

Dadansoddi ar gyfer Polisi



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

Number: 13/2012

[www.cymru.gov.uk](http://www.cymru.gov.uk)

# Evaluation of the YJB Pilot Resettlement Support Panel Scheme



**Liz Phillips, Robert Smith, Kerry Martin, Palak Mehta, and Ben Durbin. National Foundation for Educational Research**

Views expressed in this report are those of the research team and not necessarily those of the Welsh Government

For further information please contact:

Name: Robert Willis

Email: [robert.willis@wales.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:robert.willis@wales.gsi.gov.uk)

Welsh Government Social Research, 2012

ISBN 978 0 7504 7491 7

© Crown Copyright 2012

## Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>List of abbreviations and acronyms</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Background</b> .....	<b>3</b>
	3.1 The resettlement panels .....	3
	3.2 Methodology .....	5
<b>4.</b>	<b>Case study 1</b> .....	<b>10</b>
	4.1 The resettlement panel: set up and functioning .....	10
	4.2 The resettlement support worker .....	13
	4.3 The review body: role and effectiveness.....	15
<b>5.</b>	<b>Case study 2</b> .....	<b>21</b>
	5.1 The resettlement panels: set up and functioning .....	21
	5.2 The resettlement support worker .....	28
	5.3 Reviewing function.....	30
	5.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources .....	31
	5.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people.....	33
	5.6 Asset analysis.....	34
	5.7 Conclusion .....	38
<b>6.</b>	<b>Case study 3</b> .....	<b>41</b>
	6.1 The resettlement panel: set up and functioning .....	41
	6.2 The resettlement support worker .....	43
	6.3 Reviewing function.....	46
	6.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources .....	47
	6.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people.....	48
	6.6 Asset analysis.....	50
	6.7 Conclusion .....	54
<b>7.</b>	<b>Case study 4</b> .....	<b>58</b>
	7.1 The resettlement panels: set-up and functioning .....	58
	7.2 The resettlement support worker .....	63
	7.3 The review body: role and effectiveness.....	63
	7.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources .....	63
	7.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people.....	66
	7.6 Asset analysis.....	69
	7.7 Conclusion .....	72

<b>8.</b>	<b>Case study 5</b> .....	<b>75</b>
	8.1 The resettlement panels: set-up and functioning .....	<b>75</b>
	8.2 The resettlement support worker .....	<b>79</b>
	8.3 The review body: role and effectiveness.....	<b>81</b>
	8.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources .....	<b>81</b>
	8.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people.....	<b>83</b>
	8.6 Asset analysis.....	<b>86</b>
	8.7 Conclusion .....	<b>89</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Case study 6</b> .....	<b>92</b>
	9.1 Resettlement support panels: set-up and functioning .....	<b>92</b>
	9.2 The resettlement support worker .....	<b>96</b>
	9.3 The review body .....	<b>96</b>
	9.4 Resettlement support plans: commitment of resources .....	<b>97</b>
	9.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people.....	<b>99</b>
	9.6 Asset analysis.....	<b>102</b>
	9.7 Conclusion .....	<b>106</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Summary of findings: all case studies</b> .....	<b>109</b>
	10.1 The resettlement panels: set-up and functioning .....	<b>109</b>
	10.2 Panel functioning and effectiveness .....	<b>110</b>
	10.3 The resettlement workers .....	<b>111</b>
	10.4 The review bodies: role and effectiveness .....	<b>112</b>
	10.5 Commitment of resources.....	<b>112</b>
	10.6 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people.....	<b>113</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>117</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Recommendations</b> .....	<b>123</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Appendix: Interview schedules used in the evaluation</b> .....	<b>126</b>

## **1. Acknowledgements**

The research team at NFER would like to thank all of the strategic and operational personnel and young people who gave up their time to take part in this research.

The team would particularly like to express their thanks to staff at each of the Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) for coordinating the case study visits and for their cooperation with providing the quantitative data used in the evaluation.

We owe a debt of thanks to Lynzi Jarman of the YJB for her support and work to enable the project to proceed smoothly.

Thanks also go to Lowri Randell-Evans, Sagina Khan, Alison Riley and Margaret Parfitt for their administrative and technical support.

## **2. List of abbreviations and acronyms**

ASB: Anti-Social Behaviour

ASBO: Anti-Social Behaviour Order

ASSET: Young Offender Assessment Profile data

AWYOS: All-Wales Youth Offending Strategy

CAF: Common Assessment Framework

CAMHS: Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services

CRB: Criminal Records Bureau

CSP: Community Safety Partnership

CYPP: Children and Young People's Partnership

EET: Education, Employment and Training

DTO: Detention and Training Order

IFST: Integrated Family Support Team

IOM: Integrated Offender Management

ISS: Intensive Supervision and Surveillance

LA: Local Authority

LAC: Looked After Child / Children

LSCB: Local Safeguarding Children Board

MAPPA: Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangement

MARAC: Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference

NACRO: National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders

NEET: Not in Education, Employment or Training

PPO: Prolific and Priority Offender

RSP: Resettlement Support Panel

TAC: Team Around the Child

WAG: Welsh Assembly Government

YISP: Youth Inclusion and Support Panel

YJB: Youth Justice Board

YOI: Young Offender's Institution

YOS: Youth Offending Service

YOT: Youth Offending Team

YRO: Youth Rehabilitation Order

YJS:: Youth Justice System

### 3. Background

The National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) was jointly commissioned in October 2009 by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) and the Social Research Division of the Welsh Government to undertake an evaluation of the YJB Pilot Resettlement Schemes. The evaluation was completed in August 2011.

#### 3.1 The resettlement panels

The YJB made funding available in July 2009 to enable six selected Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) in Wales to expand resettlement for young people aged 12 to 17 who are leaving custody. The funding is also aimed at preventing young people from entering custody in the first place.

The pilot resettlement schemes are a new approach to addressing the issues faced by young people in custody. They fit in with the priorities of the All-Wales Youth Offending Strategy (AWYOS) Delivery Plan, in particular, reducing reoffending and the use of custodial sentences, and increasing effective resettlement.

Other reasons for adopting this approach, as outlined in the YJB-WAG *Resettlement Support Panels Pilot Guidance: 2010-2011*, are:

- the comparatively low cost of providing a service that is predominantly aimed at coordinating access to shared resources
- the prior existence of suitable panels, such as Youth Inclusion Support Panels (YISPs), in many areas of Wales which would enable existing infrastructure to be used
- the need to hold partners to account for delivering services to those who are often marginalised and excluded
- the essential role that effective multi-agency coordination and information sharing has for preventing reoffending upon release.

[Source: Youth Justice Board and Welsh Assembly Government (2010). *Resettlement Support Panels Pilot Guidance: 2010-2011*]

The guidance makes clear that the Resettlement Support Panels (RSPs) are a key aspect of the pilot resettlement schemes. RSPs should have clear links with local Children and Young People's Partnerships (CYPPs), Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), Local Safeguarding Children's Boards (LSCBs), and the Local Criminal Justice Board.

The RSPs' main objective is to coordinate multi-agency support for the resettlement of young people through addressing substance misuse, accommodation problems, mental health and education issues. The Panels also assist young people in accessing education, employment and training opportunities, mediate with families and peers, and encourage more appropriate use of leisure time. Developing young people's life skills, budget management, healthy living, and raising their self-esteem and confidence to facilitate positive decision-making are also RSP objectives.

RSPs are based on the following core operational components:

- a multi agency panel comprised of officers with sufficient seniority to commit resources to resettlement action plans
- an operational manager who is accountable for its delivery
- a named resettlement support worker or workers with responsibility for oversight of resettlement support plans for individual young people
- where a partner agency delivers parts of RSP, a service level agreement should be in place, including clear information-sharing protocols.

[Source: Youth Justice Board and Welsh Assembly Government (2010). *Resettlement Support Panels Pilot Guidance: 2010-2011*]

RSPs typically have membership from social services, education, health (particularly Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)), the police, local authority housing department, housing providers, careers advisers, YOT personnel, Young Offenders' Institutions (YOIs), and Youth Services.



The six Welsh LAs who took part in the evaluation were Bridgend, Caerphilly and Blaenau Gwent, Conwy and Denbighshire, Gwynedd and Ynys Mon, Merthyr Tydfil and Wrexham.

All RSPs are required to review the delivery of resettlement support plans and outcomes for participating children and young people. Bridgend and Wrexham, however, have an enhanced review function. This means that they are required to scrutinise individual cases to ascertain whether resettlement support could have been delivered differently to offer a more effective community-based alternative to custody.

### **3.2 Methodology**

The aims of the evaluation are to conduct a:

Process evaluation which examines:

- the setting up and functioning of the RSPs particularly with regard to 'buy in' from member agencies, and working together
- the role and impact of the resettlement support worker and the supervision support worker
- the role and effectiveness of the review body, and an:

#### **Outcome evaluation**

to determine:

- the effectiveness of the scheme in improving outcomes for young offenders
- the extent to which partners commit resources to resettlement support plans.

Recommendations for more effective implementation of the scheme based on the conclusions are also included.



The NFER adopted a mixed methodology to fulfil the evaluation objectives. The evaluation was conducted in five distinct yet complementary phases, some of which were undertaken simultaneously.

Phase one was the project inception.

In Phase two, the research team collected and analysed quantitative Asset (Young Offender Assessment Profile) data on the young people participating in the pilot schemes. This data is compiled by YOTs and YOIs on all young offenders. Asset data includes information on a young person's age, gender, offence(s), factors or circumstances which may have contributed to their offending behaviour, their particular needs or difficulties, and risk of reoffending. Young people who received a custodial sentence in the six pilot areas in the year before the pilot scheme were compared with those who were or are involved in the scheme.

In Phase three of the evaluation, five bilingual topic guides for the qualitative data collection were designed. The topic guides are included in the Appendix to this report, and were designed to be used in interviews with:

- Strategic WAG and YJB personnel
- Members of the RSPs
- Resettlement support workers
- YOT managers and case workers
- Up to five young people participating in the pilot schemes in each area.

In Phase four, NFER researchers visited each pilot area twice, once during May-July 2010, and again during November 2010-January 2011, to interview these people.

During the first visit, the interviews explored the processes involved in the set-up of the RSPs, their composition, and the rationale behind the pilot schemes. In addition, the effectiveness of partnership working in the area before and

after the establishment of the RSPs was examined. NFER also considered the emerging impacts of the pilot schemes and the RSPs, along with the role and impact of the resettlement support workers.

During the second visit, the research team focused more on the progress of the RSPs and pilot schemes in improving outcomes for young people. Any changes to the approaches adopted in each area and the impact of the pilot schemes, including how they changed over time, were also explored.

Young people were asked about the resettlement work in terms of what had been done, their opinions of it, and its impact(s) on their:

- offending behaviour
- accommodation status
- use of drugs and alcohol
- engagement with education, training and employment
- finding new, more positive interests
- family and friends
- self-esteem
- feelings about their offending.

Analysis of Asset scores was used as part of the outcome evaluation. Asset is a national format which the YJB expects YOTs to use when working with young people. The young people are assessed to identify the likelihood they may reoffend. This is on the basis of 12 'dynamic' factors affecting offending behaviour and four 'static' factors. A low Asset score indicates a lower likelihood of reoffending.

Data was supplied by five out of the six areas on young people with whom they have had contact. The data received varied between areas but typically covered offences committed; programme participation; Asset scores; background characteristics such as age, gender and ethnicity; and some information on enforcement.

In summary the approach was to:

1. Identify young people who have participated in the programme, and describe their pre-intervention characteristics using the available data (focussing on fields where data was deemed to be reasonably reliable and complete).
2. Identify a comparison group of young people sharing similar characteristics but who did not participate in the programme. To ensure that the analysis was not biased by unobserved characteristics which may have influenced both participation in the scheme and the outcomes of interest, the young people in the comparison group should not have had the *opportunity* to participate.<sup>1</sup>.
3. Compare post-intervention outcomes – defined as the one year period beginning the month after the intervention start date – across the two groups of young people.

In practice, there were some challenges implementing this approach. There were low numbers of young people participating in the scheme, and missing data was substantial. The analysis therefore used two comparison groups, balancing the competing demands of ‘quality’ and ‘quantity’ of data:

- a core comparison group sharing similar characteristics in terms of number of offences committed, maximum gravity of offence and average Asset scores
- an extended comparison group which was similar to the core comparison group by way of gender, ethnicity and age.

During Phase 5 of the project, the research team collated and analysed all of the evaluation data. A Final Report and executive summary were then produced, and a presentation of the findings given to the project steering group.

---

<sup>1</sup> In practice this was achieved by defining a dummy intervention start date one year prior to the actual start date of the resettlement programme in each area. For the purposes of comparison with programme participations, young people’s “pre-intervention” characteristics were then measured prior to this date, and “post-intervention” characteristics after it.

