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1. Introduction

Many homeless young people offend and are homeless upon entry into the criminal justice system, and many young people in custody are homeless on release (Maguire and Nolan, 2007; Howard League for Penal Reform, 2009). To help tackle the cycle of homelessness and reoffending, the Welsh Government (2015a) introduced the National Pathway for Homelessness Services to Children, Young People and Adults in the Secure Estate (referred to as ‘the Pathway’). Two strands of the Pathway were created – one for adults and one for children/young people. The Pathway was devised to ensure that people who leave custody facing homelessness have equal access to the preventative measures introduced by the Housing (Wales) Act 2014, and to bridge this legislation with the Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014 and the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms, which have resulted in an increased number of adult prison leavers subject to post-release supervision on licence.

The agencies involved in the Pathway have now had over three years to implement it in practice, following its official launch in December 2015. An evaluation of how the Pathway for adults is operating in practice was published in June 2018 (Madoc-Jones et al, 2018). Thus, an evaluation of the Pathway for children/young people is timely. While Welsh Government statistics indicate the nature of the successful ‘reasonable steps’ for 16-17 year olds taken by local authorities to prevent and relieve homelessness (Stats Wales, 2017), the outcomes specifically for young people leaving the secure estate remain unclear. This evaluation, therefore, sits alongside its adult-focused counterpart (Madoc-Jones et al, 2018) by exploring the experiences of young people leaving the secure estate, as well as the impact on stakeholder agencies. Indeed, this evaluation cross-references its findings to some of those of the evaluation of the adult Pathway to determine whether there are similar issues across both Pathways.

---

1 Although it had been operating in a shadow form since May 2015 (Madoc-Jones et al, 2018).
Chapter 2, the evidence review, situates the Pathway within its wider legislative context and examines the specific details of the Pathway for children and young people. The chapter also reviews the evidence pertaining to youth homelessness and its links with crime, outlines resettlement issues for young people leaving prison and reviews the international youth resettlement literature. Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed to answer the research questions. Chapter 4 presents the findings from all the methods alongside one another and, where applicable, discusses them in relation to the issues raised in the resettlement literature presented in the evidence review in Chapter 2. Chapter 5 summarises the key findings and sets out our recommendations.
2. Evidence Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the following evidence in this field:

- academic literature from searches of academic indices and abstracting tools (e.g. criminal justice abstracts and applied social science index and abstracts) and specific journals (e.g. Housing Studies, European Journal of Homelessness, Youth Justice and Criminology and Criminal Justice) using key words

- legislation

- analysis of data collected and made publicly available by the Welsh Government and Youth Justice Board (YJB) and other UK Government department websites.

The primary key words are listed in the table below. Additional words were used for searches on more specific areas of interest.

### Table 2.1: Key words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key word 1</th>
<th>Key word 2</th>
<th>Key word 3</th>
<th>Key word 4</th>
<th>Key word 5</th>
<th>Key word 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>Young person/people</td>
<td>Resettlement</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>What works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Secure estate</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Through care</td>
<td>Offending</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Custody</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>After care</td>
<td>Reoffending</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also searched for publications by key individuals including all members of the project team (especially Peter Mackie and Mike Maguire), as well as Kathy Hampson, Suzanne Fitzpatrick, Neal Hazel, David Clapham, Peter Raynor and Tim Bateman.

The evidence review begins by situating the Pathway within its wider legislative context before examining the specific details of the Pathway for children and young
people. Subsequently, the need for the Pathway and its corresponding legislation is demonstrated through a review of the evidence pertaining to youth homelessness and its links with crime. It is argued that young people who experience homelessness and who are involved with the criminal justice system represent a highly vulnerable group with a range of complex needs. The review then discusses resettlement for young people leaving prison before ending by outlining resettlement issues that are specific to Wales.

2.2 The Housing (Wales) Act 2014

Wales’ Ten Year Homelessness Plan (Welsh Assembly Government, 2009) and National Housing Strategy (Welsh Assembly Government, 2010) identified a need to re-examine its homelessness legislation which, despite interim housing legislation\(^2\), had remained largely unchanged in its structural framework since its commencement in the Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977. The existing framework placed a duty on local authorities to provide settled accommodation to households who met four main criteria: (1) eligibility to receive public funds; (2) unintentionally homeless; (3) in priority need; (4) with a local connection to the area. The Mackie Review criticised this structure on two grounds (Mackie, 2014). First, it excluded non-priority need households (predominantly single people) from receiving any meaningful assistance. Second, the legislation was incompatible with homelessness prevention services that had started in 2004/2005; many stakeholders expressed a need for such services to be prioritised and integrated into the legislation (Mackie, 2014; 2015; Mackie, Thomas and Bibbings, 2017).

The resulting Housing (Wales) Act 2014, therefore, places prevention at its core; it has been described as ‘pioneering’ in that Wales is the first country in the world to incorporate a statutory ‘prevention duty’ (Mackie, Thomas and Bibbings, 2017). All households can now receive assistance in some form regardless of whether they meet the four criteria highlighted above (which, for now, have been retained\(^3\)).

\(^2\) Housing Act (1996) and Homeless Persons (Priority Need) (Wales) Order 2001

\(^3\) In early 2019, Welsh Government commissioned an independent review of the use of the priority need test in Wales after calls for it to be abolished (National Assembly for Wales, 2018). At the time of publication this is an ongoing piece of work with the key findings to be determined. For now, the four criteria (eligibility,
following are key features of the Act (Welsh Government, 2016) that diverge from previous legislation:

- a new duty for local authorities to take ‘reasonable steps’ to prevent/relieve homelessness
- the future period within which a person may be deemed ‘threatened with homelessness’ has been extended from 28 to 56 days
- the intentionality test is now a ‘power’ instead of a ‘duty’
- more powers for local authorities to discharge a homelessness duty into the private rented sector
- stronger duties on housing associations to cooperate with local authorities in accommodating homeless people
- removal of automatic ‘priority need’ status for prison leavers.

The removal of priority need status for prison leavers has affected adults more than young people, as all young people qualify for priority need under two further provisions outlined in Section 70 of the Housing (Wales) Act 2014:

- a person who is aged 16 or 17 when the person applies to a local housing authority for accommodation or help in obtaining or retaining accommodation
- a person who has attained the age of 18, when the person applies to a local housing authority for accommodation or help in obtaining or retaining accommodation, but not the age of 21, who was looked after, accommodated or fostered at any time while under the age of 18.

Indeed, there are multiple legislative provisions that intersect with housing legislation for children and young people; these are outlined in the following section.

When a local authority accepts a homelessness application, the applicant is notified of which ‘duty’ they are legally entitled to. Duties include:

- Section 66 – duty to help prevent homelessness: applies when a household is threatened with homelessness in the next 56 days

intentionality, priority need and local connection) have been retained in some form but are used differently by different local authorities. For example, some have abandoned intentionality and local connection, whereas others have not.
• Section 68 – duty to provide temporary accommodation: applies when there is reason to believe that a household may be eligible for assistance, may be homeless and may be in priority need. This occurs pending an enquiry into whether a household is owed a duty under Section 73

• Section 73 – duty to help to secure suitable accommodation: applies when a Section 66 duty has failed or when a household is already homeless when the application is made

• Section 75 – final duty to provide settled accommodation: applies when a household is eligible and in priority need and where ‘reasonable steps’ taken under Sections 66 and 73 have been unsuccessful.

The ‘final duty’ (Section 75) is, therefore, not owed unless a household has progressed through ‘reasonable steps’ to prevent (Section 66) or relieve (Section 73) their homelessness, and such steps have failed, and they are in a priority need category. ‘Reasonable steps’ involve a range of tools at the disposal of local authorities. These can include:

• mediation
• payments by way of a grant or loan
• guarantees to landlords/lenders that payments will be made
• support in managing debt, mortgage arrears or rent arrears
• security measures for applicants at risk of abuse
• advocacy or other representation
• accommodation
• information and advice
• other services, goods or facilities.

2.3 Additional Key Legislation

Given the removal of priority need for prison leavers, the Pathway (which is described more fully in section 2.4) aims to ensure that prison leavers have equal access to the prevention and relief duties, and their corresponding ‘reasonable
steps’. Furthermore, it draws together the provisions of the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 with other key pieces of legislation relevant to those leaving the secure estate. What follows is a brief overview of this legislation and how it relates to the Pathway.

Offending and Rehabilitation Act 2014: This Act provides the legal basis for the extension of supervision to adult offenders sentenced to less than 12 months. It is part of a broader suite of ‘Transforming Rehabilitation’ changes implemented at a national level from February 2015. The ‘Transforming Rehabilitation’ programme aims to bring down reoffending rates through a number of reforms including reorganising prisons to resettled offenders ‘through the gate’, with continuous support from custody to community and the introduction of mentors for short term prisoners being released in the community.

Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014: This legislation ensures that both adults and young people have access to care and support whilst in the secure estate. For young people, the legislation stipulates that, where a young person was an ordinary resident prior to entering the secure estate, the local authority is responsible for providing care and support to that young person regardless of whether he/she is held in England or Wales. This local authority is known as the ‘Welsh Home Local Authority’. In addition, the legislation places duties on local authorities for looked after children to promote their wellbeing and to create/maintain a care and support plan.

Part 11 of this Act is supplemented with the National Care and Support Pathway for Children and Young People in the Secure Estate (Welsh Government, 2015b). This ‘Support Pathway’ parallels and intersects with the homelessness Pathway in that it sets out the obligatory steps to be taken by key professionals at different stages of a child/young person’s time in the secure estate. Briefly, youth offending teams (YOTs) are required to identify and include care and support needs in an individual’s pre-sentence report. Upon reception into custody, if a care/support need exists, health staff undertake an assessment and the case is referred to the home local authority to assess the individual’s eligibility for referral to key support agencies. Consideration of care and support needs occurs in conjunction with
consideration of housing need and at every stage of custody; both types of need should be addressed together.

**Mental Health (Wales) Measure 2010:** This places a statutory duty on local authorities and local health boards to provide primary mental health services to those held in custody. Furthermore, under this measure, arrangements should be made to ensure that an individual in custody has access to appropriate mental health services upon release. Regarding the Pathway, as well as identifying and supporting mental health issues whilst in custody, mental health needs should also be documented in the housing referral made to a local authority to ensure the most appropriate housing outcome for that individual.

**Crime and Disorder Act 1998:** This Act introduced YOTs, which have a key role in the Pathway by co-ordinating with children’s services and housing options teams to support young people in the secure estate and on release.

**Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012:** As mentioned in the previous section, an individual is granted priority need status under the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 if they are aged 18 to 21 and have been looked after at any time prior to the age of 18. Section 104 of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 states that all children/young people remanded to youth detention accommodation are to be treated as looked after by the designated authority, meaning that they will be classified as priority need.

**Southwark Judgement:** Priority need status for 16-17 year olds is likewise reiterated by the Southwark Judgement, which, in clarifying Section 20 of the Children Act 1989, obliges children’s services to provide accommodation and support for homeless individuals of this age. In other words, while housing options teams are involved in providing homelessness assistance and accommodation to children/young people under the age of 18 leaving the secure estate, overall responsibility for this lies with children’s services (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016).
Welsh Government and Youth Justice Board (2014) joint strategy for youth justice: Finally, in addition to the provisions outlined thus far, the Welsh Government and Youth Justice Board’s (2014) joint strategy for youth justice – *Children and Young People First* – includes resettlement and reintegration as one of its priorities. Reintegration and Resettlement Partnership Boards (RRPBs) have been established to take a multi-agency approach to reduce the risk of reoffending among young people leaving custody through the provision of wrap-around services (which incorporates accommodation) specific to individual need (Hampson and Kinsey, 2016). The Welsh Government is proposing to give RRPBs statutory status through the introduction of a duty in the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 (Welsh Government, 2015a).

### 2.4 National Pathway for Homelessness Services to Children, Young People and Adults in the Secure Estate

The homelessness Pathway (Welsh Government, 2015a) was the product of the Prisoner Accommodation Resettlement Working Group, which was established to ensure that all prisoners have access to the new prevention duty of the Housing (Wales) Act 2014. Although children/young people facing homelessness upon release from the secure estate are likely to be classed as priority need, and therefore eligible to receive the ‘final’ duty to accommodate (Section 75), this will only be the case if the ‘prevention’ (Section 66) and ‘relief’ (Section 73) duties have failed.

The Pathway itself is divided into four sections, mapping on to four chronological periods that children/young people experience as they progress through the youth justice system⁴. These are: pre-custody; reception; resettlement; and release. YOTs are responsible for overseeing the majority of processes in the children/young people’s Pathway. However, RRPBs are involved from an early stage and local

---

⁴ It is worth noting Section 117 of the Pathway which states that it should be read alongside Article 3 of the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* which stresses that the best interests of the child must be the focal point of any actions taken that concern them.
authorities become increasingly involved after a housing referral is made. The following paragraphs set out what should happen at each of these stages. The stages are also shown in the diagrams in Annex 1: Accommodation Support (Young People) (Welsh Government, 2015a).

During the pre-custody stage, YOTs produce a pre-sentence report indicating the child/young person’s: living situation; housing need; and whether they are looked after. This is sent to the YJB. If a child/young person receives a custodial sentence of less than 66 days (which is likely to be the case for Detention and Training Orders – DTOs\(^5\)), and there is housing need, the YOT makes a referral to the local authority to consider whether it owes a duty to house the young person. Upon reception into custody, a Sentence Plan is prepared (within 10 days and reviewed monthly), indicating any housing need. Sixty-six days before release, they enter the resettlement stage and if a housing need still exists, a referral is made to the appropriate local authority. If the local authority accepts they have a duty under the Housing (Wales) Act 2014, the authority then has a duty to prevent or relieve the child/young person’s homelessness.

If the relief efforts fail, the child/young person is then entitled to secure accommodation because all children/young people being released from custody are deemed to be in priority need. The final stage – release – is shaped by the outcome of the local authority referral. If the child/young person has been granted the relief duty, they are further entitled to suitable temporary accommodation (Section 68) until more settled accommodation is found. It should be noted that Bed and Breakfast (B&B) accommodation is not deemed suitable for children/young people unless it is a last resort (Welsh Government, 2015a; 2016). This is due to the risks associated with children/young people living in the same premises as adults, with little privacy and supervision (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016).

\(^5\) Detention and Training Orders are determinate custodial sentences which can last from four months to 24 months in length. A child spends the first half of the order in custody and the second half in the community on licence (Youth Justice Board, 2019a)
2.5 Youth Homelessness

Although Wales is the first country to place homelessness prevention on a statutory footing, preventative activities had been occurring in a piecemeal manner across the UK prior to this (Fitzpatrick et al, 2009). Prevention of youth homelessness in the UK has typically taken the form of local authority service provision of mediation between young people and their parents, as well as help to access accommodation when a tenancy is ending (Pawson et al., 2007).

The scale of youth homelessness in the UK is, however, unclear. Government statistics only stratify some, but not all, homelessness data by age. In Wales, there are some data available for the outcomes of homelessness applications made to local authorities by age. Latest figures show that for the period 2016-17, 810 homelessness applications were made by 16-17 year olds in Wales: 168 of these received a ‘prevention’ outcome (Section 66), 282 received a ‘help to secure’ (relief) outcome (Section 73) and 81 received a ‘final duty’ outcome (Section 75). The remainder were either not deemed to be eligible, homeless/threatened with homelessness or were intentionally homeless (Stats Wales, 2017). While these figures provide some indication of the scale of youth homelessness in Wales, one individual may make several applications and/or receive multiple outcomes meaning it is not possible to isolate the number of people who are homeless and aged 16 to 17 years in a given time period. However, it is important to recognise that a substantial proportion of young people’s homelessness is ‘hidden’ due to non-engagement with services, sofa surfing and rough sleeping (Clarke, 2016). Clarke (2016) estimated that on any one night, at least 216,000 young people in the UK are sofa surfing and 40,000 young people are sleeping rough. These figures are substantially higher than official figures would suggest, leading Clarke (2016) to conclude that most young homeless people are not engaged with services. Interestingly, the profile of the young people who she surveyed was less vulnerable than that of the young people in other research based on those who access services. Hence, she suggests that it is the most vulnerable homeless, young people who engage with services.
2.6 Youth Homelessness, Crime and Custody

Vulnerability among young people who are homeless is captured by research that has attempted to identify common causes of youth homelessness, including family breakdown/conflict; violence and/or financial difficulties in the family; having been in local authority care and having been involved in crime or antisocial behaviour (Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009; Pleace, 2008; Neale, 2001). For some young people, their (repeated) entries into, and exits from, homelessness are intertwined with antisocial behaviour, offending, victimisation and substance misuse (Clapham et al, 2014; Mayock et al, 2013; Pain and Francis, 2004; Wardaugh, 2000). One report that collected data on nearly 5,000 young people accessing homelessness services in England found that 15 per cent of the sample had a history of offending (Homeless Link, 2018). Yet, the report also highlighted that many young people who are homeless have a multitude of problems, of which homelessness and offending are only two (Homeless Link, 2018). Moreover, certain groups of young people are at an increased risk of homelessness including: those with BAME backgrounds; those who have been in care; those who are LGBTQ; unaccompanied asylum seeking children or those with refugee status; EEA nationals; and 16 to 17 year olds as compared to young people of other ages (Homeless Link, 2018). Fitzpatrick et al (2013) use the framework of ‘multiple exclusion homelessness’ to conceptualise the significant overlap between homelessness, spending time in institutions such as prison, and a range of complex needs which entrench individuals in chronic social exclusion.

Youth offending literature equally recognises the complex backgrounds of many young people. The concept of ‘adverse childhood experiences’ has gained the attention of criminologists, housing professionals and youth justice practitioners in recent years due to evidence demonstrating the correlation between childhood trauma, abuse and neglect with involvement in crime during adolescence and adulthood (Beckley et al, 2018; Pflugardt et al, 2018; Baglivio and Epps, 2016; Fox et al, 2015). Further evidence has pointed to the relationships between youth offending and being in local authority care (Day, 2017; Darker et al, 2008), having mental health and/or substance misuse problems during childhood (Mallett et al, 2011), and family risk factors (Haines and Case, 2005). Recently, the YJB Cymru and Welsh Government trialled an ‘Enhanced Case Management’ approach in
which some YOTs adopted a psychologically-informed model to enable them to more carefully tailor interventions to support individuals. While homelessness was not specifically discussed, several of the young people involved in the trial had been looked after and the evaluation of the trial noted the young people’s multiple problems including substance misuse, experience of domestic violence, and being the victim of physical abuse (Welsh Government, 2017). In other words, the profiles of young people with prolific offending histories greatly overlap with those who experience homelessness.

Young people who commit the most serious crimes and who receive a custodial sentence often have particularly high levels of complex problems, which can be exacerbated through the experience of imprisonment (Cesaroni and Peterson-Badali, 2010). The number of young people entering the youth justice system in England and Wales has been falling over the past decade. Youth justice figures for England and Wales in 2017-18 reported a 70 per cent decrease in custodial sentences over the last ten years, although there was a 3 per cent increase in custodial sentences within the past year; the first such increase since 2008 (Youth Justice Board/Ministry and Justice, 2019). In the year ending March 2018, the average monthly population of children and young people in custody at any one time, in England and Wales, was just under 9006 (Youth Justice Board/Ministry of Justice, 2019, p.36). The same report noted that the proportion of children and young people in custody for more serious offences (violence against the person, robbery and sexual offences) has continually increased over the past 10 years. This is to be expected with the less serious offenders not being sent to custody. The report also found that the proportion of individuals from BAME backgrounds in custody is disproportionate to the general population. Reoffending is also a significant occurrence among children and young people. Since 2014, reoffending among children and young people has been falling, but it is still higher than it was ten years ago. Moreover, for the year ending March 2017, children and young people who reoffended committed an average of 3.92 offences each, representing

---

6 It is important to keep in mind that some children/young people may serve a custodial sentence more than once in a given period meaning that youth justice statistics report on the ‘proportion’ rather than ‘number’ of individuals in custody.
The figures above represent children and young people in both England and Wales. Demographic data is publicly available for young people attached specifically to a Welsh YOT (although these young people may serve their custodial sentences in an English establishment). Table 2.2 below indicates the gender, age and ethnicity breakdown for these individuals over a seven-year period ending in March 2018. It further includes the legal basis upon which a custodial sentence was issued. The table reflects the trend that custodial sentences have been continually decreasing over time. The number of young people attached to a Welsh YOT, serving a custodial sentence, is now just over a third of what it was in 2012 (Youth Justice Board, 2019a). There were 32 young people in custody in 2018 compared with 90 in 2012. These figures also highlight that most young people attached to a Welsh YOT and who receive a custodial sentence are male, 17 years old and white, and most custodial sentences are based on DTOs.
Table 2.2: Demographic and legal basis data for young people attached to a Welsh YOT, serving a custodial sentence between the years ending March 2012 to year ending March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years old</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years old</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention and Training</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 91(^7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Youth Justice Board (2019a)

Note: We note that the total of the ethnicity cells is greater than elsewhere (for example gender). However, the data presented here accurately replicates the data presented in the source.

Taking together the data on youth homelessness and crime, and on young people in custody, evidence indicates that the numbers are small, but that there is a group

\(^7\) Section 91 allows the Crown Court to sentence children (under 18 year olds) charged with ‘grave crimes’ (those listed in Section 91 - certain serious offence other than murder for which an adult could receive at least 14 years in custody) to custody. It is normally used to pass a sentence longer than the maximum two years available under a DTO (Youth Justice Board, 2019a).
of young people who experience the sharpest end of vulnerability and social exclusion, which may lead to a cycle of homelessness and frequent and/or serious (re)offending, particularly if they have received a custodial sentence.

2.7 Youth Justice and Resettlement in Wales
Young people in England and Wales, who receive a custodial sentence, serve this sentence in either a Young Offender Institution (YOI, only one in Wales), Secure Training Centre (STC, none in Wales) or a Secure Children’s Home (SCH, only one in Wales). YOIs are operated by the prison service and typically accommodate males aged 15-20 years old; STCs are run by private companies and typically accommodate both males and females aged 12-17 years old; while SCHs are run by local authorities and accommodate younger, more vulnerable children (Cavadino et al, 2013). In February 2019, there were 834 under 18s in youth custody in England and Wales\(^8\) (an increase of 22 young people in comparison to the previous month), 694 of whom were aged 16 or 17 years old (Youth Justice Board, 2019b). Twenty-seven of the 834 under-18s were attached to a Welsh YOT and 33 were in a Welsh secure establishment (many of these came from YOT areas outside Wales). Table 2.3 outlines the type of institution and legal basis for all under-18s in custody in England and Wales in February 2019; these monthly data do not isolate the figures for Wales or for 16 to 17 year olds.

\(^{8}\) This figure rises to 915 when 18-year olds are included.
Table 2.3: Under-18s serving custodial sentences in England and Wales in February 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Number of young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Offender Institution</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Training Centre</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Children’s Home</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal basis</th>
<th>Number of young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention and Training Order</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 91(^7)</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Youth Justice Board (2019b)

While criminal justice policies have not been devolved to Wales, the devolution of services that would normally partner with youth justice (children’s services, health, social services, education and housing) led to opportunities to develop the *All Wales Youth Offending Strategy* (Welsh Assembly Government, 2004) which took a more welfarist approach with an emphasis on ‘children first, offenders second’ (Case and Haines, 2015; Drakeford, 2010). The Pathway sits firmly within this distinctly Welsh approach in aiding resettlement.

