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Foreword

This Core Case Inspection of youth offending work in Cornwall & the Isles of Scilly took place as part of the Inspection of Youth Offending programme. We have examined a representative sample of youth offending cases from the area, and have judged how often the Public Protection and the Safeguarding aspects of the work were done to a sufficiently high level of quality. Our findings will also feed into the wider annual Comprehensive Area Assessment process.

We judged that the Safeguarding aspects of the work were done well enough 64% of the time. With the Public Protection aspects, work to keep to a minimum each individual’s Risk of Harm to others was done well enough 58% of the time, and the work to make each individual less likely to reoffend was done well enough 67% of the time. A more detailed analysis of our findings is provided in the main body of this report, and summarised in a table in Appendix 1. We also provide some separate information about the work done on the Isles of Scilly with and for children and young people, for feeding into their separate Comprehensive Area Assessment processes.

These figures can be viewed in the context of our findings from the regions inspected so far. To date, the average score for Safeguarding work has been 64%, with scores ranging from 38-82%, the average score for Risk of Harm work has been 60%, with scores ranging from 36-85%, and the average score for Likelihood of Reoffending work has been 66%, with scores ranging from 50-82%.

We also found that the Isles of Scilly had not had a post-court case to supervise for some two years and were impressed with the preventative work that had been undertaken there.

Overall, we consider this a relatively encouraging set of findings. It was clear that senior managers were aware of most of the issues raised during the inspection and had already begun to consider how to address them, recognising that this report will help identify a clearer agenda for change. We judged that the YOS has promising prospects for the future given their readiness to act on the recommendations in this report.

Andrew Bridges  
HM Chief Inspector of Probation  

February 2010
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Scoring – and Summary Table

This report provides percentage scores for each of the ‘practice criteria’ essentially indicating how often each aspect of work met the level of quality we were looking for. In these inspections we focus principally on the Public Protection and Safeguarding aspects of the work in each case sample.

Accordingly, we are able to provide a score that represents how often the Public Protection and Safeguarding aspects of the cases we assessed met the level of quality we were looking for, which we summarise here.

We also provide a headline ‘Comment’ by each score, to indicate whether we consider that this aspect of work now requires either MINIMUM, MODERATE, SUBSTANTIAL or DRASTIC improvement in the immediate future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguarding score:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong> 64%</td>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Protection – Risk of Harm score:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong> 58%</td>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> SUBSTANTIAL improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Protection - Likelihood of Reoffending score:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score:</strong> 67%</td>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We advise readers of reports not to attempt close comparisons of scores between individual areas. Such comparisons are not necessarily valid as the sizes of samples vary slightly, as does the profile of cases included in each area’s sample. We believe the scoring is best seen as a headline summary of what we have found in an individual area, and providing a focus for future improvement work within that area.
**Recommendations** (primary responsibility is indicated in brackets)

Changes are necessary to ensure that, in a higher proportion of cases:

1. a timely and good quality assessment of the individual’s vulnerability and *Risk of Harm to others* is completed at the start, as appropriate to the specific case (YOS Manager)

2. as a consequence of the assessment, the record of the intervention plan is specific about what will now be done in order to safeguard the child or young person’s well-being, to make them less likely to reoffend, and to minimise any identified *Risk of Harm to others* (YOS Manager)

3. the plan of work with the case is regularly reviewed and correctly recorded in Asset with a frequency consistent with national standards for youth offending services (YOS Manager)

4. there is evidence in the file of regular quality assurance by management, especially of screening decisions, as appropriate to the specific case (YOS Manager).

Furthermore:

5. work is required to ensure that consistency in the quality of work done between the two operational sites is achieved (YOS Manager).

**Next steps**

An improvement plan addressing the recommendations should be submitted to HM Inspectorate of Probation four weeks after the publication of this inspection report. Once finalised, the plan will be forwarded to the Youth Justice Board to monitor its implementation.
Service users’ perspective

Children and young people

Fifteen children and young people completed a questionnaire for the inspection.