## **4. Case study 1**

This pilot covered an area with two local authorities (LAs). The research team visited the Youth Offending Team (YOT) in July 2010 and again in December 2010. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with strategic and operational YOT staff at both visits. Telephone interviews were conducted with young people during the second visit only.

### **4.1 The resettlement panel: set up and functioning**

#### **4.1.1 Panel structure and membership**

Respondents defined the main aim of the pilot resettlement scheme as supporting young people to access the services they needed. To achieve this, the RSP was used to hold discussions between staff from different support agencies. One respondent explained this in the following way: “It is a matter of providing the support up-front. We have a small number of young people who many people don’t consider [providing services for] and this is a way of highlighting their needs and ensuring they access the type of support they require.”

The resettlement work built on effective partnership working already in place, including links between the YOT, housing agencies and education and training providers. The fact that the RSP covered two local authorities was not thought to have reduced its effectiveness, largely because of the history of collaboration between some of the agencies involved. Limited capacity was reported to affect some stakeholders’ engagement with resettlement work, rather than their willingness to engage.

It was decided not to establish a stand-alone resettlement panel in the YOT 1 area as it was thought that this could duplicate work already being undertaken. Consequently, young people’s resettlement was discussed at an existing panel which met monthly to consider Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS), custody and resettlement cases.

The panel's function was defined by interviewees as:

- Evaluating case management processes and formulating effective resettlement support plans on a multi-agency and independent basis
- Linking in processes to monitor young people's risk of harm, vulnerability and likelihood of re-offending
- Collating, considering and discussing information about young people on a multi-agency basis to inform release plans and the resettlement process
- Linking into custody reviewing processes, in particular when planning for the final release date.

Although participation in the pilot resettlement scheme was voluntary, staff operated on an assumption that young people would take part. A typical comment which outlined this rationale was, '*It is not an opt in but a opt out*'.

The following individuals and agencies made up the RSP:

- YOT operational manager
- YOT prevention manager
- YOT education officer
- Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services representatives (CAMHS)
- Police officer
- Substance misuse service staff
- Social services representatives.

Members were permitted to nominate deputies to attend panel meetings on their behalf. Other agencies were invited to attend to discuss a particular case if appropriate.

The irregular attendance of some panel members added to the work of the YOT staff because they had to follow up decisions and discussions with those agencies whose representatives had not attended. YOT staff and panel members attributed these absences to workload issues.

Young people leaving custody or at risk of a custodial sentence were referred to the panel through multi-agency teams. Their vulnerability and the risk of harm they posed to themselves and others were considered by the panel.

Resettlement support plans and arrangements for supervision were also put in place at panel meetings.

The panel was chaired by a former social services manager who was respected as an impartial and authoritative figure. The YOT provided the secretariat for the panel. Initially, the chair's role was limited to reading reports and chairing RSP meetings. However, during the pilot project, the chair became more involved with leading the resettlement work and contributed to individual case discussions.

Members believed that the panel worked well, as it provided an opportunity for a wide range of stakeholders to meet and discuss individual cases from a number of different angles. They felt that those attending the initial panel meetings had sufficient authority to commit resources when required to do so. At the second case study visit, however, it was noted that those attending lacked such authority.

#### **4.1.2 Panel functioning and effectiveness**

Panel members believed that the RSP had encouraged less 'silo' working among the attending agencies. This was attributed to the commitment and work of stakeholders in the field rather than to the impact of the panel per se. Silo working had not disappeared completely, however as those interviewed felt that some people still needed to be convinced that the RSP was undertaking work of real value to the young people concerned.

Several panel members questioned the need for the panel, on the grounds that it duplicated existing work. They said that many of the young people who were discussed at the RSP were also discussed at other meetings.

Some respondents felt that the RSP should be a responsibility of the YOT, and that the lack of engagement by some external agencies reflected this feeling. They were also concerned that actions agreed by the panel were often not carried out. A panel member made the following comment which emphasised the lack of impact that the panel had on improving young



people's resettlement; "The world isn't very different because of this panel. It may be that things would be less structured and less formal without it. The other agencies might not have had the full picture at the time of the risk assessment but the quality of the work wasn't down to the panel".

The YOT amended the panel's functioning in several ways through the course of the evaluation. Firstly, they changed the format of the reports prepared for the panel, to focus more on young people's risk and vulnerability.

Progressively fewer young people were referred to the panel. The decision to consider fewer young people was intended to prioritise those most in need of resettlement support. Panel members believed that this improved the quality of the resettlement support plans. They also maintained that it had led to a more 'joined-up' approach that took account of the full range of issues affecting young people, such as accommodation, education and welfare. As one panel member said, "We went through a large number of cases, but not always to the level of detail that was required. Now we have become more focused, looking at what the priority cases are and giving more attention to them".

A further change to the panel's functioning was that any young person already in custody, already undertaking resettlement work, or deemed by the relevant agencies to be high risk or very vulnerable, would be referred to the panel automatically. This was because of significant crossover between these groups.

#### **4.2 The resettlement support worker**

The resettlement support worker was central to the success of the pilot scheme. Respondents believed that the resettlement support worker needed to be known by the young person and should establish a relationship with them early on. The worker should also maintain contact with agencies such as housing and ETE to ensure that young people's needs were fully met. As one respondent noted, "It should not be about duplicating, but ensuring that what

the young people need is available, that they have what they need to be able to move on at the end of their sentence”.

Interviewees felt that the resettlement support worker’s role provided:

- additional contact over and above that provided by the case manager
- informal monitoring to identify problems and gaps in resettlement support plans
- a link between resettlement work and the case manager
- advocacy and support for the young people
- a way of signposting young people to services and helping them to access them.

In addition to the role of the resettlement worker, a member of staff seconded from Careers Wales had a central role in the resettlement scheme. The focus of their work was on linking with ETE providers to meet the needs of the participating young people. The Careers Wales officer also examined the young people’s support needs when accessing ETE provision, and ensured that they had access to information about the ETE options open to them.

The resettlement worker, together with the Careers Wales officer, visited custodial settings to meet the young people six to eight weeks prior to release. This was to begin establishing a relationship with them and to identify their ETE needs. Both officers also worked with young people on the resettlement scheme who had not received a custodial sentence, to ensure that their ETE needs were met.

The resettlement worker dealt mainly with accommodation issues faced by young people leaving custody. This was done by referring the young people to accommodation agencies and monitoring the service and support they received, to ensure it was appropriate and sufficient.

Interviewees felt that the number of young people who engaged with the resettlement scheme was disappointing. The resettlement worker had found it difficult to make and maintain contact with the young people after their

release, despite prolonged efforts to do so. Interviewees also noted that the resettlement worker had made nearly all the contact rather than the young people themselves. One respondent stated, “We have tried to sustain the links and raise awareness of what is offered, but the take-up was disappointing. A lot of effort is put into it but very often the only contact is that initiated by the resettlement staff”. This emphasises the challenges of engaging with the young people and the need for those responsible to be continually proactive in promoting engagement.

As a result, from August 2010, the resettlement activities were started at the point of Pre-Sentence Review (PSR). This was much earlier than at the start of the pilot scheme. Since then, the resettlement worker accompanied the YOT case workers to each PSR meeting to offer support to the young people before they went to court. The fact that a young person was engaged with the resettlement scheme was mentioned at the pre-sentence hearing.

However, this change had not encouraged more young people to engage with the resettlement work, even though many were at risk of receiving custodial sentences. Those interviewed were disappointed about this, as illustrated by the following comment: “The relationship is being started a lot earlier but we are still a long way from getting the take-up we want ... the strength is that this model is more likely to succeed than what was previously in place”.

#### **4.3 The review body: role and effectiveness**

YOT 1 did not have an enhanced review function. Instead, YOT 1 reviewed the pilot resettlement scheme and the resettlement work undertaken through it in two main ways.

Firstly, YOT staff examined the resettlement work delivered through the pilot scheme internally in 2009 in light of the challenges encountered in engaging with young people. YOT 1 also undertook an assessment of the RSP’s effectiveness measured against a set of key criteria . A report of the findings

from the latter review was sent to the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) and the Children and Young People's Partnership (CYPP).

This had resulted in the following changes, which had been implemented by October 2010:

- The RSP chair became more involved with planning the resettlement work and contributing to individual case discussions
- Changing the format of reports on young people discussed at the RSP to focus more on risk and vulnerability
- Referring fewer young people to the RSP to prioritise those most in need
- Automatically referring young people already in custody, and those who were high-risk or very vulnerable, onto the panel.

The impact of these changes is subject to further evaluation.

#### **4.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

YOT 1 used the resettlement funding to develop the work of the resettlement panel and to appoint a part-time resettlement worker. Most of the funding for the services that were required for effective resettlement work to be undertaken was to be committed by the service providers involved.

Panel members believed that the agencies represented on the panel had contributed the required resources. They thought this was due to their recognition of the young people's vulnerability and to a shared commitment to meeting their needs. The panel had no statutory powers, however, and therefore relied on its members' goodwill and good practice. Some members felt that the RSP should not ask its members to commit additional resources as these should be available anyway, if the need arose. Rather than obtaining resources, they thought that that the panel's role should be to obtain better coordination, and to inform decisions around young people's resettlement.

#### **4.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Interviewees said that the pilot scheme had helped to increase the effectiveness of young people's resettlement, and enhanced the quality of the resettlement work undertaken by YOT 1. The RSP had added coordination to resettlement and increased young people's contact with available services and support. Improved partnership working between panel members and more efficient referral of the young people to the relevant support services underpinned this, as the following comment reflects

“We are probably not doing anything radically different, it is more of a matter of trying to get more joined-up thinking and of highlighting cases of need to the relevant service providers”.

However, as noted earlier, the number of young people engaging with the service was lower than intended. This was attributed to a feeling that the young people did not want to be associated with the YOT after their orders came to an end. According to one respondent, “The problem we face ... is that a lot of these young people associate the YOT and all the staff working within it as part of the sentence, something they are required to do .... Many of them then want nothing to do with it once their orders have come to an end.”

Individuals delivering the resettlement work pointed to the positive benefits it had brought for the small number of young people who had engaged with the work. Were it not for the pilot scheme, the additional support provided by the resettlement worker would not have been possible. “It is an added value, something that is there to help and support them”, was how one respondent described it. The resettlement worker's role had also been important in ensuring that relevant agencies responded to the needs of young people. Moreover, the Careers Wales officer was considered to have helped the resettlement work by ensuring ETE provision was in place, upon their release from custody. A key aspect of this was their attendance at a local ETE forum.

This allowed discussion of young people's needs with ETE providers in advance of their engagement with any provision.

YOT personnel and panel members thought that resettlement work had influenced the young people's attitudes towards reoffending. However, these stakeholders emphasised that its contribution was one of many factors affecting this.

Stakeholders believed that it was difficult to attribute any changes in substance misuse to the intervention work undertaken through the resettlement scheme. While resettlement work could refer a young person to substance misuse services, the outcomes depended on whether a young person chose to engage with those services.

The fact that the resettlement worker could carry on working with the young people after their sentences came to an end was cited as a positive impact of the pilot scheme because it helped them to deal with issues that arose at a crucial stage in their lives when they were especially vulnerable. Some interviewees felt that the pilot scheme had strengthened exit strategies for those leaving the youth justice system. However, as noted earlier, this was not a universal view, given that some young people were keen to break away from an involvement with the YOT as soon as possible.

It was recognised that the resettlement support provided through the scheme was not the only factor influencing reoffending. For example, it was noted that the local police were more likely to resort to on-the-spot fines, than to take young people to court, which had a major impact in reducing the reported level of offending in the area.

#### **4.6 Asset analysis**

It was not possible to obtain Asset data from YOT 1 in time for the evaluation.

## 4.7 Conclusion

The evidence from YOT 1 emphasised the need for young people's resettlement issues to be addressed by individuals with sufficient seniority to be able to take decisions and to commit resources to meeting their needs.

The fact that the work of the body responsible for resettlement had been reviewed had ensured that some key issues concerning the working of the panel had been addressed. The need for systematic and regular review of the way resettlement work is addressed became evident. Adding the responsibility for resettlement to an existing body was effective in this case and avoided the creation of an additional body.

The resettlement worker contributed by providing individual, one-to-one support, including specific links with education and training providers. The practical work of acting on behalf of the young people signposting services and ensuring that service providers responded to needs was central, if the role was to benefit the young people. For this approach to work there was a need for the resettlement worker to establish relationships early.

The need to maximise the number of young people taking up the support was recognised and the relatively low numbers engaging would suggest that more work is needed to convince young people of the value of resettlement support.

