Misspent Youth, published in 1996, identified a number of problems with the system for dealing with young offenders...

- prosecution through the courts is slow
- not enough is done to address offending behaviour
- the agencies involved often work in an unco-ordinated way
- little is done to prevent young people from offending in the first place

...and the Government’s Crime and Disorder Bill means that agencies will have to make substantial changes to address these issues.

Audits of local criminal justice services reveal that much has yet to be done if these changes are to take place on time...

- on average, a case takes four and a half months from arrest to sentence – over two months before it even reaches court
- only 2 per cent of offenders are given 'caution plus' programmes, which will shortly be introduced everywhere as 'warnings'
- on average, only 30 per cent of youth justice workers’ time is spent addressing offending behaviour
- information systems are often inadequate and do not facilitate data exchange between agencies
- one-third of supervision plans fail to address the educational needs of offenders.

...but there is wide variation.

- performance is not related to the level of resources and there are examples of good practice
- fast-tracking for the most persistent can speed up the process for all offenders and frees up staff to address offending behaviour
- effective bail support programmes can reduce remands to custody
- early intervention can be helpful for first offenders
- good 'caution plus' programmes by multi-agency teams can reduce re-offending and save over £20 million

The best way to reduce crime by young people is to prevent them from offending in the first place through co-ordinated strategies.

- support for schools and pupils at risk can reduce problems and increase educational achievements
- joint work between social services, schools and police can reduce disruption and help young people in local areas
- some local multi-agency strategies are being developed and evaluated in the UK

For the Crime and Disorder Bill to be successful, a number of challenges must be met.

- good-quality systems should be established to allow sharing of information
- agencies dealing with young people, such as schools, should review how well they serve those at risk to prevent them becoming offenders
- authorities have an opportunity to review how they allocate resources for best effect
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Misspent Youth, published in November 1996, criticised the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of the services that deal with young offenders. It highlighted the following problems:

1. prosecution through the courts is slow (four months on average from arrest to sentence) and often ineffective in reducing re-offending;
2. most of the £1bn spent each year on dealing with young offenders goes on processing and administration; only a fraction is spent on direct work to address their offending behaviour. Half the cases sent to court are dropped or end with the young person being discharged;
3. monitoring of re-offending after different sentences and disposals is rare;
4. the many agencies involved work in an unco-ordinated way, often with different priorities and performance targets. Many of them are accountable to different government departments; and
5. little is done to prevent young people from getting involved in offending in the first place.

The report’s recommendations for improving the situation included:

1. local targets for the time taken from arrest to sentence for young offenders;
2. increasing the use of multi-agency ‘caution plus’ action programmes for early offenders, as an alternative to the court process;
3. more effective supervision orders for young offenders, based on what is known to work, to address offending behaviour;
4. regular monitoring of young people’s re-offending after sentence or other disposals;
5. better co-ordination between local agencies working with young offenders, regular youth court users’ group meetings and the development of joint agency teams; and
6. multi-agency strategies to prevent young people from offending, targeted to high-risk areas and based on approaches that have been shown to work elsewhere.

Youth crime continues to cause concern to the public and to generate debate among policymakers. Tackling it is one of the new Government’s stated top priorities. A key pledge is to halve the time from arrest to sentence for persistent young offenders. Proposals for reform of the youth justice system were set out in the White Paper, No More Excuses – A
New Approach to Tackling Youth Crime in England and Wales (Ref. 2) and many of the proposals requiring legislation are contained in the Crime and Disorder Bill which is currently before Parliament. Local agencies that deal with young offenders will need to take action now, in advance of the new legislation, if they are to make these changes successfully, and auditors have been working with them to help identify where they need to focus their attention. This report summarises the audit findings and suggests actions to tackle offending by dealing with offenders more effectively and preventing youth crime in the longer term.

4. The White Paper proposes changes in policy for young offenders to deal, in particular, with three issues:
   - tackling delays;
   - addressing offending behaviour more effectively; and
   - multi-agency working.

It also proposes a number of approaches to preventing crime by young people. The main proposals are set out below, with further details in Appendix 1.

Tackling delays

5. To tackle delays in sentencing, the separate elements of the process from arrest to sentence will have statutory time-limits. These will be stricter for young offenders than for adults and tighter still for ‘persistent young offenders’ (defined as those who have been sentenced by a criminal court for recordable offences on three or more separate occasions and arrested again within three years of the third conviction).

6. A number of actions can be taken by the agencies involved, so as to prepare for the new requirements:
   - courts and youth court users’ groups can monitor times from arrest to sentence, taking special note of the times for persistent offenders, and aim to reduce them;
   - pre-court procedures, such as decisions on whether to prosecute, can be streamlined;
   - the number of court appearances can be reduced, by improving the communications between parties before the court case and by reducing the need to adjourn for pre-sentence reports (PSRs);
   - youth justice and probation services can provide effective bail support schemes;
   - PSRs can be produced within the national standards limit of 15 working days, and courts can be ready to receive them; and
   - all courts and other agencies can review procedures.
Police cautions are to be replaced by ‘reprimands’ and ‘warnings’, which do not require a court process.

Addressing offending behaviour

7. To address offending behaviour more effectively, a number of new penalties have been proposed. Police cautions are to be replaced by ‘reprimands’ and ‘warnings’, which do not require a court process. The warnings will comprise a package of measures, possibly including reparation, to be devised and supervised by multi-agency ‘youth offending teams’ (YOTs).

8. There will be four new court orders relating to young offenders: the reparation order, the action plan order, the parenting order, and the detention and training order [EXHIBIT 1]. The first two will enable the court to require reparation to the victim or the community and to require a short, intensive programme to tackle offending behaviour. The parenting order can be given in addition to the young person’s penalty, or for parents of children below the age of criminal responsibility who are also the subject of a child safety order, and may require parents to attend training and guidance sessions. The new detention and training order will replace secure training orders for persistent offenders between 12 and 14 years old and detention in a YOI (young offender institution) for 15-17 year olds; half the order is to be spent in custody and half under community supervision.

EXHIBIT 1
Penalties and interventions for youth offending and those at risk
There will be four new court orders relating to young offenders: the reparation order, the action plan order, the parenting order and the detention and training order.

Source: Audit Commission/Home Office
Youth justice services and youth court users’ groups can monitor the re-offending of young people after different sentences and other disposals, to discover which interventions are most effective.

9. A new court order – the child safety order, intended to prevent children under ten from getting involved in crime – will be available to family proceedings courts, on application from the local authority. The order may require the child to be at home at certain times or to attend school. In addition, local authorities will be enabled to introduce local child curfews for children under ten for limited periods.

10. In order to prepare for the new requirements on addressing offending behaviour, a number of actions can be taken now:
   - multi-agency groups can develop 'caution plus' action schemes (similar to 'warnings') to tackle the offending behaviour of early offenders instead of sending them to court, and can begin to develop reparation schemes;
   - youth justice services can give greater priority to addressing offending behaviour, based on evidence about what works, and enable staff to spend more of their time on direct work with offenders;
   - supervision plans can place greater emphasis on addressing offending behaviour by making sure that offenders take them seriously, and are brought back to court if sessions are missed without good reason; and
   - youth justice services and youth court users' groups can monitor the re-offending of young people after different sentences and other disposals, to discover which interventions are most effective.

All these actions will help to ease the implementation of the changes later on.

Multi-agency working

11. To further multi-agency working, statutory youth offending teams (YOTs) will be introduced, with social services, education, probation, police and health staff as members. The chief executive of the local authority will be responsible for ensuring that YOTs are in place, and all the agencies will be required to commit resources. Staff from the youth service, voluntary organisations and young offender institutions may also become involved. The teams will be responsible for ensuring that warnings, bail and remand support, court reports, post-sentence supervision and throughcare for young offenders are delivered. Local authorities are to prepare a youth justice plan, in consultation with the police authority, probation committee and health authority, setting out how services are to be provided and funded.

12. In order to prepare for the new requirements on multi-agency working, a number of actions can be taken, including the following:
   - police and youth justice services can develop local guidelines on whether to caution or prosecute young offenders, based on gravity-factors;
   - PSR authors can ensure that those providing education or employment training are consulted when reports are written;
statutory youth offending teams will be introduced, with social services, education, probation, police and health staff as members.

- PSR authors can discuss their recommendations with magistrates and the youth courts users' group, to promote understanding over sentencing options;
- supervision plans for young offenders can incorporate strategies to address the offender's needs for education or training. Where the young person has problems with mental health or substance abuse, plans could involve local health services; and
- youth justice workers can establish links with local YOIs to contribute to sentence planning and training during a young person's time in custody and to assist their progress on release.

13. At national level, a new body (the Youth Justice Board) is to co-ordinate policy and monitor the operations of the entire system. It will oversee the work of local teams and individual youth justice agencies, including the delivery of secure provision. The new body is to be independent of existing government departments and is to include practitioners and experts in the field of youth crime, as well as civil servants.
Policies for crime prevention

14. This is the most important area for development, since preventing young people from offending could have a greater impact on the level of youth crime than any changes to the criminal justice system. A number of measures are being introduced to address the problems of families and children at risk, including the new Social Exclusion Unit, a strategy to help those under 17 who have 'dropped out' to re-engage in education or training, and the appointment of an anti-drugs co-ordinator who is to put forward a strategy for young people. The Crime and Disorder Bill, currently before Parliament, will require local authorities and the police to draw up joint community safety strategies. These should include analysis of the problems in the area, consultation with local agencies and groups and long- and short-term targets for each element of the plan.

15. In order to prepare for the new requirements on crime prevention, a number of actions can be taken now, and have begun in many areas:

- police, local authorities and other agencies can jointly develop strategies for youth crime prevention, based on identified risks and 'good-practice' knowledge of what is working well elsewhere;
- local agencies can carry out an audit of youth crime problems;
- pilot programmes can be set up in the most deprived areas, and their effects evaluated;
- local criminal justice agencies can identify where savings may be made, in order to redirect resources into preventive work; and
- agencies that deal with young people, such as schools and social services, can ensure that the needs of those most at risk of offending are met appropriately.

16. The changes required will mean considerable preparation by the agencies involved. When Misspent Youth was published in 1996 the Audit Commission began to audit the activities of local youth courts and youth justice services in England and Wales to see how well placed they are to respond to the changes that will be needed.

17. Youth justice services will be audited again in 1998 and 1999, as the new arrangements begin to come into operation. The results of the first phase are presented in Chapter Two. Chapter Three describes some options for preventing crime by young people, drawing on the experience of a number of other countries. This report follows previous Audit Commission studies of services for young people and criminal justice agencies, and future reports will look at related areas. A study of the progress of local authorities and police in developing strategies for crime prevention and community safety is expected to report in the autumn of 1998 [EXHIBIT 2].
EXHIBIT 2

Audit Commission reports on services for young people and crime

A study of the progress of local authorities and police in developing strategies for crime prevention and community safety is expected in 1998.

_source: Audit Commission_
Most local authorities found data-collection a very difficult task. Computer systems were rare, and paper recording systems were slow to provide the information required.

18. During 1997 auditors collected data on the criminal justice services for young people aged between 10 and 17 throughout England and Wales. The effectiveness of these services can only properly be measured by reference to the level of re-offending by known young offenders, and perhaps to the level of crime by those who might be deterred from committing offences. The auditors’ monitoring included a preliminary exercise to collect re-offending data, so as to demonstrate that this is possible, but interpretation of the figures is controversial. Many factors affect the outcome, not least the characteristics and backgrounds of the young people concerned. Nevertheless it has been useful for drawing initial conclusions and stimulating further discussion. ‘Process’ measures of the performance of agencies are easier to measure reliably and are useful where some aspects of the process have been shown to be related to effectiveness.

19. The activities of the agencies in relation to the key recommendations of *Misspent Youth* and the changes required by the new government were examined. The results have provided a baseline measure, indicating how much preparatory work is needed before the changes come into force. Further auditing will take place in 1998 and 1999. The areas of performance looked at were:

- time through the criminal justice process;
- effort spent addressing offending behaviour;
- the monitoring of re-offending after different kinds of disposal; and
- inter-agency communication and co-ordination.

The relationship between the resources and workload of local youth justice services was also investigated. While agencies in some areas are in a good position to respond to the changes required by the Government, others have much to do.

20. The first point of contact for the audit monitoring has always been the local authority youth justice service. Social services youth justice services and integrated teams jointly managed with the probation service have therefore been monitored (single-agency probation work was not included, although future audit work will cover it). Much of the comparative information generated in these audits is better considered in a multi-agency context, as it relates to the courts and other agencies that deal with young offenders.
21. Most local authorities found data-collection a very difficult task. Computer systems were rare, and paper recording systems were slow to provide the information required. Some items could not be monitored in every authority, as the information was not available. Good-quality information systems are needed in all areas before the implementation of the Crime and Disorder Bill.

22. The stages of the criminal justice system for young offenders were outlined in Misspent Youth [EXHIBIT 3]. Local information on the time taken for the whole process, the number of appearances in court and the production of PSRs was gathered in the audits.

**Time from arrest to sentence**

23. The average time between arrest and sentence in the youth court was 131 days. This is a more accurate figure than in the original study, as it is based on a larger sample (120 local authorities). Such a long delay means that a young person caught for breaking into a car, say, at the end of February does not know his punishment until midsummer. It can be difficult for a teenager to make the link between cause and effect over such a long period.

---

**EXHIBIT 3**

The criminal justice system for young offenders

The police can decide to give a warning or caution instead of sending an offender to court.
Average delays varied between 80 and 220 days in different local authority areas, [EXHIBIT 4a]. Slightly more than half the time was taken before the first court appearance – an average of 70 days before the first appearance (and 61 days after), although this also varied. There was no significant difference between delays for young people of school age and those over school age (using the Levine and Students T tests). Cases generally took longer in London boroughs than in other types of authority, most of the difference being at the pre-court stage [EXHIBIT 4b]. These findings imply that the agencies responsible for bringing cases to court – the police, Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and others – need to review their practices, especially in London, to work out together how they can reduce the time needed to sentence a young offender.

EXHIBIT 4A
Days from arrest to sentence, by individual authority
Average delays varied considerably between local authority areas...

