

CYOS SQS Action Plan 2016

The inspection was conducted from 28-30 June 2016 as part of HMIP programme of inspection of youth offending work. The report is published on the HMI Probation website.

Context

The aim of the youth justice system is to prevent offending by children and young people. Good quality assessment and planning at the start of a sentence is critical to increasing the likelihood of positive outcomes. Twenty cases were examined of children and young people who had recently offended and were supervised by Coventry Youth Offending Service (YOS). Wherever possible, this was undertaken in conjunction with the allocated case manager, thereby offering a learning opportunity for staff. Coventry YOS had only recently moved premises, changed to the use of a new database and implemented AssetPlus.

Summary

The published reoffending binary rate for Coventry was 36.0%. This was slightly better than the previous year and better than the England and Wales average of 37.8%.

HMIP stated that

“Overall, we found that Coventry YOS was performing well in most areas of practice. Case managers were engaging children and young people from the outset of their supervision, as well as their parents/carers. Where it was necessary, they were also enforcing orders. The assessment of factors contributing to offending behaviour was a strength, as was the understanding of diversity issues. Improvement was required in the assessment of vulnerability and the planning for safeguarding work, and in the effectiveness of management oversight.”

HMIP identified as key strengths

- Committed and experienced staff.
- Assessment and review of factors contributing to reoffending.
- Efforts to understand and work with diversity needs.
- Enforcement and compliance.

HMIP identified areas requiring improvement

- Assessment of vulnerability and planning for safeguarding work.
- Management oversight of public protection and safeguarding work.

CYOS comment

The Inspectorate recognised that the service was experiencing significant transitions including new IT, new site , new data base and assessment framework . In addition to this there have been staff reductions approx. 18 months ago and a formal restructure is underway at the moment.

Some of the work under scrutiny would be both managers and staffs first assessments and oversight activity under the new framework. The consultants who undertook our restructure review did not think that HMIP would visit during a transition to AssetPlus as “there would be little that they could learn during that period”

Given the timing of the inspection we were pleased that we were assessed as performing well in most areas although we recognise that we need to move forward from the changes and ensure consistent practice embeds across all areas. Managers time has been utilised very heavily resolving IT/ system / provider issues, which is ongoing, and cascading training to staff but as we go in to the autumn we expect consistent practice and oversight to become increasingly evident

	Action	Timescale	Lead	Outcome	Progress
<p>HMIP stated that, where there were deficiencies in assessment and / or planning , these had not always been addressed (by management)</p>					
1	<p>Visit and learn from a very high performing YOT (recent Inspection Judgement))</p> <p>Gateshead</p> <p><u>Currents reports</u></p> <p>Sign off to be included as part of weekly Risk Registers</p> <p>Frequency of contact and appointments offered to be available within 1 week of end of counting period</p>	August	<p>CYOS Georgina Kell</p>	<p>Identified enhanced local performance functionality within Child view</p> <p>Request made for additional data team resource to provide weekly reports, discussions on going regarding resource to provide required reports</p>	<p>Completed</p>
			<p>CCC Data Team David Woodhouse or alternative provider. To be determined</p>	<p>Reports available weekly</p>	<p>In progress</p>
			<p>CCC Data Team David Woodhouse</p>		<p>Outstanding</p>
					<p>Outstanding</p>

<p>HMIP stated that where assessment of safeguarding and wellbeing was not sufficient it was generally due to offence based vulnerability not being recognised and not recognising some of the new vulnerability indicators (VF) This meant that in two cases a low vulnerability judgment had been made where medium was appropriate (offences of TWOC)</p>					
2	<p>Workshop- AssetPlus Safeguarding and well-being, judgments and interventions</p>	<p>September</p>	<p>CYOS Adrian Seymour</p>	<p>Learning Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff can demonstrate that they understand the changes in thresholds between AssetPlus and Asset • Identify adverse outcomes • Identify impact • Identify context , likelihood and imminence • Be able to identify offence based vulnerability 	<p>In progress , training dates identified across September</p>
<p>HMIP commented “case managers understood the principles of effective practice and the policies and procedures that they were</p>					

working to”. There was an exception which was the new AssetPlus stage signing off process “... that not all staff were confident in the sign off process “

3	Management oversight to now include low as well as medium to high	September	CYOS Operation Managers	Temporary oversight process in place to run parallel with training workshops	Completed
	Sign off agreement amended and recirculated to staff.	September	CYOS Tom McSweeney	All staff are confident in the sign of process and correctly submitting stages for sign off	Completed
	Staff will be asked to confirm they understand the process in supervision	September	CYOS Operation Managers		In progress
	Following audit and staff demonstrating appropriate thresholds for low judgments oversight will reduce to medium and high only	To be reviewed November	CYOS Management Team	All thresholds are correctly applied and responded to	Early findings expected November