Wales is divided into 15 YOTs; five of these cover two local authorities, and one covers three. YOTs comprise of representatives from health, social services, education, police and probation and they have a statutory responsibility for managing children/young people who are subject to court orders and work closely with the secure estate in making arrangements for all children/young people leaving custody. The youth secure estate in Wales is comprised of two establishments: Parc YOI (located in Bridgend, South Wales) and Hillside SCH (located in Neath,
South Wales). In addition, small numbers of young people with a Welsh YOT are imprisoned in establishments in England. These include, but are not limited to, Rainsbrook STC (located in Willoughby), Vinney Green SCH (located in Bristol), Wetherby YOI (located in Wetherby) and Werrington YOI (located in Stoke-on-Trent) (Jones, 2018). Table 2.4 indicates the numbers of young people in custody in March 2018 with a YOT based in Wales, by establishment.

Table 2.4: Young people attached to a Welsh YOT who were in custody in March 2018 by establishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of establishment</th>
<th>Number of young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parc (YOI)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werrington (YOI)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainsbrook (STC)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinney Green (SCH)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside (SCH)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetherby (YOI)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Jones (2018)

Accommodating people from Wales in English establishments can be problematic for resettlement. Increased distance from home makes it difficult for families and support workers to visit and it limits the potential for Release on Temporary Licence (ROTIL)9 (Hampson, 2016). ROTIL allows people to leave custody for a short time for resettlement purposes; one of which is visiting post-release accommodation (Prison Reform Trust, 2015). Many children and young people in Wales who have offended are excluded from ROTIL because they are incarcerated too far from home. While this problem has historically been more relevant for young people from north Wales imprisoned in English establishments, the reduction in YJB placement sites in Wales means that this problem is now felt among young people imprisoned in south Wales (Hampson, 2016). A second problem faced particularly by north Waliens in English institutions relates to language barriers. Table 2.5 shows that, in some local authority areas, a substantial proportion of the population speak Welsh as their first

9 Release on temporary licence means being able to leave the prison for a short time on the governor’s approval.
language (Welsh Government and Welsh Language Commissioner, 2015), yet imprisonment in England means that most communication regarding their support needs is conducted in English (Jones, 2018; Hampson, 2016).

Table 2.5: Language mainly spoken at home, by local authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Always/ almost always Welsh</th>
<th>Mainly Welsh</th>
<th>Roughly equal use of Welsh and English</th>
<th>Mainly English</th>
<th>Always/ almost always English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Anglesey</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample size: 7,100


Note: This question was asked of all adults and children.
Such language barriers can enhance feelings of isolation and may mean that important details regarding a young person’s support needs get missed (Jones, 2018; Hampson, 2016). This evidence indicates a need to be sensitive to the geography of Wales and requires an understanding of the local authorities young people move to upon release. Such data, however, are unavailable in the public domain although the YJB does report on the YOT that an individual was involved with when they were cautioned or sentenced. Table 2.6 denotes the number of custodial sentences delivered to 10-17 year olds in 2017-2018 whose cases are managed by a Welsh YOT. Two notes of caution are warranted: (1) those with custodial sentences may not necessarily be resettled in the same YOT area that they were initially engaged in; (2) in Table 2.6, the number in the right-hand column is the number of custodial sentences, not the number of people; one person may have received more than one custodial sentence.

Table 2.6: Number of custodial sentences received in 2017-2018 by 10-17 year olds by Welsh YOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of YOT</th>
<th>Number of custodial sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau, Gwent and Caerphilly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway and Denbighshire</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cwm Taf</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd Mon</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire and Torfaen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Bay</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Youth Justice Board (2019c)
Successful resettlement upon release is challenging, yet critical for reducing reoffending (Maguire and Nolan, 2007), and has been of prime focus for the YJB Cymru and Welsh YOTs. Hampson (2016) outlines the seven ‘resettlement pathways’ identified by the YJB that form the focus of YOTs when working to reduce reoffending. These pathways cover: accommodation; education, training and employment; substance misuse; health; families; finance, benefits and debt; and case management and transitions. Ensuring that young people leave custody and move into secure and settled accommodation is not only crucial for tackling homelessness, it is equally critical for resettlement and reducing reoffending. What works in resettlement is the focus of the next section.

2.8 International Research into Resettlement Support

Given the vulnerability of young people who receive custodial sentences, resettlement and reintegration into the community post-custody is of prime concern for mitigating risk and reducing reoffending (Bateman et al, 2013). This section of the chapter briefly reviews the international research on effective resettlement support and highlights innovations in youth resettlement.

2.8.1 Defining and evaluating resettlement support

‘Resettlement’ is ‘the effective reintegration of imprisoned offenders back into the community beyond the period of any licence to which they may be subject’ (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons, 2001, p.3). This term has over-taken the previously used terms of ‘aftercare’ and ‘through care’, but is still criticised as it implies the individuals were ‘settled’ and ‘integrated’ in their communities prior to imprisonment, which is not necessarily the case (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons, 2001). This critique is particularly relevant for young people who (re)offend, as their difficult backgrounds closely resemble and overlap with young people who have experienced homelessness (Burke, 2016). The relationship between having a complex background, receiving a custodial sentence, and the high risk of reoffending among young people is captured by Johns et al (2017, p.3): “The vast majority of young people who can be diverted from further offending are being diverted, and the group ‘left behind’ comprises those with the most complex needs, manifest in the most challenging behaviours”.
In terms of what makes resettlement effective, most research measures reoffending. However, commentators have increasingly suggested that focusing on reoffending as a single outcome may be inappropriate. The critique that reoffending, or more accurately proven reoffending rates, is too simplistic a measure to be used to define success is well documented (see Pierpoint, 2017; Copas and Marshall, 1998). In brief, reconviction is a measure of the process of an individual being (re)dected and (re)convicted of an offence within a particular time frame. Of course, it may underestimate reoffending by, for example, not capturing undetected offending or focusing on a short time frame. However, the concerns here are, firstly, reconviction rates may reflect the practice of targeting the ‘usual suspects’ characterised by their powerlessness, who perpetrate generally low level/less serious crimes (see Clarke 2014). The second concern is that it does not reflect the long-term, potentially zigzagging, journey of desistance. Thirdly, reconviction rates do not capture the shorter-term successes or progress (such as in accommodation or employment), which may be very important in working towards reducing reoffending or at least reducing the frequency or severity of offending behaviour.

Beyond Youth Custody published, in March 2017, an end-of-term report reflecting on the lessons learnt from 16 projects with young people funded for 5 years. The report warns against a single focus on reoffending and advocates a longer-term understanding of resettlement as a process that promotes desistance, wellbeing and social inclusion. It is also recognised that, at present, there is insufficient robust evidence to draw firm conclusions about the impact of different elements of resettlement, including accommodation programmes, on reoffending (Malloch et al, 2013). Moreover, the literature does not often delineate between adults and young people, or, indeed other vulnerable groups. That said, the remainder of this section summarises the results of a review of the international literature into the elements of effective resettlement and discusses the factors that are, generally, thought to increase the success of resettlement support.
2.8.2 **Continuity of contact**

Research has demonstrated the importance of ‘continuity’ between work in custody and after release, including efforts by professional staff or mentors to develop relationships with prisoners that will be continued ‘through the gate’ (Maguire and Raynor, 2017; Hudson et al, 2007; Clancy et al, 2006; Lewis et al, 2003). It is also important to ensure that support is provided immediately on release (Bateman et al, 2013). The Pathfinders resettlement programme for prisoners on short-term sentences, in the UK, was an example of a successful intervention based around continuity of support through the gate. The evaluation of the programme found that the offenders who maintained post-release contact with a mentor who provided emotional support and help with practical problems had lower reconviction rates and were more likely to be employed post release than those who did not (Lewis et al, 2007). Moreover, in the second phase of the evaluation, 80 per cent of (n=51) offenders stated that the programme had helped them to control their substance misuse problem to some extent (Raynor, 2004).

2.8.3 **Supporting transition**

Transitioning from custody back into the community can lead to young people feeling overwhelmed, anxious and isolated (Hampson, 2016; Visher, 2007), as they have to adjust to a less regimented environment, re-establish relationships and rebuild their previous lives (Youth Justice Board, 2006). It is, therefore, not surprising that research has consistently found that reoffending, or breach, are both more likely in the period immediately after release (Hazel et al, 2010a; Hazel et al, 2002; Hagell et al, 2000). Hence, it has been suggested that a resettlement plan should be in place and relationships with service providers should be established prior to release and clearly communicated to the young person, and that the plan should be implemented as soon as the young person returns to the community (Hazel, 2004).
2.8.4 **Engagement and collaboration with users**

Consistency of contact can also help to build trust between service users and providers. However, it may be useful to separate the monitoring and support functions of through-care, as monitoring can reduce openness between service users and providers (Malloch et al., 2013). Mason and Prior (2008) argue that the building of successful relationships requires highly skilled practitioners able to: demonstrate empathy; show respect; exhibit a commitment to social justice that recognises the social and material hardship the young person may have endured; promote individual responsibility for actions and behaviour; and involve the young person in planning for their future.

Users should see the development of a plan as a collaborative endeavour in which they have input into the services that they receive and outcomes at which they are aiming (Malloch et al., 2013; Hart and Thompson, 2009). Furthermore, offenders who maintain a higher contact rate with support staff are more likely to have lower rates of reoffending (Clancy et al., 2006). It has been suggested that one possible element to successful work with young people leaving custody would entail according them similar rights to those enjoyed by care leavers (Hollingsworth, 2012).

2.8.5 **Public recognition of desistance**

Publicly recognising that offenders have desisted from offending may help reduce the chances of future offending, but further empirical testing of this is required (Scottish Government, 2015; Maruna, 2014). There are studies which have found that public recognition of young offenders' progress can help them develop a new, non-criminal identity and lead to improved self-esteem (The big step, 2008). Examples of recognising desistance markers include: sealing of criminal justice records earlier in the offenders' criminal career than usual; restoration of civil rights; awarding certificates; and inviting ex-offenders to give talks to others (Calverley and Farrall, 2011). However, one would have to carefully consider the appropriateness of using such initiatives with young people, and arguably they should normally be contemplated only after the person has reached the age of 19.
2.8.6 Holistic programmes
It is thought that resettlement works best when it has a focus on thinking and motivation as well as welfare (Raynor, 2004). The individual importance of (1) thinking of future selves and motivation and (2) support through the gates has been highlighted above. However, there is evidence that holistic resettlement programmes, combining these issues, can help to reduce reoffending (see, for example, Maguire and Raynor 2017).

2.8.7 Accommodation
While no direct impact on reoffending has been observed, partly because it is difficult to separate out a distinct effect, accommodation is considered important for resettlement and desistance (Scottish Government, 2015). While having a home that is safe and secure is fundamentally important for wellbeing (Clapham, 2011), it is particularly salient for young people leaving custody because accommodation intersects with the additional support needs identified in the seven ‘resettlement pathways’ (Hampson, 2016) mentioned in section 2.7 above. For example, a lack of suitable accommodation has been found to severely constrain opportunities to fully engage in education and employment (Ofsted, 2010). Similarly, accessing services to help with debt, substance misuse and health problems is extremely challenging in the absence of having a secure base, not least because GP surgeries, banks and employers normally require an address (Bowpitt, 2015; Baldry et al, 2006; Galea and Vlahov, 2002). Moreover, unless people in prison receive help to end an existing tenancy or mortgage, they may accrue sizeable arrears, adding to the already difficult experiences they are likely to face upon release (Bowpitt, 2015).

There is debate in the literature over the most appropriate form of accommodation for young people. For example, there is mixed evidence on the effectiveness of hostel accommodation in reducing reoffending. Some evaluations have reported cases where the hostel fostered the development of networks between offenders, thus reducing the likelihood of desistance. Hence, commentators in Europe and North America, have argued that it is better to re-house offenders into mainstream accommodation with security of tenure, rather than into hostel accommodation.
(Lutze et al, 2014). Similar concerns have been raised when homeless young people are placed in shared temporary accommodation (Quilgars et al, 2008; Humphreys et al, 2007). Research published by the (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016), based on data collected prior to the implementation of the Pathway, found that one in three 16-17 year olds in the sample were living in unsuitable accommodation post-release, including some who were placed in B&B accommodation alongside unknown/dangerous adults. Not only did this increase the risk of reoffending, it increased the vulnerability of young individuals with complex needs. The report concluded that all 16-17 years olds must be placed in secure and safe accommodation upon release and that assessment of accommodation and support needs must commence upon sentencing; the Pathway, in principle, should ensure these recommendations are met. It does not deem B&B accommodation to be suitable for children/young people unless it is a last resort (Welsh Government, 2015a; 2016).

In the absence of an alternative, young people may leave custody and return to the family home without it being clear whether this would be the best environment for them (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons, 2011). Given that transitioning from custody back into the community can lead to feeling overwhelmed, anxious and isolated (Hampson, 2016; Visher, 2007), if this is accompanied by the possibility of homelessness or inappropriate accommodation, it follows that the risk of reoffending is high:

‘The period of transition from custody to the community provides a window of opportunity when young people are enthusiastic to change, however this is impeded by a lack of sufficient, relevant and timely support, leading to disillusionment and a return to offending’ (Bateman et al, 2013, p.2).

Hence, it is important for the most appropriate accommodation to be provided, as well as to ensure that young people are clear and happy about their future destination. In short, housing has been described as a ‘necessary but not sufficient’ ingredient for successful resettlement (Humphreys and Stirling 2008; Maguire, 2007).
2.8.8 **Partnership working and co-ordination**

The impact of partnership working and co-ordination does not appear to have been empirically tested in the literature and, indeed, would be difficult to do so. That said, it is still argued that it is key to ensuring that young people have access to the services that they require while in detention and after they are released (Hazel et al, 2010b; Youth Justice Board, 2006; 2010; Carney and Buttell, 2003). This argument is based on the fact that individual partners will not be able to cater for the broad range of needs of young people alone. It is also argued that partners should involve the family, representatives of the community, and employers from the area in which the young person will reside, to ensure that there remains a network of support once statutory and voluntary support is withdrawn (Bateman et al, 2013). As well as having the appropriate partners in place, the literature also discusses their co-ordination. Bateman et al (2013) suggest that, based on the literature, a partnership co-ordination (or ‘brokerage’) model is effective. In other words, each YOT should appoint a manager to champion resettlement and to act as the key contact for partners.

2.8.9 **Gaps in the literature**

While evidence above points to a range of factors relevant to effective adult, and sometimes specifically youth, resettlement, it also, as observed by Beyond Youth Custody (2017), leaves a number of questions unanswered. The authors of Beyond Youth Custody (2017) identify these issues as:

- transition to adulthood
- sustained engagement
- support without an increased risk of breach
- diversity issues
- ending resettlement support
- including the remand population.
2.8.10 Good practice/innovations

A number of publications flag up various projects as models of good practice, but it is not always clear how they have been selected (Local Government Association, 2011; Allender et al, 2005). Beyond Youth Custody (2017) also points to the following innovations in youth resettlement:

- embedding resettlement key workers in prisons
- interventions lasting beyond the licence period
- employing resettlement workers as partnership co-ordinators rather than caseworkers
- sharing services between local authority areas
- multi-agency case reviews
- employers’ schemes that begin while the young person is in custody.

2.9 Conclusion

The National Pathway for Homelessness Services to Children and Young People in the Secure Estate (Welsh Government, 2015a) represents a commitment by Welsh Government to address housing need early, with the aim of reducing homelessness upon release. This evidence review has outlined the various and interconnected legislation that the Pathway encompasses, demonstrating the array of responsibilities placed upon local authorities, YOTs and children’s services in supporting young people in the secure estate.

This evidence review has also presented literature concerning the difficult backgrounds and complex vulnerabilities characteristic of both youth homelessness and youth offending, arguing that these problems are overlapping. Such high levels of vulnerability indicate the added significance of ensuring a holistic resettlement process, with safe and secure housing being at the forefront. There is a body of evidence about what is needed in terms of resettlement support, also reviewed in this chapter, but there is a need for detailed research to tell us what is actually
happening on the ground and what needs improving regarding delivery – the focus of this evaluation. It is crucial to examine how the Pathway is operating in practice and whether it is having a positive outcome for children and young people in the secure estate.
3. Research Questions and Methodology

This chapter sets out the research questions and describes the methods employed to answer these.

3.1 Research Questions

The primary research questions were:

**Q1.** How has the Pathway (as applies to young people in this case) been implemented by:

- local authorities (homelessness and children’s services)
- YOTs
- secure establishments
- other relevant stakeholders (including from the third sector).

**Q2.** What have the initial impacts of these changes been on:

- local authorities (homelessness and children’s services)
- YOTs
- secure establishments
- other relevant stakeholders (including from the third sector).

**Q3.** What initial impacts have there been on young people leaving the secure estate?

In essence, the project is concerned with establishing:

- how local authorities, YOTs, secure establishments and other stakeholders have operationalised the processes set out in the Pathway and what challenges they have faced (including the extent to which the above agencies work together to produce a ‘holistic’ or joined up’ service to individuals)
- how this differs from previous arrangements and what effect it has had on stakeholders
- the experiences of the young people who come into contact with the new processes
perceived impacts on the young people’s housing, re-offending and other aspects of their lives including education, training and employment

examples of good practice and areas for improvement.

In order to answer these questions, we used the following methods:

- semi-structured interviews with national and local stakeholders (n=65)
- online survey of stakeholders (n=41)
- semi-structured interviews with young people (n=8)
- case studies of two young people including interviewing six stakeholders relevant to their case
- focus group with senior stakeholders (n=9).

The following sections will explain these methods in more detail. Fieldwork was conducted between August 2018 and April 2019. The National Research Committee and the Faculty Ethics Committee at the University of South Wales provided approval for the research project prior to fieldwork starting.

3.2 Interviews with National and Local Stakeholders

We asked stakeholders to be interviewed on a face-to-face basis. However, some participants preferred to be interviewed on the telephone, to which we agreed in order to maximise the response rate and to optimise the use of research resources. We also asked stakeholders to be interviewed on a one-to-one basis, although some organisations asked for two interviewees to be present per interview, their rationale being that it should enable fuller responses, rather than to check the responses being given by junior staff.

Each interview lasted around 45 minutes. With the stakeholder’s permission, the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. A coding manual was developed with which to analyse the transcripts.
3.2.1 Selection and recruitment

The research specification listed a wide variety of individual and institutional stakeholders as potential interviewees. We consulted Welsh Government to identify the most suitable interviewees in each organisation, broadly aiming to select senior managers with a high level of knowledge, experience and/or decision-making powers in the area. The eventual sample is shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Interview sample for national stakeholder interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Target sample in bid</th>
<th>Eventual sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Government policy officials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMPPS in Wales&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4S&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YJB Cymru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Custody Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rehabilitation Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness and Supporting People Network</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Wales Heads of Children’s Services Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Directors of Social Services Cymru</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third sector strategic stakeholders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total national interviewees</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>10</sup> Senior managers were interviewed from Parc and Werrington YOIs and from Hillside SCH as part of the local stakeholder interviews.
In the case of the local stakeholder interviews, we purposively selected five YOTs (along with the five corresponding local authorities in which the YOTs were geographically based). The selection was made based on range of characteristics, including:

- location in a variety of regions,
- areas which are predominantly urban or rural in character,
- areas with high or low numbers of young people who are serving custodial sentences,
- areas with young people serving custodial sentences in Parc YOI, Werrington YOI and Hillside STC and
- areas with high or low numbers of young people in unsuitable accommodation upon release/end of sentence (this was the closest that we could get to establishing homeless or at risk of homelessness approaching release).

Parc YOI and Hillside SCH were selected by Welsh Government as they are the only two secure establishments based in Wales. Werrington YOI (located in Stoke-on-Trent) was also selected by Welsh Government as, after Parc YOI, it has the highest number of young people in custody with a YOT based in Wales, as shown in Table 2.4 in the previous chapter. Having considered the range of characteristics above, these areas were selected:

1. Cardiff YOT/Cardiff Council
2. Cwm Taf YOT / Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council
3. Conwy Denbighshire YOT/Denbighshire Council
4. Western Bay YOT/ Swansea Council
5. Newport YOT/Newport City Council

In each of these areas we attempted to interview seven people:

1. YOT manager or operational manager
2. YOT caseworker
3. local authority head of housing options
4. local authority housing options officer
5. local authority head of children’s services
6. local authority children’s services staff member
7. third sector organisation representative

In the case of the latter category of interviewee, we asked the local authority to identify the most appropriate third sector organisation to approach. This included a consideration of which organisation was doing most work with young offenders with
housing issues. Stakeholders were emailed a request to be interviewed, along with an information sheet.

To preserve the anonymity of the national stakeholders when citing them in this report, the quote identifiers are numbered as NS1 (National Stakeholder 1) to NS19 (National Stakeholder 19). The larger number of local stakeholders meant that we could provide some further details in the quote identifiers to denote their profession while maintaining anonymity. Thus, the following identifiers are used for the local stakeholders:

- LSH: Local stakeholders from local authority housing departments (n=9)
- LSCS: Local stakeholders from children’s services (n=11)
- LSYOT: Local stakeholders from YOTs (n=9)
- LSSE: Local stakeholders from the secure estate (n=8)
- LSTS: Local stakeholders from third sector organisations (n=6).

3.2.2 Interview schedules

The interviews were semi-structured. Topics were drawn mainly from the research specification, the evidence review and the Welsh Government’s priority areas. Interview schedules included core sections, where the questions were put to all interviewees, as well as supplementary sections that varied according to the sector/role of the person being interviewed. A key aim was to obtain interviewees’ experiences and assessments of the overall impact of the legislative changes, both on their own organisation and on outcomes for young people, in order to gain an in-depth understanding of the challenges they have faced and how they have tried to overcome them. The interview schedule can be found in Annex 2.

3.3 Interviews with Young People

Obtaining views from young people is key to understanding the support provided and the appropriateness and sustainability of accommodation sourced as a result. We did not propose a reconviction study because the minimum cohort size required by Justice Data Lab is 60. Most young people were interviewed face-to-face to enable the research team to gain an in-depth understanding of the impact in practice of the legislative changes on those in need of housing support. Two were interviewed over the telephone. With the face-to-face interviews, a peer researcher
accompanied a professional researcher from Shelter Cymru as discussed in section 3.3.1.

We agreed also with secure establishments that a member of staff would sit outside the interview room or be on hand if any problems arose or if the young person wanted support from someone they knew. The interview in the community took place in local supported accommodation. The use of financial incentives to encourage attendance at interviews is not supported by Welsh Government.

Interviews lasted around 45 minutes and were audio-recorded and transcribed with the interviewees’ permission. The young people were given pseudonyms in the transcripts and in this report and recordings deleted once transcribed, to protect their identities.