The need to promote multi-agency working was something which became evident although this was not confined to resettlement work. There was also a need to share good practice across LAs given the fact that the level of engagement by individual LAs (and specific services within them) varied.

## **Key findings: YOT 1**

### **The RSP: set up and functioning**

The pilot resettlement scheme at YOT 1 supported young people to access the services they needed. YOT 1 used an existing panel to discuss young people's resettlement. This functioned well, but some members lacked decision-making authority. Some members who attended less regularly than others felt that young people's resettlement should remain the responsibility of the YOT. The panel encouraged cooperative working between agencies, however, some respondents felt that it duplicated existing work.

### **The resettlement support worker**

The resettlement support worker's role was central to the success of the pilot scheme. They supported and monitored young people; gave them advocacy and support; provided a link between resettlement work and the case manager; and signposted young people to services. The worker engaged with young people at the point of Pre-Sentence Review (PSR). This helped to build relationships with them. Respondents felt that the numbers of young people who engaged with the pilot scheme was disappointing, despite the sustained efforts of the resettlement support worker.

### **The review body**

YOT 1 did not carry out intensive reviews of interventions on individual young people. YOT staff reviewed the work of the RSP internally, and reported regularly to the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB). The reviews led to changes in the resettlement worker's role and that of the RSP chair, of the report format, and of panel intake and referral.

### **Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

YOT 1 used the resettlement funding to develop the panel's work and to appoint the resettlement support worker. Respondents felt that the agencies had committed the necessary resources.

### **Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Offending had reduced among young people over the course of the pilot scheme, although it was not possible to attribute this directly to the resettlement work supported through it. The pilot scheme had improved the effectiveness, coordination and quality of young people's resettlement, according to interviewees. The funding had added value to the resettlement support provided.



## 5. Case study 2

Youth Offending Team (YOT) 2 was initially visited in June 2010, and again in November 2010. The Resettlement Support Panel (RSP) was fully functional at both visits. RSP members, YOT staff and young people were interviewed at both visits.

### 5.1 The resettlement panels: set up and functioning

Concerns about the number of young people sentenced to and remanded in custody in this case-study area prompted the need for a greater focus on resettlement support. Despite a history of effective partnership working in the authority, a more joined up approach was required in order to provide an enhanced package of support for young people. Utilising Youth Justice Board (YJB) funding, the Youth Justice Service (YJS) led on the development of a multi-agency resettlement panel and appointed a resettlement support worker in September 2009. The first panel meeting was held in October 2009 and continued to meet on a regular basis<sup>2</sup> over the course of the pilot.

The aims and objectives of the YOT 2 RSP are to:

- develop a shared understanding and benchmarking for good multi-agency resettlement practice and decision making around custodial and remand sentence
- identify provision that could decrease the use of custody
- identify and address gaps in provision that could delay a young person's release from custody
- increase inter-agency collaboration to overcome gaps in provision and avert possible remands to custody or custodial sentences.

Summing up the aims of the panel, one member partner said:

“I think it's about trying to come together to pre-empt any problems and clear out any blockages which may jeopardise the successful resettlement of a young person”.

---

<sup>2</sup> A total of six meetings were held between October 2009 and December 2010.

### **5.1.1 Panel structure and membership**

The RSP met quarterly on YOT premises. Meetings were stand-alone and not part of other scheduled events. The YOT took responsibility for the organisation and administration of the panel meetings. The head of the YOT chaired the session and took the minutes. Meetings typically lasted two hours and followed a standard format. The minutes of the last meeting were discussed and action points followed up. The resettlement support worker then presented a progress report covering the following items:

- young people sentenced to custody (since the last meeting)
- young people remanded to custody or secure accommodation (since the last meeting)
- young people currently in custody and planning for their release
- follow-up of young people released (to measure the success of panel decisions)
- follow-up of young people where a custodial outcome was averted (due to the panel providing a package of support).

Panel members felt it would be useful to receive prior notice of the matters to be discussed in advance of RSP meetings. This was felt to make for a more effective meeting, as it enabled panel members to gather further information from colleagues and identify solutions to present to the panel at its meeting.

Panel members were committed to attend meetings and to facilitate resettlement support in their day-to-day work in their own organisations. Between meetings, should an issue arise, that could not be resolved by operational level staff within a partner agency, panel members had agreed that the resettlement worker could contact them directly. This helped to prevent delays and achieved a more rapid resolution to issues. Describing this process, a panel member commented:

“We meet every quarter, we’ve got terms of reference now, and each of these people committed that they would try and come as often as they

can, but in between times, if there were ever any blockages or ever any problems, they would sort them out and that's happening."

There was no formal method for referring young people to the panel. YOT case managers identified young people requiring assistance from the resettlement support worker. The support worker gave feedback about individuals at each panel meeting based on a detailed analysis of each case, developed through contact with the young people. Panel members also drew attention to other young people (particularly the younger siblings of those being discussed) who were known to their services, and who may benefit from early intervention.

The resettlement support worker's crucial role was evident here in providing an effective conduit for information about all young people. They also had dedicated time to prepare written reports and attend panel meetings. Without such a role, it was likely that information about young people would be required from several case managers and would be presented to the panel in a more piecemeal way.

Over the course of the pilot, the numbers of young people in custody in this area had fallen. This had allowed the panel to spend more time considering the needs of a wider range of young people, including those at risk of custody, and to discuss preventive measures. One panel member, describing types of young people discussed at the panel, said:

"When custody numbers were high, those individuals were the focus of the meeting, that sort of occupies people's minds. But if you look to the medium-longer term, less people in custody means less people coming out. So that's given us scope to talk about others. We all appreciate that, you know, being able to do something before you get into that position".

Resettlement support panel meetings were attended (predominantly) by senior strategic personnel. Panel members included:

- Head of YJS (Chair)
- Operational Manager -YJS
- Resettlement Support Worker – YJS
- Superintendant - North Wales Police
- Head of Service - Corporate Parenting
- Young Offenders Institution (YOI) representative
- Team manager - Community Safety Partnership (CSP)
- Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)representative
- Chief Officer - Prevention & Inclusion
- Service Manager - Housing
- Career Wales representative
- Senior Manager - Leaving Care
- National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO) representative
- Independent housing provider representative.

In general, interviewees felt that all relevant services and agencies were represented on the panel and numbers were sufficient for effective and purposeful discussion. Membership grew slightly over the course of the pilot, as representatives from NACRO and a YOI, attended more recent meetings. Suggestions for potential future members included the youth service and the young people’s substance misuse service. Initially, it was thought that the panel meetings would be attended by court personnel such as the deputy court clerk and the chair of youth court. Those individuals highlighted a potential conflict of interest and decided not to attend, but welcomed feedback on the panel’s work.

The level of representation on the resettlement support panel was seen as one of the key factors in its success. Panel members told us:

“If somebody comes here and says, ‘oh we’ve got this problem’, I’m in a position to perhaps see the bigger picture because I’m involved in

other services, and then I can go back to the office and say, 'this is what I want to happen'".

"It's really handy, because with them [other panel members] being at that level they'll take things forward and pass things down to their staff. It helps me because you can go and say, 'I was at a meeting and your manager said', or you can contact them [panel members] direct and then they'll pass it down to whoever I need to see".

Panel meetings were generally very well attended and given the senior level of personnel involved, this demonstrates a high level of commitment to improving outcomes for this group of young people.

### **5.1.2 Panel functioning and effectiveness**

Interviewees typically reported that they had agreed to attend panel meetings, because of the need to establish a more coordinated approach to resettlement support. They felt that it was beneficial to have a greater awareness of the work of other services. They also saw sharing information about their own work (including service remit, procedures and targets) as important. Panel members recognised that, in order to improve the resettlement of young people, services needed to become more solution-focused:

"I have tried to make a point of coming to these resettlement panel meetings in particular, because I understand what [the head of YJS's] dilemma was a year ago, in terms of the number of people that were being remanded in custody, and some of that was because of lack of accommodation. When [the head of YJS] communicates that message you think, 'well actually we might be part of the problem or part of the solution, that's why I'm keen to come to these meetings.'"

Panel members were strongly committed to resolving some of the issues which had presented difficulties in the resettlement of young people in the past. One interviewee commented that the panel had provided them with the "opportunity to sit down in a more proactive role".

There have been very few challenges to the functioning of the panel in this case-study area. One interviewee highlighted a potential difficulty when the panel was first established due to the conflicting views one partner organisation had about its aims and objectives:

“What he was saying is, ‘you’ve come to say that there’s too many people going into custody, well actually some of us might think that’s the best thing’. So then, we had a conversation about the limitations of custody and how it didn’t perhaps help that young person, and he was fine”.

While some individuals had missed meetings occasionally, panel members agreed that that all of the necessary services and agencies were represented and were equally committed to its work. They recognised that the panel may not have functioned quite as successfully, had it not been for a concurrent change in strategic level personnel in some of the partner organisations.

One of the biggest challenges for the effective resettlement of young people in the area, and therefore a key challenge for the panel, was the limited availability of accommodation. As a panel member explained:

“We don’t have a ready stock of vacant property and vacant supportive housing available. So if say [the Head of YJS] or [the resettlement support worker] phones up and says ‘look I’ve got this individual, they need housing in two weeks’, we’ve got to give some certainty that there’s going to be property there available for them. We can’t always say that we can, because it means we’ve got to leave that property vacant for two weeks, even if it’s available at that moment in time. One of the issues we’ve got is trying to reduce our costs in temporary accommodation generally and it’s going to become even more pertinent over the next three to four years when we’re facing thirty per cent cuts.”

At times, there were also challenges for the panel relating to differences in the way services interpret legislation and national guidance, particularly around housing responsibilities. This included, for example, responsibility for 16 and 17 year olds, requirements to undertake child in need assessments and the use of ‘intentionally homeless’ criteria.

The other challenges for the panel related to the pilot programme itself. Interviewees found it difficult to use the first instalment of funding in a shorter timescale than originally anticipated. There was also some uncertainty about whether the panel arrangements met YJB requirements. Interviewees reported that, to address this, they would have welcomed the opportunity to meet with other pilot projects to compare approaches and share good practice. Finally, given the time-limited funding for this work, there were also concerns around its future sustainability (particularly the role of the resettlement worker) which had implications for local planning.

Reflecting on what had influenced the success of the pilot, those involved highlighted the following key factors:

- **Senior strategic level representation:** including staff with authority-wide perspectives, an ability to make service-level decisions, commit resources and resolve operational issues. 'If there is an issue with a young person, we can raise it in this panel and from a higher level it tends to get sorted'.
- **Regular panel meetings:** which are well-attended and include representation from a wide range of services.
- **Face-to-face dialogue:** 'It's the physicality of meeting up face-to-face rather than sending requests by email and never having the chance to build relationships. It helps to decrease the time things take to progress'.
- **Collective agreement on the aims and objectives of the panel:** including, for example, members' roles and remits.
- **Commitment to a proactive approach:** which may involve compromise, time and commitment of (scarce) resources.
- **An understanding and appreciation of the needs and circumstances of young people requiring resettlement support:** including, for example, empathy for the chaotic lifestyles of the young people.
- **Opportunities to clarify service remits and establish a shared understanding.** 'That has to happen, you have to allow people to do that, but then it's the opportunity to move on, and look at ways people can work together more effectively'.
- **Well-managed yet informal meetings:** 'It runs quite well and it's quite informal as well which is important, because we need to work problems out'
- **The resettlement support worker role.** 'I think that has been at the crux of it, having that dedicated time to do that individual support. And I do worry what the future holds if that role isn't able to be supported because I think it is only when you've got somebody working and making the links

directly on a day-to-day basis that you're actually moving on, and getting some achievement. There were a couple of people who went away [from the panel meeting] yesterday with jobs, but at the heart of it was the support worker'.

## **5.2 The resettlement support worker**

The resettlement worker took up post at YOT 2 in September 2009. Prior to this appointment the officer worked as a case manager at the YJS and as a result had a good understanding of the local area and the issues relating to the resettlement of young people.

The resettlement support worker post was full time. The officer had a caseload which included all young people with a Detention and Training Order (DTO) in juvenile custody.

Many of the impacts of the support worker role were inextricably linked to the effectiveness of the resettlement panel and the commitment from strategic personnel to improve outcomes for this group of young people. Nevertheless, the role itself brought a wide range of benefits.

One of the key impacts of the role was the increased focus on and prioritisation of the resettlement needs of young people, within the YJS and partner agencies more widely.

"I think it's given a focus, the whole team now know we've got this one officer trying to keep people out of custody. So I think it's made everybody more aware that that's what we're trying to do".

The role also allowed for greater planning and delivery of resettlement support. This included the development of shared protocols with partner services and the analysis of young people's feedback on how resettlement support could be made more effective. The resettlement worker was also able to dedicate a significant proportion of time (perhaps over and above that of a typical case manager) to supporting young people's resettlement needs (particularly those in crisis). Time was spent, for example, identifying various



options to present to magistrates at case hearings to reduce the likelihood of a young person receiving a custodial sentence.