EXHIBIT 4B
Days from arrest to sentence, by authority type
...but cases generally took longer in London.

Source: Audit data returns, based on a sample of 50 cases in each local authority area
25. The audit monitoring in 1998 and future years will record the first court listing (in addition to the first appearance) in order to correspond with the Home Office guidance. It will also record separately the time taken for persistent offenders – defined as those with three or more previous sentences by the court – since speeding up the process for this group is one of the Government’s key targets.

Multi-agency panels

26. Many factors contribute to delay in processing cases, including procedures involving the police, the CPS, defence solicitors, and applications for legal aid. One possible additional source of delay is referral to multi-agency discussion panels, in which youth justice and other agencies help the police decide whether to caution or prosecute the young people they have arrested. Although very important for providing more informed decision-making in borderline cases, these add another stage to the process. Some cases are sent to such panels in 85 per cent of local authorities. Most of the panels meet fortnightly, although their use varies widely between areas. In some areas over 70 per cent of cases are sent to the panel, but in others none are sent [EXHIBIT 5]. On average, 23 per cent of cases are sent to multi-agency panels.

27. Misspent Youth recommended the use of gravity-factors to guide decision-making on whether to caution or prosecute, ideally based on agreements with the local youth justice service. The Home Office circular on tackling delays has also recommended the use of gravity-factors for most cases, to reduce the need for lengthy discussions. In authorities where gravity-factor guidelines have been developed jointly by local agencies, and most decisions are based on them, multi-agency panels can be used in a closely targeted way, with approximately 10 per cent of cases sent to them. The average unit cost of a panel discussion is £15.80. If all

EXHIBIT 5

The use of multi-agency panels

In some areas over 70 per cent of cases are sent to the panel, but in others none are sent.

Source: Audit data returns, based on all young people arrested in 1996
The Home Office circular on tackling delays recommends using a previous PSR where a very recent one is available and providing a verbal update so as to avoid the need to adjourn for a further three weeks.

authorities used panels for only 10 per cent of cases, £0.5 million might be saved by the participating agencies – to be redirected towards addressing offending behaviour. Although the marginal savings are likely to be less than this average cost, significant amounts of staff time could be redirected towards other activities.

28. Police forces and local authorities in which gravity-factor guidelines have not been developed should work together to establish these and should base most of their decisions on them. The guidelines developed by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) could be used as a basis, from which local agreement could be developed. Local guidelines should form the basis for similar decisions about reprimands and final warnings when the new legislation is implemented. Existing multi-agency panel structures may provide a useful basis for liaison meetings between the agencies, provided that the purpose of the meetings is clarified and the appropriate staff from each agency attend.

Youth court appearances

29. The average number of appearances per case in the youth court varied from fewer than two to more than six [EXHIBIT 6]. The average number of appearances was highly correlated with the time from first court appearance to sentence.¹ The Home Office’s clarification that cases need not be adjourned to tie together cases for the same defendant, and its endorsement of speedier access to legal aid and the occasional use of ‘oral updates’ (Ref. 3) should help to reduce the number of appearances.

30. If all courts required an average of three appearances before sentence was given (the lower quartile), instead of 3.6 (the average), the number of court appearances in England and Wales could be reduced by 71,021, saving £12 million (the calculations are presented in Appendix 2). If a way could be found to transfer these savings between departments, they could be used to address offending behaviour. All court users’ groups, especially those with a higher-than-average number of appearances, should consider ways in which they can reduce the number of appearances. This might be achieved in different ways in different circumstances. For example, courts that have many cases involving more than ten appearances might concentrate on these, whereas others might aim to reduce the number of appearances on half their cases. The ‘fast-tracking’ schemes identified by the Home Office Task Force (see paragraphs 35-37 below) have provided some useful guidelines.

¹ Correlation of 0.78, using the Pearson test, significant at the 0.01 level
EXHIBIT 6

Mean number of youth court appearances per case

The average number of appearances varied.

Source: Audit data returns, based on a sample of 50 cases in each local authority area.

Pre-sentence reports (PSRs)

31. One of the more common reasons for adjourning court cases is to commission a PSR from the youth justice or probation services so that sentencing decisions can take into account a young person’s circumstances. The level of requests for PSRs may be compared in authorities with integrated youth justice and probation teams, because all the reports for the youth court are provided by these teams. On average, a PSR is requested for 41 per cent of completed offence cases in the youth court. This underestimates the rate of PSR requests, as several cases are often brought together for sentencing, and one report provided for all. The rate varies between areas from 15 per cent to 88 per cent [EXHIBIT 7, overleaf], and is likely to vary between courts within the same local authority. In those with a high rate of PSR requests, many young people will have at least an extra three weeks of uncertainty before knowing what their penalty will be. Courts that make high numbers of requests should review their criteria for requests and consider whether these could be reduced for some categories of young people sentenced. This could help to reduce the average time taken to sentence a young offender and could reduce the costs to the youth justice service. The Home Office circular on tackling delays (Ref. 3) recommends using a previous PSR where a very recent one is available and providing a verbal update, or else getting a ‘fast-track’ PSR the same day, so as to avoid the need to adjourn for a further three weeks.
EXHIBIT 7
The percentage of completed offence cases for which a PSR is requested (integrated teams only)
This varies between areas and is likely to vary between courts in the same local authority.

Source: Audit data returns, based on all young people found guilty in 1996

EXHIBIT 8
The relationship between availability of resources and PSR requests (integrated teams only)
Local authorities with a higher rate of requests for PSRs generally have a higher level of staff resources.

Note: Correlation of 0.50, significant at the 0.05 level, using the Pearson test.
Source: Audit data returns

32. For an equivalent level of local need, the availability of qualified staff varies. The level of need may be estimated from the number of young people prosecuted, cautioned or warned in the authority area in one year, and the level of staffing can be compared where the service is provided by integrated teams. Local authorities with a higher rate of requests for PSRs generally have a higher level of staff resources [EXHIBIT 8]. This may be due to authorities adjusting their resources in line with the demands of the local courts. If all the courts with high rates of PSR requests were to change their practices in line with new government policies, some resources should be freed up to address offending behaviour more effectively.
33. The Home Office, Department of Health and Welsh Office have set a national standard of 15 working days to complete the report, unless the court requires otherwise (Ref. 4). On average, only a quarter of the PSRs completed were within this time, and more often in metropolitan and unitary authorities than others [EXHIBIT 9]. The average time taken to complete reports varied between authorities, with an average of 20 days [EXHIBIT 10].

**EXHIBIT 9**

**Percentage of PSRs presented to the court within 15 days in different types of authority**

The 15-day standard was achieved more often in metropolitan and unitary authorities than others.

![Percentage of PSRs presented within 15 days](chart1)

*Source: Audit data returns, based on 40 recently completed PSRs in each authority*

**EXHIBIT 10**

**Average time taken to complete a PSR**

The average time taken to complete reports varied between authorities.

![Average time to produce PSR](chart2)

*Source: Audit data returns, based on 40 recently completed PSRs in each authority*
Authorities that are comparatively well provided with staff (estimated on the basis outlined in paragraph 32) do not complete their PSRs any faster than others [EXHIBIT 11]. The absence of a correlation between staff resources and PSR completion time may be because the main determinant of the time taken is often the court schedule, leading to reports being requested for dates more than 15 working days ahead. Many of the youth justice services audited were working to a target time for PSR completion set locally by the courts – often 20 working days rather than 15. This may be acceptable to the local court, and is a key indicator for the probation service, but it may not be acceptable under the new government agenda, which entails reducing the time from arrest to sentence for all young offenders. Failure to complete PSRs quickly is not the sole responsibility of the youth justice or probation services; it may be due to the court meeting only every four weeks as a youth court. If this is the case, it may be possible for magistrates and court officials to convene as a youth court for a half day more frequently, without incurring additional costs. All parties involved in the court need to receive information about how long it takes to complete PSRs and to work out together how they can reduce it. Some sanctions or incentives should be provided to encourage them to do this.

EXHIBIT 11

The relationship between staff resources and average time taken to complete PSRs (integrated teams only)

Authorities comparatively well-provided with staff do not complete their PSRs any faster.

Note: Correlation of -0.19, using Pearson test (non-significant).

Source: Audit data returns
One common theme is the need for better communication between the agencies involved.

Fast-tracking

35. ‘Fast-tracking’ schemes have been developed in Leeds, North Hampshire and Sheffield – and have succeeded in reducing the time from arrest to sentence for persistent young offenders. This can save money and improve the experience for all those involved. The definition of a persistent young offender varied slightly, but there was sufficient similarity for it to produce a list of around 30 young people in each area over a six-month period. The time from arrest to sentence averaged 59 days, and the number of cases dealt with on a first appearance increased by a factor of three. The Leeds project identified several ways to reduce delays:

- an inter-agency group that meets regularly to review progress and discuss issues;
- a specialist team of court clerks to manage particular cases, and fixed days in court to follow these cases to completion; and
- time targets for persistent offenders and others.

36. The Sheffield project also took an indication of the likely plea from the defence at a first hearing and set the earliest possible date for a plea in all cases. Short target times were set for pre-trial reviews and trial dates. The North Hampshire scheme encouraged magistrates to have ‘cut-off points’, after which they would not adjourn to link cases together further, and used verbal assessments instead of full PSRs where possible.

37. The lessons from these projects should be applicable to courts across the country. One common theme is the need for better communication between the agencies involved, so as to overcome some of the difficulties that still occur. For example, the CPS should pass files to the youth justice service in good time, in order to expedite the production of PSRs. The potential for information technology to assist agencies in communicating should be fully explored and pilot schemes established.

38. To speed up the process of dealing with young offenders it is recommended that:

- all criminal justice agencies, especially those responsible for bringing cases to court, should review their practices to work out how they can reduce the time taken;
- police forces and local authorities in which gravity-factor guidelines have not been developed should work together to establish these, and should base most of their decisions on them;
- youth court users’ groups should be established in all areas. Those where there is a higher-than-average number of court appearances should consider ways in which they can reduce them;
- youth courts that request high numbers of PSRs should review their criteria for requests and consider whether these could be reduced for some categories of young people sentenced;
all parties involved in the youth court need to receive information about PSR completion times and to work out together how they are to meet the targets; and

- the agencies involved in the youth court should ensure that they communicate effectively – for example, by passing files to other agencies promptly.

### 'Caution plus'

39. 'Caution plus' programmes, such as those carried out by the Northamptonshire Diversion Unit, address the offending behaviour of young people who have been caught once or twice before, without the need to go through a court process. 'Warnings', introduced in the Bill, are similarly aimed at early offenders and will provide active intervention at the pre-court stage. They should include assessment of the young person's circumstances and the views of the victim, and should provide counselling or group work, reparation, supervised community work, assisted school attendance and help for the young person's parents.

40. However, only 2 per cent of young offenders were given 'caution plus' programmes in 1996, and only three authorities used them for more than 10 per cent of offenders [EXHIBIT 12]. The number of young people receiving substantive programmes equivalent to 'warnings' would be smaller still, as 'caution plus' was not tightly defined in this exercise. The figures would inevitably have included some minimal interventions, such as a single follow-up visit from a youth justice worker.

### EXHIBIT 12

**The use of 'caution plus'**

Only 2 per cent of young offenders were given 'caution plus' programmes.

Source: Audit data returns, based on all arrests of young people in 1996 (excluding NFAs)
41. More detailed information on cost savings is now available than was available when *Misspent Youth* was published. The audits revealed that in one year 12,360 first- and second-time known offenders were given a conditional discharge, an absolute discharge, a fine or an attendance centre order by courts in England and Wales. If this group of offenders had been given 'caution plus' programmes instead, £23 million could have been saved by the agencies involved in the court process, and the offending behaviour would have been addressed more effectively. If half the first- and second-time offenders given supervision orders, probation orders, community service or combination orders had been given 'caution plus', the saving would have been a further £26 million (although the figure would be reduced somewhat if some of these were ineligible to receive 'caution plus' programmes because they did not admit the offence). A number of repeat offenders received cautions during this period. If those with two or more previous offences had been given 'caution plus' programmes instead of straight cautions, this saving would have been reduced to £24 million. The calculations are shown in Appendix 2.

42. Youth justice services in all areas without such schemes will have to develop them rapidly if the requirements of the White Paper are to be in place on time, so they should be planning to do so now. All programmes should include an assessment of the offender and victim, and should contain some of the elements outlined above. They should be targeted to early offenders, who are most likely to benefit from them. The best 'caution plus' programmes, based on multi-agency teams, can take some time to establish, so it is important that implementation begins without delay, making use of the experiences of others, such as the Northamptonshire Diversion Unit, which has been in operation for more than ten years.

**Early intervention with first offenders**

43. Criminal justice agencies, on their own, can have difficulty in keeping young offenders out of trouble unless they are helped by preventive services working alongside them. Most young offenders have problems with their families, schools or social environment. Two schemes, in Denmark and Sweden [CASE STUDIES 1 AND 2, overleaf], provide a routine assessment of all first offenders and their families, and intervene if necessary. First offenders' re-offending rates in these schemes compare well with England and Wales, where 30 per cent re-offend within two years after a caution [EXHIBIT 13, overleaf]. A scheme in Milton Keynes to address shop theft has demonstrated a substantial reduction in re-offending by first offenders, although it had less impact on repeat offenders [CASE STUDY 3, p23].
CASE STUDY 1

Working with first-time offenders in Odense, Denmark

In Odense the police and social services work closely together, within the SSP (Social Services, Schools, Police) framework. The local authority has brought children’s services – schools, childminding, leisure and social services for children – together under one department. A social worker is required by law to attend the police interview following the arrest of anyone under the age of 18. In this project, which has been operating since 1992, the social worker also visits the parents at home to let them know what their child has been doing and with whom they have been associating. The social worker investigates the family situation and offers continuing regular contact if necessary, or refers them to childcare services, clubs, or job training. Over the four years since this scheme began, the number of young offenders arrested by the police has dropped steadily from 360 to 227, although the reduction is mainly in the number of very transient offenders.