3.3.1 Use of peer researchers

These interviews were conducted by a professional researcher from Shelter Cymru and a peer researcher (a person with personal experience of homelessness, with no criminal record). Involving peer researchers not only increases the chances of potential participants agreeing to be interviewed but empowers the peer researchers by providing them with an opportunity to voice their views and support others with similar experiences. It has been argued that the approach also addresses the power imbalances between the researcher and participant, which in turn can reduce bias and improve the quality and accuracy of data collected. This is particularly relevant when interviewing people who are vulnerable and may have had negative experiences with people or organisations perceived to be in a position of authority. Peers can use their experiences and expertise, which is informed by these life experiences, to enhance research projects and improve the quality of the data (Aldridge 2012). All young people in this study were happy for the peer researcher to be present.
3.3.2 Selection, recruitment and informed consent

The Pathway provides support for children and young people with housing needs at four key points: (a) pre-custody, (b) reception, (c) resettlement and (d) release. We, therefore, attempted to interview young people in custody, to gain their views on the earlier points of support in the Pathway, and after release.

We were asked to interview young people aged 16 and 17\textsuperscript{11} years, who were: (1) in custody and defined as still having a housing issue during the run-up to release; or (2) were within two months of having being released from Hillside STC, Parc YOI or Werrington YOI\textsuperscript{12} and who were resettling in an area covered by a Welsh YOT (including people who lived elsewhere before, but planned to move to Wales).

There were 32 young people, attached to a Welsh YOT, in custody in 2018 (Youth Justice Board, 2019a). We were aware that a smaller number of these young people experience housing issues and, potentially, an even smaller number would agree to and/or attend an interview. Consequently, rather than create ‘samples’ among relevant young people, we aimed to interview everyone available who met the criteria and was willing to take part (stopping if and when we reached the targets of 10 in custody and 10 in the community).

However, owing to the low number of eligible young people identified in the course of the project, we expanded the criteria to young people who had had any experience of the Pathway and had resettled within an area covered by a Welsh YOT, i.e. they did not need to have been released from Hillside STC, Parc YOI or Werrington YOI. Hence, the final eligibility criteria were young people:

- aged 16 and 17, or 18 years old if still being dealt with by children’s services\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11} The samples may include some those over 18 who are still being dealt with by children’s services (usually in cases where they reach 18 with only a short time remaining on their sentence or licence, in order to avoid the disruption to their support that might be caused by transferring them to adult services for this short period).

\textsuperscript{12} Although Werrington is in England, it deals with most young offenders from North Wales.

\textsuperscript{13} Usually in cases where they reach 18 with only a short time remaining on their sentence or licence, in order to avoid the disruption to their support that might be caused by transferring them to adult services for this short period.
who are either:

- in custody and defined as still having a housing issue during the run-up to release\(^{14}\), or
- been released since December 2015 (launch date of the Pathway)
- who are resettling within an area covered by a Welsh YOT (including people who lived elsewhere before, but plan to move to Wales), and
- within the data collection period 1 July to 31 December 2018.

While all five YOTs agreed to participate, four reported that they had no young people on their caseload who met the expanded criteria. Hence, all other Welsh YOTs were contacted asking if they were working with any eligible young people. We did arrange an interview with one young person in the Gwynedd and Ynys Môn YOT area but they did not attend the interview. We did not receive responses from other YOTs. Hence, despite considerable effort, we were able to interview only one young person outside custody (see Table 3.2). Consequently, to supplement the young people interviews, a case study approach in relation to two young people was adopted as described below in section 3.4.

\(^{14}\) Run up to release to be interpreted broadly, to include all those who have had a housing issue at any time since sentencing. This is appropriate given the Pathway includes pre-custody and reception stages. This housing issue may subsequently have been resolved.
Table 3.2: Interview sample for young people interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guide sample size for interviews(^{15})</th>
<th>Interviews completed</th>
<th>Young people interviewed(^{16})</th>
<th>No show/withdrawal/loss of contact with young person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillside STC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parc YOI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werrington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff YOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not currently working with any YP fulfilling our widened criteria. Letter sent to 6 YPs with whom they have worked in the past. No response received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cwm Taf YOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not currently working with any YP fulfilling our widened criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy Denbighshire YOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not currently working with any YP fulfilling our widened criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd and Western Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport YOT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total community</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL YOUNG PEOPLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) Rather than create ‘samples’ among relevant young people, we intended to interview everyone available who meets the criteria and is willing to take part.

\(^{16}\) Some young people have been interviewed twice, either to obtain more detail or in custody and then in the community.
Parental consent was not sought. Some of the young people were looked after. More importantly, although differences of opinion remain, a consensus is emerging about the need to let young people speak for themselves, subject to appropriate safeguards (Williams, 2006). The research adopted the youth affirmative outlook, premised on enabling and championing the autonomy and agency of young people (Pickles, 2019). Hence, a carefully constructed, bilingual information sheet was discussed with the young people by their key workers prior to the interview and again by the interviewer at the beginning of the interview. This approach was approved by the Faculty Ethics Committee at the University of South Wales.

3.3.3 Interview schedule

As with the stakeholder interviews, the interview schedule for young people was semi-structured, with an emphasis on gaining an in-depth understanding of how well the new legislation has worked for them. Many of the questions covered similar topics to those discussed with stakeholders, although there was naturally a much greater focus on their individual experiences rather than on operational or strategic issues. They were also questioned about the broader impact on their lives of any services they had received (or not received).

The questions were developed in consultation with our peer researchers, who advised on the best ways of engaging the interviewees and encouraging them to talk openly and at length about their needs and experiences. Topics included:

- what help did you get, if any, while in custody to prevent you becoming homeless?
- did you take part in any mediation to prevent this? With what result?
- at what point did you know where you would be living after release? How much were you involved in this decision?
- what did you think of the first placement you had after leaving custody? (If said to be inappropriate) what impact did this have on your life?
- (for those transitioning to adult services) how has this gone? What effect has it had on you?
- what could anyone have done better to meet your needs?
The interview schedule can be found in Annex 2: Research Instruments.

3.3.4 Support available for research participants

When interviewing vulnerable people, particularly young people who have been involved with the justice system, it sometimes happens that talking about their problems triggers an extreme emotional or stressful response and a consequent need for support. Sometimes they reveal a major need for services they are not receiving. Occasionally, too, they reveal that there may be a disclosure of matters involving serious risk of harm to them or others. We had in place clear protocols for interviewers and recommended actions ranging from simple signposting to appropriate sources of help to immediate referral to YOT or other professional staff who were able to take appropriate action to support them and/or deal with the risks effectively.

3.4 Case Studies of Young People

To obtain a more detailed picture of young people’s journeys from custody to housing under the Pathway or otherwise, case studies were completed of two young people. For one young person interviewed in custody, interviews were conducted with their resettlement worker and the YOT worker, and for a second interviewed in the community, we conducted a focus group with four key stakeholders working with the young person – a YOT caseworker, a YOT support worker, a social services personal advisor and a social worker. The topic guide can be found in Annex 2: Research Instruments.

3.5 Online Survey of Stakeholders

In order to maximise coverage of the stakeholder population across Wales and to give us the broadest possible understanding of the impact of the legislative changes, in addition to the individual interviews in five areas, we conducted a national online survey of stakeholders. Some groups of stakeholders are more likely to give feedback online than face-to-face (Pierpoint 2005). In addition to the
anonymity provided by an online survey, interviews can be very difficult to organise with certain stakeholders (e.g. caseworkers) owing to the busy and unpredictable nature of their work. For such groups, it can be easier for them to provide feedback online and they are often willing to do so at their convenience.

The online survey took place after the individual interviews. Hence, while the online questionnaire covered many of the same topics as the stakeholders’ interviews, it also gave the opportunity to explore and clarify some the issues raised in qualitative interviews.

3.5.1 Selection and Recruitment

Gatekeepers in the following organisations/networks were asked, on a number of occasions, to distribute the link to the questionnaire to anyone who has either a strategic or an operational role, however small, in assisting young ex-offenders with housing needs. These included umbrella organisations/networks, but some smaller third sector organisations were contacted directly to try to increase the response rate. All local authorities, YOTs and secure establishments were contacted directly too.

1. All-Wales Heads of Children’s Services Group
2. Care Inspectorate Wales
3. Cymorth Cymru
4. Hillside STC
5. Parc YOI
6. Werrington YOI
7. Homelessness and Supporting People Network
8. Welsh Government
9. Welsh local authorities
10. Welsh YOTs
11. YOT managers Cymru/Hwb Doeth
12. Three third sector organisations

All umbrella organisations replied agreeing to distribute the link, on more than one occasion. This, along with contacting local authorities, YOTs and some third sector organisations directly, resulted in 41 responses. It is obviously difficult to estimate the number of respondents who potentially could have responded to the survey and, hence, the response rate and representativeness of the sample. Of course, responses to an online questionnaire distributed in this fashion will not constitute a fully representative sample of all relevant stakeholders, but the results add usefully to the overall picture gleaned from individual interviews.

3.5.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire comprised 24 questions, mainly closed questions (about 80 per cent). It made use of drop-down options, tick boxes, and questionnaire completion scroll bars – all of which have been shown to improve response rates (Pierpoint 2005). The questionnaire can be found in Annex 2: Research Instruments.

3.5.3 Data analysis

Univariate statistics were produced to give a picture of current arrangements and views of the stakeholder community. Where survey respondents’ qualitative comments are cited in this report, the following quote identifiers are used: OSS1 (Online Survey Stakeholder 1) to OSS41 (Online Survey Stakeholder 41).

3.6 Focus Group of Senior Stakeholders

After completing the interviews and initial analysis, a focus group of nine senior stakeholders from youth justice, the secure estate, third sector and local government was conducted. The purpose of this was to:

- feedback the main findings and recommendations to participants, and for them to disseminate learning back to their organisations and networks
- clarify points where conflicting information had been provided
• confirm or raise questions about the validity of findings
• explore what can be done about the findings/recommendations.

The topic guide can be found in Annex 2: Research Instruments. The focus group lasted 120 minutes and was audio recorded and transcribed with the participants’ permission. The transcript was analysed by comparing its content against the existing research findings. As with the national stakeholders interviewed above, only generic quote identifiers were used when citing these stakeholders in this report as otherwise they would be too easily identifiable. They were numbered where possible (for example SS1 (Senior Stakeholder 1) to SS9 (Senior Stakeholder 9)) or, otherwise noted as simply SS.
4. Findings

The findings from the interviews, online survey and focus group of stakeholders, and from the interviews and case studies of young people, are presented alongside one another in this chapter. Where applicable, they are discussed in relation to: (1) the issues raised in the resettlement literature presented in the evidence review in Chapter 2; and (2) the findings from the evaluation of the adult Pathway (Madoc-Jones et al, 2018).

This chapter is organised according to the major themes that emerged from the research:

- understanding of the Pathway
- operationalisation of the various stages of the Pathway and the challenges involved
- availability of ‘suitable’ and supported accommodation
- engagement with young people
- relationship between partners, ownership of the duty and multi-agency structures
- impact of the pathway, good practice and areas for improvement.

To demonstrate that the evidence presented in this chapter is representative of the full sample, we have accompanied each quotation/interview extract with an anonymous quote identifier to denote the individual who made the claim.

4.1 Understanding of the Pathway

Apart from those who had been involved in its development, most national stakeholders had only general or vague knowledge of the contents of the Pathway. Most local stakeholders stated that they had some understanding of what the Pathway involves, although the level of understanding varied with some able to provide a general overview, and a smaller number describing more specific details. Several local and national stakeholders were much more familiar with the adult Pathway.
4.1.1 Awareness of the Pathway

Of the 19 national stakeholders interviewed, four had been directly involved in the creation of the Pathway, so knew a lot about it. Aside from those involved in its creation, only two had a good knowledge. Ten admitted they knew relatively little about it beyond a general understanding that it was aimed at improving the coordination of housing resettlement services to young people leaving custody. For example, when asked about their understanding of the Pathway, one national stakeholder said: ‘I’m not robust on this at all’ (NS18). However, it should be emphasised that the responsibilities of several of the sample were concerned mainly with adults, and most of these had a fair knowledge of the adult pathway. In addition, two were from national (England and Wales) organisations and did not profess knowledge of Welsh policy.

Typically, local stakeholders’ understanding was couched within their own job role, however, what was also apparent was that different local authorities have developed their own processes for responding to youth homelessness and/or resettlement and these local processes were also referred to as ‘pathways’. Therefore, in some cases, when stakeholders spoke about ‘the Pathway’, they were not talking about the National Pathway for Homelessness Services to Children, Young People and Adults in the Secure Estate, but rather the pathway(s) that had been developed in their own area. For example, one stakeholder described the ‘Young People’s Positive Pathway’ (LSCS11), while others described the ‘Young Person’s Gateway’ (e.g. LSTS2). Children’s services interviewees referred to their own ‘policies’, ‘plans’ or ‘pathway’, which was in reference to the Care and Support Pathway:

‘[…] we work to the Social Services and Well-being Act, and our ultimate drive is, we need to be working with a young person to identify what's right for them, and that's how we've always worked. To some extent, really it's about bringing those two bits together. There probably are similarities [between the two Pathways], but that's our main drive.’ (LSCS4)
A small number of local stakeholders stated that they had not heard of the Pathway until they were asked to participate in this research. The research had prompted them to read about the Pathway in preparation, but some only learned about the details of the Pathway during the interview itself. However, upon learning about the Pathway, these stakeholders recognised that they were, indeed, following it to a large extent.

4.1.2 Promotion of the Pathway

In the senior stakeholder focus group, stakeholders could recall some promotion of the Pathway, but that it had formed a smaller component of the promotion of the Care and Support Pathway. It was felt that this could explain the limited awareness of the Pathway in some cases, and participants agreed that there was a case for further promotion through, for example, the distribution of a two-page summary through national structures (e.g. YOT Managers Cymru) and management boards, but also frontline stakeholders. As one focus group participant explained:

‘I think one of the reasons why a level of awareness might be low relates to how well it’s been promoted if you like, particularly to the people on the ground who need to operate it […] So whether enough was done at the start, and whether it was done widely enough at the start I think might be an issue that you might want to think about or revisit’ (Focus group, SS7).

Several local stakeholders also recommended greater awareness raising of the Pathway by Welsh Government as well as a more proactive approach by managers to pass this information down to frontline workers.

4.1.3 Applicability of the Pathway

As well as the limited promotion work, the lack of awareness was also explained by the limited applicability of the Pathway. In other words, there are very few young people receiving custodial sentences who have a housing need in Wales. Local
authority (housing) stakeholders and third sector accommodation providers had less experience (although not necessarily less understanding) of the Pathway than criminal justice and children’s services stakeholders:

‘If I’m being really honest, I don’t know from a youth offending situation how effective that is, and how quickly they notify us if there’s a housing issue. What I do know is that one of the things that we don’t have many of is referrals in that area. So from [the local authority] perspective, just looking at some of the data, the numbers are very, very low in terms of having a housing referral at that stage. But without understanding that, I can’t answer fully how effective that is.’ (LSH3)

A lack of housing referrals primarily seemed to reflect the very small number of young people in custody, and the even smaller proportion of these young people who are in housing need. This partly appeared to be a consequence of greater efforts to divert young people from entering custody; this is discussed further in section 4.2.1. Thus, it is likely that some of the lack of familiarity with the Pathway can be explained by the fact that many stakeholders had had no first-hand experience of putting it into practice.

This was supported by local stakeholders who stated that they had more familiarity with the adult Pathway because the adult custodial population is greater and adults do not have the extra layer of social services support that young people have; thus, adults are more likely to require a referral to the housing department. As noted above, several national stakeholders interviewed were also much more familiar with the adult Pathway, and many of their responses referred to the latter rather than the under-18s, with interviewers frequently having to steer them back to the subject.

4.1.4 Usefulness of the Pathway

Local stakeholders were asked if they felt that the Pathway is important and/or necessary, and many agreed that it is. The main reasons provided were that they thought that the Pathway is important for helping to address youth homelessness and to create a more joined up approach between different agencies. A small
number of local stakeholders claimed that not much had changed since the Pathway came into effect. Two argued that the Pathway is simply a document of what was already happening in practice, while another argued that the bigger problem that the Pathway cannot address is a lack of resourcing for support services and accommodation: ‘Not a lot [has changed] to be honest. I think people do what is in the Pathway as you’ve shown me, anyway and that is just good practice. It feels like that Pathway is just writing down what people do anyway’ (LSYOT6); ‘I don’t think so, simply because I don’t think it’s an issue around policy or procedure or guidance. It’s an issue of resources available’ (LSCS11).

On the other hand, several criminal justice stakeholders explained that the Pathway, and its embedded legislation, was a useful document because it had helped them to challenge housing departments and social workers who, they believed, were not complying with it:

‘It just gives them [staff] a little bit of confidence when they’re challenging as well because obviously when they get...I mean it’s not the individuals who are resistant but obviously the process is sometimes. So when [the local authority housing department] say sorry, we haven’t got anything just as yet, they quote things from that and it gives them a little bit more strength within the argument, no, according to this pathway you have to find...it gives them a little bit more of a legal push if you like.’ (LSSE3)

Among the national stakeholders interviewed, there was a degree of cynicism about initiatives such as the Pathway; with a few saying that fine words are all very well, but what is needed are significant increases in resources and the availability of supported housing. There were general concerns about shrinking resources and, in particular, supported accommodation services closing down. These views are illustrated by the following quotes:

‘Honestly and bluntly, I think the single biggest thing that would make a difference to us would be to actually have some additional staff [...] No pathway
strategies, baubles or shiny projects’ (NS18); ‘I suppose the concern is you can [have] whichever pathway you want, but it purely comes down to provision and if there’s a lack of beds you can have any pathway, any legislation you want, local authorities are not able to provide it’ (NS14); ‘What a pathway doesn’t do sadly is actually create accommodation’ (NS18).

4.2 Operationalisation of the Pathway

The Pathway provides support for children and young people with housing needs at four key points: (a) pre-custody, (b) reception, (c) resettlement and (d) release. We, therefore, attempted to gain their views on how the Pathway is operationalised at these stages. Most views, understandably, came from local stakeholders. Young people also shared their experiences of the Pathway.

4.21 Pre-custody

During the pre-custody stage, YOTs produce a pre-sentence report indicating the child/young person’s: living situation; housing need; support needs; and whether they are looked after. Most of the views shared by local stakeholders on the pre-custody stage concerned the purpose and sharing of the pre-sentence report.

Diversion

Local stakeholders noted that one of the primary goals at this stage is to divert the young person from receiving a custodial sentence. One YOT stakeholder explained the significance of housing in this process:

’[…] having appropriate housing could make the difference in a pre-sentence report of someone going to custody or not […] we recently had a young person whose mum had gone on holiday, thought they’d left them with someone who was going to be taking a bit of responsibility and as such, and he was basically out on the street selling drugs, continuing. When he was arrested and no responsible appropriate adult could be identified, then obviously my interpretation of why the court remanded him was under welfare circumstances rather than one of ’he's such a dangerous prolific offender, we have to remove him from
circulation’. So that's a good indicator of how, if the mum would have been at home and it was a suitable place to be and this, that or the other, that decision may well have been different.’ (LSYOT5)

All local stakeholders with some knowledge of the pre-custody stage stated that housing need is identified in pre-sentence reports as the Pathway advocates. Indeed, it was explained that as soon as a young person comes to the attention of YOT, an AssetPlus assessment is completed which was described by one stakeholder as a ‘comprehensive assessment of a young person’s desistance needs’ (LSYOT6). The AssetPlus assessment is then used to inform the pre-sentence report. Importantly, stakeholders explained that the purpose of the pre-sentence report is not only to assess the offending behaviours but also to identify risks to the young person and provide a holistic picture of their circumstances, including their housing situation. One stakeholder described the pre-sentence report as ‘a map of the young person’ (LSSE1). In general, it appeared that YOT stakeholders prioritised diverting young people from custody or, where this was not possible, planning for a young person’s post-release support. This work began as soon as a young person came to their attention:

‘We actually link in to quite a large percent now before they even set foot in the building because we’re involved in the referral panel. Everything in the referral panel, I’d look at potential referrals and the first thing I’m looking at is what they’re looking at their exit plan being like.’ (LSSE2)

Sharing of pre-sentence reports

According to children’s services in the local stakeholder interviews, the YOT do not always share pre-sentence reports with children’s services, with sharing being described as ‘hit and miss’ (LSCS4). Where children’s services had seen information about housing need, it had only described the young person’s circumstances without making any recommendations as to what form of housing would be most suitable. One explanation for this is that the timescale for completing a pre-sentence report was relatively short (one local stakeholder claimed that they have three weeks to write the report) which could compromise the information that went into it.
An alternative explanation is that the role of children’s services pre-custody differs depending on the circumstances of the young person. Local stakeholders argued that, in most cases, young people referred to a YOT were already known to children’s services. One stakeholder explained that if a young person had been in Looked After Care (LAC) prior to being referred to a YOT, then the YOT would send the social worker the pre-sentence report. They would also be involved if the young person was identified as having any support needs. For those who were not previously known and who had no apparent support needs, children’s services would become involved once a young person had been remanded or sentenced to custody, thus they would not necessarily see the pre-sentence report.

It is important to note, however, that the claims of housing information not being included in pre-sentence reports or there being no recommendations about the most appropriate housing solution for a young person appeared to be the exception rather than the norm. Most local stakeholders felt that the pre-sentence report was effective at capturing housing need and recommendations were made in the report about the most appropriate housing solution.

In addition to a YOT completing a pre-sentence report, children’s services completed a ‘care and support plan’ for young people in order to identify any mental health or support needs. Contrary to claims that YOTs did not always share pre-sentence reports, it appeared that information in these reports was incorporated by the social worker when writing the care and support plan:

‘When we write our care and support plans, we would include any views of the Youth Offending Service. We would put any actions that they are completing within the plan. We would include any direct work that they're completing around offending behaviour within the plan.’ (LSCS9)

Likewise, the care and support plan would feed into the pre-sentence report. Most local stakeholders agreed that care and support needs are identified during pre-custody, along with housing needs. Furthermore, in the senior stakeholder focus
group, several participants questioned the appropriateness of YOTs sharing a pre-sentence report as it is a court document with a specific function of assisting sentencing:

‘Can I ask why children’s services want a pre-sentence report? It’s a document for the court to determine the outcome. It’s a sentencing decision. I would except children’s services if the child had had some sort of history of involvement, particularly around accommodation needs as a looked after child, children’s services would be one of the sources that would feed into the report. But the sharing of that information I’m really not sure about, because that is a document for the court, not for general or wider distribution. I would imagine in the process of information gathering, you’d certainly be having a discussion about what the accommodation status was, whether there were any difficulties, and whether they were flagging any difficulties for the future if you like.’ (Focus group, SS7)

Finally, while YOTs and children’s services were the dominant agencies involved in the pre-custody stage of the Pathway, one third sector stakeholder explained that if a young person had been homeless prior to their involvement with the criminal justice system, that third sector agency would also support the young person pre-custody (and beyond):

‘[…] where we would have involvement in that, it will be with young people who have criminal justice involvement but they’ve also, historically, recently historically, suffered homelessness, needing to be accommodated. So our support provision sometimes will be running alongside their involvement with Youth Offending Services or with children’s services. That, I would say, is joined up. We’ve seen some really good examples of three, four-way partnership based joined up approaches in terms of a young person’s need and stuff and often that involving offending behaviour.’ (LSTS2)

The same stakeholder (along with others) noted that the pre-sentence report contains details about the feasibility and appropriateness of a young person
returning to the family home. They noted that for young people who have been homeless prior to custody, a return to the family home would be unlikely and, therefore, they would work on the assumption that the young person would return to supported accommodation upon release.

