everybody the same things, and although we do not need to know about your offence, we would like to talk about what needs you may have when you leave custody. **This interview is voluntary and confidential**, which means we will not talk to staff about any of your answers. However if you tell us that you or anyone else in the prison has been or is being harmed we will have to pass the information on so that the right action is taken. Your responses will form part of an overall summary on the perspectives of young people in this establishment, and will help us to write a report on resettlement issues for young people.

Prison: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewee name: \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity: \_\_\_\_\_

Looked after child? Yes / No

### **SECTION 1. LEAVING CUSTODY**

A. How long have you been in this establishment? \_\_\_\_\_

B. How long do you have left in custody? \_\_\_\_\_

C. Do you know your exact release date? **Yes / No** Date: \_\_\_\_\_

D. Are you up for early release? **Yes / No / Don't know**

Comments:

**SECTION 2. EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT**

A. What education, training or work have you been involved in at this establishment? (*Including any compulsory academic courses such as English and maths*)

B. Do you think the activities on offer in this establishment will help you out in the community? (Education, training or work)

**Yes / No / Don't know**

C. Which activities have you found most useful and enjoyable? **Why?**

D. Have you achieved any certificates, accreditation or qualifications while in custody?

**Yes / No / Not yet, but working towards one**

Details (which establishment?):



If yes or due to:
E. Do you think this will help you to get a job or a college place when you leave?
<b>Yes / No / Don't know</b>

F. Do you plan to go back into education when you leave custody?

<b>Yes / No / Don't know</b>
Where?
If yes:
G. What are you planning to study and why?
H. Were you able to study this while in custody?
<b>Yes / No</b>
Comments:
I. Has a place been agreed for you so that you can start straight away?
<b>Yes / No</b>
Comments:
J. Is this something you wanted to study?
<b>Yes / No</b>
Comments:

K. Have you received any career advice or guidance while in this establishment?

<b>Yes / No</b>
If yes:
L. Who provided this?

**Prison staff / Connexions / IAG / YOT worker / Case worker / Other?**

M. How useful did you find this advice?

**Very / Somewhat / Not at all**

Comments:

N. Do you have an idea of the kind of career you would like to pursue in the future?

--

O. Do you plan to go to work when you leave custody?

**Yes / No / Don't know**

P. Is there a job set up for you, for when you leave custody?

**Yes / No**

If yes:

Q. Who arranged this?

R. Is this the type of work that you wanted to do?

**Yes / No**

S. How long is this employment likely to last? (Is it permanent?)

Comments:

T. Have any outside agencies come into the prison to help you with education, training or employment on release?

<b>Yes / No</b>
If yes:
U. Who were they?
V. How useful did you find this help?
<b>Very / Somewhat / Not at all</b>
Comments:

**SECTION 3. RELEASE ON TEMPORARY LICENCE**

A. Has anyone explained and discussed ROTL (release on temporary licence) with you?

<b>Yes / No (If 'no' skip to Section 4)</b>
If yes, <b>who? When (training plan meeting)?</b>

B. Has ROTL been offered to you?

<b>Yes / No – why not? / Don't know</b>
Comments:

C. Have you ever been granted ROTL?

<b>Yes / No / Did not want to apply</b> (note to interviewer: if response is 'did not want to apply' explore the reasons)
---

Comments:
If yes:
D. <b>How many times?</b>
E. <b>What have you had ROTL for?</b> Work/training/employment/family contact?
F. <b>Have you found the experience useful?</b>  <b>Very / Somewhat / Not at all</b>  Comments:

**SECTION 4. TRAINING PLANS**

A. During training plan meetings, do you discuss targets to do with education, training and work in custody?

**Yes / No**

B. Do you know what your targets are? What do these targets include?

C. Did you have a say in the targets set for you?

**Yes / No**  
  
Comments:

D. Do you try to achieve your targets?

**Yes / No**

Comments:

E. Do you think that you are given enough help to achieve your targets?

**Yes / No**

Comments:

F. Have plans for your education, training or employment on release been discussed?

**Yes / No**

If plans have been discussed:

G. Did you have a say in these plans?

**Yes / No**

Comments:

H. Has your accommodation on release been discussed with you?

I. **Yes** (during training plan meetings?) / **No**

Comments:

J. Who usually attends training plan meetings?

**Outside YOT worker?**

**Prison YOT worker?**

**Personal Officer?**

**Social worker?**

**Parents or Carers?**

**Case worker**

**Others?**

K. Have the plans for your accommodation or education, training or employment on release been discussed with you outside of (or before) training plan meetings?