- The results were overwhelmingly positive. Respondents identified staff as being interested in them and listening to them.
- Children and young people understood why they were attending and, overall, members of staff explained to them what would happen and what their responsibilities were.
- Half of the respondents were confident that they were less likely to reoffend as a result of their involvement with the YOS; and 12 of the 15 were mostly or entirely satisfied with their experience.
- Over 50% of those replying identified that they understood their offending behaviour better; and ten of them felt happier or less stressed than they had done at the time the offence was committed.

Victims

Ten questionnaires were completed by victims of offending by children and young people.

- Nine of the ten respondents were clear that they had received a satisfactory explanation of the YOS’s role and that their needs had been taken into account in terms of timing and location of meetings. They had also felt confident to ask questions and talk about how they felt about what had happened.
- Two of the victims had benefited directly from work undertaken by the child or young person concerned.
- Three of the five respondents, who had concerns about personal safety issues, considered that the YOS had given that matter sufficient attention.
- Seven people described themselves as being completely satisfied with the service they received and could not identify any ways in which it could have been improved.
- There was one respondent who was clearly dissatisfied in every respect. No reason was provided.
Sharing good practice

Below are examples of good practice we found in the YOS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment and Sentence Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Criterion:</strong> 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A thorough and sensitive assessment was prepared to inform Joe’s court report. It accurately identified the issues, namely awareness of his actions to others, appropriate self-management, communication and conflict resolution. It also recognised the personal need and the benefit of a specific approach tailored to those needs. These were addressed by referring him to the White Gold Alpaca Project. Joe did really well on this project, engaging in voluntary work and, through his interaction with the animals, made some huge steps in respect of his awareness of these issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery and Review of Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Criterion:</strong> 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy's life was marked by significant difficulties, both at home and at school, and his offending behaviour had spiralled out of control. A coordinated approach to a complex sentence was required and the case manager ensured that this worked well, by carefully planning how to manage the multi-agency group he called together to identify and deliver interventions to meet Billy’s needs. Reviews were done separately by the different staff involved and then compared at the review meetings. Good use was made of authority and of positive relationship development. Much support was offered to Billy in the steps he took for himself and the impact they had. There was also evidence of good forward planning, to assist and support him through changes, e.g. the end of his curfew.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Criterion:</strong> 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint was a 16 year old homeless burglar. He had severe dyslexia and very few coping strategies. The case manager and ISSP worker worked together to develop the best package for him. This included using a local agency resource, who worked with Clint on managing emotions and problem solving using drawing and picture boarding. This, alongside a good working relationship built on clear and frequent communication, resulted in him successfully completing his order with ISSP. He did not reoffend; began to assist dyslexic school children; and moved into independent accommodation. ISSP implemented an ‘ending plan’ with Clint to help him move on from the order, whilst maintaining control and improving his new coping strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. ASSESSMENT AND SENTENCE PLANNING

1.1 Risk of Harm to others:

**General Criterion:**

The assessment of RoH is comprehensive, accurate and timely, takes victims’ issues into account and uses Asset and other relevant assessment tools. Plans are in place to manage RoH.

| Score: 53% | Comment: SUBSTANTIAL improvement required |

**Strengths:**

1. RoH screenings in Asset were completed in a timely manner on 84% of occasions.
2. RoH management panels had been introduced into daily practice. These were chaired by a manager and provided opportunities for the case manager to share their thinking and gather a range of supporting views to help their management of the case.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. RMPs were completed in 30% of relevant cases. We found the vast majority of them to be of insufficient quality.
2. The general lack of formal risk management planning in the team meant that intervention plans did not integrate risk management issues well.
3. Intervention plans set activities to run for the duration of the order. We saw little evidence of sequencing of interventions and there was a lack of prioritisation, particularly according to RoH categorisation.
4. We considered that RoH screenings should have been followed by a full assessment on 14 occasions, but these were completed in only seven cases.
5. We disagreed with the case manager’s RoH classification in seven cases. Four times we thought it too high, the remainder too low.
6. Oversight of RoH work was judged to be effective in 21% of the cases in the sample. This was not to suggest, for example, that team managers were not reviewing and commenting on RMPs. However, we saw a number of RoH assessments and RMPs which we considered to be of insufficient quality and which had been countersigned.
(7) There was no system to flag up to managers when a RoH screening should have resulted in a full assessment but the case manager did not come to that view. This was a difficult, but important facility to develop, as without a way of identifying these cases, poor practice could self-perpetuate.