In sum, the dominant view was that the pre-sentence reports are useful and shared appropriately. However, according to children’s services, YOTs do not always share pre-sentence reports with children’s services. That said, in the senior stakeholder focus group, several participants questioned the appropriateness of YOTs sharing pre-sentence reports, as they represent a court document with a specific function of assisting sentencing. However, it presumably could be useful for children’s services when they only become involved once a young person had been remanded or sentenced to custody and, therefore, have not seen the pre-sentence report previously.

4.2.2 Reception

The reception stage is defined as the first ten days in custody as the Pathway stipulates that a joint planning meeting be held within the first ten days between the YOT caseworker, secure estate staff, young person and any other relevant stakeholder. The purpose of this meeting is to identify care and support needs that should be met while the young person is in custody but the Pathway also highlights that accommodation upon release should also be discussed. Upon having this meeting, the YOT caseworker prepares a sentencing plan, which should be reviewed monthly while the young person is in custody. If the young person has received a sentence of less than 66 days, then the reception and resettlement stages are carried out in parallel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for Release</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At sentencing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 10 days</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 days before</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon release</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After release</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stakeholder survey, total N= 41

There was an overall sense that planning for release did begin early in the process, among stakeholders interviewed and in the survey (as shown in Table 4.1), and was viewed as having critical importance for ensuring the best possible long-term outcomes for young people post-release, although short sentences and changing housing needs were identified as challenges. However, the main concern is that most young people did not feel involved in the process.

**Challenges of short sentences and changing housing needs**

As would be expected from the type of work conducted at this phase of the Pathway, YOT local stakeholders (which included caseworkers and secure estate staff) were the group who had the most knowledge and experience of this stage, while a few children’s services stakeholders also had some limited contributions to make. In line with the Pathway, most local stakeholders agreed that housing need is discussed during the reception meeting, included in the sentencing plan and that this process is effective.

Despite evidence that resettlement planning begins as early as possible, including discussions during reception, some noted that short sentences created a challenge for this:
‘Again, that would be depending on the length of sentence. So, if you get a six-month DTO [Detention Training Order] and you’re only going to do three [months], it could be a very pressing concern. We would then, with whatever immediacy we can, be looking at that as an end possibility. We’ve got an issue here. Mum and dad have said, “sorry, we’re not taking them back.”’ (LSYOT5)

An additional challenge was the acknowledgement that a young person’s housing need could change as the sentence progressed, placing restrictions on the effectiveness of housing discussions during reception. This issue was discussed typically in reference to young people returning to their family home and family circumstances or attitudes changing. However, despite local stakeholders providing examples of cases in which changes had occurred, it was generally believed that these cases were rare. Most young people would return to the family home upon release and it was unusual for this to change as the sentence progressed.

*Engaging with young people at reception*

Some young people could recall meeting with their YOT worker at this time to discuss housing issues, as shown by this extract of an interview with a young person referred to as Brian (a pseudonym):

‘Interviewer: Back to Cardiff? So when you first arrived in Parc, did anybody speak to you about where you lived and your housing situation?

Brian: I had a meeting with my YOT worker.

Interviewer: They spoke about it then, did they?

Brian: Yes, I don't know.

Interviewer: So that was your YOT worker and that was once you had come in here or was it before you came in?

Brian: Once I came in here.

Interviewer: What sort of questions did they ask you about your housing?

Brian: Where I'm going to live.
Interviewer: Did they ask you where you wanted to live?

Brian: I can't live with my mum.

Interviewer: You can't live with your mum?

Brian: No, because of her boyfriend.

Interviewer: So what did you tell them when they were asking these questions?

Brian: I can live with my aunty, sleeping on sofas. I don't really want to sleep on sofas when I'm out. I want my own bedroom.’

For two young people, this was the only meeting of this type that they could recall. Here is an extract of a further interview:

‘Interviewer: Who have you met to discuss your housing situation with in here?

Ian: Ava and Ed [pseudonyms]

Interviewer: Who's Ed?

Ian: I don’t know his surname. He works with the Youth Offending Team here.

Interviewer 1: How many meetings and discussions have you had about your housing? Have you had a lot, or…

Ian: Just one at the moment I come in,

Interviewer: Who spoke to you?

Ian: My YOT worker.’

Other young people could not recall any meetings and one said that they would like monthly meetings:

‘Interviewer: So you haven’t had any meetings or discussions about where you’re going to live on your release?

Harry: No […] Maybe they should just sit down with me once a month and say, “do you still want to go back to mum’s, do you want to go in a hostel, do you want
this, do you want that?” They don’t. Every meeting I have, they don’t talk about where I'm going, they don’t talk about how I'm feeling. They just talk about how I’m doing on the wing, what regime I’m on, when your release date’s - normal things really.’

In contrast, local stakeholders believed that young people were able and willing to discuss housing and post-release plans during reception, although with recognition that it depended on the individual. One stakeholder explained their approach to engaging a young person in conversation during reception was to ask them what is important to them. This approach was argued to be effective because it focused on what was a priority for the young person, but it could mean that accommodation was not necessarily discussed:

‘I won’t say to them “right, accommodation, let's start with number one. You tell me what's important to you because”, as I said, I was like that when I was younger. Accommodation didn't matter. If I was homeless and I slept here or there or wherever, I wasn't really that bothered. To me, what was a much more pressing priority was substance misuse because that was the key, that was the trigger that was sending me on the path that I was on. Until that was addressed, it wouldn't have mattered if they put me up at the Hilton, I would have stolen all the hotel furniture or whatever. So, again, it's that matter of prioritisation.’

(LSYOT5)

Some stakeholders in secure establishments mentioned the importance of developing good rapport with young people as this was viewed as a sign of successful communication, information sharing and being supportive. However, occasionally a young person would be perceived as unwilling to engage which could create difficulties in implementing housing and support measures. One stakeholder indicated that it might be useful for the Pathway to provide some guidance on what can be done in these situations. We will return to the issue of engaging with young people below under section 4.5.
4.2.3 Resettlement

A relatively new duty for local authorities under the Housing (Wales) Act, 2014, s.66, is to take ‘reasonable steps’ to prevent/relieve homelessness. Sixty-six days before release, young people enter the resettlement stage and if a housing need still exists, a referral is made to the appropriate local authority. If the local authority accepts a duty under the Act, the authority then has a duty to prevent or relieve the child/young person’s homelessness.

66 day milestone

Despite resettlement ‘officially’ beginning 66 days prior to release, several local stakeholders indicated that resettlement does, or at least should, start from reception:

‘There’s emphasis on 66 days here. When a young person is within 66 days of release, they enter into the resettlement stage. From my point of view, the resettlement stage should start as soon as they go in.’ (LSYOT2)

However, many local stakeholders argued that it was unrealistic to expect local authorities or children’s services to secure accommodation for a young person so far in advance of their release although it was still helpful to be notified of someone’s housing need:

‘The biggest issue I have is the 66 days. It’s completely unrealistic to expect for us to keep a bed open for 66 days for a young person. It can’t happen, it cannot happen. A young person will be found accommodation in a timely way, but I’m going to be honest, it will be seven days. It will happen. What I like about the 66 days is that the Youth Offending Service let me know that we’ve got this young person and we can start looking at it. But we cannot secure a bed for 66 days.’ (LSCS6)

As mentioned, the Pathway stipulates that 66 days prior to release, the YOT caseworker makes a referral to the local authority housing department if a housing need still exists for a young person. In addition to the mixed evidence concerning
whether these referrals were made, there were also mixed views on whether they were made in a timely manner. Children's services and YOT stakeholders stated that referrals were made on time according to the Pathway:

‘So if we got to that point, I’d obviously have those conversations, I’d maybe even do a joint visit with the Youth Offending worker to that family while that young person is in [name of establishment] or wherever. Then, if it was looking like they were homeless, I’d let housing know and I’d get their release date.’ (LCS6)

However, housing stakeholders stated that there are still cases in which they only become aware of a young person facing homelessness on the day that they are released. Again, there was an indication that sometimes children’s services might not be involved with a young person in custody despite them being legally owed a social services duty. Furthermore, there was evidence that YOT caseworkers might not always be making housing referrals for young people:

‘What tends to happen in [a local authority] is that, if a young person goes into the secure estate and they have a children’s services involvement with them, so that children’s services have a duty to them, then they will be notified and they’ll let us know that the young person’s coming out. So it’s the children’s services social worker team that will let us know. If a young person is not under a children’s services duty, we won’t know they’ve gone in and we won’t know what date they’re coming out, or whether they’re going to be homeless; we don’t get that information. So I think that should be coming from the offender management, but that hasn’t been something that we get. We do get dribs and drabs of information, but we don’t get anything consistent, and we don’t get sufficient information.’(LSH1)

One consistent finding across all local stakeholder groups, and confirmed in the senior stakeholder focus group, was the agreement that it was not easy to reserve a room in supported accommodation for a young person for a long period of time. Some stakeholders claimed this had happened for young people serving much shorter sentences although there was wide variation in the time periods specified.
Children’s services and YOT stakeholders indicated it was sometimes possible to keep a placement open for as long as six months, whereas local authority (housing) and third sector stakeholders indicated that even holding a place for as long as four weeks was usually not possible. This means that an address may not be confirmed until very close to release. As one stakeholder in the survey explained:

‘Would not be confident in saying that planning starts at the 66 days point, my impression is that it’s closer to release. Although there is a difference between planning and getting confirmation of an address, which is often very close to, release. Sentencing planning paperwork should include a section on accommodation need so that it is always addressed at meetings and actions and decisions can be identified and tracked.’ (OSS1)

There was mixed evidence concerning the consistency and timeliness with which housing referrals were made to the local authority; this reflects the finding made in relation to the adult Pathway (Madoc-Jones et al, 2018) and is discussed in more detail in section 4.6.1.

‘Reasonable steps’

When housing referrals are made, the local authority can consider a range of ‘reasonable steps’ to prevent or relieve a young person’s homelessness upon release. All local stakeholders interviewed from housing explained that reasonable steps are tailored to the individual and their circumstances; indeed, it was argued that young people being released from the secure estate were treated in the same person-centred manner as any young person in housing need.

According to the local and national stakeholders interviewed, mediation and the use of supported accommodation were the main ‘reasonable steps’ considered by local authorities for young people in custody. The other ‘reasonable steps’ most commonly mentioned by national stakeholders were grants, loans or guaranteed payments, and advocacy. However, answers to this were in many cases quite vague. Several also had to be prompted by being asked whether specific steps
were being taken: ‘I think that paying off rent arrears definitely happens […] I think help with deposits, that happens’ (NS1). This finding was also reflected in the stakeholder survey findings (see Table 4.2). Also worthy of note is that B&B was the fifth most frequently selected answer in the survey, despite the Pathway deeming B&B accommodation unsuitable for children/young people unless it is a last resort (Welsh Government, 2015a; 2016). The point is considered in more depth in section 4.3.2 below.

Table 4.2: Which are the most frequently used 'reasonable steps'/prevention and relief activities? Please select up to 3 activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation - Supported accommodation</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation - Return to the family home</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation - Taken into/returned to care</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation - B&amp;B</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and advice</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support in managing debt, mortgage arrears or rent arrears</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation - Privately rented accommodation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy or other representation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantees to landlords/lenders that payments will be made</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments by way of a grant or loan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security measures for applicants at risk of abuse, e.g. provision of sanctuary scheme or help to access injunctions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to close down a tenancy if appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stakeholder survey, total N= 41, multiple responses permitted
Mediation
As mentioned, mediation and the use of supported accommodation were the main ‘reasonable steps’ considered by local authorities for young people in custody. Returning to the family home was the most common situation for young people and was the first option considered by the YOT caseworker and children’s services when planning for release. Where there was a problematic family relationship, mediation was sometimes used during reception and resettlement with the aim of facilitating a smooth return to the family home. The use of mediation was the clearest example of a resettlement practice that sometimes began prior to the formal commencement of the resettlement stage (i.e. earlier than 66 days before release). Some national stakeholders confirmed this:

’[When shown a list of reasonable steps] The one that jumped out at me straight away was mediation […] I think it’s a default position for local authorities, for housing in particular, that even if the home situation isn’t suitable, even if this young person would be better off in a secure welfare place, they’ll go to mediation first because if they can get mum to agree to take the child back, problem solved’ (NS14).

Some stakeholders noted that a barrier to mediation was if the young person had younger siblings living in the family home. In this situation, the safeguarding of the younger children was prioritised, meaning that if the young person was deemed to pose a risk to the younger children, they would not be allowed to return home. In this respect, mediation was viewed as irrelevant as it would not assist with the young person’s post-release accommodation.

However, evidence from other stakeholders indicated that mediation would still be a valuable intervention even if the goal was not to return to the family home. This discussion arose when discussing the use of ‘reasonable steps’ with local authority (housing) stakeholders. Some pointed out that mediation can be used to prevent homelessness as well as to facilitate a return to the family home. Additionally, one stakeholder argued that mediation to improve family relationships was important for
supporting a young person to live in alternative accommodation (e.g. in supported accommodation or their own flat).

Mediation was only one practice used by YOTs and children’s services to engage families in resettlement. Multiple examples were provided about the importance of inviting parents to reception and follow-up meetings, being in constant communication with parents to maintain the family connection, assisting parents to travel to secure establishments to visit their children, doing home visits to check the suitability of returning home, and working with parents to support them in dealing with their child’s difficult behaviours. This work with families continued post-release when the young person was back in the community. This is encouraging given that the resettlement literature argues that partners should involve the family to ensure that there remains a network of support once statutory and voluntary support is withdrawn (Bateman et al, 2013). That said, not all young people would want to participate in mediation. One young interviewee explained that he would not have wanted mediation:

‘Interviewer: Where someone sits down with you and mum and you go to… almost a little bit like counselling, and try and work things out.

Adam: No, I just do all that **** on my own.

Interviewer: You didn’t want to do that?

Adam: No.’

Supported accommodation
Along with mediation, the other ‘reasonable step’ most often considered by local authorities for young people in custody was reported to be the use of supported accommodation. It was felt that the very nature of being under 18 meant it was unlikely that a young person had the skills to live independently, and the added vulnerability of being in custody increased the likelihood of these young people having complex needs. Therefore, in the absence of returning to the family home or LAC, supported accommodation was viewed as the most suitable form of accommodation. One local authority (housing) stakeholder explained that if a young person was living independently prior to custody (which was unlikely) and had
received a short sentence, the local authority would try to work with the landlord to keep the accommodation open. Another explained that they might provide financial assistance to a family to support that family in accommodating a young person:

‘So, for example, we've had somebody who was in education and he was getting EMA [Education Maintenance Allowance] so that was £30 per week that he was getting but his mum also had five other children and was struggling financially so she was taking it off him. So they were arguing all the time. So it got to the point where she told him to leave and he came to us. For the sake of £30 per week, we gave mum £30 and said he needs to keep his EMA because he's going to college.’ (LSH8)

The main challenge here is the lack of availability of supported accommodation, considered in section 4.3 below.

**Sentencing plan reviews**

The Pathway stipulates that the sentencing plan should be reviewed on a monthly basis. Most stakeholders agreed that sentencing plans are reviewed. However, there was evidence that these meetings were not taking place as frequently as every month. One children’s services stakeholder stated that meetings took place every six weeks, while one secure estate stakeholder stated that they were every three months:

‘So the national standards that we adhere to says that the sentence planning meetings have to take place every three months. So the YOT come in every three months to review the sentence-planning journey. [...] If someone is a very complex need who's playing up, fighting, assaulting, not engaging in education, absconding previously, refusing to return back, we wouldn't hold them every three months, we would hold them far more regularly because we need to be addressing what’s going on for that child.’ (LSSE3)
Another secure estate stakeholder claimed that the frequency of sentence plan reviews depended on the length of sentence; those on long sentences would have their plans reviewed every three months, but those on remand or on short sentences would have their plans reviewed each month. Several YOT stakeholders stated that three-monthly reviews was in adherence with the YJB’s ‘national standards’. Two young people could recall having monthly meetings:

‘Interviewer: Who have you met with to have these discussions?
Jamie: My YOT worker and social worker.
Interviewer: So they’ve come in to speak to you about it?
Jamie: Yeah.
Interviewer: How many meetings or chats do you think you’ve had about it altogether?
Jamie: One a month since I’ve been here, I’ve been here five months.
Interviewer: How many meetings and discussions have you had about your housing?
Jamie: … is like once a month, they discussed housing with me.’

4.2.4 Release

Seven day deadline

As discussed, the main housing option considered by YOTs and children’s services while working with young people in custody was a return to the family home; in these cases, the local authority (housing) was not always involved. If this was not possible, then the expectation was that, unless a young person was returning to LAC (which was not very common among 16-17 year olds), the main housing option for young people was supported accommodation. Thus, unless otherwise specified, when stakeholders spoke of accommodation post-release, they were referring to supported accommodation.
The Pathway stipulates that accommodation for a young person should be secured at least seven days before release meaning the young person should have at least a week’s notice as to where they will live. There were mixed responses as to whether this seven-day deadline was always met. There were two primary reasons for the deadline not being met: (1) a young person’s family circumstances changed at the last minute (e.g. the family changed their mind about allowing the young person to return home); and/or (2) the lack of suitable supported accommodation made it difficult to find a placement. As mentioned previously, substantial work was undertaken with families during the resettlement period to ensure a smooth transition into the family home upon release and, therefore, stakeholders explained that it was rare for a family to change their mind so close to a release date. However, if accommodation did break down at the last minute, it often resulted in key stakeholders frantically trying to put something else in place:

‘[…] there was a young person who’s due to be released on Friday and I think accommodation was provisionally in place but that fell through […] one of the admin team just sent me an email saying there’s been a bit of a breakdown and he might not get a release address until the day of release, which I’m not happy with because, for me, that’s really unsettling for the young person. We try to create a smooth, seamless transition into the community, aiding his resettlement and then there’s all the uncertainty around where he’s going to go. So I’ve emailed them this morning asking for a response and asking for it to be escalated, and I want, I really stressed, prior to his release date rather than not finding out until the day’. (LSSE4)

Again, the lack of suitable supported accommodation, was a problem that all stakeholders recognised as a significant barrier to successful resettlement:

‘When there are problems it does seem to come down…and we have had a couple of examples in [local authority] where it does come down to the wire. We’ve had them be two days before they’ve been released and that’s because they haven’t been able to identify a placement because there aren’t any’. (LSYOT6)
Furthermore, one local stakeholder from the secure estate explained that the 7-day deadline should be a ‘worst case scenario’ and, in fact, post-release accommodation should be secured approximately one month prior to release for the necessary checks to be carried out. Indeed, it emerged that there is a mismatch between the timeline specified in the Pathway and youth justice processes. Although a housing referral can be made 66 days prior to release, due to the difficulties in reserving a room for a long period of time, often a place is not confirmed until one or two weeks prior to release. This, then, only leaves a very short period of time for YOTs and children’s services to make referrals to wider support services and education/employment placements for the young person. It also has implications for a young person’s licence conditions:

‘I think for us, when we were consulted at the time, obviously there’s the Youth Justice Board national standards for managing end-to-end case management. Within the guidance, you can refer in as a priority need at the 66-day point prior to release, which gives you a reasonably healthy amount of time, but the local authority only has to confirm accommodation at the final planning meeting, which can be ten to seven days prior to release. Within YJB national standards, there is a presumption that accommodation will be nailed down at the four-week point, so that we can make sure that all the other plans…for instance, education, training, employment opportunities, registering with a local GP, putting in mentoring, allowing the YOT to be ready and available, all of that support mechanism that we might put round the child can be in place. In my view, seven days is not long enough, because you’re talking about a lot of different agencies all getting a collective response around one child, seven days isn’t long enough.’ (LSSE5)

Stakeholders were asked a series of questions in the interviews about the processes for the day of release depending on whether a young person was returning to the family home or whether they were being released into supported accommodation, LAC, or if they were released with nowhere to go. Every stakeholder conclusively argued that a young person would never be allowed to end
up sofa surfing or rough sleeping. Some stakeholders provided accounts of a young person being released with no accommodation in place. However, rather than leaving the young person to find their own accommodation (which they legally were not allowed to do), stakeholders described a process of frantic phone calls and negotiations in order to find emergency accommodation for the young person. During this time, the young person would be taken either to the housing office or to the children’s services office to wait while accommodation was found.

Conversely, in the stakeholder survey, 10 out of 40 respondents (data missing in 1 case) stated that they were aware of cases when a young person released was from the secure estate with no accommodation. Two main categories of reasons were given. The first category related to communication problems being reported between the partners and insufficient time and information provided for a solution to be found, as demonstrated in this quote: ‘They were released from the secure estate with no notification and presented to the housing solutions team on day of release’ (OSS2).

The second category of explanations given, related to the nature of offending, risk and needs of the young person in question which meant that the supported accommodation and social landlords approached were not willing to house him (this theme is returned to in section 4.3.4).

