

APPENDIX 2

Corporate Parenting Committee Report Derby City YOS work with Children in Care

On the 19th June 2018 there were 143 open cases to Derby City Youth Offending Service (YOS). Of those cases 12 young people (9 Male and 3 Female) were Looked After Children (LAC).

Age	Total
12	1
13	1
14	2
15	1
16	4
17	3

Table 1

Table 1 to the left shows a breakdown of the LAC by age. Table 2 on the right shows a similar breakdown but in relation to ethnicity.

Ethnicity	Total
White - British	8
Any Other White Background	2
White and Black Caribbean	1
Black and Any Other Ethnic Group	1

Table 2

Display Name	Start Date	End Date	Intervention Type	Days on order	Offences 12 months prior to order	Offences Whilst on Oder	Index Offence
E	12-Apr-18	12-Apr-19	DTO Post Custody/Licence	76	3	1	Threats to kill
J1	08-Dec-17	07-Dec-18	Youth Rehabilitation Order	201	5	0	Assault by beating
J2	23-Apr-18	19-Oct-18	Youth Rehabilitation Order	65	32	0	Criminal Damage
J3	29-Jan-18	28-Jan-19	Youth Rehabilitation Order	149	4	1	Acquire criminal property
K1	05-Feb-18		Youth Conditional Caution	142	4	1	Attempt arson
K2	18-Jun-18	17-Dec-18	Youth Rehabilitation Order	9	1	0	Use threatening behaviour
M1	24-May-18		Remand in Custody (YDA) SCH	34	2	0	Burglary Dwelling
M2	23-Apr-18		Youth Conditional Caution	65	1	0	Possess blade on school premises
M3	06-Nov-17		Remand in Custody (YDA) YOI	233	7	0	Section 18 - wounding
N	27-Oct-17	26-Oct-18	Youth Rehabilitation Order	243	8	1	Assault a constable
R	16-Oct-17	01-Nov-18	Referral Order	254	4	0	Possess knife blade in public place
T	15-Nov-17	19-Dec-18	Referral Order	224	7	0	Assault by beating

Table 3

Table 3 above displays a list of 12 anonymised young people and the current order they are subject to. It also shows the numbers of days each young person has been on the order and the index offence resulting in the order. It goes on to show the number of offences committed by each young person 12 months prior to the order starting. The average number of offences is 6.8 offences per young person. However due to the excessive number of offences committed by one young person (J2), if you remove their offences from the calculation, then the average drops to 3.8 offences per young person. Only four young people have committed offences whilst on their order. If we look at the per centage reduction of offences committed in the 12 months prior to the Court Order compared to offences committed whilst on the Court Order, we can see a 94.8% reduction overall.

Display Name	Risk at Start	Risk at End	Lor at Start	Lor at End	SW at Start	SW at End	Yogrs at Start	Yogrs at End
E	High	Very High	High	High	High	High	63	54
J1	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	High	74	77
J2	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium	High	82	87
J3	Medium	Medium	High	High	Low	Medium	79	86
K1	N/A	High	N/A	High	N/A	High	27	27
K2	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium	High	77	83
M1	High	High	High	Medium	High	High	72	71
M2	Medium	N/A	Medium	N/A	High	N/A	27	
M3	Medium	High	Medium	High	High	High	83	80
N	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	64	58
R	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	N/A	High	76	74
T	Medium	N/A	Medium	N/A	High	N/A	65	

Table 4

Table 4 above shows the Risk of harm (to others), Likelihood of Reoffending (Lor), Safety and Well Being Level (SW), and the YOGRS score of each young person at the start and end of their intervention. Where a box contains N/A, then this indicates an assessment was not completed or that particular part of the assessment was not completed due to the intervention not having yet ended. If the order has only recently started then the levels 12mths prior to the start of the order have been taken where possible.

What the table demonstrates is that 3 young people had a risk of harm assessment that increased in risk level, 3 had a risk of harm assessment that decreased in risk level and 6 had a risk of harm assessment that had a static risk level.

In relation to safety and well-being, 6 young people had an assessment that increased in risk level, 2 had an assessment that decreased in risk level and 4 had had an assessment that had a static risk level.

