

Date: Tuesday, 30 April 2013

Location: The Chamber, City Hall, London

Hearing: MOPAC Challenge - Reducing Reoffending

Start time: 10:00am

Finish time: 11:30am

MOPAC Panel Members:

Stephen Greenhalgh, Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime

Helen Bailey, Chief Operating Officer, MOPAC

Linda Duncan, Chair of MOPAC/MPS Audit Panel

Jeremy Mayhew, MOPAC Advisor

Faith Boardman, MOPAC Advisor

Jonathan Glanz, MOPAC Advisor

Steve O'Connell, MOPAC Advisor

Metropolitan Police Officials:

Mark Simmons, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service

Chris Bourlet, Chief Superintendent, Metropolitan Police Service

Guests:

Lin Hinnigan, Chief Executive, Youth Justice Board

Emily Thomas, Governor of HMYOI Cookham Wood

Heather Munro, Chief Executive, London Probation Trust

Liz Calderbank, HM Chief Inspector of Probation

Dr Helen Powell, Lead Evaluator of Ipsos Mori

Professor Neal Hazel, Director of the Centre for Social Research, Salford University

Date: Tuesday, 30 April 2013

Location: The Chamber, City Hall, London

Hearing: MOPAC Challenge - Reducing Reoffending

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Welcome to, I think this is the eighth MOPAC Challenge, and if all of you could quickly take your seats, we're starting late. Apologies for that; I'm sure we will catch up. I am Stephen Greenhalgh, the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, and I am delighted to be surrounded by my colleagues, MOPAC advisers, but importantly some people who are major players in the field of youth justice. Today is all about how we can tackle one of our challenges for MOPAC, and that is to reduce the rate of youth reoffending, really not just from those leaving custody but all of those that enter the criminal justice system. I will start off with a few slides to set the scene, and then I will ask our first group of attendees to introduce themselves and make short statements, and then we can get straight into the discussion. Can I have the first slide? I think this is where we have some technical adept skills. Is the first slide going to come or not? I can carry on without slides. Is it coming? Great. I think I have surprised you with my haste. Right, the first slide is on disposal of young offenders from London. This chart really shows that if we just focus on custody, it's a relatively small proportion. Obviously the experts here realised that, but only 1,200 young people leaving custody. The truth is that the figures are startlingly high. 66% of them reoffend within one year, and I think that rises to close to 80% certainly after two years. But if we look at pre-court, the reoffending rate is far lower, about a quarter. The first tier, the reoffending rate rises to about 40%, and among those with community sentences, community orders, the reoffending rate is 61%. So, interestingly enough, for London the average of all of that, I am told, is 39%, which is above the national average of 36%. Next slide. If you look at this map of London, it's really designed to show that reoffending rates are universally quite high. The highest is in Islington. Lewisham follows next, and my old borough, Hammersmith and Fulham, at close to 50% is also very high, as is Haringey. So these are all inner city boroughs with relatively high reoffending rates. But frankly all the boroughs are pretty high, and more could be done. Next slide. Interestingly enough -- I do not want to get too obsessed with the fact that some boroughs have 100% reoffending rate for young people leaving custody, because for some of those that have 100% reoffending rate it is only two people, so if they had halved that it would have been a 50% reoffending rate. But there you can see the London average is very high at 66%, and a number of boroughs are well in excess of that average. Next slide. The interesting fact is that this is not on the decline. The reoffending rate for those leaving custody has increased in the last few years. Next slide. The next slide shows the reoffending rates for young offenders given a community penalty, broken down by borough, and the reoffending rates vary massively. So Hounslow has the highest reoffending rate, close to 80%, but then Kingston-upon-Thames has the lowest at 42%. So a big spread through the average of 60%, from 80% down to 40%. Next slide. Now, this is the thing that I really want some help on and some comment on from our experts. I have asked my colleagues at MOPAC to map the money, and suffice it to say that there is a lot of money swishing around, but it is from all four corners of the universe. There are lots of people that are throwing money at this problem. There is no

single pot, there is no single direction, and the funding flows are certainly incoherent. This probably understates the level of coherence, frankly. Next slide. This is the final slide. This slide is not legible, but the point we are trying to make here is to see whether there is a correlation between the amount of money you spend and reoffending rates. Frankly, based on this evidence, there is an inverse correlation. The more you spend, the higher the reoffending rate. So there is absolutely no correlation between expenditure and reoffending rates. There is little transparency about why we spend more per offender in somewhere like Kensington and Chelsea, and far less in other parts of London. So that is a quick overview. Our big challenge is, rather than wallowing in why we cannot do anything, I am really looking to the experts here to, yes, note the difficulties that we face today in London, but what can we do positively together to really drive and improve what is unacceptable, this very, very high level of youth reoffending? So if I can ask our first group of people to introduce themselves? We have Liz Calderbank who is from the HM Chief Inspector of Probation. Delighted to have you, Liz. I know you have a lot of insights. Dr Helen Powell, the Lead Evaluator of Ipsos Mori, who will give us some insights from Daedalus. Professor Neal Hazel, the Director of the Centre for Social Research from Salford University. Perhaps I can start with you, Liz. Perhaps you can quickly introduce yourself and say a few words?

Liz Calderbank: Right. Thank you. I head up the probation inspectorate within the Ministry of Justice. What we do is we inspect probation trusts and youth offending teams (YOTs), and in 2011 we conducted an inspection programme of all the youth offending teams. We completed it, and that included looking at all the London YOTs as a region. We also inspected the London Probation Trust. In addition to this we conduct thematic inspections, which will typically include one of the London boroughs in it. So most recently we published an inspection on looked-after children who are housed away from their home area and supervised by youth offending teams, and an inspection on children who commit sexual offences.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Quite a remit.

Liz Calderbank: Yes.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): I will quickly introduce the other two people, and then perhaps you could start off with ... Dr Powell, do you want to introduce yourself?

Dr Helen Powell: Hello, I am Helen Powell. I head up the crime and justice team at Ipsos Mori, and my remit stems from doing public confidence work all the way up to doing evaluations, particularly around youth offenders, looking at the services that they receive in custody as well as in the community. We have recently completed the evaluation of Daedalus, which obviously was a resettlement programme looking at the role of services and the role of practitioners in addressing reoffending for young offenders in London. We've also looked more broadly, and we do quite a lot of work with young offenders and adult offenders both in custody and in the community, looking at it from their perspective in terms of what makes a difference to them, and then also looking at it from the practitioner and the service provider

point of view in terms of what they feel needs to be done and what barriers they face in delivering an effective service as well.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Professor Hazel?

Professor Neal Hazel: I think I am here because I have been involved for about 15 years in research on resettlement of young people when they come out of custody, and also custody evaluations. I have done a series of those. The first one was Medway Secure Training Centre, then evaluated the detention and training order nationally, then resettlement consortium more recently, and quite a few other evaluations with the Youth Justice Board. I completed a cross-national comparison of youth justice systems across the world, and was a reviewer for the Daedalus evaluation. I am now involved in a five-year project called Beyond Youth Custody, which is lottery funded, involving Nacro and some other organisations including Arcs and University of Bedfordshire, looking at innovations in resettlement going forward.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Fantastic. So we are really looking to all of you for what we can learn for London in particular, the youth justice system in London. It would be quite helpful, Liz, to get a feel for how London compares with the rest of the country, if you could give that both in terms of the YOTs and probation and similar services, but the system in general.