Those interviewed also felt that the resettlement worker had relieved the workload of the wider YJS. For example, case managers no longer needed to undertake time-consuming tasks such as contacting accommodation providers and completing housing-related documentation. Describing the situation, one YJS case manager told us:

“Me and my colleagues are under so much pressure. It’s really difficult to allocate time to do it, because it is really time intensive... There was some concern about what would happen about this initiative, if there wasn’t a dedicated officer. My own feeling is that we would struggle a bit, because no one would be taking responsibility for it and it’s possible that wouldn’t be the top of the priority list really”.

Having a single point of contact within the YJS, for liaison about a young person’s resettlement needs, was also key. As a result, there were clearer lines of communication, not only for staff but also for young people. This reduced the time it took to resolve issues. One respondent noted:

“I know each individual and what area they work in, and if we have an issue with a young person, because we’ve developed a relationship with these individuals, it’s far easier to sort things out”.

“You can contact [name of resettlement support worker], he’ll have the answer for you... whereas if there was lots of different [resettlement support workers] then it’s difficult. I would imagine for the young people, because they know it’s [name of resettlement support worker] who they need to go to, it’s easy for them to contact him. Sometimes when you’re trying to contact the other youth justice workers about your clients, it takes time finding out who they are, tracking them down, trying to find what days they’re in.”

The resettlement worker was also central to the development of more effective relationships with existing statutory partners and development of new (and improved) relationships with voluntary sector services. Good relationships were linked by respondents to the high personal regard the officer had among other agencies:

“My impression is from my dealings with him, is that he’s very courteous and considerate, and good at getting your cooperation, which is important, because that’s the vital ingredient isn’t it? If you’re able to communicate with members of staff, that don’t meet very often perhaps.”

The effectiveness of the role was also linked to the specialist knowledge and expertise of the resettlement support worker, particularly relating to housing law and duties of care. This meant partnership working was effective, as more meaningful dialogue could take place.

“I have the knowledge of what the local authorities need to do, or have to do – what their obligations are, duty of care, stuff like that, which a more general practitioner they would probably have to go through all that time to discover [it] and work it out so I think that’s part of it”.

### **5.3 Reviewing function**

YOT 2 had an enhanced review function. At each panel meeting, the resettlement support worker presented a progress report on individual cases which had been discussed previously by the RSP. This included the follow-up of young people released from custody and those for whom a custodial sentence was averted due to the support provided by the panel.

## **5.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

While the agencies represented on the panel did not pool financial resources for resettlement support services, they had each made a commitment to attend regular panel meetings. Given the seniority of panel members, this demonstrated a significant commitment of 'in kind' resources and should not be underestimated. Indeed, many (if not all) of the services which made up the panel were facing significant cutbacks in service funding, yet members continued to attend meetings despite considerable pressures on their time.

### **5.4.1 Partnership working around resettlement**

Interviewees agreed that the resettlement support panel had led to a range of positive impacts, not only in terms of improved outcomes for young people, but also wider improvements within and between services.

Commenting on the situation before the pilot, panel members referred to difficulties in meeting young people's resettlement needs, due to issues of communication and cooperation between partner agencies. Coming together for the panel was perceived to have removed these barriers and led to improved relationships between services. One panel member, for example, told us:

"I felt as though a lot of people were in their silos, in a tin house defending their budget and trying to limit their responsibility and just passing it off, and it got pretty frustrating. But there's absolutely no doubt what the establishment of this has done for us, it's changed all that."

"What the resettlement support panel's done in my view, has made my job a hell of a lot easier, because it's actually been a good tool to unblock things that were blocked up in the past, where you couldn't get hold of people or you didn't know who to talk to, or you were dealing with people at a lower level. Because this is a strategic body, you can give them a phone call and they'll sort things out for you, so it's all worked out quite well."

The panel was felt to have provided a forum for partners to explain to other panel members the remit of their service, and the levels of support they were able to offer young people, and the reasons for this. This in turn led to a greater shared understanding among all those involved, and helped to clarify how each service could contribute to improvements in this area:

“We’ve been able to have agency discussions about how we move things forward as well. It’s about clarification of roles, it’s about better working arrangements, and that’s important. And it’s about dispelling some myths as well, because sometimes there are myths about who should be doing what when in fact, they really shouldn’t. It’s just that opportunity to bring some clarity.”

“Coming to this panel just means I get to see what everyone else is inputting... it just helps that we all work together.”

There was a view that sharing information at resettlement support panel meetings had led members to develop a better understanding of the wider needs of young people and a stronger sense of urgency and commitment to support them.

“Before, you were in your individual department and you were looking at your protocols and procedures for support and say this young person actually didn’t meet the criteria. You come here and you’re having a discussion with their worker and they’re saying ‘this and this and this’. The dialogue is open here, we can say ‘yes that is a stumbling block, but what can we do about it in addition to what we normally do?’ So I think there is that better understanding of each other’s priorities, and a willingness to think, ‘well actually I have a contribution to this’.”

“There’s nothing like focusing the mind when you’re talking about individuals and the impact on individuals or families, you can do all that policy work but actually it’s not until you start talking about individuals where it reveals there may be tensions between different people’s problems, and I think you can only really do that if you’ve got that basis of trust and respect and an opportunity of, ‘well, how can we work together to get over this?’”

The panel was also felt to have enabled more efficient working practices by streamlining process, cutting through bureaucracy and reducing the number of contacts with different staff before a solution could be identified.

“The panel gives me time to put a name to a face and build up relationships. It means that I’m no longer dealing with any one of twenty staff every time there is an issue. I’m not having to go in cold and build bridges, or spend hours going round in circles. I think it’s an efficient and effective way of dealing with other agencies.”

In the case of one agency, involvement with the panel had also led to the increased prioritisation of young people with resettlement needs in their own service planning:

“We’ve understood that there are some individuals who have such chaotic lives, and have such needs that the supported accommodation that’s already out at the moment just can’t cope with them basically, and you think, ‘well what are we going to do with this individual?’ So in our supportive operational plan we have done some work in terms of identifying supported accommodation for people with high needs... So that’s in our operational plan as a priority now.”

## **5.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Over the preceding year, this case study area had seen a dramatic decrease in the number of young people sentenced to custody.

“Our custody rate has gone down by over fifty per cent. Now whether it’s because we’ve got a resettlement support officer or not I don’t know, but it has.... I don’t know whether it’s what we’re doing with the young people [anyway]. It’s very difficult [to know] why has it gone down but it has, and it coincides exactly with the time this post was put into place.”

There were individual cases where the resettlement support worker had secured accommodation and, as a consequence, the court felt able to impose a community order rather than a custodial sentence. Describing a recent situation where the resettlement support worker assisted with a young person’s placement in supported housing, a case manager explained:

“At the end of the month they’re back in crown [court] so we can get the ball rolling before then, and so it allows us to build a much more robust proposal as an alternative to custody, because we’re saying ‘we’ve got this lined up, we’ve been talking to children’s services, we’ve got

something lined up'. We could say that we can propose ISS [Intensive Supervision and Surveillance] to this address, and we have some confidence [of its success] rather than some B and B or something like that."

There were examples of where the resettlement support worker had mediated between the young person and family members enabling the young person to remain in the family home, or had acquired emergency accommodation for the young person. The impacts of securing more appropriate accommodation for young people was felt to reduce the likelihood that they would engage in substance misuse and crime.

There were also impacts for young people in terms of improved access to education and training. One panel member, for example, described how improvements in the exchange of information about young people leaving custody meant that community based provision could be arranged in advance of their release:

"You've got an idea of the issues before they come out [of custody] and then we all work together when they come out, it helps them to settle down quicker so they won't reoffend. If they've got something set up for them as soon as they come out of prison, they tend to respond better. It's that gap when they're hanging about waiting for things to do that you can find they can often reoffend... They come out and they're doing education where they never thought they would."

## **5.6 Asset analysis**

This analysis is based on evidence for a total of 17 young people who were referred to the panel. A core comparison group (drawn to reflect the offence histories and characteristics of the intervention group closely) was selected comprising of 15 young people, together with an extended comparison group of 7 young people. This means that the total number of young people who are included in the analysis is 39. Given the small number in the sample the analysis should be treated with care.

The majority (35 of 39) of the sample were male while 2 were female and the gender of the other 2 was not known. The majority (27) were described as White British.

**Table 5.1: Sample age profile**

Age	Intervention group	Core comparison group	Extended comparison group
13	-	-	-
14	-	-	-
15	4	2	1
16	3	5	0
17	8	5	2
18	2	3	0
Not available	-	-	4
Total	17	15	7

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

The Asset scores for each category for the sample of 39 young people before the intervention are presented in Table 5.2.

**Table 5.2: ASSET score analysis all young people**

	No with score of 0	No with score of 1	No with score of 2	No with score of 3	No with score of 4
Living arrangements	11	33	31	23	1
Family and personal relationships	2	19	36	36	6
Education, training or employment	5	10	46	31	7
Neighbourhood	14	25	43	17	1
Lifestyle	1	9	40	42	7
Substance misuse	13	23	28	23	12
Physical health	64	27	7	1	0
Emotional and mental health	16	21	32	25	5
Perceptions of self	9	24	53	11	2
Thinking and behaviour	0	5	36	49	9
Attitude to offending	4	14	47	26	8
Motivation to change	9	14	41	27	8

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Around half of the sample were assessed as having an Asset score of 3 or more in relation to family and personal relationships, lifestyle, substance misuse, thinking and behaviour, attitude to offending and motivation to change.

The profile of the number of young people is presented in Table 5.3:



**Table 5.3: Number of offences committed by group of young people**

	Intervention group		Core comparison group		Extended comparison group	
	Pre	post	pre	post	pre	post
0 offences	0	5	0	4	0	5
1 offence	0	6	0	4	0	1
2-5 offences	2	5	6	4	6	1
6-10 offences	2	0	6	3	1	0
10+ offences	13	1	3	0	0	0
Total	17	17	15	15	7	7

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Most of the young people in the intervention group (15 young people) had committed more than 6 offences before the intervention. This was a higher percentage of the group than the core or extended comparison groups. Five of the young people in the intervention group committed no offences after the intervention, 6 offended once and 1 committed more than 10 offences. The figures for the intervention group compared well with those for the core comparison group (where 8 out of 15 young people committed 1 offence or less) but contrasted with 6 of the 7 in the extended comparison group who committed one offence or less).

The maximum gravity of the offences committed by the young people before the intervention is presented in Table 5.4.

**Table 5.4: Maximum gravity of offences by group of young people**

	Intervention		Core		Extended	
	pre	post	Pre	post	pre	post
0	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	-	0	-	1	-	-
4	3	8	9	7	4	1
5	4	1	1	1	1	1
6	9	0	4	2	2	0
7	1	-	1		0	0
No data	-	8	-	4	-	5
Total	17	9	15	11	7	2

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

The nature of the young people in the intervention group meant that they were the most serious offenders before the intervention. The young people in the intervention group were the most likely to commit the most serious offences (gravity of 6 or higher) than the comparison group. After the intervention only one of the young people in the intervention committed an offence of a gravity of 5 or higher. This compared to 3 of the 15 in the core comparison group. One of the young people in the intervention group committed an offence with a gravity of 5.

## **5.7 Conclusion**

The evidence from YOT 2 would suggest that ensuring a specific focus on resettlement through a dedicated RSP had contributed to raising awareness of the needs of the young people concerned and that it had helped to promote multi-agency working in meeting their needs. This was in many ways related

to the way that relevant stakeholders had engaged with the RSP's work and their willingness to contribute resources. For resettlement to work, it needed to be valued and recognised as important by those with sufficient seniority in the relevant responsible organisations. The enhanced review function had contributed to resettlement by providing a focused and informed discussion of the issues concerned. However it is not evident what additional information was shared or whether it was the intensity with which cases were discussed that contributed to the effectiveness of the enhanced review body.

Resettlement work had benefited from the fact that a recognised and experienced officer had been allocated responsibility who was able to intervene and advocate on behalf of the young people concerned. As was noted in the case study, this included ensuring effective communication between key stakeholders.

The resettlement process within YOT 2 benefited from the fact that the members of the RSP attended on a regular basis and took the time to work together to develop appropriate responses to the needs of the young people for whom they were responsible.

### **Key findings: YOT 2**

#### **The RSP: set up and functioning**

RSP meetings were held separately from other processes at YOT 2. They aimed to reduce the use of custody for young offenders, to raise understanding of good practice in young people's resettlement, foster inter-agency working around resettlement, and to identify gaps in resettlement provision. Meetings were used to discuss young people currently in custody and those in the community who had received non-custodial sentences. Members felt that panel meetings worked well overall. They saw key partners as committed to attend meetings and to facilitate resettlement support. Membership of the RSP had expanded over the course of the pilot.