1.2 Likelihood of Reoffending:

**General Criterion:**

The assessment of the LoR is comprehensive, accurate and timely and uses Asset and other relevant assessment tools. Plans are in place to reduce LoR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(1) There was sufficient evidence of an active engagement with the child or young person, to inform the initial assessment, in 71% of the sample. This reduced to 59% of relevant cases in respect of parents/carers.

(2) LoR assessments were undertaken and were timely in all cases. We judged 68% of them to be of sufficient quality.

(3) The YOS had a systematic approach to forwarding information to custodial establishments, thus ensuring that assessments were always made available to the prison whenever that was required.

(4) There was sufficient evidence of initial LoR assessments being reviewed at appropriate intervals in 84% of the cases inspected.

(5) In all but one of the 38 cases there was an appropriate intervention plan. The vast majority were completed on time.

(6) Intervention plans reflected the purposes of the sentence and met national standards requirements in over 70% of the sample.

**Areas for improvement:**

(1) Although there was a form for assessing the child or young person’s learning style, there were no formal underpinning procedures for its use and we saw evidence of case managers attempting this activity in 39% of cases.

(2) We considered that intervention plans sufficiently addressed the identified needs in 47% of the sample.

(3) There was evidence of the child or young person being involved in the planning process in 60% of the sample cases; and relevant parents/carers involvement was identifiable in 42% of them.
More than two-thirds of the intervention plans were reviewed at the end of the order, rather than on a more frequent basis as work progressed.

### 1.3 Safeguarding:

**General Criterion:**

*The assessment of Safeguarding needs is comprehensive, accurate and timely and uses Asset and other relevant assessment tools. Plans are in place to manage Safeguarding and reduce vulnerability.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td><strong>SUBSTANTIAL improvement required</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. Vulnerability screenings in Asset were completed on time in 89% of cases. 73% of them were reviewed appropriately.

2. In all cases where there was a VMP, it was used to inform both the intervention plan and any other applicable plan.

3. Where relevant, copies of other plans were available on the file in 83% of cases and in a similar proportion a contribution had been made, either through CAF or other assessments, to the plans of other organisations.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. In terms of vulnerability and Safeguarding we considered that there should have been a VMP in 61% of the sample cases. These had been prepared in 26% of them.

2. Safeguarding needs were taken into account in intervention plans in just 54% of the cases and positive factors were included in 32% of them.

**OVERALL SCORE for quality of Assessment and Sentence Planning work: 59%**

**COMMENTARY on Assessment and Sentence Planning as a whole**

Cornwall was one of the largest counties in England and Wales and one of the least densely populated. This presented significant additional challenges to the YOS in terms of contact with children and young people. Much of the work was done at home, with all of the distractions that naturally apply there. There were two office locations some 30 miles apart so there was also limited opportunity for staff from those two offices to work together or to conduct benchmarking exercises as a whole team. The nearest custodial establishment was in Bristol.
and numbers going into custody were low. This resulted in case managers travelling for over six hours in total, perhaps to attend a single one-hour planning meeting. This reality needed to be included in all strategic thinking about the service.

The last inspection of Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly YOS was 18 months prior to this inspection and it had worked hard on implementing its improvement plan during that time. There had clearly been work done in terms of training around the core work and there had been a restructure of the team, in an attempt to achieve more efficiency and effectiveness. At the same time there had been a number of long-term staff absences which had held up some of that forward movement.