While HMIP identified understanding of diversity issues was a strength they identified some plans did not pay sufficient

attention to diversity factors

<p>4</p>	<p>Workshop- Diversity, from assessment in to effective intervention</p>	<p>October</p>	<p>CYOS Andrea Barnes</p>	<p>Staffs good understanding of diversity factors and barriers to engagement will be clearly reflected in Intervention planning and communicated to appropriate professionals.</p> <p>Learning objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be able to describe the different methods used to address diversity needs(for example putting in reminder systems for those with speech, language and communication needs) • Be able to identify where such factors may be a barrier to engagement • Identify how parents or careers could be supportive in reducing barriers • Demonstrate an understanding of the range of interventions available based on diverse need and reflect this in Intervention Plans • Can demonstrate appropriate recording (correct section on system , rationale for selection of key interventions , reduction of barriers based on YPS diversity need, how parent/ careers support will be utilised and communication of plan to relevant professionals 	<p>In progress , training dates identified across October</p>
-----------------	---	-----------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

5	<p>Measure impact of workshops on practice</p> <p>Audit two per worker and ongoing on risk led basis</p>	November (post workshop)	CYOS Management Team	<p>Young people's safety and well-being risk is identified and reflected in planning and interventions</p> <p>Diversity responsivity clearly evidenced in Intervention planning</p> <p>Identified Victims are protected through good risk management planning and interventions</p> <p>Evidence of consultation with parents / careers , self-assessment (scanned and stored in documents) and reflection of priorities in plan</p>	Not started
<p>HMIP stated that that planning to manage risk to others was carried out well enough in a high proportion of cases. That said , they did identify that, where there was an identifiable victim or potential victim the management of risk of harm posed to them had not been managed well in four out of ten cases</p>					
6	<p>Victim lead to review planning to manage risk to victims</p> <p>Deliver workshop -Protecting</p>	September	<p>CYOS Matthew Haynes</p> <p>CYOS Matthew</p>	<p>Review to provide additional key learning points for training referenced below</p> <p>Learning outcomes</p> <p>Staff will be able to identify actions to reduce risk</p>	In progress , training dates identified

	identified victims	October	Haynes	<p>to victims / potential victims. This will include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>specific victims</u> • potential changes in risk of harm are anticipated within the plan which includes arrangements sufficient for the case circumstances • understanding whether a prime causal factor should be targeted or whether additional external controls are required • ensuring sufficient attention is paid to diversity • how to make overt that objectives / interventions are included because of the risk of harm or vulnerability 	
<p>HMIP stated that while there was good engagement of young people and their parents in the assessment process this dropped to two thirds with regard to being involved sufficiently in planning</p>					
7	<p>Workshop - Service user active involvement in planning “ what does it look like”</p> <p>Audit 2 cases per worker,</p>	<p>October</p> <p>December</p>	<p>CYOS Georgina Kell</p>	<p>Staff will be able to identify quality indicators which include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan developed with active involvement of the young person / parents prior to signing • the plan has been provided to the child and young person / parents / careers and signed • Plan is written in language the child can understand and is meaningful to them • The custodial plan evidences effective engagement with children and young people additional to the requirements of 	<p>In progress training dates identified</p>

	continued on a risk led basis			<p>formal planning</p> <p>Staff will evidence their application by ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-assessment completed and relevant outcomes from the self-assessment (scanned and stored in documents)are reflected in the plan and the YP has been assisted to understand the link • Evidence of consultation with parents / careers , self-assessment (scanned and stored in documents) and reflection of priorities in plan • Evidence of active participation including being discussed in advance and not just provided for signature. The discussion must be recorded in case diary entry 	
<p>HMIP stated (verbal feedback) that case managers should be “enabled to sit back from the forms and look at what’s going on “ and needed more “ thoughtful interrogation “</p>					
8	<p>Case managers supervision contracts are refreshed</p> <p>LA 2016 RIP model and LA reflective practice template and</p>	<p>September</p> <p>October</p>	<p>CYOS Operation Managers</p>	<p>The primary purpose of supervision is to achieve better outcomes for children and young people and victims of youth crime by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring the supervisee is clear about roles and responsibilities; enabling decision making on behalf of the child and the agency • <u>providing space for case discussions and critical reflection; deepening their</u> 	<p>Commenced</p>

	<p>approach utilised</p> <p>Targets to be included, as required, in appraisal process</p> <p>Bi monthly practitioners forum introduced – practitioner led</p>		<p>CYOS Practitioners</p>	<p><u>knowledge of a child and their critical analytical skills</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • offering guidance and support; to construct and oversee plans which provide positive change for children • <u>identifying gaps in learning, deepening workers skills and knowledge and promoting a learning culture</u> • <u>facilitating performance management; supporting workers to maintain emotional resilience</u> • <u>valuing workers views and feelings; motivating them</u> <p>Staff can identify areas of practice they wish to discuss with peers</p>	<p>Dates set and circulated for 6 months</p>
<p>HMIP stated that in cases where there were indicators of child sexual exploitation, the YOS was not always as included in the work by others agencies as it should have been</p>					
<p>9</p>	<p>Review YOS engagement with the developing MOG and COG meetings / processes to ensure appropriate exchange of information on YOS young people</p>	<p>October</p>	<p>CYOS HOS Nancy Meehan</p>		<p>Commenced</p>

	Review mechanisms for information exchange between YOS and social care re YOS young people subject to complex CSE investigations, to ensure that case holders are aware of and can contribute to discussions				
--	---	--	--	--	--