Liz Calderbank: Well, overall London, from our inspection reports, is operating slightly below the rest of the country on the average. However, having said that, what you have to bear in mind is that our inspection of the youth offending teams, the fieldwork, was undertaken in 2011, so it is actually getting quite old now. One of the things that we do know about the youth offending teams is that their performance can change very quickly. What we saw when we looked at them, however, was a very widespread performance. We saw some of the best performance that we've seen in the country, and also some of the poorest. Again, when we looked at the London Probation Trust we saw some pockets of very high practice indeed, and others where there were areas of concern that brought the average down. The differences aren't that wide to merit too much consideration, because generally across the country as a whole there needs to be improvement, and so I think we did not find anything in London that we did not find elsewhere in the rest of the country. What made it different, I think, is the concentration. I mean the concentration of population, the density, the number of boroughs close together, which of course when a lot of crime -- particularly gang-related crime, serious violence -- can be postcode orientated, is a factor. We saw a significant difference in the number of robbery cases within London; interestingly, slightly less on violence but more on robbery. We also noticed -- and again this cut across both the youth offending teams and the probation trusts -- difficulties that I think impact on all public sector organisations in London in recruiting suitably-qualified staff, and what we felt was an over-reliance on agency staff. Certainly within some of the boroughs, some responded by carrying vacancies and others recruited staff who quite frankly we didn't think were up to the performance that they should have been, and I know that is something that has been recognised. The other thing that I think

characterises London, when you look at it in comparison to the rest of the country, is the speed with which serious incidents can take place. And of course, by that I am referring to the civil disturbances that then spread, that came out very quickly there.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That is very helpful. Do my colleagues have any questions, any points they want to raise? What would be helpful is, given that background that London is a metropolis with concentrations of population, gangs and serious youth violence as a problem, what do you see as the thing that the statutory agencies, the voluntary sector -- what would be your recipe for success?

Liz Calderbank: I think as the problems come up from the different areas, so the solutions lie in cooperation and cross-agency cooperation. The political structures within London are also different, of course, with MOPAC, and that in itself provides an opportunity for greater partnership working. We saw, both through an inspection that we did a while ago on gang-related activity within the YOTs and also in our court case inspection, a number of initiatives taken by different boroughs where there were very good examples of leadership by the chief executives in taking issues forward. These need to be spread over, and I know that there is work following on from our inspection, because we have played a small part in actually looking at promoting that kind of work.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Linda, did you want to ask anything?

Linda Duncan: Yes. You mentioned the difficulty in recruitment of staff. Is there an opportunity through the cooperation of the boroughs to address that? How do you see a solution for finding and recruiting the right quality of staff?

Liz Calderbank: We saw a number of initiatives. Some of the YOTs who were actually holding off on recruiting people were quite actively and quite unashamedly doing what they described as "growing their own", taking people on as volunteers and then actually promoting them proactively through the structures. We saw some very good people being promoted and taken forward in that kind of way. I think it is a challenge for any organisation within the public sector, and undoubtedly beyond, about how far do you hold your nerve and not recruit people if you have doubts about their capability to deliver, and having the strength to actually do that when you're faced with vacancies and high workloads. I think it is important actively to promote the role, and to recognise the challenges that are faced in it. Certainly within your YOT workers and your probation officers, they are working in an extremely challenging environment and that often is not recognised. That kind of recognition helps in actually promoting it as a good place to work.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): When you made the statement about the broad spread of performance between the various agencies, how do you define that? How do you measure that?

Liz Calderbank: Between the different youth offending teams?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Yes, or the probation trusts. You said you saw pockets of excellence, and --

Liz Calderbank: Yes. Essentially what we looked at in that inspection was how well do the individual youth offending teams assess the young people? Because if they do not do a good assessment, they do not know what is basically the right thing to do. Then from that, how far did they deliver work that actually addressed the assessment, and then what was the outcome? We measured them on those three parameters. Within that we looked at how far was work done to actually manage the risk of harm the young person presented to the community, how far was work done to look at the likelihood of them reoffending, and was work also done to actually safeguard them? A lot of the young people that we see who are being supervised by the YOTs are themselves actually extremely vulnerable, and that can be a factor in their offending.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): So, risk of harm ...?

Liz Calderbank: Yes. The risk of harm to the community.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Then you looked at reoffending. What was the second one?

Liz Calderbank: Yes, the likelihood of reoffending. And the other was how safe they were. Whether there were issues done to actually protect them.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): So issues around vulnerability, child protection issues?

Liz Calderbank: Yes, that's right. This all ties in with the likelihood of reoffending and the risk of harm. A lot of young people who are convicted of knife crime will say that they started carrying knives, for example, for their own protection because they felt vulnerable.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Linda?

Linda Duncan: Just thinking about these youths and their transition into adulthood, what do you see as the main challenges of transitioning those individuals from the YOTs into the adult system?

Liz Calderbank: I do not think we pay enough attention to it, because when you look at the young people, as you say they are individuals and their maturation varies quite considerably. Of course, what we are talking about is not only transition between youth and adult offending services, but all the other supporting ones like health, education, etc. Ensuring that those get passed over at the same time is really important. What we have seen -- and again, we did an inspection on this in 2012 -- is the importance of work being done beforehand to smooth that transition forward is paramount. I know the Youth Justice Board have actually undertaken some

work on this in terms of how this is taken forward. It will be interesting to see how this then pans out with the changes that are being proposed for the probation service in the future, because of course at the moment we are talking about a youth offending service and a probation service where all of the work is held within the probation trust. In the future we're likely to be looking at young people being transferred, if they are high risk, to the probation trust, or if they are low or medium risk to a number of different organisations. The mechanics of that still needs to be worked through, and certainly needs to be given serious consideration, because this is the area where there is the best opportunity for intervention. We have seen how youth offending rates have dropped. We have seen how the custodial rates have dropped in numbers. There are some very positive things to be said for that. The group of young people that you have left are probably amongst the most challenging, and the most likely to continue offending into adulthood, so if there is an opportunity of diverting them at that time of transition it should be taken.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): And one of the agencies -- I will perhaps bring Mark in here -- that clearly is critical at the outset is how the police deal with this issue, because before the first tier, it is essentially police discretion. Can you just explain to those of us who are not expert how that works, effectively, how the police get involved?

Mark Simmons: I will let Chris talk you through the actual process, because he lives and breathes it a little more closely than I do, but one of the things that comes out just in this early stage of the discussion, and certainly in our thinking about this event today, is -- as Liz says in her work -- the wide range of practice that you have found. When we think about how we manage from the police point of view, how we engage around the performance in different parts of London, it is very much done on a local level. One of the first things that comes into my mind is that we do not do enough benchmarking across boroughs against each other, looking at the good practice and the differences; whether it is about the funding in relation to outcomes, whether it is the decision making, whether it is the range of different things that generate that spread on the map. So that is a very clear thing. I will ask Chris to talk through the process, but that is clearly one of the early challenges that has come out for us in terms of how we look across the ...

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Mark, before I turn to Chris, clearly that is an area where MOPAC can play a part, to shine a light on some of the performances across London. If you were to pick the things we should benchmark, obviously the reoffending rates are interesting in themselves, but what else would you want to shine a light on?

Mark Simmons: Firstly, I would like everyone to understand the actual reoffending rates more closely, so there is an obvious piece in terms of that chart with the three bars about understanding to what extent 2010 was driven by the disorders in 2011, and the significant number of arrests and prosecutions that were carried out following that. I just do not know, at the moment, and that is a huge gap in my knowledge and mea culpa for not knowing that. This is a key point, actually. Understanding the data first off, then looking at how that varies across

London, takes us straight into what is the quality of the decision making that we are making in the early stage, as you point out. Is that consistent or not? We will find variations in it, because in every area of performance that we look at, of course we find variations, and then that takes us on into the practice, the way in which the members of the YOT are actually working. I think each borough is looking in isolation at their own performance, which from the police point of view is pretty much how that happens, but it clearly does not give us that full picture. So I think that is an area where at this stage I do not know what I do not know, and I need to know a bit more about that.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Would you be able to give, for instance, the pre-court activity by borough? Would you be able to supply that and break that down by borough? So you could look at how many essentially young people are diverted at pre-court stage relative to when you get further up, the first tier and into the court system?