A detailed analysis of the results of this inspection, in which the sample was quite evenly split between the two worksites, showed significantly different scores between them. This was an issue that the senior managers had become aware of prior to the inspection and which they were clear needed to be further assessed and addressed. The findings of this inspection should assist in focusing on specific areas for improvement.
2. DELIVERY AND REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS

2.1 Protecting the public by minimising Risk of Harm to others:

**General Criterion:**

*All reasonable actions have been taken to protect the public by keeping to a minimum the child or young person’s RoH to others.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>MODERATE improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. Changes in RoH factors were anticipated in 70% of relevant cases and identified swiftly in 93% of others.
2. There was evidence in all cases, both custody and community, of case managers and other relevant staff contributing effectively to multi-agency meetings other than MAPPA. There were no MAPPA eligible cases in the sample.
3. As the majority of contact with children and young people takes place at the family home due to the rurality challenges in Cornwall, the frequency of home visits more than met the requirements of the national standards for visiting family homes, in accordance with the level of RoH posed and Safeguarding issues presented.
4. There was sufficient evidence in 86% of relevant cases that a high priority had been given to victim safety.
5. Appropriate resources were allocated according to RoH in all cases inspected.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. Thorough reviews of RoH, in line with the required timescales, were evidenced in 51% of cases and in 33% following a significant change.
2. Changes which had been identified in RoH factors were acted on appropriately in 36% of the sample.
3. A full assessment of the safety of victims had been carried out in 67% of relevant cases. Senior managers were considering whether or not changes in the approach to victims, in an attempt to produce a higher response rate, would have been a manageable development. There were resource implications to this.
Specific interventions to manage RoH to others in the community were delivered as planned in 63% of cases. This reduced to 20% of relevant cases for the custodial sample.

2.2 Reducing the Likelihood of Reoffending:

**General Criterion:**

The case manager coordinates and facilitates the structured delivery of all elements of the intervention plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>MINIMUM improvement required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

(1) There was good evidence of appropriate, structured interventions being used with the children and young people subject to supervision. In particular, in over 70% of cases there was an effort to deliver in line with the apparent learning style of the child or young person. The interventions were of good quality and designed to reduce the LoR; and there were clear efforts to address presented diversity issues.

(2) In all relevant cases YOS staff had been appropriately involved in reviews of interventions in custody.

(3) Sufficient resources appeared to have been allocated to address LoR issues in all cases in the sample.

(4) There was strong evidence that staff consistently and actively motivated and supported children and young people in all cases; and wherever possible took the opportunity to reinforce positive behaviour, whether in custody or the community.

(5) Again, in all relevant cases there was strong evidence of staff actively engaging parents/carers.

**Area for improvement:**

(1) Interventions delivered to children and young people were not sequenced in just under half of the cases inspected and were reviewed appropriately in 21% of the sample.
2.3 Safeguarding the child or young person:

**General Criterion:**

All reasonable actions have been taken to safeguard and reduce the vulnerability of the child or young person.

| Score: 73% | Comment: MODERATE improvement required |

**Strengths:**

1. Wherever relevant it was clear that staff had taken all necessary immediate action to safeguard and protect other children or young people involved with those subject to supervision.

2. In the 12 cases where it was needed, all necessary referrals to ensure Safeguarding had been made to the relevant agencies. There were at least two cases that had been referred to children's services, which had refused to become involved. In both cases we strongly supported the actions of the case manager in referring and were surprised and disappointed at the response that had been received.

3. There were a number of good examples of case managers convening and successfully managing multi-agency groups of staff, to identify issues and work with specific children and young people, to achieve more appropriate outcomes.

4. Specific interventions to promote Safeguarding, both in custody and the community, were identified in 81% of the sample and incorporated the VMP actions in all applicable cases.

5. There was good evidence of all relevant staff supporting and promoting the well-being of the child or young person throughout the course of the sentence in 90% of the cases inspected.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. We judged that all necessary immediate action had been taken to safeguard and protect the child or young person subject to supervision in two-thirds of the relevant cases.

2. Identified interventions to promote Safeguarding were delivered in 63% of relevant cases and reviewed every three months or after a significant change in 38% of them.