Both risk of harm and safety and well-being ratings historically take longer to reduce due to a range of complex factors such as:

- Time needed to help young people understand both the risk that they present to others and/or risk others present to them and to work with that young person in order to develop the thinking and practical skills to help keep themselves safe from the behaviours of others, or others safe from their actions
- Difficulty in changing the environment in which a young person either lives within or engages with, i.e. some were living in care settings that did not meet their assessed needs and some went missing to areas where they were at risk of being exploited or placed at risk by others.
- There can also be some nervousness on the part of practitioners in reducing risk levels in assessments too early, thereby potentially reducing the multi-agency input and coordination that is necessary in managing risk.

In relation to likelihood of re-offending, 2 young people had an assessment that increased in risk level, 3 had an assessment that decreased in risk level and 7 had an assessment that had a static risk level. This is despite the reductions in volume of offending demonstrated in table 3. This is perhaps due to a bias in thinking caused by practitioners developing more knowledge of young people's risk factors associated with

offending as they got to know the young person more. It highlights a need for continued training for some practitioners around assessment of all domains of risk.

The YOGRS scores, which are static risk factors associated with offending behaviour such as age at first conviction, as opposed to more dynamic factors which can help a young person move away from a lifestyle associated with criminal activity such as having a strong sense of family and personal identity within a cohesive social network. YOGRS scores saw increases for 4 young people, decreases for 5 young people, 1 static outcome and 2 where the outcome was not known.

Desistance Factors

Since the introduction of Asset Plus, which is the assessment framework for all young people that are involved in the Youth Justice system; the scoring method of measuring factors that directly contribute to a young person's offending (criminogenic risk factors) has been replaced by a system of rating factors that can affect future behaviour in a more positive way and lead to the greater probability of avoiding crime in the future (desistance factors). In order to assess these factors over a period of time (that a young person is under the statutory supervision of the YOS) we have scored using four ratings in line with Youth Justice Board guidance as follows:

Potential 1; Weak 2; Moderate 3; Strong 4.

Using this system makes it possible to measure the improvement/decline in each desistance category over the period of young people's time under supervision. The tables in Appendix 1 show the individual scores for each young person where they have had at least two completed assessments. In order to standardise the way they have been measured, we have taken the most recent assessment and compared it where possible to the assessment completed 12 months prior to the most recent date.

Name	Score
E	-7
J1	2
J2	6
J3	-1
K1	?
K2	7
M1	0
M2	?
M3	3
N	-2

Table 5 to the left shows the overall score of each young person. Where the score is a minus figure then their overall assessment has declined and likewise where it is positive their overall assessment has improved. Table 6 bottom left shows the numbers that have improved, declined,

Category 2	Score
Resilience and goals	8
How the young person relates to others	4
Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	3
Parenting, Care and Supervision	3
Substance Misuse	1
Social and Community/neighbourhood	1
Self Identity	0
Features and Lifestyle	2
Engagement & Participation	-2

Better	4
Declined	4
Same	1
Not Assessed	3

Table 6

of ASSET Plus ratings and over a longer period of time; we would expect to see further reductions, given table 3. The reductions are encouraging but perhaps suggest a degree of assessors being a little more lenient in scoring. Desistance theory training is planned as part of the YOS staff training and workforce development. It is clear that further ASSET Plus training would also be beneficial, especially in light of some of the findings of the recent YOS HMIP inspection.

It is clear that young people in care often demonstrate resilience in the face of great adversity and this is evidenced in the ASSET Plus ratings and in the fact that all of the 12 young people examined in this report have had reduced volumes of offending whilst subject to YOS supervision. The ASSET Plus analysis also highlights that the relational focus of Desistance theory has helped young people to develop stronger relationships with others, although family and wider networks did decline in ratings, this was often related to relationships with birth parents and peers, which tended to impact negatively on behaviour, whilst relationships with YOS practitioners and residential staff improved.

Of those ASSET Plus categories that decreased, emotional and mental health was a key factor, which relates to trauma, loss, attachment issues and the impact of young people's life experiences on their emotional and mental health. The YOS has access to a range of health staff in the service including a CAMHs practitioner to address these issues. However, this work is often long term and changes are often incremental.

and might not always be sustained for prolonged periods. Engagement with health services is a key part of the CONCORDAT work and Health are represented on both the steering group and tactical group for this work.