**Yes / No**

Comments:

**SECTION 5. ACCOMMODATION**

A. Where will you be living after you leave here?

B. Is this where you were living before your stay in custody?

**Yes / No**

Details:

C. Who arranged this accommodation? *(Or do you know who will be arranging this?)*

**You / parent / case worker / social worker / YOT / through a service in the prison / other**

Details:

D. Did you have a choice in this matter and were you involved in the decision process?

**Completely / To some extent / Not at all**

Comments:

E. Do you think that the arrangement will work?

**Yes / No / Don't know**

Comments:

F. How long will you be able to stay in this accommodation? (Is your time there limited?)

--

G. Will you be expected to pay rent?

**Yes / Maybe / No / Don't know**

Comments:

If yes, maybe or don't know:

H. Will/would paying for your accommodation be a problem for you?

**Yes / Maybe / No**

Comments:

I. Have you been offered any financial help or services in preparation for your release?

**Yes / No**

Comments: (If yes, from who?)

J. Do you feel the accommodation arranged for you is in a safe place?

<b>Yes / No / Don't know</b>
If there are any safety issues:
K. Are your feelings of safety affected by neighbourhood issues? <b>Yes / No</b>
L. Are your feelings of safety related to who you will be living with? <b>Yes / No</b>
Comments:

M. Is the accommodation suitable i.e. is it near enough to your workplace or college / will you have your own room / enough freedom to come and go as you wish?

<b>Yes / No / Don't know</b>
Comments:

N. Have any outside agencies come into the prison to help you with accommodation needs on release? (eg. *Outside YOT worker, Barnardo's, Rainer, Depaul Trust*)

<b>Yes / No</b>
If yes:
O. Who were they?
P. Were they useful?
<b>Very / Somewhat / Not at all</b>
Comments:



## FOR LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN

**Q. How often do you see your social worker?**

**R. Have you had a LAC review, since you have been in custody?**

**S. Do you feel you've been treated differently because you're a looked after child?**

*e.g. Financial support from your LAC, being denied early release, etc*

# Appendix VI

## Interview template for case supervisors and follow-up pro forma

***Ensure that the caseworker has operational oversight of the young person's training and resettlement plan. If not then this interview needs to be completed with the person who does.***

***This questionnaire may have to include interviews with different people.***

**The interview needs to be conducted with the relevant documents (T forms, eASSET, case file) in front of you both, so what is written can be discussed.**

Name of case worker.....

Names and designation of other staff interviewed.....

.....

Name of interviewer.....

Date of interview.....

### **COMPLETE THIS BOX PRIOR TO INTERVIEW**

Name of young person (case study).....

Type and length of sentence: .....

How long have they been in the current establishment? (Months and weeks) .....

Date they are leaving the establishment. (If early release has not yet been decided give dates of early and mid-point). Actual date ..... Early ..... Mid point .....

MAPPA case (which level): .....

YOT area: .....

IRS area? Yes / No

Looked after child? Yes / No

Local authority: .....

Sec 20 or 31?

Is this clearly marked and where? .....

**Early information, initial assessments and links to the training planning process**

1. **What written information did you receive from the YJB** (electronic yellow envelope: eASSET, PSR, PCR) **or other external agencies** (local authority; LAC – education providers) **when the young person was received at the establishment?**
2. Was the young person transferred from another establishment? Y/N - If so was all the relevant information passed on? Comment below.
3. Did the information highlight potential resettlement issues?