3. Effective management oversight of Safeguarding and vulnerability needs was evident in one-third of the cases. This again linked to the absence of a system to flag up cases to managers, where there should have been work done on the vulnerability and Safeguarding but this was not spotted by the case manager.
OVERALL SCORE for quality of Delivery and Review of Interventions work: 75%

COMMENTARY on Delivery and Review of Interventions as a whole:

The delivery of interventions was the strongest section for Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly YOS, as reflected by the scores. This suggested that assessment and planning were both under-recorded and underused as the order progressed. The high scores in this section reflected the work that was done on any individual visit. It was encouraging to identify that case managers in the YOS had access to and the ability to deliver good constructive interventions, particularly as so much of their work was done in the child or young person's home, where there were inevitably distractions.
3. OUTCOMES

### 3.1 Achievement of outcomes:

**General Criterion:**

Outcomes are achieved in relation to RoH, LoR and Safeguarding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td><strong>SUBSTANTIAL improvement required</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

1. Enforcement action was taken sufficiently well in 80% of cases where the child or young person had failed to comply with the requirements of the order. Staff described good working relationships with sentencers and had confidence when returning the child or young person to court that full consideration would be given to any proposal they made.

2. There was evidence that all reasonable actions had been taken to keep the child or young person safe in 78% of cases inspected.

**Areas for improvement:**

1. RoH to others was effectively managed in 60% of the sample.

2. Full compliance with the requirements of the order was evident in 47% of the cases.

### 3.2 Sustaining outcomes:

**General Criterion:**

Outcomes are sustained in relation to RoH, LoR and Safeguarding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score:</th>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td><strong>MODERATE improvement required</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strength:**

(1) Community integration was given full attention in all custody orders and in 76% of community orders.

**Area for improvement:**

(1) There was evidence of action having been taken, or plans put in place, to ensure that positive outcomes were sustainable in half of the custody orders and 60% of those based in the community.

**OVERALL SCORE for quality of Outcomes work: 62%**

**COMMENTARY on Outcomes as a whole:**

The scores in this section reflected an absence of follow-through on the good delivery of interventions referred to earlier. It was difficult to assess how far this was a failure of recording compared to action, but in either event there was not the evidence to support a higher score for sustainability of progress.

The commitment demonstrated by staff, to the well-being of the children and young people under their supervision, suggested that there would be support for any work done to develop ways of achieving sustained improved outcomes in the future.
There had been no cases requiring post court supervision on the Isles of Scilly for approximately two years. Although the number of children and young people aged between 10 and 18 on the islands was very small, nonetheless previously there had always been some activity which required the involvement of the YOS.

In recent years there had been considerable effort put into addressing the needs of the children and young people who lived on the islands. Although this work was not inspected directly, the lead Inspector met with the assistant director for technical services, whose portfolio included matters to do with offending and prevention. He was also the representative for the island’s authority on the YOS Management Board.

Considerable importance was placed on the children and young people being involved in the identification of gaps in provision. This helped to generate their ownership of solutions from the outset. The other key aspect to all of this work was the active involvement of the police and other members of the authority in working with the assistant director and the children and young people. This had resulted in a noticeable change of attitude towards adults in authority and indeed by some of those adults towards the children and young people concerned.

The island’s community was very small and there was a degree of neighbourhood support and activity unlikely to be found on the mainland. There were also some key arrangements which had a bearing on the children and young people. On reaching the age of 11 the only secondary school is on the main island and all the children from the outer islands lived in supervised hostels from Monday to Friday during their high school years. From the age of 16, in order to attend college, they had to reside on the mainland and there were a series of addresses approved for this purpose.

An outcome of these arrangements was that the times when there were children and young people, between the ages of 10 and 18, on the island with free time were very specific and any provision needed to be open and accessible when they are most likely to be used fully.

Notwithstanding this positive position, the assistant director had plans to improve provision, in partnership with the Cornwall & the Isles of Scilly YOS. The YOS manager attended the Children’s Committee – the equivalent of the Children’s Trust on the mainland - and he also attended the Community Safety/Drug Alcohol Reference Group. Informal contact was maintained with the police and youth services on the islands. Plans were in place for one of the White Gold Prevention Project workers to go to the islands on a monthly basis to discuss any cases for concern. There was also planning in place to recruit and train two or three volunteers to support any ongoing work that might arise, whether prevention or core tasks. Discussions were also taking place about the involvement of a youth worker and the development of additional sports facilities on the islands.