#### **The resettlement support worker**

The resettlement support worker was a former case manager at YOT 2, and had a good understanding of the area and of issues around resettlement. Their role prioritised resettlement among partner agencies, and improved resettlement support planning and delivery. It had also relieved the workload

of other YOT staff. The resettlement support worker had helped to improve relations between partner agencies and clarified lines of communication between them around young people's resettlement.

### **The review body**

The RSP at YOT 2 had an enhanced review function. This involved RSP members sharing information on the progress of individual young people participating in the pilot scheme at each RSP meeting.

### **Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

The agencies represented on the RSP did not pool financial resources to support resettlement. The time commitment of panel members to attend RSP meetings was significant, however.

### **Partnership working around resettlement**

The RSP improved partnership working around resettlement in YOT 2. Respondents commented that it had helped to improve communication and cooperation between agencies responsible for young people's resettlement.

### **Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

The numbers of young people in custody in the YOT 2 areas had fallen dramatically over the course of the pilot scheme. The resettlement worker's role in resolving accommodation problems had been key to preventing custodial sentences in several cases. The pilot scheme had also improved young people's access to education and training.

## **6. Case study 3**

This pilot covered an area which included two local authorities (LAs). A member of the research team visited the Youth Offending Team (YOT) in August 2010 and in November 2010. Young people, and strategic and operational YOT staff, were interviewed on both occasions. Panel members were interviewed during the follow-up visit.

### **6.1 The resettlement panel: set up and functioning**

The pilot scheme in YOT 3 was defined as an additional 'premier' service for those who had either come out of custody or who were at risk of receiving a custodial sentence. It had the following specific objectives:

- ensuring young people were supported to receive their entitlements
- providing help with accommodation
- building or rebuilding family connections where appropriate
- helping young people to find appropriate employment, training and (ETE) or other constructive activities to develop their self-esteem and confidence to move on
- helping to minimise risk and opening doors to a more positive future.

These objectives had underpinned the pilot scheme in YOT 3 since it started, but the exact focus of the resettlement work had changed. The early emphasis was on providing constructive activities. This continued subsequently but on a smaller scale. At the time of this report the pilot's main focus was on the resettlement support panel (RSP).

The resettlement support provided through the pilot scheme was intended to continue for six months beyond the license period, when it would be reduced gradually but not removed altogether. It was intended that the resettlement work would support the young people to develop other constructive links, for example with youth service provision, to empower them to continue with a positive engagement.

RSP meetings began in summer 2010. YOT 3 initially planned to combine the RSP with an existing crime prevention panel, however this had proved difficult. YOT 3 therefore decided to set up a new panel to examine young people's resettlement needs.

YOT 3 staff noted that the panel helped to resolve matters which had hampered effective resettlement in the past. These related in particular to housing, and had been a cause of concern to many staff. For example, it was noted that

“We have all these regs, and housing say it's not their responsibility – go to social services and social services insist it's a housing matter. They all have their priorities and their responsibilities. But it doesn't help these vulnerable young people when they have these discussions and they [the young people] are sent from one place to the next on their own while people refer them on ...the resettlement worker role has given them someone who can help them with this”.

#### **6.1.1 Panel structure and membership**

In terms of membership, the RSP at YOT 3 comprised:

- the police
- LA housing representative
- LA education representatives
- independent housing providers
- local ETE providers.

The YOT had informed all of the partner agencies that panel members needed to have sufficient seniority to commit resources and make decisions. However, this had not happened consistently. Senior staff had attended initial meetings but some of the staff attending recent meetings did not have the required authority. The resettlement worker then had to coordinate responses from those staff and follow up decisions with the relevant senior staff. “He has to do a lot of running around, phoning different people to get a decision. This could be avoided if the right people attended the meetings regularly”, noted one of the key respondents.

Referral onto the RSP was done through weekly YOT meetings where YOT case managers identified young people due to leave custody soon. The panel also dealt with a smaller number who were at risk of receiving a custodial sentence.

### **6.1.2 Panel functioning and effectiveness**

Most respondents felt that it was too early to make firm conclusions about its effectiveness. However, some members believed that its membership should be extended to more of the voluntary organisations already working with young people engaged with the YOT.

Interviewees felt that the panel had made partnership working around resettlement more effective. Panel members were more willing to work together and accept responsibility for supporting young people. The panel had also helped them to gain a better understanding of the young people's needs. A YOT representative commented that '*individual agencies are offering advice and guidance and are taking things back*'. This would not have happened to the same extent in the absence of the pilot resettlement scheme.

## **6.2 The resettlement support worker**

The resettlement worker was employed using the YJB resettlement funding. The officer worked closely with other YOT staff to ensure seamless resettlement support. The resettlement worker's role included:

- visiting Young Offender's Institutions (YOIs) to introduce the pilot scheme and engage with young people targeted for involvement
- making referrals to the panel and ensuring actions are followed up
- working alongside YOT staff to coordinate the supervision and resettlement of young people
- family mediation
- recruiting mentors to provide additional support to the young people
- accompanying young people to appointments with services, such as meetings to discuss ETE provision and to arrange benefits
- liaising with ETE providers to arrange placements and resolve issues.

The resettlement worker emphasised to the young people that participation in the resettlement scheme was voluntary. The resettlement worker used data and discussions with case managers to identify the likely resettlement support needs of the young people. Resettlement plans were developed from the point of sentence, to ensure that support was in place upon release. One interviewee emphasised the importance of planning resettlement support in advance of release from custody as follows:

“We need to ensure that we reach the young people before the problems set in, when they are still likely to want support and before they get to the stage where they think that everyone’s against them, that no-one wants to help them, which is when many of them go back to their old ways”.

Lack of suitable housing was a major contributing factor in reoffending, and the resettlement worker had helped to resolve these issues. The resettlement worker provided guidance and mediation, acting on young people’s behalf to arrange accommodation and resolve issues. Incidences where young people had been placed in inappropriate accommodation happened to a lesser extent following the employment of the resettlement support worker.

YOT staff believed that more collaboration was needed between different agencies to address housing issues. Young people needed to have earmarked accommodation on release. The YOT staff had highlighted this in the panel meetings and this had been taken on board by the housing professionals who attended. The resettlement worker had a key role in brokering these links and in highlighting the issue.

The roles of the Detention and Training Order (DTO) Officer and the resettlement worker were distinct but complementary. The DTO officer aimed to prevent reoffending whereas the resettlement worker was more concerned with welfare and support. The resettlement worker offered the young people more support than the DTO officer would have been able to do and this created a different type of relationship with them. As one interviewee noted, ‘It’s a less formal relationship that builds a positive rapport’.



Interviewees felt that the resettlement worker provided a motivating and responsive service for the young people, that was voluntary, and non-threatening. The resettlement worker related well to the young people and their issues.

The role of the resettlement worker had changed significantly during the course of the project. This had coincided with a change of post holder, but YOT staff emphasised that the role would have changed regardless. Initially, the resettlement support worker had spent a lot of time developing support packages, which included activities and projects to engage and occupy the young people, when resettling into the community from the YOI. These were designed to develop self-respect, respect for others, self-esteem and social skills through “encouraging a positive approach to life”.

Participation was also intended to prepare the young people for more formal ETE. The officer considered young people’s characteristics such as their communication needs, learning styles, and personal interests when developing their support packages. The types of activities offered included kick boxing, art and craft, and ceramics work. A football apprenticeship scheme, that included basic skills training, was soon to be offered. However, the resettlement worker spent progressively less time on this type of project work as the role became more focused on working with the RSP.

Interviewees felt that visiting young people in the YOI before their release, was central to the success of the resettlement support worker’s role. This enabled positive relationships to be built early on. As a panel member explained, “They meet the resettlement worker and get to know about what he can do for them, the support he can provide, that the links have been made. That helps overcome the apprehension that a lot of them feel”.

Several of the young people interviewed also commented on this, stating that early engagement with the resettlement worker had made them feel more

confident about their ability to prevent themselves reoffending and to “sort things out” at the end of their sentences.

Respondents believed that the resettlement worker undertook a role in ‘hand-holding’ to help the young people to access services. Housing was identified as a major issue where the resettlement worker had been an advocate for the young people and helped them to resolve problems. For example, one young person explained how the resettlement worker had helped, by discussing their housing needs with service providers. In another case, the resettlement worker had enabled a young person to obtain money for a housing bond to secure accommodation.

The resettlement worker had also raised the awareness of those delivering services to the challenges facing this group of young people. Service level personnel were consequently better able to make informed decisions about how the young people’s needs could be met through their provision.

The resettlement worker’s role with making and following up referrals to the RSP helped to identify issues which arose when agencies interpreted their responsibilities differently. It also kept young people’s needs at the forefront when decisions were taken. One example of where this had happened was when the resettlement worker had prevented young people from being housed in unsupported hotel accommodation alongside adult ex-offenders.

### **6.3 Reviewing function**

There was no enhanced review body in YOT 3. A sub-group of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) discussed the resettlement work delivered through the pilot scheme to ensure that young people participating in the pilot scheme were adequately safeguarded. The chair of the RSP passed on selected information from monthly reports completed by the YOT manager to the LSCB steering group for discussion at these meetings.

LSCB sub-group monitoring meetings were informed by indicators such as:

- the percentage of the young people who were offered and volunteered to take up the provision offered through the pilot schemes
- accommodation status
- ETE status
- re-offending rates (including seriousness and frequency)
- vulnerability and risk scores at the beginning and end of young people's engagement with the pilot scheme
- agency participation in each individual resettlement plan.

## **6.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

The resettlement funding supported the resettlement worker and volunteers, and sustained a small young people's fund.

The extent to which partners had committed resources to resettlement varied, partly depending on the individual needs of the participating young people. Some interviewees were concerned that organisations' different interpretations of their responsibilities for young offenders affected their willingness to commit resources. However, because the panel only began in the summer of 2010, it was too early to come to conclusions about inter-agency resource commitment.

### **6.4.1 Partnership working around resettlement**

Interviewees highlighted the contribution of the RSP and the associated resettlement work in meeting the needs of the young people. It had helped to create links between the YOT and other agencies by fostering understanding of the roles of other agencies, as the following quotations reflect:

“A lot of the panel members probably wouldn't have met, other than perhaps to refer people to each other. There was an opportunity here for a broader range of agencies to become involved more deeply with each other.

It brokered links between agencies which had not worked together before ... they knew what each other was doing and who they worked with, but there wasn't much contact between them.”

Several respondents said that in the past there was a lack of communication between the young people, the YOT and other partner agencies. For example, it was felt that, although the partner agencies involved in the RSP had worked together, the effectiveness of the collaboration had been uneven. A typical comment to this effect was, “A lot could be patchy – it wasn’t a deliberate thing ... but there wasn’t one person with responsibility for it in the YOT that the agencies could link with”.

## **6.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

During the project, more young people were sentenced in the community and fewer received custodial sentences. It was not possible to isolate the extent to which this was due to the pilot scheme and the resettlement work carried out as part of it.

The research team gathered strong qualitative evidence to suggest that the resettlement scheme in YOT 3 had provided benefits for the participating young people. These were especially apparent during the first six months after leaving custody.

The young people interviewed felt positively about the resettlement support they had received. It raised their awareness of the opportunities open to them and helped them make constructive use of their time. One young person said that, “It’s better than sitting at home doing f\*\*k all and getting into trouble” , while another commented “It helps get me thinking about what I could be doing”.

YOT staff felt that the young people enjoyed the activities. The young people were also positive about the activities. Although the young people recognised that the activities were similar to others available to them, they doubted whether they would have participated in them in the absence of the pilot scheme. . “I would have been left to hang around the streets and go back to my old haunts with the crowd I used to be with”, was one typical comment.

Young people's attitudes to offending had improved through participating in the pilot scheme. Some said that they were less likely to reoffend. For example, one young person referred to the more positive outlook he had developed since leaving custody. Upon release, he had been supported by the resettlement worker and that, together with becoming a father, meant he would not risk reoffending and returning to custody. He said, "I don't want to go back to the way I was now I've got a child. Taking part in the work with [resettlement officer] has given me a chance to get things sorted and set things up so I can start again".

The pilot scheme had helped to break down barriers and promote engagement in positive activities by giving the young people a sense of achievement. As one member of staff noted, "Some of them have never had the chance to believe in themselves ... they have been bereft of any sense that they could achieve something". The activities delivered through the scheme had provided support and offered a 'safety net' that helped reduce re-offending. For example, one interviewee described how "she was actively watching the young people's behaviour to see whether they were in danger of falling back into their old ways, picking up on things like whether they were being given 'grief' by other people and whether they were being bullied into the kind of activities that had got them into trouble before".