Mark Simmons: Yes, we would be able to gather that data. I have to say that it is not something that we routinely gather and look at in comparison across the piece at the moment. There is some work that Chris has just pointed out to me, some work that we have done to try to look at what that looks like for London as a whole, and we can take that down to a borough level and see what the variations are. So the triage process, how does that work differently in different places.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That is the first question that Chris ... I am interested, when I saw this chart for the first time, that we think about this as a whole system, effectively, that young people are becoming engaged with at the outset, having committed some kind of act, whether they enter the criminal justice system or not. The variation in how diversion takes place across London would be interesting. So Chris, can you take us through what you do?

Chris Bourlet: I will just pick up on Liz's point. I think the assessment process is probably one of the most key elements. What we do is look at an holistic assessment, gathering all the information we can from police databases and from partners as well, looking at what the situation is for that individual young person, what their previous offending history is, what will work for them. I think one of the successes we should talk about, and I think Liz has already alluded to this, is the number of young people that we are diverting away from the youth justice system in the first place, and the numbers are dropping in the cohort, which I think is a success. These are young people who are on the edge of offending, whom we are able to divert through various methods, whether it be out-of-court disposal such as was the final warnings, reprimands, etc. -- which now, as you know, have been replaced with the caution system -- or whether that is for a triage in itself, that we do not take people through the criminal justice system, we look at restorative justice options or community-based options or support packages that go with that individual's needs. I think for a lot of young people, that has proven to be very successful in diverting them out. I think the challenge lies in those, what we have always described as the harder core people who have severe chances of reoffending. That is where I

think we have more challenges going forward, because clearly those restorative justice/community aspects do not appear to be working for that cohort.

Jeremy Mayhew: Can I just ask very quickly, following up what Stephen said about tracking people at different points of the chain, so to speak, how much do we then track outcomes, systematically? In other words, how much can we adduce evidence across the piece as to whether people are permanently, temporarily, not at all diverted, so to speak?

Chris Bourlet: That is a really interesting point. There is some work that we have now just started to try to get a more standardised approach across London for all our YOTs, from the centre, looking across the 32 boroughs, looking at each YOT to find out how many people are coming through and what outcomes they are getting for their offending. So, for example, whether they are being cautioned, whether they are going through restorative justice, or whether they are going into custodial.

Jeremy Mayhew: I am asking something beyond that. Do they then reappear or not, so to speak, in the system? Because ultimately, I think the question we are asking in one way or another throughout this session is, we need some evidence about what works.

Chris Bourlet: Absolutely right. For adults, for example, the Home Office have now brought in a system called Idiom which does enable us to track adults through the system. What I do not think we have at the moment in London is a system which tracks young people automatically.

Jeremy Mayhew: So we do have a gap in that systematic analysis?

Chris Bourlet: For example, for the gangs cohort that we have in London, we now have an automated system which tells us when some young person has come to police notice, so for the gang cohort, with the criteria that we set we have now developed an automated system which will flash up to the gang managers on the boroughs that something is happening.

Jeremy Mayhew: You have to have entered the gang cohort to be part of that, which is a bit late in the day in that sense.

Chris Bourlet: Well, there are different cohorts, actually, because overall, the pattern of youth offending is perhaps acquisitive crime. They are shoplifting, they are getting into trouble. Gangs is about risk and harm, so someone who is on a gangs cohort may not actually have come to the notice of the police for offending, but we know that with all their associations they are at risk of becoming harm to the community. So there are slightly different cohorts, although of course they are all part of the same issue.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Okay. We have picked up the need for benchmarking, potentially the need for more systematic analysis, and I think that is a fantastic segue. Professor

Hazel, if you could take us through your experience and what you think London needs to focus on, that would be really helpful. You mentioned resettlement consortia amongst other things.

Professor Neal Hazel: Yes, sure. First of all, just to back up what Liz was saying in that the numbers are going up year by year because we are focusing on the hardest group now, because the numbers going into custody are less and less, so therefore you would expect the reoffending rate to go up.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): It's a hardened cohort.

Professor Neal Hazel: Yes. And the reason why, backing up what was said by Mark and Chris, one of the key reasons why the numbers going into custody is going down is because of the amount of early diversionary work that is going on, so a reduction of first-time offenders and so on going through the system. In terms of what we know works with resettlement from custody, and what reduces reoffending, it is all about two things really. First of all it is focusing on resettlement right from the start, so when somebody goes into custody you do not focus on detention and what you do with them inside. You focus on what is going to happen when they come out, straight away, and that custody is about resettlement. The second thing is about, as we have been talking about already, coordination and partnership. It is absolutely key, and that is coordination across the transition between custody and community and coordination within the community as well. So there are three specific things that I would suggest we need to look at, and as Liz was saying, it is simply greater in London than everywhere else, but the same lessons as everywhere else. First of all, we need to make sure that everybody is focused on resettlement, so that for instance it would be useful if there were an aim for the custodial institutions which was on reoffending when they come out and was on working with resettlement partners, and if there were a joint target. It would be useful if there were less restrictions on ROTL, release on temporary licence, and if that was up so there was more transitional help. So it means that people outside could have young people coming out on licence to arrange accommodation, to arrange employment, and so on. At the moment because the emphasis is on risk, understandably, but not on resettlement, there are few people coming out on temporary licence. It would help if all sentence planning was focused on resettlement right from the beginning, or in fact even the pre-sentence report, and that joint planning meetings were focused on resettlement rather than focused on what to do inside. There is not enough dovetailing between the custody and the community parts of the sentence, so for instance young people can come out of custody and there will be no education because they come out in the summer and so there is no course. So there are not enough roll on roll off courses for young people. The education that is done inside may well be towards some qualification, if they are in there long enough, but it does not necessarily prepare them for what they need when they come out. Again, it is not about looking for what they need in terms of resettlement. Also, communication flow between the institution and outside. It would be very useful if everything that was done with a young person inside was recorded, so that when they come outside they can know where they are picking up and there will be continuity of sentence. The detention training order is meant to be a continuous sentence, but in practice it is usually

not because there is not that communication flow. It would be useful if we had accommodation and ETE set up for when the young person comes out. As I am sure Helen would say, research project after research project has shown that at least a third and usually a half or more of young people come out and there is no accommodation for them at the time of release, or there is no ETE set up for them at the time of release. So the key period, when you need to capture good intentions --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): What is ETE, sorry?

Professor Neal Hazel: Education, training and employment. The acronyms abound. Yes, so that has not been set up for them. We know there is a key period of enthusiasm when young people are released from custody that you really need to capture, but we also know that it is a very short period, and as soon as they feel as if they are not getting what has been promised to them, they quickly get disillusioned. Or if there are not things set up for them when they come out, they just go and hang out with their offending peers again and things go down very quickly. Then coordination in the community is absolutely key. We know from research projects, and indeed the resettlement consortia, that ideally you want a broker, somebody in the middle who is coordinating partnerships, whose job it is to bring in different partners, employers, accommodation providers both statutory and non-statutory. When I say "broker" I do not mean a mentor, as was used in the Daedalus example, but I do mean somebody whose job it is to coordinate partnerships, whether that be within the individual YOTs or across different areas, as it was with the resettlement consortia. Liz has also pointed to another key area that we desperately need to get right, and that is that transition to adulthood, that point at 18 where all learning about a young person is in danger of getting lost; it does not always, but it quite often does. There is no compatible communication system or IT system in most places, and it is a real point where we need to focus because certainly in terms of records and analysis, quite often they go off the map and we find it very difficult to track them at that point as well. So that is a key point to look at.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That is helpful. You have covered a lot there in a short time. Thank you for that. Faith, do you have any questions you want to ...?