All of the provision that was described had been established with the needs of the children and young people in mind and it was unsurprising that with the developments and approach described, there had been a reduction in the numbers of children and young people appearing before the court for sentence.
Appendix 1: Summary

Cornwall and Isles of Scilly CCI
General Criterion Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>General Criterion Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Risk of Harm to others – assessment and planning</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Likelihood of Reoffending – assessment and planning</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3: Safeguarding – assessment and planning</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1: Assessment &amp; Planning</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1: Protecting the Public by minimising Risk of Harm to others</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2: Reducing the Likelihood of Reoffending</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3: Safeguarding the child or young person</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2: Interventions</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1: Achievement of outcomes</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2: Sustaining outcomes</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3: Outcomes</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Contextual information

Area

Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly YOS was located in the South-West region of England.

The area had a population of 501,267 as measured in the Census 2001, 10% of which were aged 10 to 17 years old. This was slightly lower than the average for England/Wales, which was 10.4%.

The population of Cornwall was predominantly white British. With only 1% of the population with a black and minority ethnic heritage, this was below the average for England/Wales of 8.7%.

Reported offences for which children and young people aged 10 to 17 years old received a pre-court disposal or a court disposal in 2008/2009, at 30 per 1,000, were below the average for England/Wales of 46.

YOS

The YOS boundaries were within those of the Devon and Cornwall police and probation areas. The Cornwall & the Isles of Scilly PCT covered the area.

The YOS was located within the Integrated Youth Services section of the Cornwall Council Department for Children Schools and Families. It was managed by the Head of Integrated Youth Services.

The YOS Management Board had been chaired by the Director of Children and Education. Following his unexpected departure, this role was taken on by the Cornwall Council Corporate Director for Communities. All statutory partners attended meetings regularly.

The YOS Headquarters was in the town of Truro. The operational work of the YOS was based in Bodmin and Redruth. ISSP was provided by a county wide team.

YJB Performance Data

The YJB summary of national indicators available at the time of the inspection was for the period April 2008 to March 2009.

Cornwall’s performance on ensuring children and young people known to the YOS were in suitable education, training or employment was 71.9%. This was an improvement on the previous year, but below the England average of 72.4%.

Performance on ensuring suitable accommodation by the end of the sentence was 91.5%. This was lower than the previous year and than the England average of 95.3%.

The “Reoffending rate after 9 months” was 0.65%, better than the England average of 0.85% (See Glossary).
Appendix 3a: Inspection data chart

Case sample information: Cornwall and Isles of Scilly CCI

- Under 16: 6
- 16-17: 31
- 18+: 1
- Male: 32
- Female: 6
- White: 35
- Black & Minority Ethnic Other Groups: 3
- First Tier Community Supervision: 24
- Custody: 6
- High Very High ROH: 4
- Not High ROH: 34
Appendix 3b: Inspection data

Fieldwork for this inspection was undertaken in November 2009

The inspection consisted of:

◊ examination of practice in a sample of cases, normally in conjunction with the case manager or other representative
◊ evidence in advance
◊ questionnaire responses from children and young people, and victims

We have also seen YJB performance data and assessments relating to this YOS

Appendix 4: Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice

Information on the Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice can be found on our website:

http://www.justice.gov.uk/inspectorates/hmi-probation

The Inspectorate is a public body. Anyone wishing to comment on an inspection, a report or any other matter falling within its remit should write to:

HM Chief Inspector of Probation
2nd Floor, Ashley House
2 Monck Street
London, SW1P 2BQ
Appendix 5: Glossary