Three of the young people on the pilot scheme who were interviewed said they had accessed courses such as budget management and independent living. This had helped them to be more organised and live less chaotically. Reflecting on this, one interviewee commented that, "for some of these young people there's a need to rebuild or even build fairly basic skills like knowing how to read a bus timetable, knowing how to plan a journey, speaking to people appropriately".

Three young people taking part in the pilot scheme had progressed to college. One of these had her sentence reduced because the resettlement worker had convinced the court that a longer sentence would have jeopardised both the college placement and the opportunity to 'turn around' which it represented.

The young person believed that the resettlement worker was someone reliable, in whom she could confide, and who could help her deal with challenges constructively. She explained how the resettlement work had facilitated her reduced sentence as follows:

“They let me out early because the court was told that I was doing this resettlement work and I could go to college and get a job. So, because they knew I’d be doing something, they thought that was better than keeping me inside”.

The pilot scheme had improved the quality of the substance misuse service provided by the YOT. The resettlement worker helped young people to access and benefit from this service. For example, they had facilitated one young person’s access to acupuncture as a means of overcoming an addiction. However, interviewees recognised that a very broad range of factors affected young people’s attitudes towards, and involvement with, substances. Interviewees also acknowledged that the young people participating in the scheme were often not easy to help. Many had deep-seated problems which could not be overcome easily. Some held attitudes which were prohibitive to engaging with, and accepting help from, services, which, to them, “were there to fight against”, in the words of a staff member.

A YOT worker said that some of the young people had not complied with any court order given. As such, it was not easy to predict whether they would engage with the resettlement scheme. The qualitative evidence gathered from stakeholders and the young people suggested they were more likely to engage with the one-to-one support made available through the pilot than with previous approaches.

## **6.6 Asset analysis**

This analysis is based on evidence for 30 young people who took part in the intervention. A core comparison group comprising of 10 young people (drawn to reflect the offence histories and characteristics of the intervention group closely) was selected. A further extended comparison group of 70 young

people was also selected, comprising young people with similar offence histories, but who were not necessarily matched on background characteristics such as gender and ethnicity. Therefore the total number of young people included in the analysis is 110, all of whom have had an involvement with the YOT.

Most of the 110 were aged 16 or over before the intervention as were most of those in the intervention group (Table 6.1).

**Table 6.1: Sample age profile**

Age	Intervention group	Core comparison group	Extended comparison group
13	0	0	3
14	0	0	2
15	8	3	11
16	7	6	22
17	14	0	22
18	1	1	10
Not available	-	-	-
Total	30	10	70

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

The gender and ethnicity of three quarters of the sample group was not recorded and therefore it was not possible to undertake an analysis based on those variables. Almost all (96 per cent) of the sample was aged over 15 and three quarters were aged 16-18.

The Asset scores for the sample of 110 young people before the intervention are presented in Table 6.2.

**Table 6.2: ASSET score analysis all young people**

	No with score of 0	No with score of 1	No with score of 2	No with score of 3	No with score of 4
Living arrangements	11	33	31	23	1
Family and personal relationships	2	19	36	36	6
Education, training or employment	5	10	46	31	7
Neighbourhood	14	24	43	17	1
Lifestyle	1	9	40	42	7
Substance misuse	13	23	28	23	12
Physical health	64	27	7	1	0
Emotional and mental health	16	21	32	25	5
Perceptions of self	9	24	53	11	2
Thinking and behaviour	0	5	36	49	9
Attitude to offending	4	14	47	26	8
Motivation to change	9	14	41	27	8

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

In most cases, the young people were assessed to have an Asset score of 2 or less in each Asset category.

The profile of the number of young people included in the intervention group is presented in Table 6.3:



**Table 6.3: Number of offences committed by group of young people**

	Intervention		Core comparison		Extended comparison	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
0 offences	0	23	0	5	0	47
1 offence	2	2	4	2	20	10
2-5 offences	13	5	6	3	32	13
6-10 offences	9	0	0	0	16	0
10+ offences	2	0	0	0	2	0
No data	4	-	-	-	-	-
Total	30	30	10	10	70	70

Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)

The total number of offences committed by young people before and after the intervention was analysed. Information was available for 26 of the 30 young people who took part in the intervention; 13 had committed 2-5 offences, 9 had committed 6-10 offences and 2 had committed more than 10 offences before the intervention. 23 of the young people who took part in the intervention committed no offences after the intervention while 2 had offended once since the intervention and 5 had committed 2-5 offences. None had committed more than 5 offences. Therefore, three quarters of those who had taken part in the intervention had not reoffended after the intervention. Considering comparison young people, half (n=5) of the core group and two-thirds (n=47) of the extended group had not reoffended during the same period. This suggests that those in the intervention group were less likely to re-offend. However, the differences were not large and are based on only a small number of young people, so the finding should be treated as indicative only.

The maximum gravity of the offences for the intervention group before the intervention is presented in Table 6.4.

**Table 6.4: Maximum gravity of offences by group of young people**

	Intervention		Core comparison		Extended comparison	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
NA	-	23	-	5	-	47
1	-	0	-	0	-	1
2	1	1	1	1	9	0
3	7	3	5	4	25	17
4	6	0	2	0	18	4
5	3	1	1	0	9	0
6	9	2	1	0	9	1
No data	4	-	-	-	-	-
Total	30	30	10	10	70	70

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Fewer young people in the intervention group committed the most serious offences (maximum gravity of 5 or more) after the intervention. Before the intervention, 12 from this group had committed gravity 5 or 6 offences (3 and 9 young people respectively). Afterwards just 1 young person committed gravity 5, and 2 young people gravity 6 offences. There was also a reduction in the gravity of offences committed by the comparison groups, although this was from a lower starting point (almost half of the intervention group had committed offences with a gravity of 5 or over compared with a quarter of the extended comparison group).

## 6.7 Conclusion

The need for resettlement workers to develop one-to-one relationships with the young people was evident from this case study. Because of the trust which had developed the resettlement worker had been able to work with the young people to signpost services and to ensure that providers were aware of their needs and responded accordingly. Good practice had been nurtured because of the close working between the resettlement officer and the DTO officer. This had meant that the roles had developed in ways which complemented each other and that young people's need for different types of support was acknowledged.

Challenges had been encountered where those individuals attending RSP meetings lacked the authority to commit resources or where attendance had not been consistent. There was also a need to establish clear criteria to determine who should be responsible for funding aspects of the support needed by the young people. This was not an issue which could be resolved locally in every case as there were conflicting interpretations of legislative requirements. Clarity and agreement about implementation was therefore required.

The need for all agencies to be equally committed to the resettlement work was emphasised in this case study. Different LAs or sections within LAs had engaged to varying degrees. In order to maximise the potential of the agencies represented on the panel to meet the needs of the young people greater consistency was required.

The effectiveness of the new approach to the RSP would need to be monitored over a period of time before firm conclusions could be drawn. At the same time the diversionary activities supported through resettlement funding were now less important than at the beginning of the pilot; their value, over and above other aspects of the resettlement work, could only be measured over time.

### **Key findings: YOT 3**

#### **The RSP: set up and functioning**

The pilot scheme in YOT 3 aimed to give young people additional resettlement support; to assist with their accommodation needs; to mediate with family members; to support them into ETE or other constructive activities; and to minimise risk posed to and by them. The RSP was set up as a separate panel after plans to integrate it with an existing one at the YOT were unsuccessful. RSP members did not always have decision-making authority, which had led to problems. Some respondents felt that voluntary agencies already providing resettlement support should be included on the RSP.

### **The resettlement support worker**

The resettlement support worker visited young people at YOIs; made referrals onto the RSP; coordinated young people's supervision and resettlement alongside YOT staff (in particular the DTO officer); mediated between young people and their families; accompanied them to meetings; recruited mentors; and liaised with ETE providers. Aspects of the worker's role which had the greatest impact included visiting young people in custody to start building a relationship with them; helping young people to access services; and making partner agencies more aware of resettlement and the challenges faced by young people participating in the pilot scheme.

### **The review body**

YOT 3 did not have an enhanced review function. A sub-group of the LSCB monitored the resettlement support delivered through the pilot scheme. The YOT 3 manager compiled reports on this for discussion at LSCB sub-group meetings.

### **Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

Respondents felt that the extent to which partners committed resources to resettlement plans varied. They saw this as partly because of the needs of the individual young people, and partly because of the different ways in which agencies interpreted their responsibilities for supporting young people's resettlement. It was seen to be too early to reach definitive conclusions about this, however.

### **Partnership working around resettlement**

The YOT 3 RSP had improved partnership working around resettlement. In particular, it had helped to improve inter-agency communication.

### **Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Custody rates in YOT 3 had fallen since the start of the pilot scheme, but the extent to which this was due to the work carried out under the scheme was not clear. As a result of participating in the pilot scheme, young people were more willing to engage with support services. They enjoyed the activities offered to them as part of the scheme, which had helped them to stay out of trouble. Young people had taken up a range of ETE opportunities through the pilot scheme. In some cases, their commitment to this had led to reduced sentences.



## **7. Case study 4**

YOT 4 works over two local authorities (LAs). The research team visited YOT 4 in June and in November 2010. The YOT Manager refused permission for the young people to be interviewed. The Resettlement Support Panel (RSP) was not functioning at the time of the first visit, so the researchers did not speak to any panel members. At the time of the second visit the RSP was set up and some panel members were interviewed. YOT personnel were interviewed during both visits.

### **7.1 The resettlement panels: set-up and functioning**

#### **7.1.1 Panel structure and membership**

YOT 4 initially proposed that a new multi-agency Resettlement Support Panel (RSP) would be convened with oversight from strategic groups, such as the Youth Offending Service (YOS) Local Management Board, and the Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs) and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) of both LAs.

However, YOT personnel stated that it had not been possible to implement this model. This was because of low attendance at RSP meetings by strategic personnel from partner agencies. Without these people, it was not possible to make decisions around young people's resettlement.

According to YOT personnel, some of those invited did not consider the matters discussed at RSP meetings to be in their remit, and thought that operational staff would be better placed to attend. One YOT interviewee gave the opinion that operational level staff should sit on the RSP, as they have a more in-depth understanding of the young people's needs, issues and circumstances:

“For me, personally, it is a shame that the service level and senior level oversight has to be a function of the panel...Who better to formulate a plan than those who are working with the young person? If there is a

resource issue, for example, needing to purchase something, it is something that the YOT can do and I don't see the issue with a practitioner getting it ok-d by the YOT Manager. That process would be a lot more succinct."

This individual's view is that RSPs should have an input from the staff working directly with the young people when discussing their needs. Such input would be invaluable in reviewing whether support services (housing, education providers, social services and so on) were committing resources to meet the needs of the young people. At the same time, the presence of senior staff from the various support services ensured that they could make decisions about allocation of resources.

YOT 4 proposed a new structure for the RSP. The wider resettlement work continued largely unchanged at operational level. The new RSP -RSP Integrated Offender Management- (RSP, IOM) was comprised of senior-level personnel. It was integrated with the existing police and Community Safety Partnership (CSP)-led IOM group. This structure was decided upon because the IOM group already discussed the resettlement of adult Prolific and Persistent Offenders (PPOs) nearing release.

YOT 4 had also set up an additional RSP comprised of strategic and operational personnel from education, social services, health, accommodation, and youth services. Other agencies attended as appropriate.

This removed the need for the strategic personnel to attend RSP (IOM) meetings. It also ensured that resettlement plans were in place when the young people left custody, rather than there being a delay which increased the risk of them reoffending.

No RSP meetings had taken place under the new proposed structures at the time of the first visit. Both panels had been set up and were functioning at the time of the second case study visit. However, the second multi-agency panel

was in its infancy, membership was not yet consistent, and so interviews with panel members could not take place.

In November 2010, membership of the RSP (IOM) was as follows:

- YOT Manager
- Police Superintendent
- Police Service Manager
- Police Data Manager (attends when relevant to share police data)
- Police Inspectors
- Head of Police Armed Response Team
- Probation Officer
- Head of Youth Services
- CSP Manager from one of the LAs
- Housing Manager from one of the LAs.

One senior respondent felt that housing and social services should be represented on the RSP (IOM). This would ensure that young people's housing needs were met more consistently. Lack of staff to carry out the agencies key tasks had prevented these agencies from attending, rather than a lack of willingness, it was felt.

### **7.1.2 Panel functioning and effectiveness**

All young people in custody in the YOT 4 area are offered the opportunity to participate in the pilot scheme. Some on community orders who need intensive support and are at serious risk of entering custody can also participate. Resettlement support under the pilot scheme is offered for a period of six months.