Faith Boardman: It strikes me very much, listening to you, that this is as much about processes and information flows and systems, rather than perhaps the amount of resources and such that is available. Is that a fair estimate? Do we know how the resources devoted in London compare with, for example, other cities?

Professor Neal Hazel: I do not know the answer to that last question, but I can tell you that yes, it is about processes and it is about coordination. Inevitably when you looked at the slide earlier which showed that more expensive options are not necessarily better, that is because the more expensive options involve custody and are quite often dealing with the most serious offenders and so on. So the analysis there is quite complex, and there is really no simple answer to that one. In terms of what works, yes, it is --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Surely every London borough will have the whole cohort, some places will have more serious offenders than others. Across London, to see that variation and lack of correlation is just interesting, even if you delve deep.

Professor Neal Hazel: Yes, but that chart in itself does not tell us the whole answer --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): No, sure. It just begs more questions.

Professor Neal Hazel: It does, exactly, which as a researcher I would love to examine.

(laughter)

Professor Neal Hazel: In terms of the coordination, you are right. If you just put resources into more case workers in an area, that would not necessarily do any good. It is not about more case workers or more resources for that case worker. It is about ensuring the coordination, ensuring wraparound services, because we know that these kids have multiple needs, have very complex needs, and you need to meet all of that. You cannot do it just from the justice services. You cannot even do it just with the state statutory services. It is about coordinating and organising the processes more widely. That is the key.

Faith Boardman: Are there any other metropolises, or larger cities, where you think they are actually doing this better, that we could take a look at?

Professor Neal Hazel: One of the areas where the Youth Justice Board resettlement consortia operated was in Manchester and the northwest, and they have had very good results there. So the indicator we have used there -- we have not used the twelve month reoffending indicator because it has not been twelve months since -- we have used a proxy which is the number of arrests for an offence during the licence period, and that pretty much halved when the resettlement consortia came in. It was partly also to do with coordination with just one custodial institution, which is Hindley Young Offenders' Institution (YOI). They have got that benefit up in the northwest; we have not got that benefit in London, and the multiple institutions is one of the problems really that you have in London.

Faith Boardman: Within London, we also obviously have the borough boundaries, and as I think Liz pointed out that does not really fit with real life on the estates, very often. So there is the issue of coordination between boroughs. Are you aware, again, of any good examples where neighbouring boroughs are in fact cooperating on this issue of resettlement?

Professor Neal Hazel: Absolutely. That was one of the ideas behind the resettlement consortia, to have a consortium of neighbouring boroughs. So we have that in the southwest, we have it in Hampshire and we have it in the northwest, around Manchester. They are now trying it in various areas in Wales. So that is the idea, partly so that they can share resources

and it is more cost-effective. There are other benefits, like for instance if a young person is involved in gangs or some other kind of territory or with offending peers, they can if they want to move to another of the areas that is coordinated and working together.

Faith Boardman: OK. Thank you.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Did you want to ...?

Jonathan Glanz: Have you talked very much about the importance of accommodation for young people as they come out of institutions? Clearly housing for young people is an issue across the piece, and there are a number of changes which are taking place in relation to welfare and housing benefit which may key into this, but do you have any suggestions or ideas as to how local authorities, housing associations or charitable organisations could look to provide more and better accommodation which could help to bridge this gap? I am aware of work being done by an organisation called Commonweal, and I think there are others in the field, but do you think it is something that could be pursued more widely?

Professor Neal Hazel: Yes, there are two or three things that I would suggest need to happen. The first is there needs to be an earlier assessment of homelessness. It tends to happen just before they are released, or after they are released, rather than right at the beginning. That is the first thing. Secondly, it is a problem partly because if the young person does have some accommodation beforehand, or indeed if you sort something out at the beginning of the sentence, the chances are it cannot be left open for them. One thing that has been tried, and it seems to be successful but has not been properly evaluated, is when a local authority or a charity involved with justice buys up a stock, or rents a stock, of housing, and again if you coordinate with different areas, then you have more flexibility about bringing people in or taking people out. You need to have that available, and to be flexible for when people leave and go back in and so on. We do know that some level of independent housing is useful, but on the other hand we also know that it needs to be pretty well structured and supervised. It is not an easy task. Accommodation, and getting employers involved, are probably the two biggest challenges in terms of practical efforts that need to be made. So you are right, it is an issue.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): I think we should bring in Dr Powell to talk a little bit about Daedalus, and I visited the Heron Unit and clearly the use of resettlement brokers is a critical part of what we have learned from that project. Perhaps you could let us know what the lessons are?

Dr Helen Powell: Yes, definitely. I think, feeding on from the points that Liz and Neal both made about the multi-agency situation to start with, that was what came through the evaluation of Daedalus was that multi-agency arrangements were so significant to the successful delivery of the programme. Within that, it was about everyone being very clear what their roles were, and at the start of Daedalus I think that is where a few problems were caused in terms of

bringing in a resettlement broker or a voluntary organisation or another agency within the statutory mix. It was just being very clear about who was responsible for what. There is a danger in that, if you are not clear from the start who is responsible for what element and taking forward a piece of work, that service is not delivered and so young people still fall through the gaps. I think that was really something we noticed very much through this piece of work. Having a sort of governance structure that oversees the agency agreements and set up greatly contributed to that, because it enabled everyone to have a check list on a routine basis in terms of who was involved, who was delivering what, and if there were notable gaps or notable problems, how those were best responded to. I think the role of the resettlement broker was undoubtedly the fundamental part of Daedalus, and I think a lot stems also from what we know in research around the significance of that one-to-one relationship that a young person can have with a worker, whether it be a YOT worker or a resettlement broker in this instance. The work that they do beyond what is required, in terms of the core assessment and their accommodation, ETE, family needs, means that they can work with that young person to develop much more positive life skills and so tackle all aspects of their lives, because what was so evident with the cohort that went through Daedalus is, much as we know from young offenders more generally, the chaotic nature of their lives. On leaving the gates at Feltham and thinking, "Let's get them into ETE," there is a whole raft of other issues that need to be tackled first before you can get to that point. Those are fundamental issues around where they actually live within the community, family relations, any kind of personal issues that they may have, and it is the work that goes into being involved. There is a lot of effort that needs to be put in at that point, as well as thinking about the harder outcomes in terms of getting them into ETE or getting them to turn up to their YOT for various meetings. It is thinking about having somebody there on a day-to-day basis who is supporting them through their life, to make that successful progression away from offending. I think, interestingly, that also came out from the young people's relationship with staff in the Heron Unit, where a lot of attention was given to the staff to young people ratio and who the staff were on the unit. That fostered a lot of motivation and wanting to engage in the service, more than I think is evident on other units within other establishments, because of the way in which the staff interacted with the young people and also interacted with the resettlement broker. Like Neal was saying, very much in terms of thinking right from the word go, from their joining the unit, what needs to be prepared and done for their release, and then continuing that on into the community. I think that was the fundamental element, and having somebody who met them at the gate if there was nobody else to meet them, and to be with them in those first days, weeks, months on release, working with them. It was somebody who was not seen as being a statutory body, that as part of their order they had to go along to a YOT and check in. It was somebody who was there who they felt was more there for them, who they could trust, and who in developing that kind of relationship they were much more willing to engage with services and to talk more about the issues and problems that they faced, which were then better met, which then had a better impact on their likelihood of getting involved in problem offending going forward. I think that was very noticeable from Daedalus.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That is a helpful overview. Steve, you have some questions.

Steve O'Connell: Yes. Thank you very much. I think it is recognised, and certainly the tone of your report, of some of the 137 pages I took the opportunity to read, was that Daedalus has been a success, but it is a question as to the degrees of success and the costs around it, because it was quite cost intensive. The Rathbone resettlement brokers are fantastic assets and they work hard, and they are completely integral to it, but there are costs around it. There are relatively small numbers for measurement, and there is a lack of a comparable group that you could actually compare the work to. How did you feel about that, when you were making your conclusions?