CASE STUDY 2

Social work within the Stockholm police

The police in Stockholm have established a special juvenile squad of 30 staff who deal with crime by young people and share their office base in the police station with a team of social workers. A member of this team attends the interview of each young person arrested, visits the family at home to assess whether there are any special problems and reports to social services. A simple report is sufficient in most cases, but additional social services intervention is requested in 25 per cent of cases. Using this system, it is estimated that 90 per cent of first-time offenders do not return, although firm data could not be obtained. Five per cent go on to become persistent offenders and the remaining 5 per cent are borderline cases, where taking quick action is particularly important.

EXHIBIT 13

Re-offending by first offenders after a caution in England and Wales

Thirty per cent re-offend within two years.

Source: Audit data returns: data for 3,344 cases
CASE STUDY 3
The Milton Keynes Retail Theft Initiative

This was introduced by the Milton Keynes area of Thames Valley Police in 1994. Anyone arrested for shop theft who admitted the offence, was not violent and agreed to attend the scheme was given an appointment at the police station. All attenders had a one-to-one interview with a police officer, followed by a combination of modules to address their offending behaviour. These were drawn from:

- an interview with a store manager;
- sessions with the youth service;
- a training session on ‘protective behaviours’ – how to deal with peer pressure; and
- a talk by the prison service.

All attenders received a formal caution by a uniformed officer. The age range was wide, but most offenders were under 18 (peak age 15 years). Those under the age of ten could attend the scheme but did not have an official caution recorded. An evaluation, carried out over an 18-month period, showed a re-offending rate of 3 per cent for 239 first offenders. A similar group of first offenders in an area that did not have such a scheme had an average re-offending rate of 35 per cent. For those with a previous record, the re-offending rates were similar for attenders and non-attenders of the scheme.

Social intervention, possibly in combination with reparation for the victim, may be appropriate on a first occasion for some young people, where there are known to be family problems.

44. On the basis of the evidence available about these schemes, they appear to be more effective in reducing re-offending by first offenders than does cautioning in England and Wales. The new ‘warnings’ for young offenders will include assessment and a range of possible interventions for early offenders. This should enable a flexible response to the young person’s situation and needs. Social intervention, possibly in combination with reparation for the victim, may be appropriate on a first occasion for some young people, where there are known to be family problems and the risk of further offending is high. The police officers who carry out ‘reprimands’ for first offenders should be given special training, and this should include instruction on how to identify those who would benefit from a broader social assessment.

Bail support

45. Re-offending on bail is a serious concern, especially where the bail period is long. Forty per cent of the offences by young people bailed in one county were committed by those who had spent more than three months on bail (Ref. 5). So speeding up the court process to reduce the time spent on bail can mean that action can be taken more quickly to address offending behaviour. The Home Office White Paper has identified bail...
supervision and support as essential functions of YOTs in all areas. Effective bail support schemes can help to reduce re-offending at this time and can sometimes encourage the court to grant bail, often with conditions, as an alternative to residential or custodial remands, thus saving money, as illustrated by the scheme in Rotherham [CASE STUDY 4].

46. Seventy-nine per cent of authorities audited provide a bail support service, at an average cost of £85 per week, which is considerably lower than the costs of the Rotherham scheme. But the effect on the level of remands in those authorities was only slight. Remands averaged 11 per cent in authorities with bail support, and 13 per cent in those without; the difference was not statistically significant, using the Levine and Students T tests. This finding implies that bail support schemes need to be fairly intensive, perhaps involving frequent supervision and home visits, if they are to reduce remands and associated costs significantly. Substantive bail support schemes should be made available in all areas. Regular monitoring of the effectiveness of such schemes should be part of the routine local data-collection.

CASE STUDY 4

The Rotherham bail support project

The Rotherham bail support project is a joint venture between the local authority, the probation service and the voluntary organisation that runs it. It provides community supervision for a targeted group of young people who would be likely to be remanded either to local authority accommodation or to custody, because most are persistent offenders. It provides close supervision and monitoring, a mix of home visits and reporting to the bail office; varied support to the offender and his/her family, which may include help with school attendance, training opportunities, housing or drug problems; and an effective breach procedure for those who fail to comply.

In the four years that the scheme has been in place the number of young people remanded to local authority accommodation has fallen by an average of 76 per cent, and the number remanded to custody has fallen by an average of 60 per cent. The remand figures are substantially lower than in any of nine other metropolitan authorities in the same part of England. This indicates that magistrates have sufficient confidence in the scheme to commit young offenders to its care, rather than to place them on remand. The cost of the scheme is £350 per young person per week, which is a little over half of the cost of custody (£600) and considerably less than local authority accommodation (£1,200 for open accommodation and £2,500 for secure). The evaluation also noted that families of those on the scheme felt that the service had been valuable and that those involved had taken a genuine interest in the whole family.

If Rotherham had the same rate of remands to local authorities and custody as the other nine authorities in the group the additional net cost to the taxpayer would be £246,520 per year. This saving was made in one small authority of approximately 250,000 population, so around £34 million could be saved throughout England and Wales by similar schemes. The calculations are presented in Appendix 2.
2 · REVIEWING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM

Time spent on offending behaviour

47. The time spent by youth justice workers on different activities was recorded by means of a diary exercise in which approximately 800 youth justice and probation staff took part. All direct work with young offenders (work with people on supervision orders, bail support, 'caution plus', visits to custody and work with people on licence) was classified as activity which addresses offending. The remaining activities included writing reports, attending court, meetings, 'appropriate adult' visits, administration and travel. This leads to an overestimate of the resources for addressing offending, since only a portion of the time in each of these activities is devoted to this. Nevertheless, on average, approximately 30 per cent of staff time was spent on direct activities, and hence on addressing offending behaviour, and in many authorities it was less than 20 per cent [EXHIBIT 14a]. Staff in metropolitan authorities and counties generally spent more time addressing offending than in other kinds of authority [EXHIBIT 14b].

EXHIBIT 14A
Percentage of youth justice workers’ time spent addressing offending behaviour, by individual authority
Only 29 per cent of staff time, on average, was spent on these activities.

EXHIBIT 14B
Percentage of youth justice workers’ time spent addressing offending behaviour, by authority type
Staff in metropolitan authorities and counties generally spent more time addressing offending.

Source: Audit data returns, staff diaries over one month
48. Staff in authorities with more staff do not necessarily spend more time on addressing offending behaviour [EXHIBIT 15]. All authorities, especially those where the lowest proportion of time is spent with offenders, should review their priorities to enable staff to spend more time dealing with offending behaviour. Reducing the time taken by the criminal justice process frees up staff to spend more time addressing offending behaviour directly. Reducing the number of requests for PSRs and the time taken to complete them, as well as using trained volunteers for 'appropriate adult' duties (see paragraph 69 below), should also make more time available for addressing offending. Increasing the number of young offenders receiving 'caution plus' programmes should also increase the amount of time spent on addressing offending. The steering group for youth offending teams (Ref. 6) should include these issues in its initial discussions.

EXHIBIT 15

The relationship between relative staff resources and time spent on offending behaviour (integrated teams only)

Youth justice staff in authorities with higher staff levels do not necessarily spend more time on addressing offending behaviour.

Note: Correlation of -0.25 using the Pearson test (non-significant).
Source: Audit data returns
Supervision orders

49. The beginning of a supervision order is an important time for a young offender to learn to obey authority and to understand the difference between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. Prompt and reliable action by the supervising officer is important, to let the offender know that the order is being taken seriously. National standards (Ref. 4) require the first interview with a young person on supervision to be carried out within five working days of the court order being made but, on average, only just over half of first interviews were carried out within this time [EXHIBIT 16a], especially in London boroughs [EXHIBIT 16b]. This finding is worrying, because it implies that many young offenders are not being given a clear message by those in authority that their behaviour needs to change. Improving performance in this area is one of the most significant changes that can be made to address the behaviour of young offenders.

EXHIBIT 16A

Percentage of supervision orders in which the first interview was carried out in five working days, by individual authority

Only just over half of first interviews were carried out within this time.

EXHIBIT 16B

Percentage of first interviews for supervision orders carried out in five days, by authority type

Fewer interviews were carried out within this time in London boroughs.

Source: Audit data returns, based on 25 supervision orders in each authority
50. The national standards (Ref. 4) also require a supervision plan to be drawn up within ten working days which, in a similar way, tells the young person that the order is being taken seriously. But several authorities failed to achieve this for any of the supervision orders sampled, and only half the supervision orders, on average, were drawn up within this time [EXHIBIT 17a]. On average, inner London boroughs performed better on this measure than other types of authority, but the variation within any type of authority was wider than that between groups [EXHIBIT 17b]. All youth justice managers should monitor compliance with national standards guidelines for starting supervision orders and for drawing up supervision plans. Failure to meet the deadlines should warrant investigation.

EXHIBIT 17A

Percentage of supervision plans drawn up within ten working days, by individual authority

Several authorities failed to achieve this for any of the supervision orders sampled.

EXHIBIT 17B

Percentage of supervision plans drawn up within ten working days, by authority type

Inner London boroughs performed better on this indicator than other types of authority.

Source: Audit data returns, based on 25 supervision orders in each authority
51. When a young offender on supervision misses sessions without a valid reason (being sick or attending court are valid reasons) the supervising officer can instigate 'breach proceedings' and bring him or her back to court. The national standards document (Ref. 4) states that anyone who misses more than two sessions in 12 months should be breached. Ninety-three per cent of authorities said that they had a policy on breaching young people who miss supervision but, although over 40 per cent of young people on supervision missed more than two sessions, only 16 per cent were breached [EXHIBIT 18a]. More sessions were missed in London than elsewhere, but the percentage breached was similar [EXHIBIT 18b]. Further research would be needed to determine the reasons why more sessions are missed in some authorities than others and to find ways to address the problem.

EXHIBIT 18A

Percentage on supervision who missed two or more sessions and were or were not breached, by individual authority

Over 40 per cent of young people on supervision missed at least two sessions, but only 16 per cent were breached.

EXHIBIT 18B

Percentage on supervision who missed two or more sessions and were or were not breached, by authority type

More sessions were missed in London than elsewhere.

Source: Audit data returns, based on 25 supervision orders in each authority
52. One possible reason why youth justice officers do not formally breach young offenders is that the court is unable to impose a more severe penalty than the existing supervision order, unless the order was specifically made as an alternative to custody. The new legislation will give the court a wider range of options when an order is breached. If this leads to a significantly increased workload for courts, some new approaches to dealing with them could usefully be piloted. Collecting information about breaches of orders and other matters is vitally important to improve the level of knowledge of what works. Youth justice services should ensure that such information is collected and made available for monitoring purposes.

Effective work with persistent offenders

53. The introduction of more structured supervision orders and the new detention and training orders may provide the opportunity for a range of interventions with young people. The experience of successful schemes in Britain and elsewhere could provide useful models to follow. A scheme in the Netherlands [CASE STUDY 5], providing intensive community supervision, has proved to be more effective in reducing re-offending and considerably cheaper than the institutional alternatives.

CASE STUDY 5
Help at Home, Assen, Netherlands

The scheme is for disturbed young people aged 6-14 who are either persistent offenders or have sufficiently severe mental health or behavioural problems to need residential care. Half the clients come from the criminal justice system, and half from the mental health services. It is a substitute for five specialist agencies which provide funding, supplemented by a central government initiative. A key worker visits the young person at home up to six times per week, providing between 4 and 15 contact hours per week for up to six months. Much of the work takes place in the evening or at weekends. Interventions are firmly based on the priorities of the family and the child, especially their practical everyday problems. The worker may take over some practical tasks for a brief period before teaching the family members to carry them out for themselves. The staff are given special training, provided by a university department, and receive individual and group supervision. Assessment of problems is based on a structured schedule that identifies problem areas and strengths, and produces data for evaluation. Problems are usually resolved in less than six months, and it is extremely rare for the intervention to be needed beyond the six-month period.

Help at Home costs £1,667 per child, for a six-month intervention, and £3,300 for a whole family. In comparison, foster care for a child costs £3,700 a year, residential care £12,000, and intensive residential care (like secure provision in the UK) £60,000.
Monitoring re-offending

54. As part of the audit, youth justice services traced information on the offending patterns of all young offenders who, in November or December 1994, received a community sentence or a police caution or warning, or were released from custody. The frequency and seriousness of offences recorded in the previous year and in the subsequent two years were recorded. Ninety-three authorities managed to complete the exercise, many of them having to request data from local probation and police services. Those with computerised information systems found the task considerably easier than those without. Such systems need to link up with the probation service or the police in order to track the behaviour of young people who reach their 18th birthday within two years of being sentenced.

55. The national data show the percentage of offenders who did not re-offend within two years, those who re-offended less frequently than before and those who offended more frequently [EXHIBIT 19, overleaf]. The percentage with reduced or no re-offending (the left hand bar for each disposal category) gives an initial indication of the 'success' of each type of disposal. It partially compensates for the fact that the more serious sentences are likely to be given to those with higher levels of previous offending, as it is based on the change from the previous pattern. On this basis, attendance centre orders appear to be the 'least successful' disposals and probation orders the 'most successful'. However, some caution should be used in interpreting these data. They are not as robust as the Home Office figures that compare actual reconviction rates with predicted rates based on the offender's age, sex, offence and criminal history [Refs. 7,8], but they provide a basis for comparison that takes some account of the offender's previous offending history.¹

¹ Methodology: To obtain the frequency of re-offending, the average number of offences in the subsequent two years was halved, in order to make an equivalent comparison with the number in the previous one year. To obtain a seriousness value, offences were classified into nine groups, according to seriousness, on the basis of discussions between police, youth justice services and academics. The average score of each offender's most serious offence was used, in order to avoid distortion of seriousness scores by large numbers of lesser offences. Re-offending two years from the end of a custodial sentence was compared with re-offending two years from the beginning of a community sentence.
The frequency of recorded re-offending in the two years after disposal, or release from custody appears to be the 'least successful'.

Attendance centre orders appear to be the 'least successful'.

Source: Audit data returns, all young offender disposals from a two-month period.