Overall, there are a lot of positives in this area of work, as we can see that the volume of offending does reduce significantly when children in care are supervised by the YOS. Future reports could look at volume of crime post YOS supervision to test out the sustainability of YOS interventions in the medium term.

There are less encouraging signs in regards to risk of harm and safety and well-being work for children in care with increases in risk levels for some young people. This can be caused by the behaviour of young people in care including going missing, being at risk of CSE and substance misuse. The analysis did however take place at a time where there was a high concentration of young people in DCC care homes within the city with similar risk related behaviours, which had a negative impact on missing children figures. A number of these young people have since moved to new placements, which has addressed some aspects of this risk and the CONCORDAT work planned for children in care has a broader focus than just criminality, to encompass wider teen vulnerabilities such as missing, CSE and substance misuse risks. This work is a key thrust of both the YOS' Youth Justice plan for 2018-19 and the missing improvement plan for 2018-19.

Appendix 1

N	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2	Change	Value	-2
	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	1	Potential	Family and wider Networks	worse	-2	
For Desistence	1	Potential	Learning Education Training Employment	1	Potential	Learning Education Training Employment	same	0	
	1	Potential	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	0		Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	worse	-1	
Low is bad	0		How the young person relates to others	4	Strong	How the young person relates to others	better	4	
High is good	0		Care History	1	Potential	Care History	better	1	
								2	
Low is Good	4	Strong	Attitudes of Offending behaviour	4	Strong	Attitudes of Offending behaviour	same	0	
High is Bad	3	Moderate	Features and Lifestyle	1	Potential	Features and Lifestyle	better	2	
	3	Moderate	Resilience and goals	0		Resilience and goals	better	3	
	0		Thinking and Behaviour	3	Moderate	Thinking and Behaviour	worse	-3	
Against Desistance	0		Learning Education Training Employment	3	Moderate	Learning Education Training Employment	worse	-3	
	0		Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	3	Moderate	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	worse	-3	
								-4	
R	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2			-15
For Desistence	3	Moderate	Engagement & Participation	3	Moderate	Engagement & Participation	same	0	
Low is bad	3	Moderate	Learning Education Training Employment	0		Learning Education Training Employment	worse	-3	
High is good	0		Resilience and goals	2	Weak	Resilience and goals	better	2	
	0		Family and wider Networks	2	Weak	Family and wider Networks	better	2	
								1	
	0		Attitudes of Offending behaviour	4	Strong	Attitudes of Offending behaviour	worse	-4	
Against Desistance	0		Emotional development and Mental Health	4	Strong	Emotional development and Mental Health	worse	-4	
Low is Good	0		Engagement & Participation	3	Moderate	Engagement & Participation	worse	-3	

High is Bad	0		Features and Lifestyle	3	Moderate	Features and Lifestyle	worse	-3	
	0		Family and wider Networks	2	Weak	Family and wider Networks	worse	-2	
								-16	
J2	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2			6
For Desistence	1	Potential	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	1	Potential	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	same	0	
Low is bad	0		Emotional development and Mental Health	3	Moderate	Emotional development and Mental Health	better	3	
High is good	0		Learning Education Training Employment	1	Potential	Learning Education Training Employment	better	1	
	0		Attitudes of Offending behaviour	1	Potential	Attitudes of Offending behaviour	better	1	
							same	5	
	4	Strong	Parenting, Care and Supervision	3	Moderate	Parenting, Care and Supervision	better	1	
Against Desistance	1	Potential	Features and Lifestyle	1	Potential	Features and Lifestyle	same	0	
Low is Good	3	Moderate	Substance Misuse	3	Moderate	Substance Misuse	same	0	
High is Bad	4	Strong	Self Identity	4	Strong	Self Identity	same	0	
	4	Strong	Learning Education Training Employment	4	Strong	Learning Education Training Employment	same	0	
								1	