Dr Helen Powell: It is a situation that I have been in before with other evaluations, and it is always a very tricky one, to find a suitable comparable group where you can make claims around effectiveness. I think what was evident was that by using a national baseline, and also looking more generally at Feltham and other establishments as well, it gives you a good indication. In an ideal world yes, you would very much want a comparable group, because then you can apply much more certainty to what you are saying. I think with what we were faced with, we did the best we could, and I think it was looking at what we really wanted to bring out through that report -- probably hence the length in the end, as well. Yes, we wanted to look at the reoffending figure, but we also wanted to look very much in terms of behind that, in terms of other outcomes that were made. We were very keen to stress in the report that those should not be lost, and I think that is something very key in terms of going forward in measuring any reductions in reoffending.

Steve O'Connell: I would agree completely. I think it is a measure of the success of the Heron Unit, and I think we will hear later the YJB will continue with the Heron Unit and look at the transitional process. It is important for us, and the Deputy Mayor and others, to judge the success of Daedalus to see how that will inform future work. Again, I think we will touch upon this later, but what was marked to me is that the response from many of the guys in there was that the thing they wanted was employment afterwards. That was the most important thing. They talked about where they were going to live when they came out, but it seemed to be that those that wanted, it was work that they wanted to look forward to through the resettlement broker. The resettlement broker would be key in that, would you say?

Dr Helen Powell: Definitely. I think also key in managing their expectations, as well, so it is key to helping work with them in custody, in terms of doing mock interviews and getting CVs and thinking of likely employment opportunities on release. I think what was very evident from the young people that we spoke to was yes, what they wanted to achieve was employment, but their expectations were often far off in terms of what was probably likely on release. So it is making sure that those are met, and very much that the stepping stones are put in place to get to that point of getting successful employment. That work needs to happen in custody. I think the resettlement brokers were key, but the staff on Heron, in terms of the modules and courses that were run, were also very key. Also, bringing in employers into the unit was just essential, and that made huge steps forward for most of these young people who had never come face to

face with these types of employers, had never done a mock interview, had never looked at doing a CV and thought about that process. So even on leaving, even if they were not successful in getting into a job immediately, actually going through that process and getting ready for a job was a significant leap forward for many of these young people, and the resettlement broker was able to assist them and support them through that process.

Steve O'Connell: The point, again, is the continuity. When they leave, they have a continuous contact that they can rely upon, to nurse them through and hold their hand, and it has proven in the figures on reoffending. Again they are figures that are significant. I think you have 37 compared to what you would expect is something like 48, which is significant savings, and often there is also the savings of cost to the system of less reoffenders. One last comment really would be around mentors, because obviously the mentoring scheme is something that is important to this building and elsewhere. Going forward in any new model, how would you see mentors coming in somewhere along the line, behind this? Resettlement brokers are not necessarily mentors as such, are they? Or would you describe them as mentors?

Dr Helen Powell: We describe them in the report as being like an enhanced mentor role, in a sense enhanced because they offer the mentoring but they actually have access to all the services, and they are tapped into the statutory provision, and I think that was one of their key strengths, to be honest. Because they were not seen by a young person as somebody who had statutory authority, they were a mentor in that way that they could support them, but the added bonus was that because of their role, they were able readily to access any of the services for young people. They understood the system more. I think that is a key model, having them involved again in custody, and that continuity out into the community. It is making sure that you have that level of mentoring support, but somebody who has got access, who understands the services that are available locally that they can tap into easily. I think that was a huge strength.

Steve O'Connell: So it is like a mentor plus, so the mentors that, for example, this building are interested in are mentors out in the neighbourhood, as it were?

Dr Helen Powell: Yes.

Steve O'Connell: The resettlement brokers already had that relationship within Heron, and then going forward?

Dr Helen Powell: Yes.

Steve O'Connell: Thank you very much.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Yes. Just before we move on to the next comment, I was interested, we do not have resettlement consortia in London, is that the case? What have been the barriers in setting that up, essentially?

Professor Neal Hazel: Well, I think Daedalus was an alternative approach to the resettlement consortia. I don't know if there is -- maybe Lin will be able to explain why. I am not sure that there is a barrier in particular, and I certainly would suggest that that approach is one worth looking at very seriously.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): As for resettlement as a strategy, does that go beyond young people who have custodial sentences? Is that useful, presumably, all the way through?

Professor Neal Hazel: Well, the principles that are involved in resettlement --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Are generally applicable?

Professor Neal Hazel: Absolutely, yes.

Liz Calderbank: I would certainly support that, and certainly listening to Neal and Helen, one of the advantages that I think you have in London, with the density of the boroughs, is that given the political will of co-commissioning across boroughs to address these really quite serious problems for small numbers, and looking at how you can deal with them and using your powers of procurement to actually address the issues.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That is very helpful, Liz, and you have some key messages there. From Mark and Chris the need to benchmark will be helpful at a borough level, because that enables people to realise, "Is this working or not? Can we do better?" Look at the differences, understand that, ask sensible questions, direct resources. Equally what you have just said about the collaboration between agencies, and the need to get the government structure right for that to happen. Lastly, that we seriously look at how we can -- it sickens me to say this -- learn from the northwest of England --

(laughter)

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): -- how we can introduce some of these ideas around resettlement consortia that the Mayor started in his first term with Project Daedalus. So, thank you all for coming along. Would the last of our three colleagues to come step forward? Thank you.

[pause while some of the speakers change places]

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): So, whilst everyone is getting settled in and the name tags, I am delighted that we have Lin Hinningan, the relatively new Chief Executive of the Youth Justice Board (YJB) --

Lin Hinningan: Very new. Very new.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): -- which is great, because you can be entirely frank with where we are today. Emily Thomas, the Governor of one of our young offender institutions at Cookham Wood, and of course Heather Munro, Chief Executive of the London Probation Trust, our criminal justice partner. So we have had the scene set, if you like. I am sorry it has taken a bit longer, but it has been helpful in the sense that it has talked about getting better data, if you like, to inform decision making, and good benchmarks would be useful particularly at the borough level. We have had some discussion about how we might improve governance and the environment for agency working between the statutory agencies, but also with voluntary groups, because obviously that is a critical success factor. Lastly, how we mainstream some of the thinking around resettlement here in London. So perhaps I could ask each of you to give us an idea of how we can reduce youth reoffending in the round. Over to you, Lin, perhaps, to kick off.

Lin Hinningan: OK. I think for YJB, our overarching duty is to prevent offending and reoffending by children and young people, so this is really core to our business. Certainly in this year's business plan, that is our big priority. We have had tremendous success in London and nationally on reducing the number of first-time entrants, and we need to keep focus on that. I think we must not lose sight of that, drop that ball, because we need to keep diverting young people away from the criminal justice system. We have had massive reductions in the number of young people in custody, but the reoffending, particularly of young people coming out of custody, remains very stubborn and particularly in London, it is continuing to increase. I think what we are prioritising is analysis, to help us understand the nature of that group. I think undoubtedly, as colleagues have said, there is an argument that it is more complex, that as we have reduced the numbers we have a cohort of more complex young people who are more challenging and more complex in terms of their own needs. That is perhaps a partial and significant part of the explanation, but I think we have to do more really to understand those individuals. As the cohort becomes smaller, we need to dive down and look at the sub-groups within that. There are different issues around age, around type of offence, around a number of different factors that we should better analyse, because I think we have to get down to that micro level in order to be able to help, because it is about every individual young person. I would reflect what colleagues have said about the particular challenges in London, but there are YOTs who are performing better than the national average in terms of reoffending and there are some really good examples of good practice. The Pathfinder in west London, one of the projects that YJB has supported to enable local areas to reinvest savings from reduction in custody costs, is into its second year, and it has a target of 11.8% bed night reduction and is currently on target to achieve that. The messages that come out from there, I think, are the same as I would see applying across the piece. They are that micro-management of cases, they are actually getting on top of every individual young person and saying, "What do we need to do with this person?" and targeting resources at the places where the risk is greatest. Secondly, there is strong senior management support across the piece there. It is those two levels, I think, that are really important. Hammersmith and Fulham, for instance, have weekly risk panels where they are actually looking at the individual young offenders who are medium and high risk.