EXHIBIT 19

56. The most useful function of these data may be as an audit tool, to stimulate local discussion and review by comparing the national figures with the performances of local areas, which vary considerably. In authority A, supervision orders were less successful than the average, while in authority B, both attendance centre orders and supervision orders were more successful than the national average [EXHIBIT 20]. This kind of information should be used by local youth court users' groups to stimulate discussions about the relative performance of local services and to examine their practices to see whether any changes need to be made. The relatively small samples collected for the audit should be extended to see whether the differences are significant. If so, ways of improving local performance should be investigated. Authorities with agreements for data-sharing with police and probation services found the collection of data easier than others.
EXHIBIT 20

The frequency of re-offending in two local areas

In authority A, supervision orders were 'less successful' than the average and, in authority B, both attendance centre orders and supervision orders were 'more successful' than the national average.

Source: Audit data returns, young offender disposals from a two-month period in two local authorities
57. The seriousness of re-offending in the two years following sentence can be presented in the same way, and local results compared with the national pattern. This shows that the 'least successful' sentences are supervision orders, attendance centre orders and YOIs [EXHIBIT 21].

58. Re-offending after a 'caution plus' programme was significantly less frequent and less serious in authorities that had integrated youth justice and probation teams than in others [EXHIBIT 22]. This finding provides encouraging evidence that joint teams may have provided more effective programmes to reduce offending. When the new legislation is implemented, all youth offending teams will need to include staff from probation, social services, education, police and health services, and be managed jointly – so work to establish such teams should begin now.

---

EXHIBIT 21

The seriousness of re-offending in the two years after disposal

The 'least successful' sentences are supervision orders, attendance centre orders and young offender institutions.

![Comparison of seriousness of offending following various disposals in 1994](image)

Percentage of young offenders re-offending

Source: Audit data returns, all young offender disposals from a two-month period
EXHIBIT 22

**Exhibit 22**

**Frequency of re-offending after ‘caution plus’ programmes provided by integrated and non-integrated teams**

Re-offending was less frequent in authorities that had integrated teams.

Note: The difference between integrated and non-integrated teams was significant at the 0.003 level for frequency, the 0.001 level for seriousness and the 0.001 level for combined frequency and seriousness figures, using the Pearson test.

Source: Audit data returns, all young offender disposals from a two-month period

59. Re-offending did not differ markedly between integrated and non-integrated teams following most of the other disposals [**TABLE 1**]. Re-offending after supervision orders was slightly less in integrated teams but the difference was not significant. The results for probation orders and community service orders did not differ significantly, but combination orders showed a non-significant tendency towards less re-offending in non-integrated teams. The only disposal, other than ‘caution plus’, to show a significant difference between integrated and non-integrated teams was the supervision order with requirements, on which the data favoured integrated teams at a lower level of significance.

**TABLE 1**

**Re-offending after various sentences in integrated and non-integrated teams**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISPOSAL</th>
<th>INTEGRATED</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Less frequently</td>
<td>Less serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Caution plus’</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision order</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision order with requirements</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation order</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service order</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination order</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Less frequently</td>
<td>Less serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Caution plus’</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision order</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision order with requirements</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation order</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service order</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination order</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance Level**

- 0.001
- 0.01
- ns

Source: Audit data returns, all young offender disposals from a two-month period
It is recommended that more 'caution plus' schemes are developed, with the involvement of other agencies.

60. To address offending behaviour more effectively it is recommended that:

- more 'caution plus' schemes are developed, with the involvement of other agencies – these will become final warnings;
- bail support is developed in all areas – also a requirement under the new legislation;
- a higher priority is placed on direct work with young offenders, including more time on supervision orders, bail support and people on licence. The latter will be an essential element of the new detention and training orders;
- the national standards time-limits for first interviews and drawing up supervision plans are adhered to when supervision orders are given by the court. Local monitoring of achievement of these time-limits should be carried out in all areas;
- re-offending after different sentences and other interventions is monitored on a regular basis and the results made available to all those involved in dealing with young offenders; and
- information systems are established that facilitate communication and sharing of information between different agencies.
61. Most young people who have offended enough to make them the subject of a pre-sentence report or a supervision order have serious difficulties with education or employment. Sixty per cent of those on supervision were unemployed and not in training or education at the time of sentence. This varies between different geographical regions and is highest in the Eastern Region, London and Wales [EXHIBIT 23]. Two-thirds of those of school age who are sentenced in court have either been excluded or are known to be missing a significant amount of schooling through truancy (Ref. 1). Many others are likely to have problems with school performance. Young people who have nothing to do with their time and few prospects for the future find it more difficult to change from a pattern of offending behaviour to something more constructive.

EXHIBIT 23
The percentage of those on supervision who are employed, in training or in education, in different regions
This is lowest in the Eastern Region, London and Wales.

Source: Audit data returns, based on 25 supervision plans in each authority, analysed for the regions of the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR)
Involving education

62. The national standards document (Ref. 4) requires all PSRs for children of school age to have some contribution from education – either the school, the local education authority or a pupil referral unit. This is essential if the problems which most such offenders have with their education are to be addressed. Where agencies are communicating effectively and co-ordinating their efforts it should not be difficult to include an education component. However, while some authorities managed to include an education component in every PSR, many others included one in fewer than half [EXHIBIT 24a]. Although the variation between individual authorities on this measure was wide, there was little consistent difference between types of authority [EXHIBIT 24b]. Relationships between individual youth justice services, local authority departments and schools probably make more difference than the authority setting. All PSR authors should ensure that they include a contribution from the education services in the reports they write about school-age children.

EXHIBIT 24A
Percentage of PSRs for schoolchildren that had education input, by individual authority
In many authorities fewer than half the reports included education.

EXHIBIT 24B
Percentage of PSRs for schoolchildren that had education input, by authority type
There was little consistent difference between types of authority.

Source: Audit data returns, based on 20 PSRs in each authority
Supervision plans should ensure that school-age offenders receive education. Two-thirds had a strategy for achieving this, but the range of performance was very wide – in some authorities all the supervision plans included education, but in others none did [EXHIBIT 25]. Surprisingly, the relationship was very weak between authorities where most supervision orders included a strategy for education and those in which most PSRs contained an education component [EXHIBIT 26]. This may be because report-writing and supervision are sometimes carried out by different workers who do not communicate with each other very effectively.

**EXHIBIT 25**

Percentage of supervision plans for school-age offenders that included a strategy to ensure education

In some authorities all the supervision plans included education, but in others none did.

*Source: Audit data returns, based on 25 supervision plans in each authority*

**EXHIBIT 26**

The inclusion of education in PSRs and supervision plans

The relationship between authorities that included education in PSRs and supervision orders was weak.

*Source: Audit data returns, based on 20 pre-sentence reports and 25 supervision plans in each authority*
A referral to youth justice should act as a trigger to the investigation of other problems within the family or with school.

64. All supervision plans for school-age children should address the question of education. Links with education services are particularly important for younger children, as there may be some opportunity to deal with problems at school before it is too late. A referral to youth justice should act as a trigger to the investigation of other problems within the family or with school. Youth justice teams should start to communicate and co-ordinate more effectively with education and other agencies ready for the new YOTs, before the legislation is implemented. Education services should become more involved in addressing the behaviour of pupils who offend. The inclusion of education workers in the new YOTs may help to identify and head off difficulties in education and to access help from other support services. Schools with high levels of offending and behaviour problems could benefit from a joint approach to supporting pupils with difficulties, such as the one outlined in Chapter Three, Case Study 6.

Communication with the court

65. Where the relationship between the youth justice service and the magistrates is good, a fairly high correspondence between recommendations for sentencing and the final decision of the court might be expected. Complete concordance would be inappropriate, as magistrates make independent judgments about the most suitable penalty, but a very low concordance could indicate mistrust of the youth justice service or lack of knowledge about local projects to address offending. There was considerable variation between authorities, with a national average of approximately 70 per cent agreement [EXHIBIT 27]. Those with a concordance lower than about 70 per cent should review their local communications, making use of the youth court users’ group. Where particular local projects to address offending behaviour are under-used, the project management, the youth justice services and magistrates should meet to consider whether they hold different assumptions about the main target group for the project and aim to come to an agreement.

EXHIBIT 27
The percentage of PSRs where the court sentenced in line with the recommendation
There was considerable variation between authorities.

Source: Audit data returns, based on 40 PSRs in each authority
66. There is no consistent relationship between the concordance of sentences with PSR recommendations and the likelihood of being sentenced to custody in different regions of England and Wales (as indicated by the previous offending patterns of people sentenced), although this also varies. In Wales and in Yorkshire and Humberside offenders tend to have offended more, and committed more serious crimes before being sent to custody than in the South West, for example [EXHIBIT 28].

Co-ordination with young offender institutions

67. Links between youth justice teams and custodial establishments are often minimal. The audits showed that only 2 per cent of youth justice workers' time is spent with people on licence and 3 per cent on visits to those in custody. YOIs need to develop programmes to help young offenders with future employment and reintegration into society. Where such programmes operate, they are rarely continued in community supervision on licence. Many research studies have demonstrated that learning and behaviour changes acquired in an institutional setting are difficult to transfer to life outside (Ref. 9). Closer links between the agencies should be developed, sharing information and developing joint programmes to work with people at the critical point when they leave custody, so as to help them maintain a more constructive life outside and to stay away from crime.

I A non-significant correlation of -0.23, using the Pearson test.

EXHIBIT 28
The previous offending patterns of people sentenced to custody in the regions of England and Wales

In Wales and in Yorkshire and Humberside offenders tend to have offended more, and committed more serious crimes before being sent to custody than in the South West.

Source: Audit data returns, analysed for DETR regions
All supervision plans for school-age children should include a strategy to address any problems in education.

**Employing volunteers for specific tasks**

**68.** All young people under 17 arrested by the police must have an 'appropriate adult' present when they are interviewed. When a parent or guardian cannot, or will not, come the 'appropriate adult' is provided by social services – which occurs in around 30 per cent of cases (Ref. 10). Nationally, 43 per cent of 'appropriate adult' visits are carried out by qualified social workers or probation officers, at an average cost of £37 per visit, and 33 per cent are carried out by emergency duty team staff, at an average cost of £39 per visit. Nineteen per cent are carried out by trained volunteers, at an average cost of £10 per visit, including training and expenses.

**69.** If all the visits currently carried out by social workers and probation officers (non-emergency staff) and half of those carried out by emergency duty teams were carried out by trained volunteers instead, around £2/3 million in staff time could be saved by the services and redirected to dealing with offending behaviour. This would include an extra 10 per cent for management of the volunteer service. The calculations are presented in Appendix 2. Youth justice services should consider employing trained volunteers to carry out 'appropriate adult' duties. Another option used in some authorities is employing sessional workers, who are paid and given some training, but are not formally qualified for this task. Training for all those undertaking 'appropriate adult' duties should include clarification of the limitations of the role – in particular, whether anyone other than parents or guardians can give permission for procedures such as fingerprinting.
Many authorities that are relatively well resourced are performing poorly overall, and vice versa.

To improve multi-agency communication and co-ordination, it is recommended that:

- implementation of multi-agency teams and 'caution plus' schemes begin immediately, drawing on the experience of others who have established such schemes for some time;
- all PSRs for school-age children include a contribution from the education services;
- all supervision plans for school-age children include a strategy to address any problems in education;
- youth justice services meet with magistrates on a regular basis to discuss the use of local projects to address offending behaviour;
- closer links be established between youth justice services and YOIs, to facilitate work with those who leave custody; and
- youth justice services consider employing trained volunteers to carry out 'appropriate adult' duties.

Local criminal justice services for young offenders were given a score between zero and three, according to their efficiency on the following indicators:

- time from arrest to sentence;
- use of multi-agency panels;
- mean number of court appearances;
- percentage of PSRs presented to the court within 15 days;
- use of 'caution plus';
- percentage of youth justice workers' time spent addressing offending behaviour;
- percentage of first interviews for supervision orders carried out in five working days;
- percentage of supervision plans drawn up in ten working days;
- percentage of PSRs with education input;
- percentage of supervision plans with an education strategy; and
- percentage of PSRs where the court sentenced in line with recommendation.

For each indicator, authorities in the 'best' quartile were given a score of three and those in the 'worst' quartile were given a score of zero. Averaged across all these measures, an authority's score indicates its overall efficiency in relation to the time through the system, addressing offending behaviour and inter-agency communication. (This is not a measure of the effectiveness of the authority's work in reducing offending by young people, but it indicates how closely processes follow best-practice guidelines on these three key issues; some measures depend on the actions of local courts and other agencies as well as the youth justice service.) Those with a high score are providing a faster, more efficient service that is focused on reducing offending and that makes links with other agencies to improve the quality of the young person's experience.
The maximum possible overall score is three, and the minimum is zero. A few authorities scored more than two, indicating a consistently good performance on most indicators, but some scored less than one [EXHIBIT 29a]. On average, authorities in London and in Yorkshire and Humberside scored lower than those in other parts of the country [EXHIBIT 29b].

72. There was no consistent relationship between the overall authority performance and the resources available for youth justice [EXHIBIT 30]. Many authorities that are relatively well resourced are performing poorly overall, and vice versa. Authorities should check their standing and take action accordingly.

EXHIBIT 29A

The combined efficiency of local criminal justice services on 11 indicators, by individual authority

A few authorities scored more than two, but some scored less than one.

EXHIBIT 29B

The combined performance of criminal justice services, by region

On average, authorities in London and in Yorkshire and Humberside scored lower.

Source: Audit data returns, calculated for the DETR regions
EXHIBIT 30

The overall performance of local authority youth justice services and the staff resources available (integrated teams only)

There was no consistent relationship between the overall authority performance and the resources available for youth justice.

Note: Correlation of 0.30, using Pearson test (non-significant).
Source: Audit data returns

73. Improving the effectiveness of the system that deals with young offenders is important and must take priority. But only 3 per cent of offences lead to a conviction or caution – although most are carried out by persistent offenders, who tend to be caught on some occasion before long (Refs. 8, 11). This means that the criminal justice system only deals with the tip of the iceberg. The way to make a big difference to the overall level of youth crime must be to stop young people from offending in the first place. All local authorities and other agencies that come into contact with children and young people should be considering what they can do to help those at risk, so as to prevent them from becoming offenders. Some possible approaches are outlined in the next chapter.
Reviewing the Performance of the Youth Justice System

1. Good-quality information systems should be established in all areas before the implementation of the Crime and Disorder Bill. They should aim to facilitate the exchange of information between agencies such as youth justice, probation, police and education services.