4.3 Availability of ‘Suitable’ Accommodation

Accommodation is considered important for resettlement and desistance (Scottish Government, 2015). Given that transitioning from custody back into the community can lead to feeling overwhelmed, anxious and isolated (Hampson, 2016; Visher, 2007), if this is accompanied by the possibility of homelessness or inappropriate accommodation, it follows that the risk of reoffending is high (Bateman et al, 2013). Hence, it is important for the most appropriate accommodation to be provided, as well as to ensure that young people are clear and happy about their future destination. There is debate in the literature over the most appropriate form of accommodation for young people.
4.3.1 ‘Suitable’ accommodation and its lack of availability

In this project, as mentioned, in the absence of returning to the family home or LAC, supported accommodation was viewed as the most suitable housing solution for a young person leaving the secure estate. This is due to young people being unlikely to cope with living independently and those in the secure estate being highly vulnerable and having a range of complex needs:

“They were calling it the thickening of the soup at that time, because numbers were reduced in coming through to the youth justice system because of our prevention strategies, so less young people coming through the court. What was left was, and is, a cohort of young people who present with very complex needs.’ (LSYOT2)

As explained above, the lack of (and continuing reductions in) suitable supported accommodation, however, was a finding that all stakeholders recognised as a significant barrier to successful resettlement. The focus group participants agreed with this finding:

‘Another issue also is that some people were saying that the right type of service and accommodation just isn’t there. That some of the chaotic lifestyles and the challenging behaviour people have, some of these young people have, there’s no-one who can deal with it really. I’ve had a few people who have said that it was just too difficult.’ (Focus group, SS9)

The other challenge related to the suitability of the supported accommodation. The focus group also reflected on the nature of suitable accommodation:

‘[…] we are looking at trauma informed practice, it says you can’t just work with that person and give them two hours of trauma informed work a week, they’ve got to go into a trauma informed context […] where all of the workers who are
supporting them are aware of ACEs or trauma informed practice. These young people are the most difficult at times to manage, for various reasons, you need very skilled staff, you need the right type of accommodation. It’s not idea putting them in accommodation with a lot of other people with very similar issues. It’s a long-term situation, it’s not quick win situation [...] I think this is the big challenge really. It’s having the stock, having it available on time, having the staff trained, having the right type of accommodation in the right place, because sometimes accommodation projects are way out of the nearest town and they can’t get the bus, they can’t [...] There are so many issues around routine, having the discipline, the drive, being frightened. Because no young person will say, do you know what I’m actually too frightened, I haven’t got the confidence to do this. They won’t say that, they’ll just say, I’m not f-ing doing it or whatever, because I don’t want to. But we know behind that actually they’re very frightened.’ (Focus group, SS5)

These complexities pose significant challenges for accommodation providers and there was a majority view that, although this is a small group, these young people require intensive wraparound support to accompany their accommodation, as a local stakeholder pointed out:

‘It’s a bit like saying, when you see a rough sleeper in the street, they need a house. It ain’t as simple as that, there’s lots of complexities that you need to work around. We come back to the fact that there’s the ACE agenda, there’s mental health, there’s substance misuse sometimes. Just to assume that they can go into a house and they can pay this, they can do that, it’ll all be [...] It’s not going to happen.’ (LSH3)

The senior stakeholders in the focus group also reflected on the view that accommodation should emulate family life:

‘I think that probably the most successful accommodation is that accommodation that does try and emulate aspects of family life, because everyone wants to belong somewhere [...] can think of accommodation projects where there was
24/7, at least two members of staff on, some are there overnight, small unit. Christmas dinner you cook together, there’d be a buffet for New Year, they’d be doing all of the Easter. Any type of interest, cross-religious stuff, that would be done, and I think it’s the onward journey for young people […] If they’ve come from a really difficult background for whatever reason and they do get some sort of stability in there, a really good accommodation project where they’re able to celebrate key things, they take part in maybe cooking a Christmas dinner or making the pancakes, because they might not know how to make a pancake. These sort of things, how to use a washing machine… they’re going to be far better placed when they go on to have their own families because they will actually be able to make a contribution, and it’s the long-term journey really is what you’ve got to have your eye on as well. It’s not the short-term stuff.’ (Focus group, SS8)

The focus group struggled with the question of from where funding for further placements could come. One suggested:

‘It’s either about pooling budgets or top-slicing budgets, or doing something differently with the funding to say, actually this is everybody’s responsibility and therefore… In a sense it feels like you’re making another grant stream and that’s not what I’m advocating. But somehow […] It’s like Housing First, this is actually the responsibility of a whole host of agencies, and therefore you all actually need to put your hand in your pocket for this one, and we’ll fund it out of that.’ (Focus group, SS)

### 4.3.2 Bed and Breakfast accommodation

Research has shown placing young people in B&Bs increases the risk of reoffending and to the individuals (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016). The Pathway does not deem B&B accommodation to be suitable for children/young people unless it is a last resort (Welsh Government, 2015a; 2016). It was, however, still being used at the time of data collection. This is demonstrated by the interviews with stakeholders and the fact that it was the fifth most frequently selected answer
when stakeholders in the online survey were asked about the most frequently used reasonable steps (as shown in Table 4.2 above). Moreover, the suitability of B&B was defended by some stakeholders.

As discussed above, most stakeholders agreed that it was rare for a young person to not have any accommodation in place on their day of release and, as mentioned, it was claimed by all interviewees that a young person would never be allowed to sleep rough or sofa surf. However, local stakeholders in all but one local authority explained that in emergency situations they may use B&B accommodation. All local stakeholders acknowledged that B&B is not suitable for young people, however they argued that when faced with a choice over a young person not having a roof over their head on the day of release or B&B, then the use of B&B was justifiable:

‘If there was a young person that was being released from custody and we had a housing referral, they were 16/17, we were aware they were coming out on a certain day, we would provide accommodation for them somewhere. Hopefully it would be securing a room in supported accommodation but if there was nothing then they’d get a bed and breakfast somewhere until they could find somewhere in supported accommodation.’ (LSH6)

Three reasons were provided by stakeholders as to why B&B is an unsuitable housing option for young people: (1) It is typically unsupported accommodation meaning there is nobody to monitor or support the young person closely; (2) there can be adults living in a B&B who might pull a young person back into offending behaviour, substance use or increase their vulnerability in some other way; and (3) the stakeholders do not always know who is living in a B&B which causes difficulties for ensuring a young person is safe:

‘I suppose, with a B&B for example, they’re left in a B&B but all sorts of other offenders, adult offenders or whatever, and with no support there it’s not really the perfect way of resettling the young people back into the community [...] I don’t think B&B, just being left alone in the middle of nowhere sometimes, it’s not
areas which they’re maybe familiar with, so quite often they make connections with those in there and it’s not always the most positive steps, I don’t think.’ (LSTS4)

However, everyone stated that if a young person was placed in a B&B, they would be monitored as closely as possible and every effort would be made to move them into more suitable accommodation as soon as possible. In one local authority, several stakeholders explained that they often used a specific B&B to accommodate young people because they had a close and positive working relationship with the proprietor who diligently monitored and supported young people living there. This demonstrates that there can be variability in the form that a B&B takes, with some being more supportive and safer than others.

Another reason given to justify the use of B&B in some cases was that it was preferable than being allocated supported accommodation that was far away from their support networks:

‘[…] when we are saying, there's a placement in Shropshire for you to come out to, because that's the only vacancy that's available, young people don’t want that […] if we’re being led by that young person, then it is very difficult then, because other agencies are saying to us, it’s not appropriate, you’ve got them in a bed and breakfast, that's not appropriate. Whilst it isn’t appropriate, the difference is, it’s best for the young person because the bed and breakfast is down the road and facilitates their family and friends and isn’t a long-term option, as opposed to us saying, we'll stick you 100 miles away.’ (LSCS5)

Hence, the continued use of B&B, as a last resort, is likely to reflect the shortages in supported accommodation.

A number of the senior stakeholder participants in the focus group also pointed out that there are differences in the quality of B&Bs and some provide superior care:
'There is one [...] where the landlady is almost like a parent, so [a specific local authority] have got one where they know that actually [...] and in fact they feel they're doing a disservice to this landlady because they're using her as a B&B, and actually she's got [a friendly] service much more like a [supported accommodation].' (Focus group, SS6)

'Yes, because that's what you're describing actually is supported lodgings where you've got the person onsite who actually has a caring relationship. I've known foster carers who have told young people they've got to be out the house all day while they're in work. That to my mind isn't fostering, but that happens, they don't want young people in their house. If you're just, that scenario described, I don't think anyone could argue with that, because it’s about care and quality and relationships isn’t it, and that's different.' (Focus group, SS8)

What followed was a discussion of how high-quality B&B accommodation could be brought into the fold of supported accommodation: ‘[…] it’s like, don't just chuck the baby out with the bathwater completely, although in a sense it’s how do we bring that type of B&B accommodation more into the fold of supported lodgings?’ (Focus group, SS6)

The senior stakeholders concluded that it is a possible but difficult task. The proprietor needs to be willing to be contracted to undertake the additional tasks associated with supported accommodation rather than complete them in line with their choosing. Despite these justifications, in general, the consensus was that B&B should not be used to accommodate young people, and is rarely used, but is occasionally warranted when the alternative is having nowhere else to go. It was also generally recognised that the use of B&B for young people has substantially fallen in recent years.
4.3.3 Other ‘unsuitable’ accommodation

In addition to B&Bs, stakeholders explained that sometimes they had to use other forms of accommodation that, while they were safe, were not the most suitable for meeting a young person’s needs. Examples of this included supported accommodation for adults, family accommodation, or placement in larger hostels (where it was felt that a young person would be better suited to smaller premises):

‘Sometimes we have to place young people – if it’s an emergency and we haven’t been able to facilitate it – into family accommodation. I wouldn’t say that wasn’t appropriate; the support they get there would not necessarily be the best – not the best; the support they get would not be tailored to young people. However, it would be safe, and they would have 24-hour staff covering the service, and they would be there temporarily until accommodation became available in the young person’s pathway.’ (LSH1)

Finally, although the dominant view was that the partnerships between children’s services and YOTs were positive, there was some evidence of tensions between the agencies if children’s services planned to place a young person in unsuitable accommodation. One local stakeholder described that they often had to ‘nag’ and ‘resist’ when children’s services devised a plan that involved B&B, with the stakeholder describing the situation as ‘unacceptable’ and taking credit for blocking such plans (LSSE3). Another children’s services stakeholder confirmed this tension and felt that they were sometimes viewed unfairly as the lack of suitable accommodation was often out of their control:

‘[…] it sometimes feels as if YOT thinks that we’re sometimes being obstructive or not planning, whereas sometimes that is just out of our control, and that is generally about a vacancy situation.’ (LSCS5)
This discussion of what constitutes suitable accommodation reflects the risk that if the accommodation is not deemed appropriate by the young person themselves, they will, as put by a senior stakeholder in the focus group, ‘vote with his feet’. It is unlikely that requiring a person to reside at the address would be a license condition, as sentencers try to avoid conditions which can be easily breached. This comment made by two respondents in the survey that, while occasionally, young people were released with no accommodation, more often young people were released into unsuitable accommodation and consequently ended up with nowhere to go: ‘It has occasionally happened, however more likely to be released into unsuitable accommodation, which can quickly breakdown and then may end up sofa surfing etc’ (OSS3).

4.3.4 Disadvantaged groups of young people

The local stakeholders identified two groups of young people who remain particularly disadvantaged in the current system: (1) those who have been placed in establishments far from their homes; and (2) those who are labelled as ‘high risk’ due to the nature of their offence and complex support needs. The first issue is the product of a larger structural process of reducing the number of secure establishments in Wales meaning Welsh young people may be placed in establishments in England. Young people from north Wales are disproportionately affected as the two secure establishments in Wales are situated in south Wales. This means that those from north Wales are placed in a secure establishment either in England or in south Wales. Although the broader approach of diverting young people from custody has meant that this issue has decreased in scale, stakeholders identified several drawbacks for young people of being in custody far away from their hometowns. These included: difficulties in maintaining family connections; difficulties in stakeholders visiting young people in custody; language and cultural barriers; and support agencies being less familiar with each other’s work. The family connection was of significance given that returning to the family home upon release was typically the most desirable housing option:
‘It’s not an issue now at this particular moment. But, in terms of accommodation, if they’re placed out of county or wherever and family contact can’t happen, that could have a knock-on effect to accommodation. So we always argue about keeping young people as close as possible, to keep that contact.’ (LSYOT4)

The second group of young people – those described as ‘high risk’ – were viewed as being highly difficult to accommodate. Stakeholders agreed that if a young person had committed a sexual offence or arson, their housing options upon release were extremely limited because most supported and temporary accommodation providers would refuse to accommodate them due to safety concerns:

‘It’s just housing. They’re very reluctant to work with people who are high risk. It is something that is being looked into at the moment but yes, it is a struggle trying to get someone into supported housing who has got an offending background or are high risk. A lot of providers would be reluctant to do an assessment before the person is released because then they would carry a void until that person came out.’ (LSH9)

Accommodation providers were described as ‘risk averse’ and although many stakeholders understood their reluctance to accommodate high-risk young people, this caused frustration because it left them with very few options but an ongoing duty to find somewhere for them to live. Further frustration was created due to accommodation providers making these decisions based on narrow criteria, such as a person’s offence, rather than considering improvements the young person had made while in custody. This was linked to the fact that most accommodation providers and housing options staff did not meet with a young person face-to-face while in custody but gained their knowledge through reading about them in assessment documents. It was felt by some that face-to-face meetings may be more effective in helping housing stakeholders to gain a fuller picture of the young person:
‘[…] obviously these children come with a lot of baggage, and sometimes when you read maybe some information on the child, lots of placements are reluctant to take them, and they don’t always consider any changes they’ve made within secure, and they’re not always updated. It does become a bit of a barrier, so sometimes you get children leaving [custody] and not knowing where they’re going to live maybe two or three days before.’ (LSSE6)

In these cases, independent housing with an intense package of wraparound support was often the only and, perhaps, the most appropriate solution:

‘[…] the accommodation providers we had couldn’t manage anywhere near the level of risk he presented because he was convicted of an arson offence as well […] So that’s took quite a lot of liaising between local authority, housing, ourselves, probation and trying to come up with quite a bespoke package of support around him really. We got [fire safety] involved and we worked quite closely with a provider who was most suitable to put in the biggest package we could put around him’. (LSYOT9)

4.5 Engagement with Young People

The resettlement literature emphasises the importance of engagement and collaboration with users. Users should see the development of a plan as a collaborative endeavour into which they have input into the services that they receive and outcomes for which they are aiming (Malloch et al, 2013; Hart and Thompson, 2009). Mason and Prior (2008) argue that the building of successful relationships requires highly skilled practitioners able to: demonstrate empathy; show respect; exhibit a commitment to social justice that recognises the social and material hardship the young person may have endured; promote individual responsibility for actions and behaviour; and involve the young person in planning for their future.
The sections above have dealt with young people’s participation in reception meetings and monthly reviews. The interviews with young people also considered their involvement with the completion of paperwork/forms and the extent to which they were aware of their destination accommodation and whether they had had the opportunity to visit it.

4.5.1 Paperwork/forms

No young people could recall completing any paperwork/forms on this with anyone, and all said they would like to see the forms completed about them, as shown in the extract from this interview:

‘Interviewer: You're going back to where you've come from anyway. So have you or your caseworker or any other person filled out any forms relating to your housing situation?

Gregor: No.

Interviewer: So you haven't seen any forms that have been written about you and your housing?

Gregor: No.

Interviewer: If there are forms about you and your housing, would you have liked to have been able to see them?

Gregor: Yes, because I'm in the middle of trying to get access.’

4.5.2 Keeping young people informed of destination accommodation

There are rare instances when young people are not informed of where they are going to be accommodated prior to release. This is despite intense efforts by local, key workers and senior staff, such as weekly meetings of heads of services, thinking broadly about accommodation options including a caravan park. Most often, young people are told but ‘it all seems to be last minute’. This finding was reflected on by the senior stakeholder focus group:
‘I’ve had examples fed back to me where this young person has come in homeless into my organisation, and the feedback from the young person is, well they always knew that they were never going home and they always knew their parents were never going to take them back, and they always knew they couldn’t go to their auntie or their uncle, but other people seem to think that would happen. So the young person was always very anxious and worried because they were absolutely clear that was never going to happen, and yet the people working with them and around them seemed to be saying, yes, I’ve spoken to so and so...’ (Focus group, SS2)

Local stakeholders did agree that it was important that young people were kept informed and empathised with what the young people must be feeling:

‘If you’re going to then say to them, two, three, four, five days before, you’re going to be moving to the next town over or even miles and miles away but we don’t know who you’re going to be living with, where the local bus stop is, that is completely overwhelming for a child. They get very anxious. As we see from their offending, if they’re anxious, angry, upset, that is going to lead towards more antisocial behaviour and absconding because they want to go back to where they belong, even if they’re returning to their local town, just a different area, that’s really nerve-racking for a child to have to go to live with new strangers or to supported living for the first time, if they’ve never lived semi independently.’ (LSSE3)

### 4.5.3 Pre-release accommodation visits

None of the young people interviewed had had the chance to visit accommodation but said they would have liked to visit it. Not only from knowing in advance where they will be accommodated, but also having an opportunity to visit this accommodation prior to release would increase the young people’s sense of engagement in the process and allay anxieties. The senior stakeholder focus group agreed that this never happened, although they did think it could be possible by, for example, using ROTL with the individual governor’s permission. At the moment this
is rarely used and where it is used it is for young people returning to the family home or who will be taking up employment upon release. However, they also recognised that, with the tight time frames involved, where there are difficulties in ‘holding’ accommodation, arranging a pre-release accommodation visit would be practically very difficult.

Overall, stakeholders were more positive about homelessness services than young people were. Young people were roughly split in half in terms of being happy and unhappy with their experience. One young person was very anxious that his release date was approaching and said that he had not been able to speak to anyone about his destination, despite his persistent requests.

4.6 The Relationship between Partners

It is argued in the resettlement literature that partnership working and co-ordination is key to ensuring that young people have access to the services that they require while in detention and after they are released (Youth Justice Board, 2006; 2010; Carney and Buttell, 2003; Hazel et al, 2010b). This argument is based on the fact that individual partners will not be able to cater for the broad range of needs of young people alone.

Among the national stakeholders, the role of children’s services was seen as critical, but some questioned the latter’s degree of commitment to partnership working or their readiness to regard custody cases as high priority. However, two national stakeholders argued that they sometimes acted as effective advocates with housing.

‘We still get issues between children’s services and housing options in some areas […] Mainly it’s to do with who’s got the duty to accommodate young people, that seems to be the main issue […] I think that housing options teams are better at finding good housing outcomes for 16 and 17 year olds mainly. If you look at the B&B figures…’ (NS7).
‘I think it’s a vital role. I do see them acting as advocates for young people to ensure that a young person has their needs met. They are very good at that, thus sometimes having challenging meetings with housing and ourselves’ (NS3).

Children’s services considered that their relationship was good with other partners, as expressed in this view from a head of children’s services:

‘YOT is part of children’s services for me […] So the role is how we continue to manage and support young people through the YOT […] Children who have been in the secure estate almost inevitably have a degree of vulnerability that would suggest they need wider services from children’s services and beyond the YOT […] We have a very good relationship with housing, which is really strong’ (NS18).

4.6.1 Ownership of the duty and the leading agency

As well as there being mixed evidence concerning timeliness with which housing referrals were made to the local authority, there were also different understandings of which agency was ultimately responsible, i.e. owned the duty to the young person. Due to overlapping legislation, a 16-17 year old in custody is eligible to be owed a duty by both children’s services and housing options. However, the circumstances that determine which duty is owed are complex and highly dependent on the young person and the availability of accommodation.

There were inconsistencies in stakeholders’ explanations of how children’s services and housing work together. Several stakeholders argued that children’s services are responsible for all young people in the Pathway (which is what the Pathway stipulates) and, therefore, the role of housing is to assist children’s services in securing accommodation. Given that children’s services commission supported lodgings and foster placements, a young person in custody may be placed there upon release, or they may be placed in temporary or supported accommodation, or
in independent living, facilitated by the local authority housing department. One housing stakeholder indicated that there could be instances in which a housing referral is not made because children’s services have been able to source accommodation; yet it also appeared to be the expectation that there was a high likelihood of a referral being made due to the accommodation and the need to try and find the most suitable housing solution:

‘Then [in custody] it’s about collating that [housing information], making the appropriate referral to children’s services ready for that release, so that children’s services can explore any particular accommodation options that they may have for that individual […] Alternatively, then it’s to explore avenues where appropriate with things like supported lodgings or referrals into supported housing with risk assessments etc., being collated from any offender manager who’s going to be attached to that individual to potentially try and arrange for assessments to be undertaken whilst that individual is in custody for those pathways, so that we are avoiding delays. A referral to us as the housing provider, if that individual has demonstrated an ability to manage an independent tenancy or where an accommodation option isn’t likely to be identified upon their release, and therefore risk management plans, social services planning, information should be shared with us so that we can work with both the allocated youth offender officer and the social worker to agree what the best housing accommodation is for that young person upon release’. (LSH5)

However, some stakeholders seemed to indicate that children’s services only had a duty to accommodate those young people who had previously been in local authority care:

‘Again for 16/17 year olds if it’s a Youth Justice Board young person, or YOT young person we would also look at what their entitlements are financially when they leave. So if they’ve been in local authority care for 13 weeks from the age of 14 up to 16 then social services have got within the local authority of the YJB, they’ve got a duty of care as well so it’s full accommodation, they can have that support. If they haven’t then it’s just working with that local authority to get that
accommodation with them. Again this is suitable accommodation but that would be more pulled in on the resettlement panels externally but it would be the local authority who would be the main driver on that.’ (LSSE1)

Yet other stakeholders explained that the decision over which agency owes a duty can depend on the young person’s own preferences. Given the age group of the young people, it was stated that often a young person no longer wants to have social services involvement, in which case their preference is to be owed a housing duty:

‘Some of the biggest challenges is that we have scenarios where the young person doesn’t really want support as a care leaver, but actually just wants accommodation. So then we do refer the issue into housing, but actually housing then can’t find anything suitable for the young person. It then almost feels as though we try our best to support that person as best we can, because they don’t have anything available within housing, because we don’t obviously want the young person to be homeless […] but actually it is housing’s responsibility. The challenge really for us is that housing don’t seem to have enough suitable accommodation for prison leavers who are leaving the secure estate.’ (LSCS4)

The fact that different agencies may be ultimately responsible was reflected in the stakeholder survey results too (see Table 4.3), although, interestingly, the YOT was most often designated as the leading agency.

Table 4.3: Which is the leading agency in practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOT</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stakeholder survey, total N= 41
Overall, there was a lack of clarity among stakeholders over which organisation was ultimately responsible for a young offender with housing issues, and in relation to different categories of young person e.g. whether they were on remand or in custody, whether they had been looked after prior to entering custody, their age. As a youth justice participant in the senior stakeholder focus group explained:

‘I think there are different responsibilities in that, and I think it’s very difficult for it to be the responsibility of a single agency because you’ve got to look at the legislative routes that could apply to young people depending on whether they’ve been a look after child or a 16 or 17 year old who’s encountering an accommodation difficulty for the first time. So I think the single ownership thing for me is a bit problematic […] in terms of rolling it out then, ideally you want everybody together to jointly own it.’ (Focus group, SS7)

Added to this, local arrangements also varied between different local authority areas. Different local social services have different thresholds of vulnerability and treat a young person’s wishes to become involved or not with social services differently. However, the problem with joint ownership is there a risk that a young person can end up unsupported. As pointed out by two senior stakeholders in the focus group:

‘…what happens on the ground then is that duty of care to that 16, housing duty of care is you put that 16 year old in a massive hostel, and you’ve released your duty and then there is no support put in under it. So you’ve actually got away with your responsibility, and I think what we’re trying to do here is clarify absolutely that unless it’s proven that they’re not vulnerable they are vulnerable, and it’s not just because, again if it’s a priority need in housing that often ends up with a very untenable experience as you know’ (Focus group, SS)

‘I think the confusion comes from how social services are now set up under the Social Services and Wellbeing Act legislation, it’s very much about trying to keep people out of social services. I hear what you’re saying about these are people
who are vulnerable, that doesn’t necessarily mean they hit the threshold for local authority Social Services.’ (Focus group, SS)

4.6.2 Multi-agency structures

Beyond Youth Custody (2017) refers to multi agency case reviews as an innovation in youth resettlement. In some authorities, there are now single-points-of-entry referral systems for housing which enables one team to have an overview of all accommodation providers and their vacancies. In other local authorities, there are multi-agency teams of social workers, drug workers, health advisors and housing advisors located in the same building to create a support hub. Resettlement Panels or Reintegration and Resettlement Partnerships are also in operation in some areas.