ASB/ASBO  Antisocial behaviour/Antisocial Behaviour Order
Asset  A structured assessment tool based on research and developed by the Youth Justice Board looking at the young person’s offence, personal circumstances, attitudes and beliefs which have contributed to their offending behaviour
CAF  Common Assessment Framework: a standardised assessment of a child or young person’s needs and of how those needs can be met. It is undertaken by the lead professional in a case, with contributions from all others involved with that individual
CAMHS  Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services: part of the National Health Service, providing specialist mental health and behavioural services to children and young people up to at least 16 years of age
Careworks  One of the two electronic case management systems for youth offending work currently in use in England and Wales. See also YOIS+
CRB  Criminal Records Bureau
DTO  Detention and Training Order: a custodial sentence for the young
Estyn  HM Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales
ETE  Employment, training and education: work to improve an individual’s learning, and to increase their employment prospects
FTE  Full-time equivalent
HM  Her Majesty’s
HMIC  HM Inspectorate of Constabulary
HMI Prisons  HM Inspectorate of Prisons
HMI Probation  HM Inspectorate of Probation
Interventions; constructive and restrictive interventions  Work with an individual that is designed to change their offending behaviour and/or to support public protection.
A constructive intervention is where the primary purpose is to reduce Likelihood of Reoffending.
A restrictive intervention is where the primary purpose is to keep to a minimum the individual’s Risk of Harm to others. Example: with a sex offender, a constructive intervention might be to put them through an accredited sex offender programme; a restrictive intervention (to minimise their Risk of Harm) might be to monitor regularly and meticulously their accommodation, their employment and the places they frequent, imposing and enforcing clear restrictions as appropriate to each case.
NB. Both types of intervention are important
ISSP  Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme: this intervention is attached to the start of some orders and licences and provides initially at least 25 hours programme contact including a substantial proportion of employment, training and education
LoR  Likelihood of Reoffending. See also constructive Interventions
LSC  Learning and Skills Council
LSCB  Local Safeguarding Children Board: set up in each local authority (as a result of the Children Act 2004) to coordinate and ensure the effectiveness of the multi-agency work to safeguard and promote the welfare of children in that locality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAPPA</td>
<td>Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements: where probation, police, prison and other agencies work together locally to manage offenders who pose a higher Risk of Harm to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills: the Inspectorate for those services in England (not Wales, for which see Estyn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO</td>
<td>Prolific and other Priority Offender: designated offenders, adult or young, who receive extra attention from the Criminal Justice System agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-CAF</td>
<td>This is a simple 'Request for Service' in those instances when a Common Assessment Framework may not be required. It can be used for requesting one or two additional services, e.g. health, social care or educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>Pre-sentence report: for a court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reoffending rate after 9 months&quot;</td>
<td>A measure used by the Youth Justice Board. It indicates how many further offences are recorded as having been committed in a 9-month period by individuals under current supervision of the relevant YOT, and it can be either more or less than 100%. “110%” would therefore mean that exactly 110 further offences have been counted as having been committed ‘per 100 individuals under supervision’ in that period. The quoted national average rate for England in early 2009 was 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>Risk management plan: a plan to minimise the individual’s Risk of Harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoH</td>
<td>Risk of Harm to others. See also restrictive Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'RoH work’, or 'Risk of Harm work’</td>
<td>This is the term generally used by HMI Probation to describe work to protect the public, primarily using restrictive interventions, to keep to a minimum the individual’s opportunity to behave in a way that is a Risk of Harm to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoSH</td>
<td>Risk of Serious Harm: a term used in Asset. HMI Probation prefers not to use this term as it does not help to clarify the distinction between the probability of an event occurring and the impact/severity of the event. The term Risk of Serious Harm only incorporates ‘serious’ impact, whereas using ‘Risk of Harm’ enables the necessary attention to be given to those offenders for whom lower impact/severity harmful behaviour is probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFA</td>
<td>Screening Interview for Adolescents: Youth Justice Board approved mental health screening tool for specialist workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQIFA</td>
<td>Screening Questionnaire Interview for Adolescents: Youth Justice Board approved mental health screening tool for YOT workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMP</td>
<td>Vulnerability management plan: a plan to safeguard the well-being of the individual under supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YJB</td>
<td>Youth Justice Board for England and Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOI</td>
<td>Young Offenders Institution: a Prison Service institution for young people remanded in custody or sentenced to custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOIS+</td>
<td>Youth Offending Information System: one of the two electronic case management systems for youth offending work currently in use in England and Wales. See also Careworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS/T</td>
<td>Youth Offending Service/Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>