2. Speeding up the process

   - The agencies responsible for bringing cases to court - the police, CPS and others - need to review their practices, especially in London, to work out together how they can reduce the time taken to sentence a young offender.

   - Police forces and local authorities in which gravity-factor guidelines have not been developed should work together to establish these, and should base most of their decisions on them.

   - All youth court users’ groups, especially those with a higher-than-average number of appearances, should consider ways in which they can reduce the number of appearances.

   - Youth courts that request high numbers of PSRs should review their criteria for requests and consider whether these could be reduced for some categories of young people sentenced.

   - All involved in the youth court need to receive information about PSR completion times and work out together how they are to meet the targets.

3. Better communication is needed between the agencies involved in the youth court. For example, the CPS should pass files to the youth justice service in good time, to expedite the production of PSRs. The potential for information technology to assist agencies in communicating should be fully explored, and pilot schemes established.

4. Addressing offending behaviour

   - Youth justice services in all areas without multi-agency ‘caution plus’ schemes will have to develop them rapidly if the requirements of the White Paper are to be in place on time, so they should be planning to do so now.

   - Substantive bail support schemes should be made available in all areas. Regular monitoring of the effectiveness of such schemes should be part of the routine local data-collection.

   - All youth justice services, especially those with the lowest proportion of time spent with offenders, should review their priorities to enable staff to spend more time dealing with offending behaviour.
11 All youth justice managers should monitor compliance with national standards guidelines for beginning supervision orders and for drawing up supervision plans. Failure to meet the deadlines should warrant investigation.

12 Youth justice services should ensure that information about breaches of orders and other matters is collected and made available for monitoring purposes.

13 Information on re-offending should be used by local youth court users’ groups to review their practice and to examine the relative performance of local services. Those with computerised systems should find the collection of information considerably easier than those without. Such systems need to link up with the probation service or the police in order to track the behaviour of young people who reach their 18th birthday within two years of being sentenced.

Multi-agency co-ordination

14 All PSR authors should ensure that the education services have an input to their reports on school-age children.

15 All supervision plans for school-age children should address the question of education.

16 Youth justice teams should start to communicate and co-ordinate more effectively with education and other agencies ready for the new YOTs before legislation is implemented.

17 Youth justice services where the concordance between the PSR recommendation and the court sentence is lower than about 70 per cent should review their communication with the local court, making use of the youth court users’ group.

18 Where particular local projects to address offending behaviour are under-used, the project management, the youth justice services and magistrates should meet to consider whether they hold different assumptions about the main target group for the project and aim to come to an agreement.

19 Closer links between custodial and community agencies should be developed, sharing information and developing joint programmes to work with people at the critical point when they leave custody, so as to help them maintain a more constructive life outside and stay away from crime.

20 Youth justice services should consider employing trained volunteers to carry out ‘appropriate adult’ duties.
74. Preventing young people from offending in the first place is the most promising approach to reducing youth crime in the longer term. There is a strong consensus on the main factors likely to increase the risk of young people offending [EXHIBIT 31], as identified in Misspent Youth (Refs. 12, 13). Many young people encounter one or two risk factors as they grow up, but the risks are greatest for those who have four or more in their lives (Ref. 11).

EXHIBIT 31
The cycle of anti-social behaviour

There is a strong consensus on the main factors likely to increase the risk of young people offending.

Source: Audit Commission
75. Programmes that have an impact on these risk factors can reduce the chances of young people growing up to be offenders. Combinations of interventions very early in the young person's life are the most effective in the long term – for example, parent training in the early years (especially for teenage mothers), home visits, pre-school education and good-quality day care (Ref. 14). Those who start offending at an early age are more likely to become persistent offenders (Ref. 15). But older young people also need help to stay out of trouble and to gain opportunities to use their time constructively, through active programmes. These need to be available to known young offenders, to support the work of youth justice services and YOIs. Services that intervene with families and peer groups in deprived or high-crime areas are most important, and housing, employment and training schemes and youth services can all contribute. Analysis of problems in the local area should help to identify the priority areas for action. Since no single agency can provide or arrange interventions in all of these areas, preventing youth crime necessarily involves a wide range of organisations working together.

76. Many factors, social and physical, contribute to crime. The availability of easy targets, low perceived risks of being punished if caught, a poor social situation and wrong internally held beliefs and low abilities increase the chances of an offence being committed [EXHIBIT 32]. A strategy to address crime must tackle all these factors and requires action across government departments and between local agencies.

EXHIBIT 32
The factors leading to crime

Many factors contribute to an offence being committed.

Source: Adapted from Rutter, Giller and Hagell (Ref. 16)
77. A co-ordinated approach to crime prevention requires action at three key levels:

- local agencies need to work together to identify where the major risks lie and develop co-ordinated strategies to address them;
- local services that encounter young people at risk, such as schools and social services, need to act together to promote stable environments and socially responsible behaviour; and
- the Government needs to take every opportunity to encourage different departments to work together, to contribute to an overall strategy.

Mainstream agencies such as schools need to foster a culture of social responsibility and ensure that those at greatest risk are helped to behave responsibly.

The Government has begun to take forward a more comprehensive approach to the prevention of youth crime and social deprivation. The consultation paper on health (Ref. 17) has clearly acknowledged the link between poverty, social deprivation and ill health. The Social Exclusion Unit will attempt to draw together general policies for deprived communities. Some more targeted policies for those especially at risk, such as excluded pupils and substance abusers, have also been set out. The 1998 Crime and Disorder Bill (see Appendix 1) will require local authorities and police to develop community safety strategies, involving local consultation and to monitor the results. The strategies should be based on local crime audits and should address the risk factors for young people, as well as measures such as locks, street lighting and closed circuit TV (CCTV) that are generally known as ‘situational’ crime prevention. But, more important than special initiatives, mainstream agencies such as schools need to foster a culture of social responsibility and ensure that those at greatest risk are helped to behave responsibly.

78. Many other countries have been developing policies and programmes for preventing youth crime for some time. Until now, crime prevention in Britain has not been a statutory responsibility for agencies other than the police. However, many local authorities have been active in this area, and the Commission will report on their progress later in 1998. The experience of other countries in developing crime-prevention policies may provide useful insights and some ideas that could form the next stages of the policy for tackling youth offending – moving from attention to the youth justice system to a wider agenda of social issues. Although full evaluation of these initiatives is comparatively rare, some of the experiences of other countries may be helpful in the following areas:

- national policies on crime prevention;
- multi-agency initiatives for local areas;
- education and school-based initiatives; and
- local community policing.
3 • PREVENTION OF YOUTH CRIME

National policies on crime prevention

79. Some other countries have more experience than the UK of national policies for crime prevention, as they have been developing them for longer. Most of them set goals, targets and some standards nationally – but with local flexibility, so that local agencies and communities can achieve them in their own ways. Early intervention to prevent young people from offending is a key element of policy in Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands.

80. The co-ordination of policies that have a bearing on crime prevention across government departments has been identified as a specific responsibility in Denmark and the Netherlands [BOX A]. A new national policy in Sweden, published in 1996, places a 'collective responsibility' on social services, education, police and health agencies to take action to prevent crime [BOX B, overleaf].

BOX A

Policy co-ordination in Denmark and the Netherlands

In Denmark, a National Crime Prevention Council was established in 1975 by a cross-ministerial group, including education, employment and social affairs, although it reports to the Ministry of Justice. It has five committees, with associated working parties in the following areas:

- technical security measures;
- strategy and advice to the public, including property marking and neighbourhood watch;
- crime prevention aimed at schools and parents’ associations;
- SSP (Social Services, Schools and Police); and
- crime prevention in local urban planning.

The two main functions of all of its work are preventing individuals from becoming criminals and preventing citizens from being subject to crime. One of its staff is responsible for co-ordinating a forum of all the relevant ministries in which the impact of new and existing policies is discussed. A major aim is to identify whether changes introduced by one ministry are likely to affect others, particularly in relation to crime.

In the Netherlands, a 'directorate of prevention' within the Ministry of Justice advises other ministries in four main areas of policy – the family, schools, employment and leisure. The family is considered the most important area. Pilot programmes have been developed, in which families at risk are identified by social workers, teachers, health visitors or police, and help is provided with parenting, language problems and difficult behaviour. If the pilot schemes are successful, a national policy along these lines will be implemented. School programmes are also under way, in which contracts are made with parents requiring them to control their children, with sanctions available if they fail to comply. The directorate has also helped to initiate a programme in which businesses are encouraged to employ ex-offenders, asylum-seekers and other minority groups.
Box B

Swedish's National Crime Prevention Policy, **Our Collective Responsibility**

The policy covers family support, responsibility in schools, targeting resources to high-risk areas, situational crime prevention and criminal justice. It encourages the development of local crime-prevention councils, on which all the relevant organisations are represented, including local businesses and insurance companies. Long- and short-term goals are to be set locally, for both situational and social prevention.

Policymakers argue that situational measures can be a good way to begin, as they can give rapid and measurable results, but the most significant factors are found in areas of policy that are not normally associated with crime – including parents, schools, housing and social welfare – so special attention should be paid to them. A policy implementation committee has formally consulted all local authorities about the help they will need in putting it into practice. The National Crime Prevention Council, an independent body supported by the Ministry of Justice, is to undertake some evaluation and to disseminate knowledge about problems and effective solutions. The Swedish experience in this area should help to inform similar policies on community safety and crime prevention in Britain.

Multi-agency initiatives for local areas

81. Local multi-agency and community strategies to address the problem of youth crime have been developed in the USA, through the 'Communities That Care' (CTC) programme [Box C]. CTC is based on an extensive body of research on the main risk factors associated with young people offending and interventions that have been shown to work. It aims to target areas of high risk, mobilising the local community and service agencies into tackling the problems in a focused manner – an approach very close to the one recommended in Misspent Youth. It is now starting in Britain: the Joseph Rowntree Foundation has committed £500,000 over three years to demonstration programmes in three areas of England and Wales, and support for pilot programmes in Scotland is under consideration.
BOX C

Communities That Care (CTC)

The CTC process in a local community in the USA takes between 6 and 18 months, guided by a research group based in Seattle. Some of the first programmes to be developed received federal funding for deprived-area initiatives, but most are funded by states or counties. An officer from the local area normally co-ordinates the programme, chases progress and writes reports to keep all the parties informed.

There are three main training events. The first is a ‘key leader orientation’, which aims to inform and involve the heads of agencies and community leaders. The second is a two- or three-day event on risk and resource assessment, for a smaller working group, to teach them how to use local data and to identify the resources that are currently available. Data from existing sources (archival data), in conjunction with standardised surveys of school students and households, are used to assess risks. The third training event introduces a range of ‘promising approaches’ that have been shown to produce positive results elsewhere. The participants decide on the most appropriate approaches and develop plans to implement them.

The local group has to apply for funding to implement the plans, with assistance from the research group. Evaluation is not part of the package, although it is strongly encouraged. Guidance and technical assistance on evaluation can be provided, at extra cost.

The programme has encountered some problems, such as:
- communities having already decided on the programmes they wish to implement, whether or not these bear any relation to the identified risks;
- lack of funds for the implementation of projects, especially in the longer term;
- lack of evaluation when programmes are implemented;
- difficulty in finding useful data locally, especially on protective factors; and
- communities of suitably small size, especially those with high needs, are often unable to afford the package.

But the benefits of CTC are clear to those who have participated. The research base enables thorough assessment of the problems of communities and their readiness to change, and provides a set of effective models to copy. The process of working through the local risk factors and strengths, facilitated by an informed outsider, has fostered substantial trust and communication between agencies and community groups. The technical assistance provided by the research group has helped to obtain funding, both locally and nationally.

The projects that have been developed have included:
- a parent skills training scheme, with expenses, child care and meals provided;
- a late-night drop-in facility at middle schools, providing food, a counsellor and programmes about avoiding crime;
- a peer-conflict resolution programme;
- a mentoring scheme; and
- a parent-support project, in which trained local volunteers befriend families at risk and visit them weekly. One staff member is bilingual, as are some of the volunteers.

But the most notable changes have occurred within local communities. Local leaders have emerged, and individuals have discovered new skills and abilities. Local people have become motivated to act and are beginning to hope that things could really change. Effects of this kind can be difficult to achieve through standard agency approaches, although they may be the most important factors for sustaining change in the long term.

Evaluation of the CTC programmes has not been extensive, but some of the programmes that are being planned in Britain and elsewhere include comprehensive evaluation.
82. In Denmark the SSP initiative brings together social services, schools and police in local areas to address the problems of young people at risk [BOX D]. Denmark’s National Crime Prevention Council provides leadership, but local areas can choose whether or not to have an SSP arrangement. Of the 277 police districts, 220 have one. Its model of consultation has become widely accepted by the police and local communities and has led to closer and more effective work in many areas.

LOCAL SSP WORK IN DENMARK

SSP began in Odense, one of Denmark’s major cities, and was subsequently taken up by the National Crime Prevention Council. The chief officers of the three authorities meet three or four times a year but most of the SSP work takes place at a more local level. All the authorities contribute staff resources to different projects in Odense, two of which are described below.

1. Young, second-generation immigrants to Denmark are disproportionately represented in youth crime, especially in certain areas of the city. To address this problem, a team of plain clothes police officers and social services workers, some of whom have begun to learn Arabic, operates on the streets in areas where trouble is common. The workers have got to know the group leaders and some of those at risk of being drawn in. They have made contact with parents of some young people and the leaders of the immigrant community. The police and social services report that the amount of trouble in the town centre has reduced since the scheme began 18 months ago, but no figures are available to substantiate this.

2. A youth information shop has been developed for young immigrants in Vollsmose, a very deprived area of Odense, using resources from the three agencies. Fifty per cent of the people in this area are immigrants (from Lebanon, Somalia, Bosnia), and the average income is one third of the level for Odense as a whole. Attempts to integrate the young immigrant people with the Danes in Vollsmose have failed. The ‘shop’ provides information about local sports and leisure clubs, as well as informal contacts and counselling, close to where the young people were in the habit of meeting. The staff help young people to join local clubs, accompanying them at first if necessary and providing free membership for the first two months.