They go into five or six cases in depth every week, so they really look at how they are going to make a difference to that young person. Because as we know, many of these young people are persistent, prolific offenders, and the impact they are having on their local communities is fantastic, so if we can really focus in and make a difference on their criminal behaviour, then we can make a real difference in local communities. To reinforce the messages which I think have come out from colleagues already -- and, sorry, I am going to say, "Look to the northwest" --

(laughter)

Lin Hinningan: -- because on the resettlement consortia, the messages from there are really key. The thinking about the young person and their journey and the support they need into custody, through custody and out as an end-to-end journey. All partners working together and having common aims around resettlement is a really important message. I would add into that, children's services too. As you will be aware, many of our young people involved in the criminal justice system are looked-after children, and it is really important that the local authorities and the boroughs who are the corporate parents for those young people maintain their role and do not deregister them, as it were, from being looked after, but get engaged in that partnership. So I think it is, for me, two levels. It is the micro-analysis and the micro management, and at the Youth Justice Board we have a reoffending tool on which we are working with YOTs to help them look at their cases and where they can impact, what their cohort looks like, how they can get the best impact. It is micro-management at the operational level, but it is vital at the strategic level too, because those local operational partnerships will only work if they are backed up by those strategic partnerships, by organisations across the city. I know those partnerships are more complex and multi-faceted in London, because of the different agencies plus the boroughs, but for me that is really where we need to work if we are going to make an impact on reoffending.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Lin, that is great. Perhaps I can invite everyone else to step in. Perhaps, Heather, it would be great if you could just for clarity explain the complementary role between YOTs and probations, because I need to understand that better as well.

Heather Munro: Yes, OK. Well, the London Probation Trust has a contract to deliver offender management services. We have a contract with the national offender management service, but that is really for 18 and over, so we are an adult service. We are a pan-London organisation, but we are also borough based, so we have teams in every borough. We are supervising 40,000 adults across London at any one time, but obviously we have talked about the transition point being hugely important, and I will say a bit more about that as well. We also are very involved in the local youth offending teams, so our assistant chiefs are on the management board, and we have one probation officer seconded to every youth offending team in London and we fund that post. So that is what we are working on, but we are mainly dealing with the transition, and I think the transition is quite important. Maturity was mentioned earlier, and one of the problems we have is that it is not, "Oh, tomorrow you're 18, now you're an adult and you suddenly fit into an adult world." That is how I think both within probation, and how the

service has been commissioned, there is nothing in my contract that says you have to provide something different for young people. I think what we have been realising is that we have to have a very different focus, so we have started to have 18 to 24 year old teams, we have started to have instead of a single probation officer seconded, perhaps two workers who work half and half, can manage the case across the boundary, so they are not having to transfer a case at the point of somebody being 18. As for this other key bit about being able to advise on maturity, we are doing some work with Birmingham University and the Barrow Cadbury Trust on what does maturity look like, so that we can advise sentences when we are recommending sentences and also so that our workers can target the interventions differently for this age group. One of the challenges for us is around all of us needing to be more flexible across that boundary, because it is not just the transfer from youth offending teams to probation. It is also, as mentioned earlier, the mental health, it is all these other services. When you hit 18, something different happens, and actually what we need is much more flexibility across that boundary.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): It is very interesting to get the idea of a case officer remaining the same. If you can do that, that is good. We will come back and ask some more general questions. Lastly, it is great to have someone who is right at the sharp end of it, so to speak, and Emily, if you can just give us an idea ... I have been to Feltham but I have not been to Cookham Wood; I am sure I will be able to have a visit. It is an example of, as we see, a smaller cohort of young people ending up in young offender institutions. As we have heard, what are the lessons, if you like, that you take for what it will take to reduce youth reoffending? I am sure that the reparation ends up in the young person finding a different path, rather than ending back where they started.

Emily Thomas: I thought it would be useful just to quickly explain about Cookham Wood. We hold about 130 young people at any one time, that is our population. We sometimes feel like the poor relation to Feltham when it comes to our role in looking after London young people in custody. Over the first quarter of 2013, more than 200 young people from London boroughs were held in Cookham Wood. We particularly take young people from the southeast of London, so Croydon, Lewisham, Southwark in particular are the boroughs from which we will take young people. In terms of the reduction in the cohort, we have certainly seen populations reduce. I have worked in the youth justice custody sector for seven years now, and the population has declined rapidly. Whilst that is a fantastic thing overall, what we do see within custody is -- it is difficult to explain, I suppose, but it is as though things are no longer diluted. The cohort of young people who were suitable for ROTL, who were able to work with slightly more freedom, we struggle to find those young people any more, because those young people who are coming to us have such a high complexity of need, but are also exhibiting such high levels of violence. That is violence that they have exhibited in the community, and violence that they then bring with them into custody. For example, our average population over the first quarter of this year was 100 boys. Ten of those are in for murder, another ten are in for attempted murder, 20 are in for possession of an offensive weapon and use of an offensive weapon, and a significant majority are in for street robbery often with levels of violence attached to that. So we are talking about a difficult cohort who are in for fairly serious violent crime now, and that is as it

should be. They are the young people, I think, who ought to find themselves in custody, for whom it would be difficult to find an appropriate community disposal for them given the risk to the public and the risk of harm to themselves and others. It does present some challenges in terms of how we deliver appropriate resettlement activity within the institution and in conjunction with the community, and I think we cannot underestimate how difficult that is, but that should not stop us from exploring all the avenues available to us to deal with this particular cohort. I would just like to point out that I am from the northwest --

(laughter)

Emily Thomas: -- I worked in Hindley, a prison for young people in the North West and I helped to establish the northwest resettlement consortium. I have established a southeast resettlement consortium whilst at Cookham Wood; unfortunately at the moment that only focuses on Kent, Surrey, Sussex. We are just about to take in Hampshire, which I am not convinced is in the southeast --

(laughter)

Emily Thomas: -- but I think in terms of picking up what colleagues have said, the consortia approach worked very effectively in the northwest across a number of local authorities, and I think it has real potential within London to be able to focus attention on this cohort of young people.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That is very helpful. One of the things that is interesting -- and clearly we can learn a lot from resettlement consortia -- is this question of transition, if you like, for this complex cohort from custody into the community. What would be your lessons of how we can get that right, or make that work better?

Emily Thomas: I do not think I would say anything different from what has already been raised, but it is about that absolute focus on the individual young person, and it is about understanding and recognising the high level of support that individual young person requires, particularly at the point of transition through the gate. We have very good examples of effective individual case management happening at Cookham Wood, very effective relationships with individual local authorities, but I think sometimes we are not clear on the level of need of the young person and how much focus there needs to be. I think the lesson from the resettlement brokers within the Daedalus project is absolutely that, that it was the plethora of stuff that a young person takes out of custody with them, that needs somebody to help them through it. I suppose in terms of a positive example, we have talked a lot about mentors and that role within a young person's life of an adult who can support them through this process. We work at the moment with a social enterprise which is youth service delivery, youth workers, and they are offering exactly that kind of service of being able to mentor young people and support young people in custody in a voluntary relationship, that young people see as voluntary and not part of statutory delivery. It is not about them as criminals, it is about them as children

and young people, and it can follow them through the gate. We have managed to engage in some co-commissioning arrangements certainly with Lewisham and Croydon, where there is a recognition that having that service go out into the community with young people is having a beneficial effect on them being supported through that resettlement process.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That is very helpful. Can I go back to Lin, because you mentioned in your introductory remarks moving away from the northwest to territory that is closer to home, the west London Pathfinders, which includes Hammersmith and Fulham. What strikes me is that you have a small group of young people for London, whether it is 1,200 in custody, 13,000 or 14,000 that we are talking about if you look at the whole cohort, and a reasonably large amount of money spent. The youth justice budgets for London are on the order of 100 million. What effectively you are trialling, rather than just devolving a sliver of that budget in the case of remand which may be 10 or 15 million of 100 million, effectively your biggest costs are ending up in custody and essentially getting the YOT teams to focus on outcomes, as I understand it. Now, where are we on that? If it is good for west London, I always believe it is good for the rest of London.