Comment on the written information received

**Did the written information highlight potential resettlement problems: Y / N**

Comment on potential resettlement problems

**If applicable, refers to LAC status?**

3. **Did you discuss resettlement issues with the young person before writing the initial training plan?**
4. Do you see the young person frequently to review his resettlement plans? If not the caseworker, who else dealt with the issues e.g. personal officer, worker from a voluntary organisation.

**Discussion with young person before initial training plan: Y / N**

Comment

Comment on frequency of contact to discuss resettlement plans

5. Did you discuss resettlement issues with his YOT worker or any other professional before writing the initial training plan?
6. How often do you have discussions about resettlement issues with his YOT worker and other professional workers?

**Discussion prior to the initial training planning meeting: Y / N**

Comment

Comment on the regularity of contact with YOT etc throughout the sentence

7. **Do review meetings deal satisfactorily with accommodation and ETE pre-release arrangements for X?**

**Are accommodation and ETE pre-release arrangements dealt with satisfactorily at X's reviews:  
Y / N**

Comments

**If applicable, does this mention LAC status?**

**Who attends training plan meetings?** Are they attended by the relevant people so that these issues can be fully addressed? **Prison education?**

**If applicable, social worker attending?**

**Accommodation:**

**1. Was the issue of suitable and sustainable accommodation discussed at the initial training planning meeting and did it form part of the initial training plan?**

- Why was it raised and by whom? Was it the young person?

**Sustainable accommodation discussed at initial planning meeting: Y / N**

Comment

**2. Did the initial training planning meeting conclude that, at that stage, the accommodation on release was suitable and sustainable?**

- What were the views of the young person? Were his family there and did they express a view? What was the view of the external agencies e.g. YOT and local authority?

**Was the accommodation suitable and sustainable: Y / N**

Comment

**If the answer to question 2 is yes go to questions 8 to 10**

**If the answer to question 2 is no continue with questions 3 to 7**

**3. What were the problems with accommodation and what were the plans to resolve the issue?**

(Were the plans written down, were they part of the training plan or separate to it?)

**Comment**

**4. Describe how the plans developed.** (Look to see if these were recorded)

- Where they discussed at subsequent training planning meetings?
- Did the people, who could deal with the issues, attend review meetings?
- What was the involvement of the YOT or local authority?
- Was there involvement from a specialist housing provider / advisor from the YOT / local authority / voluntary sector, and did they visit the young person in custody?

**Comment**

**5. What was the final outcome? [or current position]**

- Did they have an address to go to?
- Who took the lead on sorting out accommodation? YOI lead on providing X with support and advice about accommodation on release / YOT lead on providing X with support and advice about accommodation on release / joint YOT and YOI lead / voluntary sector organisation

**Was he found an address, having been initially homeless: Y / N**

**Comment**

**6. In the last discussions, was it agreed that the final arrangement was a suitable and sustainable address, or was this not commented upon?**

- What type of accommodation was it?
- Was there going to be ongoing support and if so what form would that take?
- When did the young person know which address they were going to be released to? (How many days/weeks before release?)
- Where they being escorted to the address? If not how would they get there?
- What arrangements had been made to help with personal finance? Had they completed any courses that would help them to live independently?

**Was it assessed as being suitable and sustainable? Y / N**

**Comment on the type of accommodation**

**Further comments**

**7. If no to question 6, what arrangements have been made for the young persons arrangements when they are released?**

- What plans were there in place to support the young person?
- How long is it before they are going to be released (give number of days)? Is the caseworker confident that arrangements for accommodation will be finalised prior to release and if so what are they?
- Is their early release dependant upon them having their accommodation finalised? (This only affects those on an 8 month DTO or longer)

**Does the young person have to report to the LA and declare themselves homeless? Y / N**

**Did not know their accommodation two weeks prior to release? Y / N**

Comment

**8. Questions if the answer to question 2 was yes.**

**What is the nature of the accommodation?**

- Family home? Y/N
- Relation's home? Y/N
- Friend's home? Y/N
- Provided by the local authority? Y/N
- Released to other accommodation? Y/N

**Describe the type of accommodation**

**9. Have steps been taken to ensure that the accommodation remains secure for the young person until their release?**

- Has family contact been encouraged/maintained throughout the sentence?
- Has family mediation or support/financial support been offered to the family?
- Has a room or place for the young person been reserved in private accommodation?