A special project teaches a variety of life skills, with a focus on responsible behaviour, to a group of the most difficult young people, most of whom are known offenders. The group is very popular and leads to a holiday at the end of a year for those who have behaved well. Another project, specifically for Palestinian young people, teaches outward-bound activities at weekends, with a team of teachers, police, youth workers and social workers, aiming to enable the young people to trust the local Danish people. Young people who offend or cause trouble are not allowed to stay in the project.
Education and school-based initiatives

83. Schools make a major contribution to the development of young people and help form social attitudes. Research in the USA (Ref. 18) has shown that programmes aimed at establishing and enforcing good behaviour through clear rules and reinforcement is effective in reducing delinquency. Programmes that develop social competencies – such as self-control, responsible decision-making, social problem-solving and communication skills – and school-wide campaigns on issues such as bullying are also effective (Ref. 19). The role of schools in crime prevention is mainly through general education and socialisation, connecting young people with society and teaching them how to use information, obey rules and learn the link between effort and reward.

84. Most young people who are convicted of a crime have problems with their education or miss a great deal of school through truancy or exclusion (Ref. 1). Although school is often the place where problems at home first become apparent, teachers seldom have the opportunity to do anything about them. They do not have the time or the training to be counsellors as well as teachers, and social services rarely become involved. However, there are some examples of good practice. A philosophy of self-control and responsibility in school, set by the headteacher, with clear rules about behaviour, backed up by sanctions, can be effective in reducing disruption and the exclusions that result.

85. Schools have much to gain from co-operation with other agencies, such as social and health services and the police, to help them deal with difficult or high-risk pupils. A school in Odense, Denmark has developed a scheme to help problem pupils through the local SSP arrangements [CASE STUDY 6, overleaf]. Most of the attenders of the Milton Keynes shop theft scheme [CASE STUDY 3, CHAPTER 2] came from two schools in the area; once it became apparent that there were problems with these schools, they received extra support from local police schools officers, such as teaching about 'protective behaviours' to help pupils resist peer pressure to engage in offending.

86. 'Educational enrichment' programmes can make a substantial difference to the life chances and behaviour of young people. Although intervention during the early years is usually assumed to be the most effective, much can be achieved with deprived teenagers, too, if they are given enough help of an appropriate nature. The Quantum Opportunities Program in the USA [CASE STUDY 7, overleaf] has demonstrated that major change is possible with this age group. It has been set up as a demonstration programme, with very careful design and intensive staff commitment, and is likely to produce good results. The intervention lasts for four years, which should be long enough to have a lasting impact. A study for the RAND organisation, that examined the costs of the four-year programme and the resulting reduction in crime concluded that providing incentives for young people to stay on at school in this way is highly cost-effective. On this basis it proved better than parent training, community supervision, home support and California's 'three strikes' law, which leads to high rates of incarceration [BOX E, p57 and TABLE 2, p58].
CASE STUDY 6

The Hojstrup School project, Odense, Denmark

The project’s aim was to improve family contact, behaviour and achievements in a school with a poor reputation, in a deprived area of the city. Before it began, 29 of the pupils were known offenders, many of them from Turkish families.

The project grew from a meeting of the headteacher with representatives of the local social services office, the school psychologists, health visitors, the local streetworker and the local ‘home-beat’ police. The group met monthly to discuss problems identified by teachers, such as regular truancy or disruptive behaviour, and decided which agency or individual was best placed to help the family. Each case was then reviewed every month. Most families wished to help their children and were happy to accept the involvement of support agencies. The trust that had developed in the group enabled information to be passed between the agencies, provided that the parents gave their permission. The project provided a much faster response than the normal social services channels, as teachers could access it immediately. The project has also provided some social-work support in the classroom and alternative lessons for bilingual children. The number of problem pupils has reduced to nine.

The cost of extra support to school pupils (mainly social services) before the project began in 1993 was estimated at £113,300 per month for 218 children. After the first year of the project this dropped to £96,600 for 216 children. The disruption within school has reduced considerably, and the police have a smaller number of transient offenders to deal with.

CASE STUDY 7

Quantum Opportunities Program (QOP), Philadelphia, PA

This provides intensive supplementary education for students from one of the most deprived high schools in the city centre and is part of a national demonstration programme, which has seven sites in the USA.

Fifty pupils from the bottom two-thirds of the class were randomly assigned to the programme, and 50 to a control group. All of them have low reading and academic ability, and many are brought up by lone parents. There is a high rate of teenage pregnancies. Some pupils are offenders, and about 15 are known to be involved with hard drugs They enter the project at the age of 12-13 for a period of 3-4 years.

The young people are given an hourly incentive payment for time spent working at the project, and may attend for as many hours as they wish. About 40 per cent of the group attend very regularly. The programme runs every day from about 3 pm, when school finishes, until the pupils wish to leave – which could be 5.30 pm, or sometimes as late as 10.30. In the summer holidays they can arrive in the morning, and sports activities are available. There is a strong work ethos and strict rules, with formal forms of address and encouragement to dress smartly. Payment can be suspended for bad behaviour.

cont./
An education plan is worked out for each child at the start of the programme, with one of the three teachers or ‘mentors’. A well-equipped classroom provides teaching materials and interactive lessons on computer files. The young people appear highly motivated and interested in what they are learning and are communicative with visitors. The programme arranges outings and exchange visits with projects in other areas as part of their social education. Visiting speakers are often arranged for the group, and a number of volunteers come in daily. One teacher visits the school every day to provide support and assistance while the pupils are there.

The room, equipment and teaching materials cost $100,000 (£62,000) to set up. The annual cost per student is $3,875 (£2,400) and it lasts four years. This is slightly more than the project’s six sister programmes, as the participation is higher and more individual payments are given. The staff work six days per week, up to 12 or 13 hours per day. In total, 580 pupils in the country are included in the evaluation. The original pilot scheme, with 125 young people, showed positive outcomes over a four-year period. There were significant improvements in school grade achievements, employment, earnings and time spent in voluntary work, and lower unemployment, school dropout and arrest rates in comparison with a control group (Ref. 20).

However, this programme only reaches 50 young people at most, so it cannot be expected to make a significant impact on the lives of most young people in the area or on local crime rates, unless it is expanded. The costs are not much higher than that of a typical school place in the UK. Instead of payment for attendance, it might be more acceptable in Britain to provide incentives for attendance in a different form.

**BOX E**

**Cost-effectiveness of a range of interventions (Ref. 21)**

The RAND analysis included three kinds of interventions:

- parent training and therapy for families with children who show aggressive behaviour in school – five studies;
- cash incentives and other support for four years (QOP) – one study; and
- monitoring and supervision of known delinquents – two meta-analyses and one study.

The assessment of programme effectiveness took into account a number of factors:

- the accuracy of targeting to known offenders;
- the reduction in crime that results;
- the time the reduction effect lasts after the intervention finishes (assuming a 10 per cent ‘decay’ of effectiveness in preventing crime each year, operating between the ages of 14 and 30) – this assumes that the effectiveness of programmes operating in the teenage years has shown very little ‘decay’;
- the delay before the intervention can have an impact on averting crime; and
- modification of the effectiveness when small pilot schemes are scaled up to cover a wider mainstream population.
**Local community policing**

87. Experiments in which small police stations are established in local communities, especially in high-crime areas, have produced some impressive reductions in crime levels [CASE STUDIES 8 AND 9]. The most effective schemes have commitment from experienced officers who are prepared to stay in the area for many years, which implies relatively high pay and status.

**CASE STUDY 8**

'Home-beat' police offices in Denmark

'Home-beat' offices were established ten years ago in all local areas of Fyn island. Four experienced officers are normally based in each city office, and one or two in each rural office. They work closely with schools, social services and the local community. In four areas they share a building with social services. Some home-beat areas have their own SSP meetings, which can involve youth clubs and groups of older people from the local community.

The home-beat officers generally stay in their area for a long time — sometimes ten years. Some get involved with schools, visiting fortnightly or so, teaching children and parents about matters such as road safety and safer routes to school, and local children tend to get to know the officers by name. They may visit more often if the school has problems with crime. Local rules require that 30 per cent of the time of home-beat officers is spent on patrol and 30 per cent on crime prevention, such as contact with young people and schools, technical advice to businesses and other organisations. Both local and headquarters police report that the crime levels have fallen since the introduction of home-beat, but no figures are available.
Experiments in which small police stations are established in local communities, especially in high-crime areas, have produced some impressive reductions in crime levels.

CASE STUDY 9
A Police 'Koban' initiative, Washington DC

This is part of a federally funded demonstration programme, following four initial pilots which led to a decrease in local crime of 25-35 per cent. A local police station, called a koban or 'safe haven', was established to serve a neighbourhood of 250-300 households, chosen for its high crime and drug problems. The local organisations commit resources of staff or buildings, as only the project director is centrally funded.

In the Washington scheme three police officers live on site or nearby. Their work is a mix of law-enforcement, youth work and counselling, with shifts covering 8 am to 9 pm. Each officer acts as a 'mentor' to ten or twelve young people aged between 8 and 17. Night-time surveillance is provided by CCTV cameras, run by a private security firm, with access to ordinary police back-up if necessary. Before the scheme began, an intensive policing operation took place in the neighbourhood, in which the three koban officers were not involved. Many arrests were made, for drug-dealing and other matters.

The crime rate reduced by 10 per cent in the first year of the programme and 20 per cent in the second. Although the scheme is highly staffed at present there is a plan to reduce cover to a single officer after another year or two. The neighbourhood now seems very quiet, clean and free from damage and graffiti. Some of the young people, although living in deprived and difficult circumstances, have developed trusting relationships with the local police officers and have benefited from the education and activities.

There are a number of potential difficulties with the scheme:

- the total cost is high for such a small area, even if it is possible to reduce it at a later stage;
- other agencies did not appear to be involved, even though most of the officers’ work consisted of running youth activities, counselling and teaching;
- the training of the officers for this kind of work did not involve any other agencies;
- the reliance on CCTV surveillance seemed at odds with the notion of a community ‘safe haven’ in which members of the community had some ownership or influence; and
- the initial ‘clearing out’ of the area before the project began may have removed most of the problems at that point, or moved them elsewhere. It may be more difficult to achieve this in an area closer to the city centre.
Conclusions and recommendations

88. Preventive work needs to target those at risk who have not yet begun to offend. It also needs to support the efforts of criminal justice agencies working with young offenders by providing opportunities for young offenders to engage in constructive activities. The structures and institutions that influence young people, especially in the early years, should provide consistent guidance and encourage responsible behaviour. Policies can be set from the top, with clear objectives and flexibility in how to achieve them. Some savings from the more efficient use of the criminal justice system for young people should, in time, be made available for preventive work, to promote a 'virtuous circle' of reducing crime, leading to further savings. Those involved in developing local community safety strategies should engage in discussions with criminal justice agencies to consider how this might be achieved.

89. Partnerships between agencies are essential, as none of them can make a fundamental difference to communities by acting alone. They need to share information about where the risks are greatest and where action is being taken to address them, in order to make best use of scarce resources and to provide solutions that fit the problems identified. Joint analysis of local problems is likely to be more effective than each agency working on its own. Inter-agency relationships can be helped by having joint targets, and staff undergoing joint training. Local people also need to be involved in decisions about community safety plans and in their implementation, in order to make them sustainable in the long term.

90. In the early years of children's lives the aim should be to strengthen families, enabling them to play a full part in controlling their children's behaviour, and not to take responsibility away from them. Some children will need extra help, so screening for emotional problems at an early stage, by a universal service – such as health visitors with special training – could help to identify these. Some neighbourhoods have a high concentration of families and young people at risk, so the need for supportive networks is greatest here. Screening by health visitors would provide an additional source of information for identifying the high-risk areas. Special family support centres and parent-assistance programmes would need to be piloted in these areas, concentrating resources where they are most needed. Evaluation of the effectiveness and the costs of these programmes is essential, as knowledge of what works best is limited.

91. Schools in areas of high risk and deprivation may also need some help in developing a culture of responsibility and self-respect. Programmes to support the work of schools in these areas need to be evaluated, so that others can learn from their experiences.

92. The Government and the Audit Commission are currently discussing the development of performance indicators for agencies involved in the prevention of youth crime. Indicators need to be developed for a wide range of bodies, including police forces, social services, education departments and perhaps probation services, young offender institutions and the courts. While outcomes can only properly be measured by the
Performance indicators for schools could be used to demonstrate how well they serve those who are less able to achieve academically. Measures such as the number of exclusions, days missed through absenteeism and the amount of time that excluded pupils spend in tuition of some kind could also be made available to complement the records of academic achievement. Such measures will need very careful definition in order to allow meaningful comparisons. Contextual information on the social and demographic nature of the population they serve will also be important for their interpretation.

94. Community safety strategies drawn up by local authorities and the police need to include action to prevent young people from getting involved in crime, in order to make a real difference to communities in the long term. The Audit Commission is currently engaged in a study of community safety, looking at the readiness of local authorities and police to implement the Crime and Disorder Bill. Issues such as the use of shared information in developing a crime audit, the coherence of strategies and initiatives in addressing specific local problems, the involvement of communities and the monitoring and evaluation of initiatives are being examined in a range of local areas. A report on the first phase of this work is due to be published in the autumn of 1998.
Some local agencies are likely to be suitably prepared for the changes needed when the new legislation comes into force, but others will need to undertake a great deal of work to improve their performance

95. The Audit Commission identified a number of problems in the system that deals with young offenders. Misspent Youth commented on the following issues:
• delays in prosecuting young offenders through the courts;
• resources spent on processing rather than on addressing offending behaviour;
• lack of co-ordination between agencies in the criminal justice system; and
• insufficient emphasis on preventing young people from offending at an earlier stage.