M3	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2			0
For Desistance	1	Potential	How the young person relates to others	1	Potential	How the young person relates to others	same	0	
Low is bad	3	Moderate	Engagement & Participation	3	Moderate	Engagement & Participation	same	0	
High is good	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	same	0	
								0	
Against Desistance	1	Potential	Family and wider Networks	1	Potential	Family and wider Networks	same	0	
Low is Good	3	Moderate	Learning Education Training Employment	3	Moderate	Learning Education Training Employment	same	0	
High is Bad	3	Moderate	Thinking and Behaviour	3	Moderate	Thinking and Behaviour	same	0	
								0	
E	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2			-7
For Desistance	4	Strong	Care History	0		Care History	worse	-4	
	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	1	Potential	Family and wider Networks	worse	-2	
Low is bad	1	Potential	Learning Education Training Employment	1	Potential	Learning Education Training Employment	same	0	
High is good	0		Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	4	Strong	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	better	4	
	0		Resilience and goals	3	Moderate	Resilience and goals	better	3	
	0		Engagement & Participation	1	Potential	Engagement & Participation	better	1	
								2	
Against Desistance	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	4	Strong	Family and wider Networks	worse	-1	
	2	Weak	Substance Misuse	1	Potential	Substance Misuse	better	1	
Low is Good	0		Emotional development and Mental Health	4	Strong	Emotional development and Mental Health	worse	-4	
High is Bad	0		Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	2	Weak	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	worse	-2	

	0		Thinking and Behaviour	3	Moderate	Thinking and Behaviour	worse	-3	
								-9	
J1	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2			-1
For Desistence	3	Moderate	Learning Education Training Employment	2	Weak	Learning Education Training Employment	worse	-1	
Low is bad	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	2	Weak	Family and wider Networks	worse	-1	
High is good	1	Potential	Thinking and Behaviour	3	Moderate	Thinking and Behaviour	better	2	
								0	
Against Desistance	1	Potential	Family and wider Networks	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	worse	-2	
Low is Good	4	Strong	Social and Community/neighbourhood	3	Moderate	Social and Community/neighbourhood	better	1	
High is Bad	3	Moderate	Learning Education Training Employment	3	Moderate	Learning Education Training Employment	same	0	
								-1	
K	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2			7
For Desistence	2	Weak	Family and wider Networks	2	Potential	Family and wider Networks	same	0	
Low is bad	2	Weak	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	4	Strong	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	better	2	
High is good	2	Weak	Parenting, Care and Supervision	4	Strong	Parenting, Care and Supervision	better	2	
	0		Learning Education Training Employment	2	Potential	Learning Education Training Employment	better	2	
								6	
Against Desistance	4	Strong	Family and wider Networks	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	better	1	
Low is Good	4	Strong	Features and Lifestyle	4	Strong	Features and Lifestyle	same	0	
High is Bad	2	Potential	Substance Misuse	2	Potential	Substance Misuse	same	0	
								1	
M2	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2			3
For Desistence	3	Moderate	Care History	1	Potential	Care History	worse	-2	
Low is bad	1	Potential	Emotional development and Mental Health	1	Potential	Emotional development and Mental Health	same	0	
High is good	2	Weak	Substance Misuse	1	Potential	Substance Misuse	worse	-1	
	1	Potential	Family and wider Networks	1	Potential	Family and wider Networks	same	0	
								-3	
Against Desistance	2	Weak	Substance Misuse	1	Potential	Substance Misuse	better	1	
Low is Good	3	Moderate	Emotional development and Mental Health	3	Moderate	Emotional development and Mental Health	same	0	
High is Bad	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	1	Potential	Family and wider Networks	better	2	
	4	Strong	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	1	Potential	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	better	3	
								6	
J3	Value	Rating 1	Category 1	Value	Rating 2	Category 2			2
For Desistence	4	Strong	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	3	Moderate	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	worse	-1	
Low is bad	2	Weak	Thinking and Behaviour	2	Weak	Thinking and Behaviour	same	0	
High is good	1	Potential	Features and Lifestyle	2	Weak	Features and Lifestyle	better	1	
	2	Weak	Family and wider Networks	2	Weak	Family and wider Networks	same	0	
	0		Learning Education Training Employment	2	Weak	Learning Education Training Employment	better	2	
								2	
Against Desistance	3	Moderate	Thinking and Behaviour	3	Moderate	Thinking and Behaviour	same	0	
Low is Good	2	Weak	Features and Lifestyle	0	Weak	Features and Lifestyle	better	2	
High is Bad	1	Potential	Emotional development and Mental Health	1	Potential	Emotional development and Mental Health	same	0	
	4	Strong	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	3	Moderate	Living arrangements, Housing & Finance	better	1	

	0	Family and wider Networks	3	Moderate	Family and wider Networks	worse	-3
							0