**Were there steps taken: Y / N**

Comment

10. Did the young person's accommodation change or was it lost altogether during the course of the sentence? If it was lost, answer questions 3 - 7 above.

**Did the young person lose the initial accommodation and become homeless: Y / N**  
**Comment**

### **Education, training and employment**

**1. Does X have an ETE placement to go to on release?**

- If yes, what is it? How was it arranged?
- If yes, will he be initially escorted to the placement?
- If the answer is don't know, ask if the caseworker can find out from someone else e.g. learning and skills

**Yes / No / Don't know**

Comments:

**2 What ETE advice has X received in custody?**

- Has he been seen by either an internal or external specialist within the establishment to help secure an ETE placement on release? If so who did they see and what was the outcome?

**Seen by specialist ETE advisor: Y / N / Don't know**

Comments

**3. Is X accumulating a portfolio of achievements gained in custody to be passed on to external ETE providers?**

- If the caseworker doesn't know, who will? *Might need to talk to the education department*

**Yes / No / Don't know**

Details/comments



## Arrangements for ROTL

**Has X been formally advised about ROTL opportunities? Y / N**

Comment

**Did X apply for ROTL? Y/N**

Comment

**Was X's YOT advised about his ROTL opportunities at any time? Y / N**

Comment

**Did X's YOT worker apply for ROTL on X's behalf? Y / N**

Comment

**1. Has there been an assessment to see if X is eligible for ROTL? Y/N**

Comment

**Did X get ROTL? Y/ N**

If yes what was the opportunity provided?

If no, why didn't he get ROTL?

**2. Was ROTL considered to assist with procuring either suitable accommodation or an ETE placement? Y / N**

Comment

**Applies only to a looked after child**

1. How successful have you been in engaging the local authority throughout X's time in custody to ensure that his needs, including financial support, accommodation and ETE provision, will be met when he is released?

Comments

2. Have there been any LAC reviews while X has been in custody? Y/ N If so how many?

- Have details from LAC reviews been incorporated into training plan documents?

Comments

3. Does X have a LAC care plan?

Yes / No  
Comments:

4. How does the care planning process link in with the training planning process, particularly those that relate to resettlement issues?

Comments

**General**

1. What works well when working with YOTs and LAs to prepare young people for their release?

2. Are there any particular problems ensuring the involvement of YOTs and LAs in the organisation and running of training planning or looked after children reviews or specific problems that arise with regard to preparation for release work?

<b>Yes / No</b> Details/comments:
How are disagreements or concerns dealt with?

3. Are there any frequent barriers to providing suitable and safe accommodation for young people leaving custody?

<b>Yes / No</b> Details/comments:
--------------------------------------

4. Are there any frequent barriers to providing suitable ETE placements for young people leaving custody?

<b>Yes / No</b> Details/comments:
--------------------------------------

**Accommodation; Education, training and employment; and ROTL arrangements for young people leaving custody**

**Final Accommodation and ETE arrangements for young people leaving custody**

**Name of establishment:**

**Name of caseworker:**

**Name of young person:**

**Date the young person left the establishment:**

**Accommodation**

1a. Did the young person have an address to go to? Please answer yes or no in the box below.

1b. When was this accommodation confirmed?

2. If 'No', what arrangements were being made to find them an address when they left custody? e.g. did they have to present themselves to the local authority (housing department) and declare themselves homeless?

Please comment below.

3. In your opinion did the young person have a suitable and sustainable address to return to? Please answer yes or no in the box below.

4. Please give a reason for your answer to question 3.

5. Was the accommodation the same as the address identified when we completed our fieldwork interview with you? If it was different please describe the accommodation. Please make any further comments about the nature of the accommodation arrangements that you feel are relevant to this review.