96. The new Government has initiated changes that address many of these issues. It has set out target times for different parts of the sentencing process and has identified examples of good practice in fast-tracking persistent offenders. It has introduced ‘warnings’, structured penalties for early offenders that do not require a court decision, and new court orders that include action to address offending behaviour, reparation for the victim and assistance for parents. Multi-agency teams are to be established in all areas, involving staff from education and health services. Strategies to address crime prevention and community safety are to be developed jointly by police and local authorities. They should address the risk factors associated with youth offending, and have the greatest potential to reduce youth crime in the longer term.

97. The Commission’s monitoring of the youth justice system has reviewed the extent to which local agencies are already working together effectively to address youth offending. While some are performing well against current standards and are likely to be suitably prepared for the changes needed when the new legislation comes into force, others will need to undertake a great deal of work to improve their performance and level of co-operation.

98. To reduce time delays:
• many local youth court users’ groups need to consider jointly how the number of appearances and the time for young offenders to be sentenced can be reduced;
• all those involved in the courts should consider reducing the number of full PSRs required and ensuring that they are completed speedily – which can be achieved without spending more money; and
• in some areas, especially in London, the agencies involved in bringing cases to court need to work together more effectively to reduce the delay before a first appearance.
99. To address offending behaviour more effectively:
- local authorities that do not have substantial ‘caution plus’ programmes for early offenders should begin to develop them, in conjunction with other local agencies;
- those without bail support will need to establish effective programmes;
- all youth justice services will need to ensure that more staff time is spent on direct work with offenders, and that, where appropriate, reparation is considered as part of the court order; and
- many authorities need to ensure that all supervision orders are started promptly, with a plan set out that addresses any difficulties the young person may have in education or employment.

100. To improve inter-agency co-ordination:
- youth justice services will need to consider the education needs of all school-age children with whom they deal, and to involve the school or other education services. This will be a requirement for YOTs in 1999;
- authorities that do not have multi-agency teams should begin to establish them, involving social services, probation, police, education and health service staff;
- the links between YOIs and community agencies should be improved;
- where communication with the court is not working very effectively, court users’ groups should ensure that youth justice services participate in their discussions and that any problems are discussed; and
- information systems should be developed that allow sharing of relevant items between different agencies.

101. To prevent and reduce youth crime, multi-agency strategies for community safety, including programmes to prevent young people from getting involved in offending, need to be established. Lessons can be learned from other countries that have been developing schemes in this area for longer. Their experiences of co-ordinating national policies on crime prevention, developing local inter-agency co-ordination, supporting schools and educational programmes and local community policing should prove valuable. More pilot schemes should be set up in Britain, targeting those at greatest risk, to intervene in the difficulties some children encounter in their families, schools, peer groups and other influences on their behaviour.

102. Much of this can be taken forward by local agencies acting together, without the need for legislative change. But other changes would be greatly helped by the leadership of central government in matters such as the co-ordination of policies across departments where they are likely to have an impact on youth crime.
The Way Forward

Youth justice services, with probation and others

1. Good-quality information systems should be established in all areas before the implementation of the Crime and Disorder Bill. They should aim to facilitate the exchange of information between agencies such as youth justice, probation, police and education services.

2. Youth justice teams should start to develop more effective communication and co-ordination with education and other agencies to facilitate the operation of the new YOTs before legislation is implemented.

3. Youth justice services in all areas without multi-agency ‘caution plus’ schemes will have to develop them rapidly if the requirements of the Bill are to be in place on time, so they should be planning to do so now.

4. Substantive bail support schemes should be made available in all areas. Regular monitoring of the effectiveness of such schemes should be part of the routine local data-collection.

5. Closer links between custodial and community agencies should be developed, sharing information and developing joint programmes, to facilitate work with people at the critical point when they leave custody.

6. Youth justice services should consider employing trained volunteers to carry out ‘appropriate adult’ duties.

7. All youth justice services, especially those with the lowest proportion of time spent with offenders, should review their priorities to enable staff to spend more time dealing with offending behaviour.

8. All youth justice managers should monitor compliance with national standards guidelines for beginning supervision orders and for drawing up supervision plans. Failure to meet the deadlines should warrant investigation.

9. Youth justice services should ensure that information about breaches of orders and other matters is collected and made available for monitoring purposes.

10. All PSR authors should ensure that the education services have an input to their reports on school-age children.
All supervision plans for school-age children should address the question of education.

Where the concordance between the PSR recommendation and the court sentence is lower than about 70 per cent, youth justice services should review their communication with the local court, making use of the youth court users' group.

Courts, magistrates and others

Better communication is needed between the agencies involved in the youth court. For example, the CPS should pass files to the youth justice service in good time, to expedite the production of PSRs. The potential for information technology to assist agencies in communicating should be fully explored, and pilot schemes should be established.

Information on re-offending should be used by local youth court users’ groups to review their practice and to examine the relative performance of local services. Those with computerised systems should find the collection of information considerably easier than those without. Such systems need to link up with the probation service or the police in order to track the behaviour of young people who reach their 18th birthday within two years of being sentenced.

All youth court users’ groups, especially those with a higher-than-average number of appearances, should consider ways in which they can reduce the number of appearances.

Youth courts that request high numbers of PSRs should review their criteria for requests and consider whether these could be reduced for some categories of young people sentenced.

All parties involved in the youth court need to receive information about PSR completion times and work out together how they are to meet the targets.

Where particular local projects to address offending behaviour are under-used, the project management, the youth justice services and magistrates should meet to consider whether they hold different assumptions about the main target group for the project and aim to come to an agreement.
The Way Forward

The Way Forward

CPS and others

19

The agencies responsible for bringing cases to court (the police, CPS and others) need to review their practices, especially in London, to work out together how they can reduce the time taken to sentence a young offender.

Police forces and others

20

Police forces and local authorities in which gravity-factor guidelines have not been developed should work together to establish these and base most of their decisions on whether to caution or prosecute young offenders on them.

Local authorities, police and others

21

Community safety strategies drawn up by local authorities and the police need to include action to prevent young people from getting involved in crime, in order to make a real difference to communities in the long term.

22

Local agencies need to share information about where the risks are greatest and what action is being taken to address them, in order to make best use of scarce resources. Joint analysis of local problems is likely to be more effective than each agency working on its own. Inter-agency relationships can be helped by having joint targets and staff undertaking joint training. Local people also need to be involved in decisions about community safety plans and in their implementation, in order to make them sustainable in the long term.

23

Those involved in developing local community safety strategies should engage in discussions with criminal justice agencies to consider how savings from more efficient use of the criminal justice system for young people could, in time, be made available for preventive work.

Childcare services

24

Special family support centres and parent assistance programmes need to be piloted in areas of high risk, concentrating resources where they are most needed. Evaluation of the effectiveness and the costs of these programmes is essential, as knowledge of what works best is limited.
Schools in areas of high risk and deprivation may also need some help in developing a culture of responsibility and self-respect. Programmes to support the work of schools in these areas need to be evaluated so that others can learn from their experiences.

Indicators need to be developed for a wide range of bodies, including police forces, social services, education departments and perhaps probation services, young offender institutions and the courts. While outcomes can only properly be measured by the amount of crime committed by young people in the area, there are major obstacles to obtaining accurate information about this. In the meantime, measures of the processes undertaken by the agencies may have to suffice.

Performance indicators for schools, for example, could be used to demonstrate how well they serve those who are less able to achieve academically. Measures such as the number of exclusions, days missed through absenteeism and the amount of time that excluded pupils spend in tuition of some kind could also be made available to complement the records of academic achievement.
Appendix 1

Tackling delays

A1. The Crime and Disorder Bill is to introduce statutory time-limits on different parts of the court process, with the exception of the trial. The various agencies involved will have non-statutory performance targets. The time-limits for ‘persistent young offenders’ (defined as those who have been sentenced by a criminal court for recordable offences on three or more separate occasions and arrested again within three years of the third conviction) will be tighter than those for other defendants. Courts are to deal with each offence for a particular defendant individually, without waiting to tie up cases together. This will also apply to parallel cases being heard in the Crown Court.

A2. A Home Office circular (Ref. 3) has identified 34 kinds of action that agencies can take to tackle delays before any new legislation is introduced. It encourages the use of court users’ groups for communicating between the key agencies and setting shared local targets for time through the system. It provides guidelines for police forces in relation to pre-trial issues, to assist in the speedy completion of paperwork, and recommends the use of guidelines based on gravity-factors for decisions on cautioning, so as to reduce the need for lengthy discussions.

A3. The circular suggests that first hearing dates be set as early as possible, and that bail support should be available in all areas. It also suggests that defendants be given a leaflet outlining the procedure for obtaining legal aid and the location and dates of any court hearings. It recommends that the CPS serve advance disclosure and pass papers to other agencies in good time. Where possible, magistrates are encouraged to request ‘oral updates’ instead of full PSRs in cases where a very recent PSR is available. It also asks local agencies to set up ‘fast-tracking’ schemes for persistent offenders, modelled on identified good-practice schemes. In some areas the introduction of a fast-tracking scheme has led to a faster response for all offenders, as it has freed up court resources for other cases.

Addressing offending behaviour

A4. The White Paper (Ref. 2) has stated that the aim of the youth justice system is to prevent offending by young people. The Bill will require all parties involved, including police, courts, prosecution, defence solicitors and youth justice services to have regard for that aim.

A5. The paper has proposed police ‘reprimands’ and statutory ‘warnings’ for early offenders, and four new court orders. The ‘reprimand’, for first offenders whose offence was not serious, is similar to the current caution or formal warning. The new ‘warning’ for most subsequent offences is similar to substantive ‘caution plus’ schemes, in which a formal caution is given by a police officer at a police station and a plan to address the
offending behaviour devised by a local youth offending team (YOT). The paper has defined the kind of intervention that could be included: assessment, counselling or group work, reparation to victims, supervised community work, school attendance and help for the young person's parents. Sometimes a warning may be given without a plan, after consultation with the youth offending team.

A6. The emphasis on assessment is important, as it allows a degree of flexibility in the use of penalties for young people in different circumstances. Assessment needs to take full account of the social situation of the young person and the victim, and should determine the nature and extent of any interventions. A further warning can be given for a minor offence committed more than two years after the first warning. This may be more cost-effective than to sentence young offenders in court. Other offenders may have committed only two offences but have considerable problems with their family and school which would benefit from an intensive intervention at an earlier stage. Without such flexibility, there is a danger that the courts could have to deal with more young people than at present, many of whom have committed relatively minor offences.

A7. There are four new court orders relating to young offenders: the reparation order, the action plan order, the parenting order, and the detention and training order. The first two will impose requirements on the young person that, at present, could be imposed under a supervision order but rarely are, with emphasis on active reparation for the victim. They are to be short-term and will enable the court to introduce penalties that are at least equivalent to those that can be imposed under a final warning. New curfew orders for young people, with electronic tagging, are to be piloted.

A8. The parenting order can be given in addition to the young person's penalty, or for parents of children below the age of criminal responsibility who have been made the subject of a child safety order. It can require parents to attend training and guidance sessions, at the court's discretion, to help them control their child's behaviour when they are unable to do so unaided. For young people between 10 and 17 it could be made in conjunction with an anti-social behaviour order and, for those of school age, it could carry a penalty for failure to ensure that the child attends school. Some of those working in the area of family support fear that such orders could have a general stigmatising effect on parent training programmes, but this is difficult to predict at present. The way in which these orders are used may make the difference between their being supportive or punitive. The non-availability of such programmes locally could be a problem in some areas.
A9. Some changes will be made to supervision orders, to allow the court greater scope to impose some specific requirements, particularly residency requirements. Breaches of the order will bring the arrangements for enforcing supervision orders in line with those for other community penalties.

A10. The new detention and training orders are to replace custodial sentences for persistent offenders between 12 and 14 years old, and for 10- and 11-year-olds where the court considers it necessary to protect the public. The order is available for all 15-17-year-olds who commit imprisonable offences. It will come into effect in mid-1999, but the provision for 10- and 11-year-olds will not be implemented yet, and the date of implementation for this age group will be decided later. Half the term of the order is to be spent in custody and half under community supervision. The supervising officer will be a member of the YOT and will be appointed at the start of the sentence, so that he or she can be involved in the planning and supervision of the entire order. YOTs, YOIs and all those working in secure accommodation will need to co-operate closely on matters such as sharing information and programmes to address offending behaviour before and after release from custody.

A11. A new court order – the child safety order, intended to prevent children under ten from getting involved in crime – will be available to family proceedings courts, on application from the local authority. The order may require the child to be at home at certain times or to attend school, and is to be supervised by either a YOT member or a social worker. This will give additional responsibilities to youth offending teams. In addition, local authorities will be enabled to introduce local child curfews for children under ten for limited periods. These are to be integrated into local community safety strategies.

A12. All the new court orders and the final warnings are to be piloted for 18 months from autumn 1998, with a view to full implementation in the year 2000.

A13. Those running youth courts will be encouraged to promote communication with defendants, their parents and victims, and to foster a less adversarial atmosphere. A longer-term plan for reform of the youth court is proposed, in which those appearing for the first time and pleading guilty could be referred to a special youth panel responsible for drawing up a contract that could include reparation, community work and education. When completed, a report would be returned to the court for signing off, and the conviction would be deemed 'spent'. If there were any problems with compliance, the case could be returned to the youth court.
Multi-agency working

A14. The Bill will introduce statutory multi-agency working in all parts of England and Wales, in the form of youth offending teams (YOTs). These will not only involve local authorities with social services and education responsibilities and probation services, but will also place a duty on police and health authorities to participate.

A15. Although the precise composition and operation of the teams should be a matter for local decision, the Government considers social workers, probation officers, police officers, education and health service staff all to be essential. Commitment of resources will be required from all the relevant agencies, and so identifying and transferring savings from local criminal justice agencies will be important. The White Paper (Ref. 2) emphasises the expertise of probation officers and would expand their role to include work with younger offenders. Members of staff from the youth service and voluntary organisations may be included as well. The teams are likely to be in place from 1999 after initial pilots. Draft guidance on the operation of YOTs, from the Home Office’s Task Force on Youth Justice, is to be published shortly.