YOT staff make clear to young people, that their engagement with the pilot resettlement scheme, is voluntary. This is reiterated in the guidance booklet provided to scheme participants and their parents and carers. A YOT interviewee explained this approach as follows:



“...Resettlement is not imposed on the young person; it’s being done as a process...We explain the benefits they will get. If they say no, it means they won’t have access to the resettlement support. If they have issues we explain that they have refused the resettlement support before, but that they can take part if they want”.

At the time of the second case study visit, when the revised RSP had been established, some interviewees reported that the meetings had been more productive, focused, and on the whole, better attended.

They felt that information sharing at the meetings was effective. The police and the YOT shared data about young people leaving custody, and about those on community sentences participating in the pilot scheme. This ensured that all cases were discussed along with factors which could influence their offending behaviour. The following response outlines how good information sharing had led to effective resettlement:

“A young woman...was being plied with drink and drugs and sexually exploited by an older, predatory group of men...she went to the secure estate through lack of compliance with court orders. When she came out we were all concerned she would end up in trouble again - we couldn’t allow her to go back to the same environment she was inhabiting before, with the same influences. She has not since reoffended

We arranged a strategy meeting to discuss this. We ensured we had substance misuse, housing, health and social services in place. The agencies all stepped out of their silos and did some child protection work. The chair of the Safeguarding Children Board took this on as a potential Serious Case Review ‘near miss’ which got people around the table.

This example makes us feel that we are doing an effective job. The future was bleak for her, but now it is reasonable”.

Those interviewed also felt that the individualised support put in place for the participating young people and efficient and collaborative inter-agency working had had positive impacts.

Interviewees identified several factors which prevented the RSP from being fully operational. Poor attendance by senior service-level personnel was one

factor, along with the view among some non-YOT personnel that young people's resettlement was primarily the YOT's responsibility. The time taken to work out how the resettlement funding should be spent was another factor, reflected as follows:

“There is the issue of how the money is being spent. It is all about need - that needs to be reviewed over time. It is quite difficult sometimes as you need something to try and work out how much you can spend on it - you need to work out the appropriateness of that”.

Different working practices in the two YOT 4 LAs had also affected the effectiveness of the RSP. One LA had more experience of multi-agency initiatives like the pilot scheme. This meant that it had adapted more quickly and easily to the level of partnership working required in implementing the scheme.

Those interviewed made some further suggestions about how the RSP and associated actions around young people's resettlement could be changed to increase the future effectiveness of the approach. These centred around:

- making young people's resettlement part of a wider preventive approach, involving their families and peers
- tackling wider issues affecting resettlement, such as substance misuse and domestic abuse
- including more restorative justice work in young people's resettlement plans such as face-to-face victim work
- including volunteer mentoring work in resettlement plans to help to sustain interventions after 2011
- having consistent attendance from social services
- sharing good practice between LAs and rolling it out across Wales
- having more flexibility in the resettlement funding criteria to try out different approaches to young people's resettlement, implying a move away from the Resettlement Panel approach.

## **7.2 The resettlement support worker**

YOT 4 did not employ a resettlement support worker with the resettlement funding. Instead, a proportion of the funding was used to provide additional hours for existing sessional workers to do resettlement work.

## **7.3 The review body: role and effectiveness**

YOT 4 was not allocated an enhanced review function.

Rather than happening on a three-monthly basis as initially planned, reviews were carried out on a needs-led basis involving the necessary strategic and operational personnel:

“Reviews happen as regularly as they are necessary. We discuss whether the right services and actions are in place for the right people; we discuss as and when in accordance with the level of need of individuals. They are customised per individual, but must be at a general or universal level also”.

Interviewees said that the review processes put in place were effective and gave evidence that the resettlement work had reduced reoffending and the use of custody.

YOT 4 planned to undertake more formal, structured reviews of the RSP and resettlement work in future. This would permit greater insight into the effectiveness of different support packages and the reasons for this.

## **7.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

### **7.4.1 Allocation and distribution of funding**

In 2009/2010, YOT 4 spent all of the resettlement funding allocated to them, although there were delays in doing so. Interviewees reported that the funding had been used as planned in 2010-11.

YOT 4 used the resettlement funding in the following ways:

- paying for an existing sessional worker to deliver resettlement support for young people
- training courses for YOT staff tailored to meeting the needs of participating young people, for instance sex offending and knife crime
- training provision for young people, and paying for building site access passes
- buying items tailored to young people's needs to facilitate their successful resettlement, for example
  - a bed for a young person who was previously sharing a single bed with a sibling
  - suitable clothing for job interviews
  - items for a young couple who had recently had a child, such as a cot, bedding, and clothing.

According to interviewees, this approach was adopted because it ensured that the funding “went directly to the young people and their families to meet their needs”. Because some young people did not require housing support, they benefitted more from the funding being used in different ways. The following quotation illustrates YOT 4's justification for their approach:

“We made a rod for our own back [by not employing a resettlement worker] because we did not want to buy in a person/people to attach to each young person coming out. This funding reached the service users...When they came out we planned to put it into direct stuff they may need such as bonds for houses or flats, furniture travel to places of work, training, employment etc...Looking at what kids needed to set up independently...This is very good in terms of aspiration...One size does not fit all – funding and needs differ a lot between different areas. It has to be a local model for local needs.”

In the view of YOT personnel, the pilot scheme had been successful in securing improved outcomes for young people. Interviewees said they would use the funding in a similar way in future.

#### **7.4.2 Partnership working around resettlement**

At the time of the pilot scheme's inception, some issues were experienced around commissioning services to support young people's resettlement.

Some service-level personnel were reluctant to do so. According to some interviewees, certain individuals, from other organisations, felt that resettlement was “a YOT thing”. It was hoped that the pilot scheme would challenge this through fostering effective partnership working.

The two LAs covered by the YOT had different levels of involvement with the pilot resettlement scheme, as mentioned in section 7.1.2. This was mainly due to one LA’s greater experience of multi-agency partnership working, gained through past involvement with similar multi-agency initiatives.

The RSP was seen as an effective way of holding agencies to account through a local escalation procedure. If actions relating to resettlement were not completed promptly, service-level managers and the YOT Manager were informed. This hastened the resolution of any such issues.

At the second case study visit, most interviewees stated that partnership working had strengthened as a result of the pilot scheme. Agencies had started to take responsibility for resettlement and associated service commissioning. The RSP had emphasised partnership working, and prioritised resettlement.

The profile of the YOT had also been raised among other agencies as a consequence of the partnerships involved in delivering the resettlement work. It had allowed agencies to learn more about the work and ethos of others. As one interviewee stated:

“[Partnership working] was more insular and siloed before. The scheme has put us on an even keel with social services. People were talking at the panel – it was like, “You do this and we’ll do that”. It has bumped up our profile in their estimation...Now they see that we are looking to the same ends, so we need to work together”.

However, some felt that partnership working had not progressed as much as it could have by the time of the second case study visit.

## 7.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people

Prior to the pilot schemes' inception, large numbers of young people from the YOT 4 area were sentenced to custody each year. Subsequent reoffending and returns to custody during licence period were also high. Most of these young people were aged 16 to 17 years, lacked suitable accommodation on release, and were not in employment, education or training (NEET).

Custody rates have since decreased significantly across the two YOT 4 LAs. One LA had no young people in custody at the time of the second case study visit, which had never been the case previously.

Interviewees felt strongly that the reduction in reoffending and the use of custody could not be directly attributed to the pilot resettlement scheme. It was also seen to be too early to measure and reflect on the range of impacts achieved over and above reductions in reoffending and in the use of custody, as this interviewee stated:

“It is early days. Impact to date has been reasonable in terms of expectation. There is a lack of knowledge due to the timing of the evaluation. It is ok having short term impacts, i.e. getting young people through their licence period, but long term impacts are what's important. The funding needs to be sustainable to induce impacts. We want to be able to demonstrate longer term effects of this type of intensive work across time. In the early days it was not effective but we have changed that. We won't be able to demonstrate impact until the end of the programme in September 2011”.

The reductions in reoffending in the YOT 4 LAs were partly related to the increased self-esteem and confidence felt by the young people supported through the pilot scheme. Most of the young people had not participated fully in education, and perceived themselves poorly. The ETE interventions, such as work experience placements and building site access cards, had impacted significantly on this, as outlined below:

“The greatest impact for some has been increased self-esteem and progress. It is a major thing for some of them just to get their

construction site card or to have participated in training schemes, as they didn't participate in education or pass any exams'.

"Feedback has been very positive. The young people really value it. They have never progressed in education and did not care about school. Many are set in the mindset of being labelled as criminals, but now they see themselves as potential employees".

Engaging with the ETE interventions delivered through the pilot scheme helped to reduce offending through occupying the young people in more positive activities and learning useful, transferable, skills. Parents gave positive feedback to staff about the impact of the ETE provision on their children. Relationships between parents and the participating children had also improved because of the ETE activities. The pilot scheme helped young people engaged with YOT 4 to access support services they would not usually have used. This is also likely to have contributed towards the reduction in offending observed in the area. The RSP had raised partner agencies' awareness of the services and opportunities available to the young people, which they might not otherwise have known about.

Some young people's attitudes towards the YOT and other services had improved as a result of their participation in the pilot scheme, in the view of YOT staff. As one explained:

"I can think of a few young people with improved attitudes. They have matured during their time inside and have appreciated what we have invested in them. Their relationships with us have improved".

The resources purchased for the young people with the resettlement funding had helped them to participate more fully in life in the community, in the view of YOT staff. For example, YOT staff had used the money to buy furniture for a flat into which a young person moved upon leaving custody. This had helped them to overcome some of their problems and to understand the consequences of their offending. These are essential to successful resettlement, as this interviewee explained

"It has given them life chances. Whether they take it or not is up to them, but the new model is able to support them in moving on.

Sometimes it is frustrating when there are young people who you want to do things for but you can't, and it gets to the stage where they have more problems because you haven't been able to do it, but this scheme helps with that. It helps them to move on...It is a good thing because it shows them the consequences of their actions".



## 7.6 Asset analysis

This analysis was based on evidence for a total of 29 young people who took part in the intervention. A core comparison group (drawn to reflect the offence histories and characteristics of the intervention group closely) was selected comprising of 391 young people. This meant that the total number of young people who were included in the analysis was 420. Given the small number in the intervention group, the analysis should be treated with care.

More than four-fifths (349) of the sample were male, while 71 were female. Almost all (27) of those who took part in the intervention were male (27 young people) together with 2 females. Almost all (417) were White British in origin. More than half the sample were aged 17 or over. Of the young people who took part in the intervention 28 were described as White British.

Of the young people in the intervention group, 24 were aged 16 or over before the intervention (Table 7.1). Similarly, most of those who did not take part in the intervention were aged 17 or over.

**Table 7.1: Sample age profile**

Age	Intervention group	Core comparison group
13	-	-
14	3	26
15	2	52
16	5	89
17	14	117
18	5	107
Not available	-	-
Total	29	391

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

The Asset scores for each category for the sample of 420 young people before the intervention are presented in Table 7.2.

**Table 7.2: ASSET score analysis all young people**

	No with score of 0	No with score of 1	No with score of 2	No with score of 3	No with score of 4
Living arrangements	184	110	82	30	10
Family and personal relationships	125	87	109	78	18
Statutory education	85	56	47	25	5
Training or employment	98	71	41	20	1
Neighbourhood	175	172	57	11	1
Lifestyle	91	137	112	68	9
Substance misuse	122	144	85	48	18
Physical health	299	93	20	4	1
Emotional and mental health	185	108	75	40	8
Perceptions of self	184	131	78	19	5
Thinking and behaviour	61	108	152	88	8

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Most of the sample were assessed to have an Asset score of less than 3 before the intervention, although higher numbers were judged to have Asset scores of 3 or more in relation to family and personal relationships, lifestyle, and thinking and behaviour. However, nearly two thirds of the young people who took part in the intervention had an average Asset score of 2 or more compared to two-fifths of the comparison group.

**Table 7.3: Number of offences committed by group of young people**

	Intervention group		Core comparison group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
0 offences	0	19	0	278
1 offence	2	4	82	39
2-5 offences	9	4	209	57
6-10 offences	5	1	43	15
10+ offences	13	1	57	2
Total	29	29	391	391

Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)

The 29 in the intervention group had committed the most number of offences before the intervention (18 had committed more than 6 offences, as is indicated in Table 7.3). 13 of the 29 had committed offences with a gravity of 4 or higher. However there is no recorded data about the gravity of offences after the intervention. Therefore the evidence of impact is that 19 of the 29 young people committed no offences after the intervention.