**Education, training and employment**

1. Was the young person going to a pre-arranged ETE placement? Please answer yes or no in the box below.

2. If 'yes' please describe the nature of the proposed placement.

3. If 'no' did they have a pre-arranged appointment with a Connexions or other ETE advisor? Please answer yes or no in the box below.

4. Please give any further comments about the nature of the ETE arrangements that you feel are relevant to this review.

**Accommodation; Education, training and employment; and ROTL arrangements for young people a month after leaving custody**

**Follow up information a month after release**

**Name of establishment:**

**Name of caseworker:**

**Name of young person:**

**Date the young person left the establishment:**

**Date this information was received from the YOT:**

**YOT area:**

**Accommodation:**

1. Is the young person in the same accommodation they resided in immediately after they were released from custody? Please answer yes or no in the box below.

2. If 'yes' please say why you think their accommodation arrangements have been successful.

3. If 'no', please explain the reasons for change and the nature of the accommodation the young person now resides in.

**Education, training and employment**

1. Is the young person currently in an ETE placement? If so, what is the nature of the placement? Was this placement arranged while they were in custody?

2. If the young person is currently in an ETE placement, why do you think it is successful?

3. If the young person is not in an ETE placement, please say what you think have been the barriers that have prevented this?

## Appendix VII

### Interview template for heads of resettlement (and relevant staff)

---

#### **Interview with the resettlement manager**

Name of establishment:

Name of resettlement manager:

Names and roles of others interviewed:

Name of interviewer:

Date of interview:

#### **General strategic issues**

1. What strategic partnerships exist for the ongoing development and monitoring of the resettlement strategy and reintegration services provided by the establishment? *Please specify.*
2. How are local YOTs and local authorities involved in setting the strategic direction and monitoring the progress of this establishment's resettlement work? *Check minutes to see who comes to resettlement strategy meetings.*
3. Do you think that all YOTs and LAs that you work with are familiar with the resettlement services offered by the establishment? If yes, how has this been achieved?
4. Does the resettlement strategy address diversity issues? Race, religion, gender, age, disability, sexuality, foreign nationals, travellers.
5. Does the resettlement strategy address the specific resettlement needs of looked after children, or is it in another strategy?
6. Does the resettlement strategy separate the specific resettlement needs of young people on remand, short term sentences (under 12 months) and long term sentences (over 12 months)?

#### **Arrangements for joint planning of individual resettlement plans**

1. How do operational managers in the establishment ensure there is effective communication with their YOT and local authority counterparts over resettlement issues? Are there joint protocols or meetings?
2. Do training planning meetings deal effectively with the planning for accommodation and ETE placements on release? If not why are they ineffective and how can they be improved?
3. Are there any particular problems with the organisation and running of training planning reviews, particularly regarding the joint work with YOTs and local authorities and other external organisations (specifically those that specialise in accommodation and ETE)? How can problems be overcome?



4. How effective is liaison with YOTs and local authorities outside of training planning meetings. Please give examples of how this takes place. Are there any barriers to effective liaison?
5. Are you satisfied that final training plan review meetings deal satisfactorily with the pre-release arrangements for a young person? If not, how can they be improved?

### **Accommodation**

1. Does the establishment collect information on the type of accommodation young people return to? Does the information indicate whether or not it is suitable and sustainable accommodation? Is that information analysed and if so, what is done with it? *Need to see the data.*
2. Do young people get released who are NFA? If so, do you know what actions are taken to find them accommodation immediately after release? Do you follow up these young people with YOTs?
3. How effectively are you able to work with YOTs in finding suitable and sustainable accommodation for young people leaving custody? Are there any barriers; if so what are they? Who generally takes the lead on finding suitable accommodation?
4. Are you able to work effectively with local social services departments in finding accommodation for looked after children?
5. What action does the establishment take when it is evident that a YOT has been unable to find suitable accommodation for a young person on their release? Do young people fail to gain early release when suitable accommodation is not found? If so, do you have figures?
6. Are there any specialist accommodation advisors or providers, either linked with yourselves or a specific YOT area, who have been able to assist with finding suitable and sustainable accommodation for young people leaving custody? If so, what service do they offer?
7. Are there any diversity issues that affect your ability to place young people in suitable or sustainable accommodation? e.g. for reasons of race, religion, gender, age, disability, sexuality, foreign nationals, travellers.
8. Are there any groups of young people who are particularly hard to place in accommodation? e.g. types of offences/length of sentences/persistent offenders.
9. How easy is it for you to discuss accommodation issues with young people in custody? What are the barriers to working with young people on accommodation issues?
10. Do you think that young people are content with the accommodation that is found for them? What do they say about it?
11. Do you think the youth justice and social care system is effective in finding suitable and sustainable accommodation for young people leaving custody?