A16. The YOT team members will be accountable to a team manager, who could have a background in any of the relevant agencies, provided he or she has the appropriate skills and experience. The manager’s line of accountability will be to a steering group of the relevant agencies and departments, at chief officer level, which can set the strategic direction and will normally be chaired by the local authority chief executive. This is modelled fairly closely on the practice in the Diversion Unit in Northamptonshire that was featured in *Misspent Youth*, although YOTs should have somewhat expanded responsibilities. Large counties are likely to have several YOTs, accountable to a county-wide steering group through local senior officers for the local area.

A17. The local teams would have a broader remit than existing youth justice services. In addition to the existing responsibilities of youth justice services they will have to ensure that assessment and intervention in support of final warnings and supervision of the new parenting and child safety orders are delivered.

A18. The Audit Commission estimates the immediate savings to courts and other parts of the criminal justice system could be of the order of £70 million (see paras 27, 30, 41, 46, 68-9, and Case Study 4, p24), with further savings to police and local authorities when the level of youth crime and disturbance begins to reduce. In Northamptonshire one-third of the resources for the Diversion Unit is provided by the police.

A19. Local authorities are to prepare a youth justice plan, setting out how services are to be provided and funded, and police, probation and health services will be required to co-operate. Local government reorganisation has led to changes in the relationships between these services in many areas, so considerable local discussion will be needed.
At national level a new body, the Youth Justice Board, is to co-ordinate policy and monitor the operations of the entire youth justice system. It will monitor the work of local teams and individual youth justice agencies, including the delivery of secure accommodation. The new body is to be independent of existing government departments, but accountable to the Home Secretary, and is to include practitioners and experts in the field of youth crime, as well as civil servants. The Board is to gather information on the workload of YOTs and, importantly, on re-offending rates.

Prevention

In addition to the measures described above for dealing with crimes already committed, measures are being introduced to address the problems of families and children at risk. It is hoped that these should contribute in a general way to the prevention of youth crime. They include the new Social Exclusion Unit, the New Start strategy to re-engage those under the age of 17 in education or training, and the appointment of an anti-drugs co-ordinator who is to put forward a strategy for young people. In addition, some centrally funded initiatives – such as the Grants for Education Support and Training (GEST) drug-education and crime prevention programmes – are targeted at young people especially at risk. The Home Office drugs-prevention initiative is evaluating a range of programmes including work with parents, community groups, schools and criminal justice agencies. A new drug treatment and testing order for those over the age of 16 will enable courts to monitor the progress of drug-using offenders whose sentence includes drug treatment.

Local authorities already have responsibilities under the Children Act 1989 to encourage those under 18 not to commit criminal offences. The 1998 Crime and Disorder Bill will require local authorities and the police to draw up joint community safety strategies. These should include analysis of the problems in the area, consultation with local agencies and groups, and long- and short-term targets for each element of the strategy. Many agencies will be required to take part in their planning and delivery, including the probation service, the health service, the police, schools and other education or training bodies, the CPS and youth services. Other groups, such as drug reference groups and training and enterprise councils (TECs) may become involved, possibly in a less formal way. Many targets will cross agency boundaries, so some monitoring of achievements will have to be carried out on a multi-agency basis.

Creating multi-agency partnerships for community safety is a complex task, partly because of the large number of different partnership structures that are being developed. The community safety strategy and targets are to be developed at district level, in conjunction with the local police division. The chief officer's group for YOTs, however, is to be convened and chaired by the chief executive of the local authority that has responsibility for social services and education. In counties these will
be different authorities, so co-ordination between youth justice plans and preventive strategies may be more difficult. In addition, drug action teams have broadly the same membership of local agency chief officers as do planning groups for social and economic regeneration. Local authority children’s services plans, which are developed within the authority responsible for social services and education, are also to take account of the local district strategy for prevention.

A24. The Audit Commission is looking into the development of community safety partnerships and the strategies they develop, with a particular focus on the problems of local neighbourhoods and how to overcome them. It will consider the use made of the various potential sources of funding for this work (including the Single Regeneration Budget Challenge Fund) in the short term, and changes within mainstream agencies in the longer term, to enable the development of effective problem-solving approaches.
Appendix 2

Costings of potential savings

**Multi-agency panels (para. 27)**

The cost per case discussion (based on 20 local authorities' staff costs, average length of meeting, average number of cases) is £15.76.

Currently, 23 per cent of cases go to panels. If only 10 per cent did so the saving would be 13 per cent of 225,305 (the total number of cases given any disposal in England and Wales in one year) x £15.76 = £461,605.

**Court appearances (para. 30)**

Mean of 3.63 and lower quartile of 3.04.

The average number of cases processed each year through youth courts in England and Wales is 866 per local authority, excluding discontinued cases and simple motoring offences.

A reduction of 71,021 appearances could be achieved in all local authorities if all courts reduced the number of appearances down to the lower quartile.

Unit cost of an appearance is £177 (based on 25 per cent of total costs being accounted for by adjournments (Ref. 22)).

Total saving amounts to £12,595,000 – approximately £12 million.

**'Caution plus' (para. 41)**

During the two months of recording in 89 authorities, 1,319 first- and second-time offenders received court sentences of discharge, fine or attendance centre order (811 discharge, 324 fine, 184 attendance centre order). These could have been given 'caution plus' instead.

Estimate of the number for a full year for England and Wales (139 authorities) is 12,360.

Cost of 'caution plus', based on Northamptonshire is £721 in 1996/97; a court process in the same year is estimated at £2,575.

The saving would be £1,854 x 12,360 = £22,915,440, approximately £23 million.

If half of the first- and second-time offenders who received supervision orders, probation orders, community service or combination orders (1,175 young people) were given 'caution plus' instead, a further saving of £1,854 x 1,175 = £2,178,450 could be made by the court and £1,117 x 1,175 = £1,312,475 from the supervision and probation orders (costs derived from Hampshire hourly unit costs).

The total saving then becomes £26,406,365.
But 2,961 young people were given cautions or warnings after a third or subsequent offence. If this group received 'caution plus' an extra cost of 2,961 x £721 = £2,134,881 would be incurred, thus reducing the saving to a total of £24,271,484, or approximately £24 million.

**Bail support (Case Study 4, p24)**

Average rate of local authority remands = 16.44 per 100,000.

For Rotherham (250,000 population) this would give 41.1 remands, costing £394,560, assuming an average of eight weeks on remand.

Average rate of custodial remands = 18.56 per 100,000.

For Rotherham, this would give 46.6, costing £222,720.

Actual remand costs are £86,400 + £153,600 = £240,000.

Bail support costs for those who would otherwise have been on remand = £130,760.

Actual saving is £246,520 in one small authority

Around £34 million could saved throughout England and Wales, using similar schemes

**'Appropriate adult' visits (paras. 68-9)**

- Qualified social workers or probation officers carry out 43 per cent of visits, at £37 per visit
- Emergency duty team staff carry out 33 per cent, at £39 per visit; and
- 19 per cent are carried out by trained volunteers, at a cost of £10 per visit (including training and expenses).

Total visits = 40,871 in England and Wales.

If all the visits currently carried out by social workers and probation officers (non-emergency staff), and half of those carried out by emergency duty teams, were carried out by trained volunteers instead, the resulting saving would be:

£26 x 43% of total + £28 x 16.5% of total = £645,762, if an extra 10 per cent is added for management of the volunteer service; without management overheads the saving would be £670,080.
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute discharge</td>
<td>Sentence of the court when it decides no action is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing offending behaviour</td>
<td>Work with young people with the object of stopping them offending. Includes work on 'caution plus', bail support, supervision orders and licence from custody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of criminal responsibility</td>
<td>Ten years old in England and Wales. Younger children cannot be guilty of an offence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate adult</td>
<td>A young person under 17 can be interviewed by the police only if a parent or other 'appropriate adult' is present. If the parent can't (or won't) attend, the police must ask social services to provide an appropriate adult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance centres</td>
<td>Attendance centres were established in the 1970s to keep football hooligans occupied on Saturday afternoons. They now tend to meet on Saturday mornings for an hour or two, usually supervised by an off-duty policeman. They are funded directly by the Home Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance centre order</td>
<td>Sentence of the court – usually to attend for, say, eight hours – which would take four to eight Saturday mornings to complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bail</td>
<td>A young person bailed by the police or court is free to go home – properly called 'remand on bail'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bail conditions</td>
<td>The police (when they release a person under arrest) and the court (when it adjourns) can attach conditions to any bail. These can include living as directed by the local authority, keeping curfew hours, and attending a bail support scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bail support</td>
<td>Activities arranged to occupy young people going through the courts. Often used for persistent offenders who might otherwise be remanded in custody. Bail support schemes vary in substance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaching</td>
<td>Where an offender fails to comply with the terms of a community sentence, the process of taking the offender back to court for re-sentencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Crime Survey</td>
<td>A biennial survey of households in England and Wales (only) which asks adults (16 and over) about their experience of crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caution</td>
<td>A lecture delivered by a police officer, usually an inspector, to a person who admits an offence. Cautions have no statutory basis. They are scored in national criminal statistics (unlike warnings which can, otherwise, be identical).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caution plus</td>
<td>Caution with additional action attached. It may include compensation, work on offending behaviour and dealing with the offender's problems, such as substance abuse. The caution cannot be conditional on the individual carrying out the activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Act 1989</td>
<td>The major current piece of legislation on welfare of children. It includes a duty for local authorities to encourage children in their areas not to commit offences (Schedule 2 section 7 (b)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination order</td>
<td>Combination of a probation order and a community service order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service order</td>
<td>Sentence of a court available for offenders over 16. Must be overseen in part by a probation officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation order</strong></td>
<td>An order made by the court for an offender to pay compensation to a victim. Made in addition to a sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional discharge</strong></td>
<td>A sentence of the court, which involves no immediate action. However, if the offender is found guilty of another offence within a fixed period (usually a year), the court can re-sentence for this offence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court appearances</strong></td>
<td>It takes an average of four appearances to complete one case. Many appearances last five minutes or less and are adjourned for a variety of reasons – for example, because a key player has not turned up, or a lawyer is not briefed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court bail</strong></td>
<td>Bail (see above) given by a court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court users' groups</strong></td>
<td>Multi-agency groups convened by magistrates' courts to expedite the business of the courts. Some confine themselves to a narrow remit; others take a wider look at what criminal justice agencies do in the locality. In some areas youth justice services are not invited to attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Procedure and Investigation Act 1996</strong></td>
<td>A minor act which includes powers that remove the need for offenders remanded by the courts to appear in court every seven days. Since January 1997 courts have had the power to remand offenders for up to 28 days on a second or subsequent court appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crown Courts</strong></td>
<td>Criminal courts presided over by judges. Few young offenders go to the Crown Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crown Prosecution Service</strong></td>
<td>Established in 1984 to take over from the police the prosecution of offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Custody</strong></td>
<td>Locking up in a police or prison establishment (police cell, young offender institution or remand centre). Being locked up in a local authority secure unit is usually not regarded as being in custody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discharge</strong></td>
<td>See Absolute and Conditional discharges (above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dismissed</strong></td>
<td>Case dropped on the orders of the court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doli incapax</strong></td>
<td>Common law requires the prosecution to show that a child under 14 knew an offending act was seriously wrong before he or she can be convicted. To change under the Crime and Disorder Bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early offenders</strong></td>
<td>Those who have been caught for offending on a small number of occasions and who admit guilt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family proceedings court</strong></td>
<td>Court where welfare cases are heard. Many young offenders appear in this court as well as the youth court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
<td>The courts can fine offenders aged 10-17 or their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal warnings</strong></td>
<td>Up to the implementation of the Crime and Disorder Bill, this has been similar to a caution, although not included in Home Office statistics or citable in court. After implementation of the Bill, it is to be replaced by reprimands and the new warnings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gravity-factors</strong></td>
<td>Criteria used by police officers to decide whether or not to warn, caution or start proceedings against an offender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indictable</strong></td>
<td>An offence which must be tried in the Crown Court.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local authority secure units

Children's homes which are locked and highly staffed. A court order from the family proceedings court is needed to place a child in one, but a new power – not yet in force – will allow magistrates to remand young people to them directly and the Home Office to pay. Currently, local authorities pay for remand cases, but the Home Office pays for sentenced Section 53 cases.

Multi-agency panel

A group which meets regularly to discuss disposal decisions on young offenders – involving police, youth justice, probation and sometimes education.

NACRO

National Association for Care and Resettlement of Offenders. The major voluntary organisation in this field, producing information, research, conferences and running some projects.

National standards

Issued by Department of Health, Home Office and Welsh Office, setting out requirements for aspects of the work of the probation and youth justice services.

NFA (no further action)

Where the police decide to take no further action (prosecution or caution) following arrest.

PACE Transfer

Under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, if the police do not grant bail to young people who have been arrested, they must transfer those under 17 to local authority accommodation – unless no LA secure accommodation is available and any other would be inadequate to protect the public.

Parenting order

A new sentence, introduced in the Crime and Disorder Bill.

Police bail

Release of most young people after arrest and interview, on condition they return to the police station, for caution or charge, or to court.

Police liaison panel

See multi-agency panel.

Pre-court

Activities involving suspected young offenders prior to, and as alternatives to, court – including 'appropriate adult' interviews, multi-agency panels, bail support, remand care and 'caution plus'.

Pre-sentence report

Requested by magistrates to help their decision on sentencing of an individual. The responsibility of youth justice or probation services. National standards set out the requirements.

Probation order

A community sentence which can be given to offenders of 16 or 17, instead of a supervision order. It has to be held formally, at least in part, by a probation officer.

Processing

A term used mainly by the Audit Commission to describe much of the work of criminal justice agencies, where they are not directly dealing with the behaviour of offenders. Mainly refers to the work of the court, and other agencies meeting the requirements of the court.

Recidivism

Re-offending.

Remand

Correctly, the 'remand status' of all defendants between court appearances, but commonly used to mean a refusal of bail. Could be to custody for 15-year-olds or over, to local authority accommodation (which can include residential or foster care) or to their own home. An extra court order is needed for secure accommodation, but this will change when the new legislation is enacted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G L O S S A R Y</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remand centres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remand fostering</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reparation order</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reprimand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary offences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision order</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported caution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warnings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Withdrawn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young offender institution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth courts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth justice services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YOT (youth offending team)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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