(laughter)

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Perhaps you could let us know where we are in establishing that this is working. Then, focusing on those principles of effectively co-commissioning with boroughs, does that necessarily have everything in-house and ensuring that they are doing all that they can to reduce that cohort further, as it should be?

Lin Hinningan: Yes. If you look at our total spend, certainly with YJB, what is spent on the secure accommodation is 245 million.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): In London?

Lin Hinningan: No, sorry, that is across ...

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): I am just thinking about London.

Lin Hinningan: I don't know, but the proportion --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): My guess is, about 100 million is the London budget.

Lin Hinningan: By far the greatest proportion of our total spend, about two-thirds or three quarters, is on custody and we want to shift that. We know it is much more effective if we can help young people stay out of the system, if we can give them community sentences. Custody does not help anybody, it is very expensive and as the Secretary of State is at pains to stress in the recent consultation, it is still leading us to reoffending. So as you are aware, yes, the remand costs have already been delegated out. That has only just happened now, but I think

that is very much a way of trialling what local authorities can do, given they are incentivised and try to reduce the number of young people who do go into custody; how does that play out and can we do it across the whole piece? I think the direction of travel is to look to do that across the whole piece. The first message is that we need to learn from the lessons on the remand, but these Pathfinders are also precisely designed to help us look and see whether it is possible to do more generally on the whole custody budget. So we are going to learn lessons both from the Pathfinders and from remand...

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): On the lesson learning from remand, there is too little money to shift behaviour in the local authority. Someone who is a council leader has a gross budget of half a billion pounds, quarters of billion pounds, it is just not enough money to shift behaviours effectively towards ... They just absorb the cost.

Lin Hinningan: Yes. Potentially, although interestingly enough --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): I have talked to my Director of Children's Services, the people who manage YOT teams, and hearing from other chief executives. If you take a whole system approach, where effectively the front end are incentivised around this, then that is more likely to work, isn't it, in principle?

Lin Hinningan: Yes. I think that is right, in principle I think that is where we want to go. Interestingly enough, you say it is not enough to change practice, but already in the six months before this came in we had quite a significant drop in remand numbers. So actually, in anticipation people were saying, "Well, can we look at making sure we are making the best use of the custody alternatives to avoid remand?" So there is already some shift.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Oh, good.

Lin Hinningan: But we need to learn, and what is very clear is that one does need to have in place those partnerships to make it work, because you put out the incentive of saying, "OK, you keep the money," and we had four Pathfinders, only two of them are continuing forward into the second year. That is because there are obstacles around making the partnerships work across different boroughs, between different agencies, etc., so we need to work out how it works before we can move on to that bigger picture.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Jeremy?

Jeremy Mayhew: This is not a criticism of anybody, but the words that keep on coming up are partnerships, coordination, strategic approach, holistic. Would it not become just a bit more granular? I wonder in what ways could agencies -- and up to a point I am going to leave it up to you to identify which agencies, but for example work with the police, work with the health service, work with mental health services -- what are the barriers to getting those partnerships working effectively, to getting the coordination for which everybody calls? What specific things

could be done better, and are there things that we could do to help you break down those barriers?

Lin Hinnigan: I think first of all I would say we can learn a lesson from history, which is YJB was created at a time when there was no distinct and separate youth justice system. The Act which created the YJB also created the youth offending team. Now, that was a really seminal moment, I think, because that put a statutory duty on authorities to bring those partners together, to make them work together. What had previously happened was each of the agencies was trying to do their bit, but actually there was no way of making it work. So I might be arguing for there being a statute behind it, I do not necessarily --

Jeremy Mayhew: So there is no obligation?

Lin Hinnigan: There is an obligation on the local authority to create that team, and there are certain things which are statutory requirements such as probation, police involvement, the requirement to cooperate. Now, I do not think that actually legislation necessarily always leads to behaviour changes.

(laughter)

Lin Hinnigan: I think bodies like MOPAC, and like London Crime Reduction Board (LCRB) where it is actually involved, working together, can create incentives to partners to work together. Mapping funding streams --

Jeremy Mayhew: I understand that, but just to press you, assuming the will is there, we need to know what are the things that we have to dismantle or create so that we know what incentives and disincentives we need to put in place.

Lin Hinnigan: I think mapping the funding streams, saying, "What is going where? Who has got what? Could we use that better in order to incentivise?" I think that money is always a good incentive for everybody, isn't it?

Jeremy Mayhew: OK.

Lin Hinnigan: There is a massive amount of resource that I am sure, in a time when resources are under pressure, we could do more with by mapping it and by knowing who is spending what. Having shared common targets around resettlement and reoffending and some of the things that sit underneath it, like education, training and employment --

Jeremy Mayhew: So you are all in it together, so to speak?

Lin Hinnigan: So you are all in it together, absolutely. So everybody is bound in and is trying to achieve the same things. I think that is the problem for London, there are so many

boundaries not only between the agencies, but between the boroughs. We have, for instance, the tri-borough arrangements with Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, who work together. You know, there is an opportunity where people are working much more closely together, where they have joined together. I think we could look at more of that, and that hopefully takes out some overheads as well as tying people in.

Jeremy Mayhew: Do others have ...?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Sorry, yes, just on --

Jeremy Mayhew: On this cross-agency theme --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): How do we make the cross-agency thing come alive ...?

Jeremy Mayhew: Yes, as opposed to just saying it is a good thing.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): We also want to hear from Mark as well, perhaps. Yes, Heather, do you want to ...?

Heather Munro: One of the problems, of course, is the relationship with the prison service, and where the prisons are. That is another challenge for us, because people go out to prisons outside of London and that is a problem. The prison service is a national organisation, so that is another bit that needs pulling together, whether that is resettlement ...

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Yes, one of the complaints from boroughs, when I meet the committee safety teams, is that they do not necessarily know when someone is leaving the custody and coming back on borough, so they are not prepared for it. That is what they are saying to me.

Heather Munro: No. That is certainly true for the under 12 months --

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That may not be true, but that is what they are telling me.

Lin Hinnigan: For adult prisoners?

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Adult prisoners.

Lin Hinnigan: Youth offending teams will always know when a young person is being released from custody.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): So basically youth offending teams are much better, and it's more of an adult issue?

Heather Munro: Yes. It is better, but they are still placed outside. I have to say another concern, of course, which Liz mentioned was the commissioning for probation in the future. My concern is that that will create more divisions and splits, so that is a worry.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Yes.

Heather Munro: But one area where there is some positive work is around the gang work, and I think again that MOPAC has helped with that because as we have heard, those people in custody, all the ones that Emily mentioned, are likely to be in gangs, and I think the work we can do together for these complex, difficult people on gangs is so important.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): That is really interesting, because after this meeting I will head off to Hendon. We are celebrating the anniversary of Trident, and of course the police have made massive strides in essentially placing judicial restrictions over young people, incarcerating I think about 1,000 gang nominals or whatever. It is a massive success, but they recognise that is only part of the problem, and certainly we have to be part of the solution. I am not going to address the issues around stopping these people reoffending and coming back into the system, and also preventing that culture existing in the first place, but on the exit point, what are your thoughts about how we could get that to work? Because at the moment we are spending some money through a fund, the London Crime Prevention Fund, which was previously the Community Safety Fund, on supporting, co-commissioning with councils on exit schemes. Is it down to potentially pooling the budgets and co-commissioning more effectively? What are your thoughts on how we can get a more coordinated approach? Also, picking the things that work. Too often I feel we are just backing hunches, as opposed to evidence. Perhaps just comments from all of you?