### **ROTL**

1. How are young people informed about their eligibility for ROTL and how to apply?

2. How are YOTs informed about ROTL and how they can apply on behalf of young people?
3. How does the establishment work with YOTs regarding the initial identification and subsequent suitability assessments for ROTL?
4. Does the establishment use ROTL to assist in finalising resettlement plans; specifically accommodation and ETE placements? If so, how what are they and how many have there been?
5. Are there opportunities for ROTL within the local community? If so what are they and how many have there been?
6. Does the establishment keep figures on the numbers and types of ROTL placements young people have? If so, how do you use the information?

## Appendix VIII

### Interview template for heads of learning and skills (and relevant staff)

---

#### **Interview with the head of learning and skills**

Name of establishment:

Name of head of learning and skills:

Names and roles of others interviewed:

Name of interviewer:

Date of interview:

#### **Strategic partnerships**

1. What strategic partnerships exist for the ongoing development and monitoring of learning and skills provision in the establishment? Is there a strong relationship with the local authority? Any relevant partnership meetings? *Need to see some TOR if there is a group or committee, minutes etc.*

#### **Practice and operational issues**

2. Does the establishment generally receive sufficient details of a young person's educational achievements and needs prior to custody? *Need also to check a sample of assets – do they provide sufficient ETE information e.g. details of examination passes, courses previously undertaken, whether the young person has a statement of special educational needs (started or completed); special or different needs.*
3. How is it ensured that individual initial assessments of young people's learning and skills needs are informed by assessments provided by youth offending services or other external agencies?
4. Are schools or colleges previously attended by young people sometimes contacted to provide further background/detail and/or to ensure continuity in a young person's educational pathway? *Any examples?*
5. Are there arrangements/systems to ensure that the learning and skills department are routinely represented at training planning reviews? *e.g. a role for IAG workers. Are there stats available which monitor the attendance of education representatives at training plan reviews?*
6. Do education and training opportunities within the establishment meet the diverse needs of all young people – regardless of, sentence length or status – and cater for all abilities?

7. How is it ensured that the qualifications on offer at the establishment are useful, relevant and linked to realistic opportunities in the employment market in the area to which they will be released? *Are there any established work experience placements in the local community?*
8. What access do young people have to careers advice, information and guidance within the establishment (including from external careers agencies such as Connexions)? *Is there a pre-release course?*
9. How is it ensured that there are clear links between initial learning and skills assessments and training planning targets? *Need to look at a sample of training planning targets as part of casework interviews.*
10. How does the learning and skills department link with education specialists in YOTs? (Please describe any strategic links as well as an overview of regular links on a case by case basis.)
11. By what process do you ensure that pre-release planning includes arrangements for employment or continuing education post-release?
12. Are young people provided with a portfolio of achievements on release? *Need to see some examples.*
13. Do the majority of young people achieve a qualification during their time in custody? *Any simple stats?*
14. Are the majority of young people released with a training placement, job or school or college placement to go to? *Need the stats.*
15. Does the learning and skills department provide ongoing support to young people after their release? *If so, please describe the provision.*
16. What are the barriers to meeting the ETE needs of young people during custody and on release?
17. Do you think that young people are content with the ETE placements that are found for them? What do they say about it?