There were mixed views on these Resettlement Panels. Generally, local stakeholders were more likely to view them as more useful than national stakeholders, particularly if there was a difficulty around a specific young person. One stakeholder in the survey explained:

‘[A specific area] has a R&R Panel every 6 weeks – Resettlement and Reintegration panel – YOT, education, housing, SS, health all sit together and discuss any cases that may be in custody/at threat of custody or in very early stages of offending – works very well.’ (OSS4)

One housing stakeholder in the local stakeholder interviews described the evolution of the Resettlement Panel in their area. Initially all cases of young people in the secure estate were discussed at panel meetings, even if there were no problems. The stakeholder explained that this felt like a waste of people’s time, whereas now, cases are only discussed where a problem exists. This was viewed as a much more effective approach. Another local stakeholder from the secure estate described the value of Resettlement Panels as being effective for holding people to account:
‘I suppose in terms of that hard-to-place child, it’s the resettlement panels that the housing providers are sat at. If it was me, we’d discuss my case, so it’s like, difficult case to place. You don’t want him, you don’t want him, you don’t want him. What are we going to do here, because this child is coming out regardless of who doesn’t want him, how are we going to resolve the issues and where are we going to find the appropriate placement? […] I guess what happens is, people are getting held to account for what they say. If you say you’re going to give me some housing, you’re held to account for that now by this panel.’ (LSSE5)

In contrast, according to the national stakeholders, resettlement panels have either been discontinued or appeared to be limping along, badly attended, in several areas. Quite a few interviewees also knew very little about them or their purpose. It was also said that they were unsure to what extent they should be strategic and to what extent operational while two respondents also saw them as creating a risk of duplication.

‘NS13: ‘I’ve always had quite a negative view of resettlement panels.
Interviewer: Why?
NS13: Because I always felt that it was another process or another link put in the chain that was being dealt with effectively elsewhere.’

‘Attendance at boards has been dire, I understand, across Wales’ (NS14)

Formal multi-agency structures did not exist in all areas, although there was sometimes an appetite for one. As explained by one national stakeholder:

‘What I think works really well, and this works in the adult estate and I’m certain this would work well with young people, is a multi-agency case conference type approach. So prior to somebody coming out all the agencies would get together […] That should be overseen by the offender manager […] but all the agencies involved with that young person coming together round the table’ (NS4).
While information sharing and partnership working was, overall, discussed positively with recognition that significant improvements have been made, from the housing stakeholders' perspectives, further improvement is needed in relation to the consistency with which referrals are made and the timeliness of these.

4.7 Handover from the Youth to the Adult Pathway

Most stakeholders reported that they were unaware of a handover process. This YOT interviewee, however, stated that significant improvements have taken place in recent years to ensure a more supported transition, although the process could perhaps benefit from further clarity in stating who should oversee this process:

‘One of the big issues with the changes in probation at the moment is that, who does that coordinating? Who’s the offender manager that sees that journey through from […] and for us, it’s the case manager within the YOT, but it’ll be joint working with, if there’s a transition period, a young person is going into young adulthood crossing the line to 18, then we would do that with a seconded probation officer for instance. If we need to, if need suggests we should, then we would remain the supervising officer with that young person for a good while longer after the 18th birthday. So a transition would take place, not exactly on 18th birthday as it used to do years ago where they’d be off the cliff and into probation, that's done now in a more much planned and efficient way so that there’s hopefully a more positive outcome. Then there will be a transition process taking place, but when the young person is ready. So joint working in that respect is massively improved to what it used to be.’ (LSYOT2)

These improvements appear to have been made due to problems in the past in which young people who were suddenly moved into adult facilities did so in an unplanned manner which, for some, significantly increased their vulnerability. This stakeholder did not know the details of how a transition in the Pathway would occur but based on this quote, joint working appears to be crucial.
Two survey respondents referred to the Youth to Adult transition pathway to probation services and four further respondents referred to the YOT playing a central role in the transition process. One of the former respondents also referred to personal advisors remaining in place for care leavers.

4.8 Impact of the Pathway

Relatively few national stakeholders identified changes in practice that had come about as a result of the Pathway. Some identified changes but were unsure if they were the result of the Pathway or of other developments (e.g. the dramatic drop in numbers in custody). As knowledge was limited about the pathway, interviewees found it difficult to quantify changes resulting from it (and some said specifically that changes could be attributed to other factors). Where interviewees could articulate changes, those most commonly identified were improvements in communication and joint working between agencies, more engagement from local authorities, and a drop in the use of B&Bs. Very few changes in procedure were identified. Around a third referred to improvements in communication/partnership/engagement from other agencies, as demonstrated in the following quotes: ‘It has brought local authorities to the table’ (NS10); ‘We’ve always had a fairly good relationship with our housing department, but I think that’s improved […] There’s increased communication’ (NS3). The local stakeholders found it easier to discuss the impact of the Pathway. Most local stakeholder interviewees highlighted the need to tackle youth homelessness and reoffending, while others argued it was to streamline the process for young people leaving the secure estate and being accommodated. This was based on a recognition that criminal justice, social services and housing processes were not always joined up and there was a greater need for a coordinated multi-agency approach:

‘My understanding is that there would be more of a multi-agency approach prior to that individual’s release from custody, so that all agencies were aware of what was available to that individual, what was best suited to that individual, so that information could be shared. That the individual was also aware upon release of what needed to happen and, where possible, accommodation options could be
identified prior to release – and appropriate support services attached to that individual ready for release.’ (LSH5)

Relatively, several local stakeholders felt that the biggest benefit of the Pathway, and the reason for its introduction, is that it sets out the responsibilities of different agencies and, in turn, agencies can more effectively be held to account.

However, several stakeholders felt that the Pathway had not changed any aspect of their practice because it simply captured what was already happening. Thus, these stakeholders struggled to identify changes that the Pathway itself had caused. There were also mixed views on whether there had been a shift towards more of a ‘problem-solving’ or ‘person-centred’ approach. Some said no, some said yes, some did not know, and some said that there had been a problem-solving approach previously.

Few stakeholders felt able to state with confidence that it had made a measurable impact. The interviewer asked one national stakeholder: ‘Do we measure the hard outcomes that we’re required to under the Act?’, the reply being ‘I think that will just come in when we report to Supporting People. I know they all do them differently, don’t they?’ (NS3). Precise information to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Pathway was lacking, though some national stakeholders had noticed an absence or reduction in cases where concerns are raised about children leaving custody to unsuitable accommodation. It was also noted that with so few cases, statistics were unreliable. Third sector interviewees also made the point that huge amounts of work with complex and difficult individuals, and important progress in terms of their self-esteem and engagement with them, often went unrecorded.

4.8.1 Good practice

In addition to the positive impact on joint working identified above, stakeholder survey respondents identified as examples of good practice: inviting new partners to meetings; holding a temporary accommodation void open for a young person; and
having a dedicated young person’s temporary accommodation officer (see Table 4.4 below). One respondent went on to explain:

'[A particular local authority] have a dedicated young person’s housing officer that sits in with social services so information can be easily shared and we also hold a monthly meeting with multi agencies, including Police, Probation, GDAS, Social Landlords, Mental health and Council Housing officer so we can all look at each custody case and best advice and work together.’ (OSS5)

Table 4.4: Have you identified any good practice or innovation within or around the Pathway of young people? (Multiple response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Practice/Innovation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inviting partners to meetings they were not previously involved in</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding a void in temporary accommodation for a short time in readiness for a young person leaving the secure estate</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dedicated young person’s temporary accommodation officer</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes which link the young person with mental health support</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of joint paperwork for sharing – to avoid duplication</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No good practice or innovation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the allocation of cases system within a partner agency</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stakeholder survey, total N= 41, multiple responses permitted

4.8.2 Challenges and areas for improvement

Drawing on the sections above, the main challenges identified by the research participants were:

- there is a lack of awareness about the Pathway; most stakeholders had only a vague or general understanding of it
- there is some suggestion that housing referrals are still not always being made or not made in a timely fashion
• there is some suggestion that housing options staff require more detailed information about young people to inform their decisions than they receive (i.e. YOT/children’s services do not necessarily provide housing with full details of a young person’s situation when making a referral)

• there were concerns about supported housing services closing and that there is not enough supported accommodation (and specifically not enough supported accommodation willing to accommodate high risk young people)

• high-risk offenders (arson and sexual offences) are very difficult to find accommodation for because most accommodation providers will refuse to take them

• Welsh young people in English establishments suffer from problems around families and support workers being able to visit them easily: but this is not an issue specifically linked to the Pathway, it is part of a bigger problem of being placed in an establishment far away from home

• it is very difficult to hold a place ‘open’ in supported accommodation for a young person due for release, meaning that they do not always know where they will be accommodated until a few days before release

• some young people do not feel engaged, sufficiently involved in or informed about the process

• there were concerns about shrinking resources and the inadequate resourcing of services in general

• there is a perception that there is no standardised practice for young people turning 18.

Not many suggestions were made for additions or changes to the Pathway in the interviews. Among those mentioned by national stakeholders were enabling YOTs to make advance payments in order to hold beds for longer periods pre-release (although it was recognised by others that this sometimes happens). The suggestion to enable holding accommodation is demonstrated in this quote:
‘We’ve got a whole gamut of other children in need, there are not enough placements, nobody can hold voids, it costs money. That’s where YOTs could step up if the planning is right. Housing are involved, that void could be covered and paid for by the YOT a month maybe in advance’ (NS16).

The respondents in the stakeholder survey were also asked about areas for improvement. Reflecting the finding above that the lack of supported accommodation is the greatest barrier to implementing the Pathway, the most called for improvement was to increase the availability of supported accommodation, as shown in Table 4.5. Stakeholder survey respondents also suggested that training on the Pathway is required. This would be sensible in view of the findings above on the limited awareness of the Pathway and confusion over ownership of the duty.

National stakeholders also recommended more multi-agency case conferences for individual service users and basing advisors/advocates part-time in custody. Similarly, Madoc-Jones et al (2018) recommended increasing capacity to deliver the Pathway for adults through evolving joint working arrangements.

Respondents to the stakeholder survey also recommended a dedicated young person’s housing officer to oversee the implementation of the Pathway. As well as having the appropriate partners in place, the resettlement literature also discusses their co-ordination. Bateman et al (2013) suggest that, based on the literature, a partnership co-ordination (or ‘brokerage’) model is effective. In other words, each YOT should appoint a manager to champion resettlement and to act as the key contact for partners. Bateman et al (2013) further point to employing resettlement workers as partnership co-ordinators rather than caseworkers as an innovation in youth resettlement.

Mirroring the finding that young people wish to be kept informed, stakeholder survey respondents also advocated the development of a process to ensure that the young person knows in advance where they will be accommodated. Again, the
resettlement literature recommends involving the young person in planning for their future (Malloch et al, 2013; Hart and Thompson, 2009; Mason and Prior, 2008).

In terms of clarifying the ownership of the duty, the senior focus group supported the idea that a two-page summary of the Pathway should be produced, and that there be further work to promote and increase awareness of the Pathway.

Table 4.5: Which improvements (if any) would you recommend to the Pathway for young people and practice related to it? (Multiple response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More supported accommodation availability</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient supported accommodation that is accessible 24/7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide young person with emergency food for 24 hours after release</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process to ensure young person knows in advance where they will be accommodated</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on Pathway</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated young person’s housing officer to oversee Pathway</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve housing in pre-custody and reception stages of Pathway</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackle high rents in supported accommodation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a summary (simplified) version of the Pathway</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better communication between managers and frontline staff re. what</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a specialist accommodation centre for young people</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to/increase awareness of out of hours services</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clearer strategy is required for handover processes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal needs assessment and to be shared with third sector</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing office building between housing and children’s services</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating regional services to improve consistency and cope with a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No improvements required/no recommendations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stakeholder survey, total N= 41, multiple responses permitted
5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This final chapter summarises the key findings and sets out our recommendations. While the evaluation collected the views from a large number of strategic, managerial and frontline stakeholders, the sample of young people was small which may generate concerns about the generalisability of their views. However, the small number of interviews reflects the small size of the population of young people released from custody with housing issues. Moreover, despite the limited applicability of the Pathway, the population to which it relates is a group of vulnerable young people with complex needs who are at risk of re-offending. It is, therefore, important to give careful consideration to all findings and recommendations.

5.1 Key Findings

- There are low numbers of young people in the secure estate and even lower numbers being released with housing issues in Wales.
  - The number of young people attached to a Welsh YOT, serving a custodial sentence, is now just over a third of what it was in 2012 (Youth Justice Board, 2019a). There were 32 young people in custody in 2018 compared with 90 in 2012. Of these young people, only some will have a housing issue. We were able to identify eight in our study.
  - Stakeholders in our study attributed these low numbers to proactive efforts by those in youth justice to divert young people from custody. Therefore, although the low numbers posed challenges for this study, overall it should be interpreted positively.

- There is limited awareness of the Pathway among stakeholders.
  - This is partly due to its limited applicability of the Pathway, given the low number of young people being released from the secure with housing issues in Wales.
• The greatest gap in understanding appears to be with which agency the duty lies and the roles of children’s services and local authority housing departments.
  
  • Some stakeholders argued that children’s services have responsibility for meeting the accommodation needs of all young people leaving custody, others implied that they only have a duty for those who had looked after status prior to custody, while others indicated there is discretion around which agency holds the duty depending on the specific circumstances and preferences of an individual young person.

• Generally, the Pathway is being implemented as envisaged, although there are some challenges and areas for improvement.
  
  • During pre-custody, most stakeholders agreed that housing, care and support needs are identified and documented in the pre-sentence report.
  
  • YOTs did not always share pre-sentence reports with children’s services but there was uncertainty about whether it was appropriate for them to do so.
  
  • There was an overall consensus that planning for release began early in the process, often from reception into custody.
  
  • Young people serving short sentences or whose housing needs changed during custody posed challenges for stakeholders as they were working within very short timescales to ensure appropriate accommodation was in place for release.
  
  • Many local stakeholders argued that, for those in housing need, it was unrealistic to expect accommodation to be secured 66 days prior to release, although it was still useful to be notified of a young person in this situation.
  
  • YOT and children’s services stakeholders stated that referrals to local authority housing were always made on time, but housing stakeholders claimed that there were still cases (albeit rare) in which they only became aware of a young person in need on the day that they were released.
Some young people did not feel that they were involved with or kept informed of accommodation planning. None reported having been involved with or seeing any paperwork completed about their accommodation situation, nor having visited accommodation pre-release. A small number did not know where they were going to be accommodated upon release.

Some senior stakeholders thought pre-releases could be introduced, possibly using ROTL. However, they also recognised that the tight timeframes involved, where there are difficulties in ‘holding’ accommodation (considered below), arranging a pre-release accommodation visit would be practically very difficult.

Young people who are placed in secure establishments far from their hometowns or young people who are deemed to be ‘high risk’ due to the nature of their conviction or complexity of their needs are more disadvantaged than others with regard to ensuring appropriate accommodation and support upon release.

Those located far from their hometowns suffer from difficulties in maintaining family connections and stakeholders visiting them in the establishments.

Young people deemed ‘high risk’ often find themselves excluded from accessing supported accommodation, as providers are reluctant to accommodate them.

Supported accommodation and mediation were the two principal ‘reasonable steps’ considered by local authority housing departments for dealing with young people in custody threatened with homelessness.

The greatest barrier to the delivery of the Pathway is the lack of supported accommodation and problems in keeping supported accommodation placements open while awaiting a young person’s release.

Although the Pathway stipulates that a young person should be notified of where they will be accommodated at least 7 days prior to release, the
difficulties in securing a place in supported accommodation means that this
deadline is not always met.

- There is a mismatch between the 7-day deadline stipulated by the Pathway,
  and youth justice processes which require accommodation to be secured
  approximately one month prior to release so that there is sufficient time to
  organise additional support, education/employment placements and to satisfy
  licence conditions.

- Although stakeholders unanimously agreed that a young person would never
  be allowed to sofa surf or sleep rough upon release, occasionally young
  people are released without suitable accommodation, or they move into
  unsuitable accommodation which they quickly leave.

- Bed and Breakfast (B&B) accommodation is still being used in some areas.
  
  - Not all stakeholders agree that it should not be used, with some citing
    positive aspects.
  
  - This is in spite of the Pathway deeming B&B accommodation unsuitable
    unless it is a last resort (Welsh Government, 2015a; 2016). Research has
    shown B&B increases the risk of reoffending and the risks to young people
    (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation, 2016).
  
  - However, the continued use of B&B seems to reflect the shortage of
    supported accommodation, as it was often used as a last resort.

- There is a need for more supported accommodation, specifically accommodation
  that provides wrap-around, specialist support for these young people with complex
  needs.

  - Some senior stakeholders mooted ideas of partners pooling budgets to fund
    this, as well as bringing high-quality B&B accommodation into the fold of
    supported accommodation.

- The main impact of the Pathway was felt to be the development of closer
  relationships between partners and helping to ‘bring agencies to the table’.
• A small number of local stakeholders claimed that the main benefit of the Pathway is as a tool for holding other partners to account if they are perceived to not be fulfilling their obligations.

• That said, some of the stakeholders who were familiar with the Pathway, or who became familiar as a result of participating in the research, stated that the Pathway simply set out what was already being done.

In terms of future implementation, it was felt that structures to support multi-agency case reviews and a resettlement/housing broker would be useful developments. Moreover, there is currently no system in place to measure and monitor the impact of the Pathway.

5.2 Recommendations

5.2.1 Increase awareness of Pathway

• Awareness needs to be raised at both managerial and frontline level across all sectors.

• A two-page summary of the Pathway should be produced.

• All promotion and training should clarify organisations’ responsibilities relating to different categories of young people (i.e. where the duty lies).

• Any promotion and training should consider how to best engage and collaborate with young people. Madoc-Jones et al (2018) also recommended training staff in principle of good offender motivation and engagement.

5.2.2 Increase availability of ‘appropriate’ supported accommodation

5.2.3 Build on partnership working

• Consider co-locating agencies or basing individual caseworkers in partner agencies (e.g. a YOT worker in housing options or a housing officer in the YOT).
• Create or support multi-agency structures for case reviews (in line with resettlement literature – Beyond Youth Custody, 2017; Bateman et al, 2013).

5.2.4 Introduce a system of partnership co-ordination

• Given confusion over ownership of the duty/lack of lead agency, concerns over timeliness of referrals and potential to improve young people’s perception of engagement, pilot having a dedicated officer or resettlement/housing broker to oversee the Pathway from start to finish (also in line with resettlement literature – Beyond Youth Custody, 2017; Bateman et al, 2013).

• Monitor the timeliness of referrals (in line with Madoc-Jones et al’s (2018) recommendation for the adult Pathway) in a way that is sympathetic to the challenges created by the current timeframes.

5.2.5 Improve young people’s perception of engagement and collaboration

• Involve young people in completion of paperwork/forms.

• Always keep young people informed of destination accommodation.

• Lobby for pre-release accommodation visits (possibly through ROTL). Collaborative planning generally is also in line with the resettlement literature (Malloch et al, 2013; Hart and Thompson, 2009; Mason and Prior, 2008).

5.2.6 Develop and promote a system for measuring and monitoring the impact of the Pathway
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Annex 1: Accommodation Support (Young People) (Welsh Government, 2015a)
Accommodation Support at Pre-Custody Stage (Young People)

Young person enters criminal justice system

Young Person is convicted

Young Person sentenced to custody

Pre-sentence report completed

Forward 'placement information' to the Youth Justice Board's placement service

Young person's length of sentence will result in less than 66 days in custody (ie, DTO)

Local Authority accepts a duty under the Housing (Wales) Act 2014?

No further action at this time but details logged

If housing need identified referral made to Local Authority

COMPLETE LA JOINT ASSESSMENT*

Yes

Applicant is in a priority need category or the LHA suspects the applicant is in a priority need category

Yes

INTERIM DUTY: Secure suitable accommodation is available on release (66)

No

Yes

No

Person meets the conditions for further support (ie young person is homeless)

Yes

RELIEF DUTY: To secure or help to secure the availability of accommodation (73)

No

Duty no longer applies

Outcome of duty: Is Authority satisfied there is reasonable prospect accommodation will be or remain available for 6 months following release

Yes

SUCCESS: applicant housed

No

‘FINAL’ DUTY: Duty to secure accommodation (75)

‘PREVENTION’ DUTY: To help to prevent and applicant from becoming homeless (66)

Yes

SUCCESS: previous accommodation is released or retained for occupation or occupation on release

No

Yes

No

Outcome of duty: Is Authority satisfied there is reasonable prospect accommodation will be or remain available for 6 months following release

Duty no longer applies

Following inquiries, applicant is established as priority need and unintentional homeless (subject to local decisions on intentional homelessness (s.78))

Yes

No

Duty no longer applies
Annex 2: Research Instruments

- Local stakeholder – housing stakeholders – interview schedule
- Local stakeholder – YOT, children’s services and other non-housing stakeholders – interview schedule
- National stakeholder interview schedule
- Online stakeholder questionnaire
- Young person in custody interview schedule
- Young person in the community interview schedule
- Topic guide for case studies
- Topic guide stakeholder focus group
Local stakeholder – housing stakeholders – interview schedule

Section 1: Questions about you

1. Please briefly describe your job role

2. How long have you been working in your present job?

3. In what capacity does your organisation work with young people from the secure estate in housing need?

Section 2: Involvement and understanding of the Pathway

[Action: read out the following statement:]

The National Pathway for Homelessness Services to Children, Young People and Adults in the Secure Estate was developed by the Welsh Government, and commenced in 2015, to ensure that people in prison have equal access to the legal duties that are owed by local authorities under the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 to help to prevent or relieve homelessness. The desired outcome is that no one should be homeless upon leaving prison. The Pathway is divided into two strands – one for adults and one for children/young people. We are evaluating the Pathway for young people only and so we ask that you try to answer the questions as they relate to young people.

[Optional question]

4. Did you have any involvement in the development of the National Pathway for Children, Young People and Adults Leaving the Secure Estate (e.g. member of the Prisoner Accommodation and Resettlement Working Group, etc)?
   a. Please describe your involvement

5. What is your understanding of why the Welsh Government felt a need to develop the ‘The National Pathway’ for young people?
   a. Do you think the Pathway is necessary? Please explain your answer
   b. What would happen if the Pathway had not been created?

6. What is your current (or recent) involvement with delivery of ‘The National Pathway’ specifically in relation to working with young people?
   [Prompt: tease out if involvement is general (adults and young people) or if specific to young people]

7. Please will you talk me through what you understand the Pathway for young people involves?
   a. What are the main elements of the Pathway?
   b. Do you know which agency is responsible for which stage of the Pathway? If so, please talk me through this? If not, please would you talk me through any confusion
   c. Please describe the role of children’s services in delivering the Pathway
      i. At which stages are they involved?
      ii. What is working well with regard to their input?
      iii. What needs improvement?