Emily Thomas: There are two things. Accommodation is absolutely key, and is often the most complicated thing to do, and it is quite often complicated by licence conditions in London boroughs. We have an example of a boy who went out a couple of months ago, where his licence conditions had banned him from entering Lewisham, Greenwich and whatever is next door to Greenwich.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Southwark.

Emily Thomas: There we go. So organising any kind of accommodation, support or resettlement activity for him was incredibly difficult, because nobody wanted to take ownership of him. The boroughs were able to say, "Well, he's not coming back here, so he's somebody else's problem. You need to find him some accommodation." So when I say it is about individual young people, it really, genuinely is. I think too often we put labels on, gangs being one, which actually hides what is underneath, what these young people need and why it is so difficult to deal with their offending behaviour, because it is not necessarily about the fact that they have committed an offence. It is about all of their childhood leading up until the point where they committed their first offence, and the missed opportunities that have gone with

that. So I think unravelling that level of complexity and recognising that they are children, and that actually they have been done a disservice by an enormous number of authorities and statutory organisations through their lives, rather than always focusing on their offending behaviour, is really key to successful resettlement, because I think too often we are trying to deal with symptoms of what the problem with the child is. So the problem is their gang membership. Well, it might be in terms of their offending behaviour, but it is not in terms of what is driving them to behave in a violent manner, what is driving them into the arms of gang members, which are entirely different and far more fundamental issues. So my frustration, I think, as the governor of a prison where I am dealing with these children every day is that when you hear their life stories, and when you understand what has been done to them in terms of physical abuse, neglect, sexual abuse and mistreatment by adults through their lives, we are focusing far too much on symptoms. We are trying to deal with: what they need is employment; they absolutely do. What they need is education; yes, I am sure they do. But actually, we also need to get them to be able to sit still in a classroom for 45 minutes, which for most of them is a challenge too far when I have got them. So we really need to unravel exactly what it is that we are trying to deal with, because I think we think that if we can get them into an ETE placement or we can get them into a decent home they will be fine, but they will not be, because actually their level of mental health need, for example, is so significant. So I suppose my plea would be that actually, this is really quite resource intensive, but also very much about a focus on individual need rather than trying to say, "Actually there's a whole cohort of people, if we just dealt with this they would be fine."

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): I am delighted you mention some of the mental health problems. That struck me when I went to Feltham. Yes, there is clear need for an enhanced mentor, resettlement broker, but actually a relatively low level of engagement with some of the mental health problems. I saw a video of some of the more disturbed young people where it was quite clear they were expert at wielding knives, and knew how not to kill someone but to seriously injure them, and this was a normal behaviour, if you like. So clearly there are counselling issues, mental health problems. To what extent are you seeing the service provision that you need, and support in custody, never mind in the community, from the mental health department?

Emily Thomas: I actually think young people in custody are very well served by mental health services. Because you have a captive audience and there is not much else to do, so they probably will hang out with mental health workers. It is much more of a problem in the community, I think.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): So it is the transition into the community?

Emily Thomas: So for example a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS), not universally but quite often, if young people do not attend for appointments they will come off the mental health service books as being a non-attender, without necessarily huge levels of effort -- and this is not true across everywhere -- without effort being made to find that young

person and find them an appropriate place. We are doing a partnership at the moment with an organisation called Music and Change, who having realised that there was a problem with young people attending for appointments decided to go on the streets and find the young people. They deliver therapy sessions, a lot of it via music, getting kids to write lyrics and make music which they are quite up for, but they also deliver therapy sessions on the bus going to school, on the street corners, outside the front of Cost Cutter, because that is the best way to engage with those young people. It has been quite successful in north London in particular, where it is based, but we are using them in Cookham Wood now, and again trying to establish that work in custody so that it can follow on through out onto release. I think we have to be more creative about how we think about mental health problems, because these boys have not got mental illness, they do not fit into the traditional delivery for mental health services. They need something which is bespoke for their particular issues.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Yes, OK. That is very interesting.

Jeremy Mayhew: You indicated calling in the police.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Yes, absolutely. So, some thoughts on these questions that we have been debating backwards and forwards, Mark and Chris?

Mark Simmons: OK. I think the things from the conversation that strike home with me are that from the police point of view, we probably need to look less in isolation at individual boroughs and across the piece a bit more, so we can understand better the variations in performance and what are delivering them. Particularly, a starting point for me would be the police decision-making role in some of that, which goes on then obviously into the partnership bit. There is a really clear narrative around what seems to work, whether it is the academic analysis, what that tells us, whether it is to look at the projects we have seen or the good practice that is in other parts of the country and bringing it down to the south. So I guess there is something about auditing where we are with that good practice across London and seeing what the differences are, because in everything there are always differences and we need to get a handle on that. I guess that should then take us into some specific issues that we and the other agencies can work on in terms of lifting the overall performance. I think that those are kind of very obvious things in one sense, but they are the kind of things that strike me from listening to the discussion. I do not think -- I certainly speak for us -- I do not think we have a clear enough focus on what is working and what is not, how we are benchmarking different places against each other on that, from the police point of view alone and in conjunction with other agencies, and I think there is some work we can do on that. Even at the most basic level, it could start with the way we apply the triage process at the beginning of the system.

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): Yes. I will come to this at the end of the MOPAC Challenge, but we want to have an action plan, and I think everyone has been uniformly restating the key planks of what we have to do. What I will try and do is outline at a very high level, and perhaps people could flesh out if I am missing important points. The first thing is, we have to start off

with more rigorous analysis and benchmarking of what is going on in this area, and shine a spotlight across London on the variability of what is happening. It may be that we get more questions, but always returning back to the level of reoffending by cohort to see that we are shifting the dial. So there needs to be some micro-analysis, but I think systemic analysis of what is going on, and then that is a good way of holding people to account, if people know that there is a regular look at that. Maybe what we could resolve to do is every year come back to a MOPAC challenge with a clear data set that we can then see how that has moved over time. We will have three more of these sessions in this mayoral term and that may set, if you like, an aspiration for the system to improve where it needs to improve and celebrate the success that we see across London. The second thing that I think we could do is tie in governance with money, because at the moment we are almost creating unnecessary division between agencies. We are a strategic agency, we have obviously the key role of the Youth Justice Board, colleagues in probation and those that are within the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and running YOIs and other secure units for young people. I would have thought we need to map the money first and then look to an appropriate governance structure, but not create a new one; work within what we have, make it effective. The London Crime Reduction Board has a target around reoffending, and it seems to me that is the forum that we can use as an umbrella forum to bring people together, including colleagues from the police. Certainly by mapping the money, we are then able to commission things together that we believe will work, and I think following on from the governance and a focus on outcomes and bringing the budgets together would be learning from the northwest. It pains me, as someone from London --

(laughter)

Stephen Greenhalgh (Chair): -- but that is also learning from Project Daedalus, that has also pointed this way. Can we make resettlement consortia work as a norm, rather than an exception or a pilot? How do we mainstream this for a relatively small cohort of young people, but making that work surely has to be one of the major challenges for the next few years and it would be good to get a readout on where we are with that. Anyone, is there anything I have missed? Those are the three broad planks, and if anyone wants to add anything to that ... No? Well, otherwise, thank you very much indeed for coming along and participating. A fascinating problem, progress being made, but an opportunity, I think, to make significant strides in the next few years. Thank you very much for coming along.

[Proceedings conclude]