8. Are there any aspects of the Pathway which are unclear or which you do not fully understand?
a. Please expand on your answer  
b. Do you think this is due to the Pathway itself being unclear or is it because you need to develop your own understanding of it?

**Section 3: Changes that have occurred due to the Pathway**

9. Since the Pathway came into effect in 2015, have there been changes to services for young people leaving the secure estate who might be facing homelessness? If so, what changes have there been?  
   a. What new practices have been developed?  
   b. What new services have been developed?  
   c. What new partnerships have been developed?  
   d. What new paperwork has been developed?  
   e. Or are all, or some, of these aspects the same as before the Pathway was implemented?

10. Have these new services/practices/partnerships been working well or not so well?  
   a. What has been working well?  
   b. What have been the challenges?  
   c. What do you think needs to be improved?

11. What changes (if any) have been implemented to how agencies communicate and share information with each other?  
   a. Have these improved or hampered the extent to which services share information?  
   Please expand on your answer.

12. The Pathway recommends that a joint needs assessment is completed to identify housing and care/health needs. This should be submitted to the local authority as part of a housing referral.  
   a. To what extent are joint needs assessments being made and passed on the local authority housing?  
   b. Who is responsible for this?  
   c. What is working well with regard to joint needs assessments?  
   d. What needs improvement

13. What changes (if any) have you had to make in your own day-to-day practice to ensure that the Pathway is being implemented?

14. What changes (if any) have been made to staffing and workload in your organisation to ensure that there is sufficient staff capacity to implement the Pathway?

**Section 4: Specific details about the Pathway**

15. When a young person is owed a duty to prevent or relieve homelessness, the local authority needs to take ‘reasonable steps’ to achieve these aims. What is your understanding of what these ‘reasonable steps’ might be?  
   a. In practice, what are the most commonly used ‘reasonable steps’ for young people who are in custody?  
   b. Why are these ‘reasonable steps’ the most common? Why are other activities / ‘reasonable steps’ not considered or less common?  
   c. What are some of the practical difficulties in carrying out ‘reasonable steps’?  
   d. Are there any activities that are carried out under the term ‘reasonable steps’ specifically for young people in custody that are not contained in FLASHCARD 1?  
   e. Does the nature of the ‘reasonable steps’ change when a young person is released from custody? Please talk me through your answer.
16. One of the aims of the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 and the Pathway is for local authorities to move from a ‘processing’ to a ‘problem-solving’ approach when working with young people who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. Thinking about young people in custody, to what extent do you think this has happened?

To what extent are a young person in custody’s specific circumstances being taken into account when decisions are made about what should happen to prevent or relieve their homelessness?

17. Given that the majority of young people will be in ‘priority need’, to what extent are ‘reasonable steps’ being considered before moving to a Section 75 duty to provide them with settled accommodation?

Section 5: Stages in the Pathway

[Action: show FLASHCARD 2 which briefly outlines the four stages of the Pathway for young people. Note that there is no ‘pre-custody’ stage for adults.]

RESETTLEMENT

18. How effective is the work carried out during the resettlement stage of the Pathway in identifying and addressing housing need/homelessness among young people?

19. To what extent do the secure estate, YOTs, local authorities, social workers and other agencies work together in practice to ensure the Pathway is implemented and young people in custody have full access to housing support?
   a. If they do work together, or if some do, please describe how this happens.
   b. If they don’t or some don’t, or they only work together on parts of the Pathway, please explain why / how this happens.
   c. What improvements need to be made to ensure joined up working in resettling young people?

20. Do you incorporate mental health needs when thinking about accommodation?
   a. If so, how?
   b. If not, why not?

RELEASE

21. How effective is the work carried out during the release/post-release stage of the Pathway in identifying and addressing housing need/homelessness among young people?

22. If young people in the secure estate have been homeless/threatened with homelessness where do they typically get accommodated after custody?

23. What happens on the day of release?
   a. If a young person is to return to the family home?
   b. If a young person is to move into a privately rented flat?
   c. If a young person is to go into supported/temporary accommodation?
   d. If a young person is being taken into/returned to care (looked after)?
   e. If a young person has nowhere to go?

24. Is inappropriate accommodation ever used?
   a. What is it?
   b. If so, what circumstances would typically lead to this situation?
   c. If so, what have been the consequences of inappropriate accommodation placements for young people after release from custody?
[Note: if the participant does not mention it then follow-up with a prompt by specifically asking if B&Bs are used – B&Bs are an inappropriate form of accommodation although they are sometimes used in certain situations]

25. How do you monitor whether or not a young person’s post-custody accommodation is suitable?
   a. What can you do if it is not suitable?

26. It is known that a proportion of people awaiting an outcome from a local authority housing referral either withdraw their application or do not receive a duty due to ‘failure to cooperate’ with the process. Do you know if these are issues that affect young people leaving the secure estate?
   a. If so, what efforts are made to encourage young people to cooperate with the local authority?

Section 6: Impact of the Pathway on young people in the secure estate

27. Is the Pathway working better for some groups of young people over others?
   a. Who has benefitted the most? Why?
   b. Who has the Pathway not worked for? Why?

   [Prompt: ask about the following (there are specific questions about gender and Welsh language below):
   i. Age
   ii. Ethnicity/cultural background
   iii. Children who were in care prior to custody
   iv. Long/short-term prisoners (including those on Detention and Training Orders)
   v. High/medium/low-risk prisoners
   vi. Geography of establishments in relation to where the young person will be resettled]

28. Are there particular issues which arise in the case of Welsh young offenders being held outside of the Welsh secure estate?
   a. If so, what are they?

   [Prompt examples might include Welsh language and distance from families]

29. Are there any particular issues which arise in the case of female Welsh young offenders?
   a. If so, what are they?

30. What improvements (if any) would you recommend to accommodation providers and services for young people leaving the secure estate?

Section 7: Final question

31. Do you have anything else you wish to add about what is working well or not well regarding the Pathway?

32. Does your organisation collect any data about the housing needs and housing outcomes of young people in custody?
   a. If so, would you be willing to share it with the research team for incorporation into the evaluation?
FLASHCARD 1

Examples of activities carried out under ‘reasonable steps’ by local authorities and partner agencies

- Mediation
- Payments by way of a grant or loan
- Guarantees to landlords/lenders that payments will be made
- Support in managing debt, mortgage arrears or rent arrears
- Support to close down a tenancy if appropriate
- Security measures for applicants at risk of abuse
- Advocacy or other representation
- Accommodation
- Information and advice
- Other services, good or facilities
Local stakeholder – YOT, children’s services and other non-housing stakeholders – interview schedule

Section 1: Questions about you

1. Please briefly describe your job role

2. How long have you been working in your present job?

3. In what capacity does your organisation work with young people from the secure estate in housing need?

Section 2: Involvement and understanding of the Pathway

[Action: read out the following statement:]

The National Pathway for Homelessness Services to Children, Young People and Adults in the Secure Estate was developed by the Welsh Government, and commenced in 2015, to ensure that people in prison have equal access to the legal duties that are owed by local authorities under the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 to help to prevent or relieve homelessness. The desired outcome is that no one should be homeless upon leaving prison. The Pathway is divided into two strands – one for adults and one for children/young people. We are evaluating the Pathway for young people only and so we ask that you try to answer the questions as they relate to young people.

[Optional question]

4. Did you have any involvement in the development of the National Pathway for Children, Young People and Adults Leaving the Secure Estate (e.g. member of the Prisoner Accommodation and Resettlement Working Group, etc)?
   a. Please describe your involvement

5. What is your understanding of why the Welsh Government felt a need to develop the ‘The National Pathway’ for young people?
   a. Do you think the Pathway is necessary? Please explain your answer
   b. What would happen if the Pathway had not been created?

6. What is your current (or recent) involvement with delivery of ‘The National Pathway’ specifically in relation to working with young people?
   [Prompt: tease out if involvement is general (adults and young people) or if specific to young people]

7. Please will you talk me through what you understand the Pathway for young people involves?
   a. What are the main elements of the Pathway?
   b. Do you know which agency is responsible for which stage of the Pathway? If so, please talk me through this? If not, please would you talk me through any confusion
   c. Please describe the role of children’s services in delivering the Pathway
      i. At which stages are they involved?
      ii. What is working well with regard to their input?
      iii. What needs improvement?
   [Prompt: tease out if this understanding is specific to young people]
8. Are there any aspects of the Pathway which are unclear or which you do not fully understand?
   a. Please expand on your answer
   b. Do you think this is due to the Pathway itself being unclear or is it because you need to develop your own understanding of it?

Section 3: Changes that have occurred due to the Pathway

9. Since the Pathway came into effect in 2015, have there been changes to services for young people leaving the secure estate who might be facing homelessness? If so, what changes have there been?
   a. What new practices have been developed?
   b. What new services have been developed?
   c. What new partnerships have been developed?
   d. What new paperwork has been developed?
   e. Or are all, or some, of these aspects the same as before the Pathway was implemented?

10. Have these new services/practices/partnerships been working well or not so well?
   a. What has been working well?
   b. What have been the challenges?
   c. What do you think needs to be improved?

11. What changes (if any) have been implemented to how agencies communicate and share information with each other?
    a. Have these improved or hampered the extent to which services share information? Please expand on your answer.

12. The Pathway recommends that a joint needs assessment is completed to identify housing and care/health needs. This should be submitted to the local authority as part of a housing referral.
    a. To what extent are joint needs assessments being made and passed on the local authority housing?
    b. Who is responsible for this?
    c. What is working well with regard to joint needs assessments?
    d. What needs improvement

13. What changes (if any) have you had to make in your own day-to-day practice to ensure that the Pathway is being implemented?

14. What changes (if any) have been made to staffing and workload in your organisation to ensure that there is sufficient staff capacity to implement the Pathway?

Section 5: Stages in the Pathway

[Action: show Flashcard which briefly outlines the four stages of the Pathway for young people. Note that there is no ‘pre-custody’ stage for adults.]

PRE-CUSTODY

15. How effective is the work carried out during the pre-custody stage of the Pathway in identifying and addressing housing need/homelessness among young people?
    a. How important/useful is a young person’s pre-sentence report for identifying and addressing housing need? Why do you say that?
16. If a young person has any care and support needs under the Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014, how likely is it that these are identified in the pre-sentence report?

RECEPTION

17. How effective is the work carried out during the reception stage of the Pathway in identifying and addressing housing need/homelessness among young people?

18. What type of information is collected on reception concerning a young person’s housing situation?
   a. Is this information sufficient in your view? If not, what else should be collected at this stage?
   b. To what extent are young people able and/or likely to discuss their accommodation needs in the first few days of being in custody?
   c. How likely is it that the details about housing collected during reception will change as custody progresses?

RESETTLEMENT

19. How effective is the work carried out during the resettlement stage of the Pathway in identifying and addressing housing need/homelessness among young people?

20. To what extent do the secure estate, YOTs, local authorities, social workers and other agencies work together in practice to ensure the Pathway is implemented and young people in custody have full access to housing support?
   a. If they do work together, or if some do, please describe how this happens.
   b. If they don’t or some don’t, or they only work together on parts of the Pathway, please explain why / how this happens.
   c. What improvements need to be made to ensure joined up working in resettling young people?

21. Do you incorporate mental health needs when thinking about accommodation?
   a. If so, how?
   b. If not, why not?

22. Is a young person’s sentence plan reviewed whilst in custody?
   a. If so, how often?
   b. Do you think this is the right level of frequency? Please explain your answer

   [Prompt: a sentence plan should be reviewed monthly according to the Pathway]

23. The Pathway sets out deadlines for when certain steps need to be taken regarding the identification and management of housing need. How do you keep track of these deadlines and whether or not they are being met?
   a. What happens if they are not being met?

   [Prompt: An example of a deadline is that:
   i. a Joint Planning Meeting needs to take place within 10 days of a young person entering custody (this is where housing need can be identified).
   ii. Also, a young person should be given detail of their post-custody accommodation 7 days prior to release.]

24. Does work get carried out with the parents/carers/families of young people in custody to address the young person’s housing need on release?
   a. If so, what form does it take?
b. If not, why not?

RELEASE

25. How effective is the work carried out during the release/post-release stage of the Pathway in identifying and addressing housing need/homelessness among young people?

26. What happens on the day of release?
   a. If a young person is to return to the family home?
   b. If a young person is to move into a privately rented flat?
   c. If a young person is to go into supported/temporary accommodation?
   d. If a young person is being taken into/returned to care (looked after)?
   e. If a young person has nowhere to go?

27. How do you monitor whether or not a young person’s post-custody accommodation is suitable?
   a. What can you do if it is not suitable?

Section 6: Impact of the Pathway on young people in the secure estate

28. Is the Pathway working better for some groups of young people over others?
   a. Who has benefitted the most? Why?
   b. Who has the Pathway not worked for? Why?

[Prompt: ask about the following (there are specific questions about gender and Welsh language below):
   i. Age
   ii. Ethnicity/cultural background
   iii. Children who were in care prior to custody
   iv. Long/short-term prisoners (including those on Detention and Training Orders)
   v. High/medium/low-risk prisoners
   vi. Geography of establishments in relation to where the young person will be resettled]

29. Are there particular issues which arise in the case of Welsh young offenders being held outside of the Welsh secure estate?
   a. If so, what are they?

[Prompt examples might include Welsh language and distance from families]

30. Are there any particular issues which arise in the case of female Welsh young offenders?
   a. If so, what are they?

31. ‘Release on temporary licence’ allows young people to leave custody for a short period of time for resettlement purposes such as visiting post-release accommodation. Is this occurring for young people being held in your secure estate/for young people being released into your area?
   a. If so, please explain how this can benefit a young person due to leave custody?
   b. If not, what are the reasons for this?

32. What (if any) have been the differences in the delivery of the Pathway for young people who were homeless prior to entering custody, in comparison to those who may become homeless as a consequence of being in custody?

33. What improvements (if any) would you recommend to accommodation providers and services for young people leaving the secure estate?
34. If a young person in a YOI with housing need gets transferred to an adult prison, what is the ‘handover process’ for moving from the young person to the adult Pathway?

**Section 7: Final question**

35. Do you have anything else you wish to add about what is working well or not well regarding the Pathway?

36. Does your organisation collect any data about the housing needs and housing outcomes of young people in custody?
   a. If so, would you be willing to share it with the research team for incorporation into the evaluation?
National stakeholder interview schedule

Section 1: Questions about you

1. Please briefly describe your job role
2. How long have you been working in your present job?

Section 2: Involvement and understanding of the Pathway

3. Did you have any involvement in the development of the National Pathway for Children, Young People and Adults Leaving the Secure Estate (e.g. member of the Prisoner Accommodation and Resettlement Working Group, etc)?
   a. Please describe your involvement
4. What is your understanding of why the Welsh Government felt a need for the development of the ‘The National Pathway’?
   a. Why did they consider it to be important?
   b. Do you think the pathway is necessary and or important? Please explain your answer
   c. Is it particularly important for certain groups or certain people?
   d. What would happen if the Pathway had not been created?
   [Note: tease out specific points about young people in relation to these questions]
5. Please will you talk me through what you understand the Pathway for young people involves?
   a. What are the main elements of the Pathway?
   [Note: tease out if this understanding is specific to young people]
6. Are there any aspects of the Pathway which are unclear or which you do not fully understand?
   a. Please expand on your answer
   b. Do you think this is due to the Pathway itself being unclear or is it because you need to develop your own understanding of it?

Section 3: Changes in services, policies and processes that have occurred due to the Pathway

7. Since the Pathway came into effect in 2015, have there been changes to services for young people who might be facing homelessness?
8. What new services have been developed as a result of the Pathway?
   a. Have any of these new services been funded/delivered by Supporting People?17
   b. What has worked well regarding these new services?
   c. What have been the challenges?
   d. What improvements are needed?
9. What new policies and processes have been developed as a result of the Pathway?
   a. What has worked well regarding these new policies/processes?

17 Supporting People refers to a programme of support services funded by the Government to help to prevent and tackle homelessness, to help vulnerable people to live independently, and to provide support to those living in temporary, supported or specialist accommodation
b. What have been the challenges?
c. What improvements are needed?

10. What new partnerships have been developed?
   a. What has worked well regarding these new partnerships?
   b. What have been the challenges?
   c. What improvements are needed?

11. What new paperwork / data collection systems have been developed?
   a. What has worked well regarding these new systems?
   b. What have been the challenges?
   c. What improvements are needed?

12. How do you know if the Pathway is working or not? (i.e. where do you get your information from?)
   a. What kind of information is your organisation collecting in relation to how the Pathway is operating?
   b. Does it collect any data about the housing needs and housing outcomes of young people in custody?
   c. Who does this information get passed to (i.e. do you see it)?
   d. How do you or your organisation use the information?
   e. What information do you currently not have that you wish you had?
   f. Would you be willing to share any summary statistics with the research team for incorporation into the evaluation?

13. Please describe the role of children’s services in delivering the Pathway
   a. At which stages are they involved?
   b. What is working well with regard to their input?
   c. What needs improvement?

14. The Pathway recommends that a joint needs assessment is completed to identify housing and care/health needs. This should be submitted to the local authority as part of a housing referral.
   a. To what extent are joint needs assessments being made and passed on the local authority housing?
   b. Who is responsible for this?
   c. What is working well with regard to joint needs assessments?
   d. What needs improvement

15. What is the role of Reintegration and Resettlement Partnerships (RRPBs) in relation to the Pathway?

16. What changes (if any) have been implemented to how agencies communicate and share information with each other?
   a. Have these improved or hampered the extent to which services share information? Please expand on your answer.

Section 4: Specific details about the Pathway

[Note: Some national stakeholders may be unable to answer the questions in this section]

17. When a young person is owed a duty to prevent or relieve homelessness, the local authority needs to take ‘reasonable steps’ to achieve these aims. What ‘reasonable steps’ are being taken?
[Action: after participant has answered Q17, show them FLASHCARD 1. Do not show them the flashcard until they have offered an answer to Q17]

a. In practice, what are the most commonly used ‘reasonable steps’ for young people in custody?
b. Why are these ‘reasonable steps’ the most common? Why are other activities / ‘reasonable steps’ not considered or less common?
c. What are some of the practical difficulties in carrying out ‘reasonable steps’?
d. Are there any activities that are carried out under the term ‘reasonable steps’ specifically for young people in custody that are not contained in the list above?
e. Does the nature of the ‘reasonable steps’ change when a young person is released from custody? Please talk me through your answer.

18. One of the aims of the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 and the Pathway is for local authorities to move from a ‘processing’ to a ‘problem-solving’ approach when working with young people who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. Thinking about young people in custody, to what extent do you think this has happened?
   a. To what extent are an individual’s specific circumstances being taken into account when decisions are made about what should happen to prevent or relieve their homelessness?
   b. Given that the majority of young people will be in ‘priority need’, to what extent are ‘reasonable steps’ being considered before moving to a Section 75 duty to provide them with settled accommodation?

19. If a young person in a YOI with housing need gets transferred to an adult prison, what is the ‘handover process’ for moving from the young person to the adult Pathway?

Section 5: Impact of the Pathway on young people in the secure estate

20. To your knowledge, what have been the main impacts of the Pathway for young people in custody who are facing homelessness on release?
   a. Which stages of the Pathway (pre-custody, reception, resettlement, release) have been working well for young people?
   b. Which stages of the Pathway have not been working well for young people?

   [Note: ask for examples of specific cases if applicable]

21. Is the Pathway working better for some groups of young people over others?
   a. Who has benefitted the most? Why?
   b. Who has the Pathway not worked for? Why?

   [Note, ask about:
    i. Gender
    ii. Age
    iii. Ethnicity/cultural background
    iv. Welsh-speaking (i.e. Welsh as first language)
    v. Children who were in care prior to custody
    vi. Long/short-term prisoners (including those on Detention and Training Orders)
    vii. High/medium/low-risk prisoners
    viii. Geography of establishments in relation to where the young person will be resettled]

22. Are there particular issues which arise in the case of Welsh young offenders being held outside of the Welsh secure estate? If so, what are they?

   [Note: examples might include Welsh language and distance from families]
23. If young people in the secure estate have been homeless/threatened with homelessness where do they typically get accommodated after custody?

24. Is inappropriate accommodation ever used?
   a. If so, what circumstances would typically lead to this situation?
   b. If so, what have been the consequences of inappropriate accommodation placements for young people after release from custody?

[Note: if the participant does not mention it then follow-up with a prompt by specifically asking if B&Bs are used – B&Bs are an inappropriate form of accommodation although they are sometimes used in certain situations]

25. What improvements (if any) would you recommend to accommodation providers and services for young people leaving the secure estate?

**Section 6: Final question**

Do you have anything else you wish to add about what is working well or not well regarding the Pathway?
Stakeholder Survey: Homelessness Services for Young People Released from the Secure Estate

Would you like to answer questions in English or Welsh? / Dyfeth chi amh oes am y Saesneg neu yna Gymraeg?

- English
- Gymraeg/Welsh
Information and privacy notice

RESEARCH - Homelessness Services for Young People Released from the Secure Estate

The Welsh Government have commissioned a team of researchers led by the University of South Wales, undertake an evaluation of the National Pathway for Homelessness Services to Children, Young People and Adults in the Secure Estate for the Welsh Government. For this project, we are interested in homelessness services for young people, rather than adults.

As part of this project, you are invited to take part in a survey which explores your organisation’s experience of the homelessness services provided to young people released from the secure estate.

Please do not worry if you feel that your knowledge of the Pathway and/or homelessness services for young people is minimal, as we are interested in capturing the extent of stakeholders awareness of these issues, and it will not be possible to identify you personally from the data that will be transferred to Welsh Government nor in any reports, articles or presentations based on this research.

It should take no longer than 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Your anonymised data - it will not be possible to identify you personally - will be used in study specific reports, and subsequent articles that will appear in academic journals and presentations at conferences. It will inform the Welsh Government’s future policies and practice in this field.

The Welsh Government is the data controller for the research. However, the University of South Wales will delete any personal data provided during research fieldwork.

Participation is completely voluntary. However, your views and experiences are important in order to help inform Welsh Government policies. If you agree to participate, you simply start answering the questions and submitting your answers will be will imply your consent to participate.

However, you do not have to participate if you do not wish to. You may leave the questionnaire now or at any point and you do not need to give any reasons. If you do agree to participate, you can choose not to answer any question and you do not need to explain.

You are still free to change your mind at any time until your answers have been analysed included in a draft report. You do need to give any reason. You can just tell the lead researcher below that you do not wish your answers to be used.

The contact for this evaluation at University of South Wales is Dr Harriet Pierpoint.

Telephone: (01443) 4 83672
Email: harriet.pierpoint@southwales.ac.uk

If you remain dissatisfied, please contact:

University of South Wales Research Governance Officer:

Telephone: (01443) 484 518
Email: jonathan.sinfield@southwales.ac.uk

PRIVACY NOTICE – Homelessness Services for Young People Released from the Secure Estate

What personal details do we hold and where did we get your details?

Personal data is defined under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) as “any information relating to an identifiable person who can be directly or indirectly identified by reference to an identifier”.

You have been invited to undertake an online survey by a “gatekeeper” in your organisation.

We are asking for your email address to try to avoid chasing respondents after they have responded. Your email address will be confidential and stored securely as described above. It will be removed from the data once the survey is completed and before the data is transferred - in an anonymised format - to Welsh Government.

What is the lawful basis for collecting the data?

The lawful basis of processing information in this data collection exercise is our public task; that is, exercising our official authority to
undertake the core role and functions of the Welsh Government. Participation is completely voluntary. Research studies such as this are important for the Welsh Government to collect information and actionable evidence about its ability to deliver government priorities.

**How secure is any personal data submitted?**

Personal information provided to University of South Wales is always stored securely. The data can only be used by a limited number of researchers who are working on the evaluation. Social researchers from the research team will only use participant email addresses to contact them for research purposes.

The University of South Wales have put in place procedures to deal with any suspected data security breaches. If a suspected breach occurs, the University of South Wales will report this to the Welsh Government who will notify you and any applicable regulator where we are legally required to do so. The University of South Wales have Cyber Essentials certification[1].

All data gathered through this research will be reported in an anonymised format. It will not contain your contact details and any identifiable information in open-ended answers will be removed. The University of South Wales will use the data to produce a report for Welsh Government, and subsequent articles that will appear in academic journals and presentations at conferences. This report will not include any information that could be used to identify individual participants. In addition, The University of South Wales will provide Welsh Government with an anonymised version of the dataset. This means the dataset will not include information that could identify you. In particular, your name and any other contact details will be deleted from this dataset.

**How long do you keep any personal data submitted?**

The University of South Wales will hold personal data during the contract period, and any personal data not already removed will be deleted three months after the end of the contract.

**Your rights**

Under GDPR, you have the following rights in relation to the personal information you provide as part of this evaluation. You have the right to:

- Access a copy of your own data;
- Require us to rectify inaccuracies in that data;
- To object to or restrict processing (in certain circumstances);
- For your data to be ‘erased’ (in certain circumstances); and
- To lodge a complaint with the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO) who is our independent regulator for data protection.

The contact details for the Information Commissioner’s Office are: Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF. Phone: 01625 545 745 or 0303 123 1113. Website: [www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)

**Further Information**

If you have any further questions about how the data provided as part of this study will be used by the Welsh Government or wish to exercise your rights using the General Data Protection Regulation, please contact:

Lucie Griffiths (Knowledge and Analytical Services, Welsh Government)

Telephone: 03000 255780

Email: lucie.griffiths@gov.wales

The Welsh Government’s Data Protection Officer can be contacted at:

Welsh Government, Cathays Park, Cardiff, CF10 3NQ

Email: DataProtectionOfficer@gov.wales.
What is your email address?

Please enter a valid email address.

Have you ever had any involvement, however small, in the development or delivery of the Pathway in relation to young people (rather than adults)?
About you and your organisation

What has been or is your involvement with the Pathway in relation to young people (rather than adults)?

☐ More info

Please select at least 1 answer(s).

☒ I was involved in the development of the Pathway
☒ I am or have been involved in some way (however minor) in the delivery of the Pathway
☒ I have not been involved in the delivery of the Pathway yet, but, if a case came up, it would be part of my job to deal with it
☐ Other

If you selected Other, please specify:

What is your job title?

For which organisation(s) do you work?

Please select at least 1 answer(s).

☒ Welsh Government
☒ Youth Custody Service
☒ Care Inspectorate Wales
☒ ADSS
☒ Conwy/Denbighshire YOT
☒ Swansea Council
☒ Hciao
☒ Action for Children
☒ Llantau
☒ Wiedh
☒ Cymorth Cymru
☒ Global
☒ Media Academy
☒ Prison Link Cymru
☒ St Giles Cymru
☒ HMI Probation
☒ All-Wales Heads of Children’s Services Group
☒ Denbighshire council
☒ Newport YOT
☒ Parc
☒ Barnardos Cymru
☒ POBL
☒ Shelter Cymru
☒ Chairs
☒ Halten Cymru
☒ NACRO
☒ Rough Sleepers Cymru
☒ Voices from Care Cymru
☒ Y3B Cymru
☒ HMI Prison
☒ WLGA
☒ Cardiff City council
☒ Western Bay YOT
☒ Newport City Council
☒ Wernington
☒ Cisda
☒ Swansea Young Single Homeless Project
☒ Adref
☒ Dewis
☒ Justice Cymru
☒ PACT
☒ Safer Wales
☒ Other

If you selected Other, please specify:
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Impact of the Pathway for young people

Thinking about the Pathway for young people (rather than adults), please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Please don’t select more than 1 answer(s) per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Pathway has increased consistency across local authorities with regard to the ‘service’ that young people leaving the secure estate receive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pathway has smoothed the transition of young people from the secure estate into accommodation (of any kind)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is frequently carried out with young people during the pre-custody stage of the Pathway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reception stage of the Pathway is working well for young people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resettlement stage of the Pathway is working well for young people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The release stage of the Pathway is working well for young people</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a real ‘person-centred’ consideration of all accommodation options for young people leaving the secure estate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pathway has improved housing outcomes for young people leaving the secure estate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pathway has improved other outcomes for young people leaving the secure estate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pathway has reduced inappropriate accommodation placements following the release of young people from the secure estate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delivery of the Pathway for young people

Which is the leading agency in practice?

- YOT
- Children’s Services
- Other
- Don't know

If you selected Other, please specify:

Thinking about the Pathway for young people (rather than adults), which are the most frequently used reasonable steps/prevention and relief activities? Please select up to 3 activities.

Please select exactly 3 answer(s).

- Mediation
- Support in managing debt, mortgage arrears or rent arrears
- Advocacy or other representation
- Accommodation - Supported accommodation
- Accommodation - Taken into/returned to care
- Payments by way of a grant or loan
- Support to close down a tenancy if appropriate
- Information and advice
- Accommodation - Return to the family home
- Accommodation - B&B
- Accommodation - Privately rented accommodation
- Guarantees to landlords/lenders that payments will be made
- Security measures for applicants at risk of abuse, e.g. provision of sanctuary scheme or help to access injunctions
- Other
- Don't know

If you selected Other, please specify:

When in most cases does planning for release start?

- At sentencing
- Within 10 days of reception into custody
- 66 days before release
- Upon release
- After release
- Don't know
- Other
If you selected Other, please specify:

What happens if a young person is released from the secure estate outside of 9am to 5pm on weekends or on public holidays?

- He has to wait until the services reopen
- There is an out-of-hours service
- Don't know

If you selected Other, please specify:

When are the opening hours of the out-of-hours service?

Please rank the following types of accommodation in order of their frequency of use for young people released from the secure estate, with 1 being the most frequently used and 5 the least used. You may also select if a type of accommodation is never used or if you don't know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>1-most frequently used</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-least frequently</th>
<th>Never used</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to the family home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately rented accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken into/taken to care (tobied after)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young person has nowhere to go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If other was ranked as 1 to 3, please explain what type of other accommodation is used:

---
Are you aware of any cases when a young person released from the secure estate with no accommodation to which to go?

- Yes
- No

In those cases, what led to the young person(s) having nowhere to go and no accommodation being found for them?

Thinking about young people (rather than adults), how does your organisation define ‘suitability’ when it comes to ‘suitable accommodation’?

If a young person in a YOI with housing need gets transferred to an adult prison, what is the ‘handover process’ for moving from the young person to the adult pathway?

To what extent is this ‘handover process’ followed?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always
- Don’t know

Can you rate the extent to which the issues below have posed a problem (if at all)?

Please don’t select more than 1 answer(s) per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A big problem</th>
<th>A small problem</th>
<th>Not a problem at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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| Geographical distance between Children's Services advisers and young people |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of choice for young person in housing outcome |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of out-of-hours services |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Welsh establishments being less familiar with the Pathway |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accommodation providers refusing to take high-risk young people |  |  |  |  |  |
| Young people not being notified of their accommodation outcome at least 7 days prior to release |  |  |  |  |  |
| Young person not having accommodation on the day of release and having to go to the housing office for emergency accommodation |  |  |  |  |  |

Thinking about the Pathway (and for young people rather than adults), please rate how well information sharing is working between the following pairs of partners.

Please don't select more than 1 answer(0) per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No information sharing or commitment to do so</th>
<th>Commitment to sharing, but gaps in arrangements</th>
<th>Some information is shared</th>
<th>Most information is shared</th>
<th>All information is shared in timely and robust manner</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services and Housing Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services and Secure estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services and Youth Offending Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Options and Accommodation providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Offending Team and Secure estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Offending Team and Housing Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about the Pathway (and for young people rather than adults), are there any other relevant partnerships that have not been identified above? This might be, for example, a partnership between a Registered Social Landlord and another organisation.

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Thinking about these partnerships that have not been listed, please identify the partners and rate how well information sharing is working between them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>No information sharing or commitment to do so</th>
<th>Commitment to sharing, but gaps in arrangements</th>
<th>Some information is shared</th>
<th>Most information is shared</th>
<th>All information is shared in timely and robust manner</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Future development

Have you identified any good practice or innovation within or around the Pathway of young people? Please select as many answers as you wish.

Please select at least 1 answer(s).
- [ ] No good practice or innovation
- [ ] Inviting partners to meetings they were not previously involved in
- [ ] Holding a void in temporary accommodation for a short time in readiness for a young person leaving the secure estate
- [ ] Processes which link the young person with mental health support
- [ ] Changes to the allocation of cases system within a partner agency
- [ ] A dedicated young person's temporary accommodation officer
- [ ] The development of joint paperwork for sharing – to avoid duplication
- [ ] Other

If you selected Other, please specify:

Which improvements (if any) would you recommend to the Pathway for young people and practice related to it? Please select as many answers as you wish.

Please select at least 1 answer(s).
- [ ] No improvements required/no recommendations
- [ ] Sufficient supported accommodation that is accessible 24/7
- [ ] Provide young person with emergency food for 24 hours after release
- [ ] Process to ensure young person knows in advance where they will be accommodated
- [ ] Create a specialist hostel for young people leaving the secure estate
- [ ] Involve Housing in pre-custody and reception stages of Pathway
- [ ] Dedicated young persons housing officer to oversee Pathway
- [ ] Tackle high rents in supported accommodation
- [ ] Improve access to increase awareness of out of hours services
- [ ] More supported accommodation availability
- [ ] Create a summary (simplified) version of the Pathway
- [ ] Better communication between managers and frontline staff re. what the Pathway involves
- [ ] Creating regional services to improve consistency and cope with a possible influx
- [ ] Sharing office building between Housing and Children’s Services
- [ ] A clearer strategy is required for handover processes
- [ ] Universal needs assessment need to be shared with third sector
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Training on Pathway

If you selected Other, please specify:
Do you have anything else you wish to add about the Pathway for young people or young people’s homelessness services generally?

Do you have any feedback on this questionnaire?
Final page

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Please may we remind you that submitting answers implies consent to participate.

You are still free to change your mind at any time until your answers have been analysed/included in a draft report. You do need to give any reason. You can just tell the lead researcher below that you do not wish your answers to be used, by contacting her at harriet.pierpoint@youthwales.ac.uk.

Key for selection options

3 - Have you ever had any involvement, however small, in the development or delivery of the Pathway in relation to young people (rather than adults)?
   Yes
   No
Young person in custody interview schedule

Section 1: Details of custody (might need to get these from prison staff)

1. Name of secure establishment
2. Start date of sentence
3. Expected release date
4. Length of sentence
5. Name of supervising officer, YOT and local authorities who/that are involved with the young person

Section 2: Background

6. Where were you living before you went into custody?
   a. What is the name of the town/village that you were living in before you went into custody?
   b. Who were you living with? (i.e. family home, friends, tenancy etc.)
   c. If not living with family, how did you come to be in that situation?
   d. How happy were you with your living situation?
      i. What could have been better?
   e. Before coming into Parc/Hillside/Werrington, were you involved with any housing/homelessness services or anyone who helped you with your accommodation?
      i.

7. What is the name of the town/village that you expect to live in after you have been released?

Section 3: Questions about experiences of the Pathway

8. When you first arrived in Parc/Hillside/Werrington, did anyone speak to you about where you lived and your housing situation before you arrived?
   a. Who spoke to you about it?
   b. What sorts of questions did they ask you?
   c. What did you tell them?

9. Since you have been in Parc/Hillside/Werrington, has anything been done to make arrangements for where you will live once you get released?
   a. What has been done?
   b. Who have you met with to discuss this?
   c. How many meetings or discussions have you had about this?
   d. Have you had the opportunity to visit any future accommodation while in custody?
      i. If no, would you have liked to?

10. Have you or your caseworker (or other person) filled out any forms relating to your housing situation?
    a. Have you had a chance to see any forms that have been written about you and your housing situation?
       i. If no, would you have liked to have to?
       ii. If yes, were they accurate about your housing situation?
11. What have you been told about where you will live when you are released (eg location, type of accommodation)?
   a. How do you feel about what you have been told (eg is it what you hoped for)?
   b. How much involvement/choice have you had in where you will live when you are released?

12. Thinking about your needs:
   a. Which of your needs do you think ARE BEING taken into account when making decisions about where you will live when you are released?
      (Prompt: demographic characteristics, work and college links, home life, health, disabilities, sexual identity, religion. Use health and disability showcard if help if needed to identify health issue/disability)
   b. Which of your needs do you think SHOULD BE taken into account when making decisions about where you will live when you are released?

13. Do you know where to go or who to ask for help and advice about housing?

14. What would you change about the process of finding you housing?

15. Have you been to a secure establishment before? If so, did you get any help with housing before and after you were released?

Section 4: Demographic details

We would like to ask you some questions so we can see how well the group of young people who we’re interviewing matches young people generally. In other words, to what extent does our sample represent the population. However, please can I remind you that you can refuse to answer any question and you do not need to give any reason for doing so?

16. Which of the following describes how you think of yourself?
   a) Male
   b) Female
   c) In another way, please describe

17. What is your date of birth?

18. What is your ethnic group? Please select, from the showcard which I will read out, the option that best describes your ethnic group or background?

19. What is your first language?
   [Note: check if Welsh is their first language]

20. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability?
   a) Yes, limited a lot
   b) Yes, limited a little
   c) No
   d) Prefer not to say

21. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your housing situation?
Showcard: Health and Disabilities

If you are happy to say, please select, from the showcard which I will read out, the option that best describes indicate your health issue/disability. Feel free to just say the number if you prefer.

1. Vision (e.g. due to blindness or partial sight)
2. Hearing (e.g. due to deafness or partial hearing)
3. Mobility, such as difficulty walking short distances, climbing stairs, lifting and carrying objects
4. Learning or concentrating or remembering
5. Mental Health
6. Stamina or breathing difficulty
7. Social or behavioural issues (e.g. due to neuro diverse conditions such as Autism, Attention Deficit Disorder or Asperger’s Syndrome)
8. Other impairment

Showcard: Ethnic background

White
1. Welsh/English/Scottish/Northern Irish/British
2. Irish
3. Gypsy or Irish Traveller
4. Any other White background, please describe

Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups
5. White and Black Caribbean
6. White and Black African
7. White and Asian
8. Any other Mixed/Multiple ethnic background, please describe

Asian/Asian British
9. Indian
10. Pakistani
11. Bangladeshi
12. Chinese
13. Any other Asian background, please describe

Black/African/Caribbean/Black British
14. African
15. Caribbean
16. Any other Black/African/Caribbean background, please describe

Other ethnic group
17. Arab
18. Any other ethnic group, please describe
Young person in the community interview schedule

Section 1: Background

1. Where were you living before you went into custody?
   a. What is the name of the town/village that you were living in before you went into custody?
   b. Who were you living with? (i.e. family home, friends, tenancy etc.)
   c. If not living with family, how did you come to be in that situation?
   d. How happy were you with your living situation?
      i. What could have been better?

2. What was the name of the secure establishment in which you served your (most recent) custodial sentence?

3. What date were you released from this secure establishment?

Section 2: Questions about experiences of the Pathway

4. What help (if any) were you given to find somewhere to live for after you were released?
   a. Who helped you? Who helped you at what stages? What did they do?

   [Prompt: Try to establish who provided support at different stages:
   Pre-custody stage
   Reception stage
   Resettlement stage
   Release stage]

5. Did you know where you were going to be living before you were released from custody?
   a. Where was that?
   b. How was it arranged?
   c. Did you have the opportunity to visit this place before you were released from custody?
      i. If no, would you have liked to?
   d. How much involvement/choice have you had in where you would live?

6. At any time when you were in Parc/Hillside/Werringston, did anyone ask you about any needs that you may have in relation to making decisions about where you will live when you are released?
   (Prompt: demographic characteristics, work and college links, home life, health and disabilities, sexual identity, religion. Use health and disability showcard if help if needed to identity health issue/disability)
   a. If yes, please can you tell me what these conversations involved?
   b. If yes, do you know if this information was taken into account when decisions were made about where you would live when you were released?
   c. If no, how do you feel about this?
   d. Would you have liked the opportunity to have spoken to someone in Parc/Hillside/Werringston about your needs in relation to housing?

7. Where did you sleep on the first night after you were released from custody?
   a. Was that the same place as the one that had been arranged for you?
   b. If not, how did you come to be sleeping in that place?
c. If you were living somewhere temporarily, how long did you stay there before you moved to somewhere more permanent?

8. On the day you were released, did you have to go to the local authority/council housing office (or meet with a housing officer) for housing assistance?
   a. If so, what happened?
   b. Who went with you? Why?
   c. Do you participate in/understand the discussion?
   d. What was the outcome?
   e. How did you feel about it?

9. Where have you been living/sleeping since you were released from Parc/Hillside/Werrington, i.e. what is your housing history since release?
   a. Is this the same place as the one that was arranged for you whilst in custody?
   b. If yes, how have you felt about living there?
   c. If no, how did you end up living there?

10. What is your current housing situation? (family, sofa surfing, private renting, supported or temporary accommodation, B&B, rough sleeping etc.)
    a. How did you end up living there?
    b. How happy are you with your current living situation?

11. What contact have you had with your YOT caseworker, local council or other support service about housing/homelessness since you were released?
    a. What method of contact and how often?
    b. What support have they given you?

12. Have you been given any other help with housing?

13. What would you like to happen?
    a. In relation to your housing situation?
    b. In relation to support with any other issues related to housing (for example: money, tenancy support, relationships etc.)

14. Since you were released, what impact do you think where you live and your housing situation has had on your life?
    a. In relation to reoffending
    b. In relation to substance use
    c. In relation to mental health
    d. In relation to family and relationships
    e. Other impact
       Prompt: education, work and training, being on TAG

15. If you could change something about the support you have received about housing, what would it be?
    a. Why?

16. Do you have anything else you want to say about your housing situation and the support you have been given (or not) from the YOT or other agency?

Section 3: Demographic details

We would like to ask you some questions so we can see how well the group of young people who we’re interviewing matches young people generally. In other words, to what extent does our sample
represent the population. However, please can I remind you that you can refuse to answer any question and you do not need to give any reason for doing so?

17. Which of the following describes how you think of yourself?
   d) Male
   e) Female
   f) In another way, please describe

18. What is your date of birth?

19. What is your ethnic group? Please select, from the showcard which I will read out, the option that best describes your ethnic group or background?

20. What is your first language?
   [Note: check if Welsh is their first language]

21. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability?
   e) Yes, limited a lot
   f) Yes, limited a little
   g) No
   h) Prefer not to say

22. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your housing situation?
Topic guide for case studies

About you
1. Please briefly describe your job role
2. How long have you been working in your present job?
3. In what capacity does your organisation work with young people from the secure estate in housing need?

Case study background
4. Can you explain chronologically x’s journey within your service to date please?

Compliance with the pathway
5. Do you feel that the pathway has been followed and adhered to by service providers/agencies involved with x?
   Prompts
   a. Has it been followed at all four stages of the Pathway for young people
      i. PRE-CUSTODY
      ii. RECEPTION
      iii. RESETTLEMENT
      iv. RELEASE

Impact of the pathway
6. What impact do you think the pathway has had upon x’s outcomes?
   Prompt
   a. How do you define ‘suitability’ when it comes to ‘suitable accommodation’?

Gaps/challenges
7. In dealing with x’s case, have you identified any gaps or challenges within or around the pathway?

Best practice and innovation
8. In dealing with x’s case, have you identified any good practice or innovation within or around the pathway?

Future direction/development
9. Do you think in x’s case anything could have been done differently?
10. What improvements (if any) would you recommend to the Pathway and practice related to it?
Topic guide stakeholder focus group

Purpose of focus group
- To reflect on the main findings and recommendations
- To clarify points where conflicting information has been provided
- To confirm or raise questions about the validity of findings
- To explore what can be done about them/recommendations
- The findings are draft and confidential
- Participants are asked to reflect on the draft headline findings (shown on PowerPoint slides) and probes

Introductions
Participants are asked to introduce themselves and their roles.

Research questions and methodology
Summarised for participants

Draft headline findings and probes

Limited awareness of the Pathway
Probe: Why is this? Is it necessary to try increase awareness? If so, how?

Operationalisation of the Pathway – Pre-custody
Probe: How to ensure pre-sentence reports are comprehensive and shared?

Operationalisation of the Pathway – Reception
Probes: Why is it that, according to stakeholders, young people appear to be engaging at the reception phase, but not later? Why does the experience of young people appear to be different to adults’ (who did not tend to engage)? Can anything be learnt from this for the adult Pathway?

‘Reasonable steps’
Probes: Do sentencing plans need reviewing on a monthly basis? If so how can this be enforced?

Operationalisation of the Pathway – Resettlement
Probes: Should the 66 day time frame be reviewed? How do we deal with the need to have accommodation secured well in advance whilst also ensuring rooms are not empty for long periods of time? What is/should be the role of ‘Reintegration and Resettlement Partnerships’?

Operationalisation of the Pathway – Release
Probe: How can more suitable supported accommodation be provided?

B&Bs and unsuitable accommodation
Probe: What should be done about the use of B&Bs?

Keeping young people informed

The relationship between Children’s Services and Housing
Probes:
- Do you agree that young people are treated differently depending on whether they have been previously Looked After or not? If so, what can do done about this?
- Do Children’s Services see the pre-sentence report before the YP has been remanded or sentenced? Is there a need for Children’s Services to see this report prior to remand/sentencing? If so, why do they need to see it?
• Does it matters how the accommodation is provided and/or by whom?

Points for clarification:
• Is the default position is that a young person in custody is owed a duty under social services? If this is the case, does this mean that if the duty is handed over to Housing, then social services no longer have that responsibility?
• Does Children’s Services always have to go through Housing to accommodate a young person? If there is supported accommodation operated by Children’s Services, can they just directly refer the young person meaning Housing knows nothing about it?
• Are there some cases where young people are not owed a social services duty? Or are social services only intervening with young people who were previously known to them? There seems to potentially be a gap in provision when it comes to young people who were not previously Looked After. In which case is the YOS responsible?

Impact of Pathway
Probes: Would you agree with these impacts? Have there been any other impacts on practice?

Recommendations
Probe: What are your thoughts on these recommendations?