**Table 7.4: Maximum gravity of offences by group of young people**

	Intervention group		Core comparison group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
0	9		212	
1	1		2	2
2	2		38	1
3	2		45	-
4	7		71	5
5	2		9	1
6	4		14	-
7				-
8				1
Not available	2	29	1	381
Total	27		391	391

Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)

The nature of the young people in the intervention group meant that they were the most serious offenders before the intervention. The young people in the intervention group were twice as likely to commit the most serious offences (gravity of 4 or higher) than the comparison group. The absence of data after the intervention means that it is not possible to draw conclusions about the intervention's impact on the gravity of offences.

## **7.7 Conclusion**

Good practice had evolved because the YOT had been able to harness the skills and background knowledge of existing staff which had enabled it to build on work which had already been developed. At the same time, the experience of YOT 4 emphasised the need for resettlement work to focus on brokering services and advocating on behalf of young people, during the period at which they were most vulnerable. In common with the approaches adopted elsewhere, this had included working with education and training providers to ensure that the young people's needs were met and also working to build or restore relationships with families. At the same time the distinctive approach adopted by this YOT had enabled them to meet some of the immediate material needs of the young people during the resettlement period, for example by purchasing goods and clothing.

The experience of this YOT suggested that there was a need for the resettlement work to be able to draw on a wide range of stakeholders, in order to ensure that a multi-agency approach was embedded. There was some evidence of inconsistency in the engagement of some stakeholders in the RSP process although it was not clear to what extent this was attributable to the model by which two separate panels had been established. The work undertaken in YOT 4 was facilitated by the fact that one of the LAs had experience of multi-agency working and were able to contribute that background to the resettlement work. However, this did not happen to the same extent in the other LA, which impacted on the way the RSP worked. This led to differences in the level to which some agencies had contributed resources, during the initial period.

Although initial data was positive, more evidence was required in order to base conclusions about the effectiveness of the model which had been adopted and the quality of the approach to resettlement work. The YOT was committed to evaluating its work based on robust evidence, although it did not believe that an enhanced review function was required. However, refusal of permission to interview young people means that their viewpoint is missing from the evaluation of this YOT. Data on gravity of offences post intervention, for the intervention group was not provided.

### **Key findings: YOT 4**

#### **The RSP: set up and functioning**

The RSP at YOT 4 was late starting due to the need to change the model initially proposed. Under the final model, the RSP was integrated with two existing police-led panels. Operational-level resettlement work continued, as it was prior to the pilot scheme. YOT 4 had also set up another RSP attended by personnel from different agencies, although this was in its infancy and membership was not yet consistent. Respondents stated that the main RSP was better attended and functioned more effectively by the time of the second visit. However, they suggested several improvements which could be made.

The decision to divide the RSP function with specific aspects delegated to two different bodies was an approach which had only been adopted in this Case Study area. The impact of this decision to set up an additional RSP comprised of strategic and operational personnel, to complement the RSP-IOM, had not become fully apparent by the end of the evaluation.

#### **The resettlement support worker**

YOT 4 did not employ a resettlement support worker, but used sessional workers to support the young people in resettlement.

#### **The review body**

YOT 4 did not have an enhanced review function. Reviews of the RSP and the resettlement work completed as part of the pilot scheme were carried out as and when needed. Interviewees felt that the review processes worked well. YOT 4 planned to carry out more structured, formal reviews in future.

#### **Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

YOT 4 spent the full resettlement grant entitlement in 2009-10 and in 2010-2011, although they were delayed in doing so in the previous financial year. They used it to increase the hours of an existing sessional worker to deliver resettlement support; to pay for training courses for YOT staff; to deliver training provision and building site passes for young people, and spent it on goods for young people such as furniture and clothing. YOT staff felt that this approach had been effective in improving the resettlement support delivered to the young people.

### **Partnership working around resettlement**

Some partners were initially reluctant to contribute resources to support young people's resettlement. This was mainly because of one LA's greater experience of multi-agency initiatives relative to the other. The RSP and the pilot scheme had helped to improve multi-agency working, but some interviewees felt that it could be improved further.

### **Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Custody rates decreased significantly in both of YOT 4's LAs over the course of the pilot scheme. One LA had no young people in custody at the time of the second visit. Respondents could not attribute this directly to the pilot scheme, although they felt it had contributed. The resettlement work delivered under the pilot had improved a range of outcomes for participating young people. These included greater self-esteem and confidence through taking up the ETE provision and improved family relations. The goods purchased had helped them to overcome some material obstacles to settling in the community.

## **8. Case study 5**

Youth Offending Team (YOT) 5 covered a single local authority area. NFER visited YOT 5 in July 2010 and in January 2011. YOT 5 did not have an enhanced review function.

The Resettlement Support Panel (RSP) was functioning during both visits. NFER interviewed YOT staff, RSP members and young people at both visits.

### **8.1 The resettlement panels: set-up and functioning**

Prior to the establishment of the RSP, the resettlement of young people leaving custody was discussed within a multi-agency forum. This forum became the RSP at YOT 5. This existing forum was used instead of setting up a new one because most of the relevant agencies already attended these meetings. They were strongly committed to planning and delivering resettlement support packages to young people.

The RSP considered resettlement support packages for young people leaving custody, and for those at risk of entering custody. The relevant agencies were allocated responsibility for implementing the required actions. Their progress in doing so, along with the effectiveness of the actions in providing improved support and outcomes for the young people was discussed at the RSP. Actions arranged and monitored through the RSP were usually Education, Training and Employment (ETE) packages and diversionary activities.

YOT 5 initially intended to commission a charitable organisation to deliver tailored resettlement support to young people using some of the resettlement funding. In 2009-10, a coordinator was to be employed for one day per week with 1.5 support workers. In 2010-11, a temporary support worker was to be funded. However, YOT 5 eventually adopted a different approach to the RSP and the resettlement support work when they employed a full-time resettlement support worker rather than using the charitable organisation.

### **8.1.1 Panel structure and membership**

The RSP's structure and membership did not change much over the course of the pilot scheme. Meetings took place monthly. All young people reaching the end of their custodial sentences were referred to the RSP.

At the start of each meeting, minutes from the last meeting were discussed.

The agencies responsible for implementing aspects of young people's resettlement plans gave progress updates, and new referrals were discussed.

An interviewee outlined the RSP meetings' structure as follows:

“The referral comes into the [RSP] - it may come from parents, agencies or the YOT. The case is discussed; agencies round the table deemed appropriate take it on and things start to move...we do minutes of last meeting first, then new referrals, we then go away and do the work with the family, look at where they are with the young person and the information they gather that week. It is very strict – we have 24 hours to make initial contact with the family, five days to visit them, and the action plan must be in place within seven days. On the agenda the following week, we discuss and update the cases. For example, we state that we have met with the family, and xyz has been done. We keep it on the agenda for at least six weeks to ensure that everything is up and running.”

The RSP comprised senior staff from the following agencies:

- YOT
- Housing
- Education
- Police Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Officer
- Mediation services
- Youth services
- Health, including Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)
- Voluntary sector
- Substance misuse charity
- Staff from the local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) (as needed).



YOT managerial staff currently chaired the RSP. Interviewees felt this worked well because the chair has well-established relationships with members developed through working with another local forum which is centred on prevention and early intervention. This helped to get actions implemented swiftly around young people's resettlement plans.

While a 'consistent core' of members attended meetings regularly, some representatives attended on a needs-led basis, such as the police and the local authority (LA) housing department. Interviewees viewed this as effective practice as it made best use of members' limited time.

All interviewees felt that the relevant agencies were on the RSP. Membership was not consistent at the time of the first case study visit, but this had been promptly remedied.

### **8.1.2 Panel functioning and effectiveness**

At the first case study visit, most respondents reported that the RSP was functioning effectively, but that it had not yet achieved its full potential. This was reportedly due to incomplete commitment from some of the agencies involved. A RSP 're-launch' event, which took place in August 2010, had partly remedied this, however.

Overall, interviewees felt that the RSP and the resettlement activities coordinated through it were very effective. The RSP was identified as an area of good practice in internal and external reviews and this was echoed by interviewees. Sometimes RSP members had to be 'chased' to implement actions or to give progress updates, but this was a minor issue.

Having all of the relevant agencies and individuals present was key to the success of the RSP. Good information sharing between members was also important, as this quotation reflects:

"With the panel there are a lot of agencies around that table, and a lot of useful information. It is fully operational".

Respondents saw the needs-led resettlement work, implemented through the RSP, as being at the heart of its effectiveness. One-to-one work with the young people, by the resettlement worker, had come to an end, as outlined in section 8.2.

YOT staff's flexibility, motivation and capability contributed to the quality of the RSP and the resettlement work. According to one interviewee:

“Facilitators [of the RSP/resettlement work] are the drive and reputation of the team prior to the projects and ongoing now. Their ability not to stand still but to question all the time how can we do this better. Being part of the team approach that goes along with that. If it means more out-of-hours work or changing the young people you work with. They can see what's behind that.”

The resettlement work carried out with young people in YOT 5 was to be expanded through introducing a volunteer mentoring scheme. This would place young people with trained volunteers who would provide information, advice and guidance in an area in which the volunteers had experience. Volunteers would be matched with young people on the basis of their interests. The planned approach to this is explained by a respondent as follows:

“We are setting up a mentoring scheme for staff and young people. That could very well fit into resettlement in future. If [there is] a volunteer with a set of skills that matches the young people's, for instance if the young person wants to join the army and the volunteer is ex-army and has all of those skills. It is about thinking outside the box a bit and matching up.”

Young people engage with the pilot resettlement scheme in YOT 5 voluntarily. Some personnel felt that more young people would engage with the scheme if participation were compulsory, as reflected below:

“I think the pureness of the model which was about additionality of contact which was voluntary doesn't play in a YOT setting. The children...would have real difficulty in separating out if their contact with the YOT is statutory and that there is some contact which is

additionality. It is very strange for the young people and also for the YOT staff...it could be improved by opening out the criteria.”

This might suggest that there was some support for developing a more compulsory model.

## **8.2 The resettlement support worker**

A full-time resettlement support worker was supported with the resettlement funding until April 2011. The worker started at YOT 5 in January 2010.

The resettlement support worker's role was to:

- provide intensive support to 10 to 15 young people at any one time
- work flexible hours in accordance with the young people's resettlement support needs
- accompany the young people on diversionary activities, such as visits to the gym, playing pool, football, golf and cricket
- take the young people to and from appointments. These typically include the Job Centre, ETE providers, and those with agencies such as housing, health and social services
- mediate between the young people and their families.

The resettlement worker was not required to visit any young people in custody who were approaching their release date, nor did he sit on the RSP.

Staff saw the work of the resettlement support worker to have had a considerable impact on preventing reoffending and returning to custody. Underpinning this success was the intensive support that he delivered.

The resettlement support worker provided out of hours support during evenings and weekends. This helped prevent the young people from engaging with pro-criminal peers and activities. Out of hours provision had only been available on a rota basis before. As a consequence of having to work out of hours, YOT staff had time off during the week, which could be difficult to cover.

The drug and alcohol support worker worked with the resettlement support worker to deliver substance misuse interventions through the pilot resettlement scheme and ISS work. This led to more young people with substance misuse problems engaging successfully with resettlement programmes.

The resettlement support worker had helped to reinforce the support provided by the drug and alcohol worker. This strengthened the impact of this work:

“We have a drug and alcohol worker, but a lot of other work gets carried out. [The resettlement support worker] picks the young people up after their placement and has the chance to take the work further on an informal basis through reinforcing the messages, but also encourages them to take up their appointments with the drug and alcohol worker.”

The focus of the resettlement support worker did not change much over the course of the evaluation. However, the resettlement support worker had not done any one-to-one resettlement work with the young people since summer 2010. Instead, the time was spent doing ISS work, in which similar resettlement activities were undertaken, but with groups of young people rather than individuals. Senior YOT staff made this change because of increasing numbers of young people being taken on as ISS cases.

Some interviewees felt that the group work lead by the resettlement worker was not as effective as the one-to-one work. They gave the following reasons for this:

- some young people may have difficulties getting along with others in a group setting
- the resettlement support worker may have to spend time controlling behaviour which could be more effectively spent doing resettlement work.
- some young people may need a more intense level of support that can only be provided through one-to-one work.

### **8.3 The review body: role and effectiveness**

YOT 5 did not have an enhanced review function. Findings from other internal and external reviews were discussed at each case study visit as they related to young people's resettlement.

Monitoring of the resettlement support put in place through the pilot scheme could be improved to assist with evaluating 'what works' at YOT 5, according to some of those interviewed at the case study visits.

### **8.4 Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

On the whole, staff interviewed at both case study visits felt that all of the relevant agencies had committed resources equally and fairly to resettlement support plans. Some of the relevant agencies were initially less keen to get involved with the pilot scheme, but this was quickly resolved.

Agencies were strongly committed to the RSP despite busy schedules and low resources:

“The beauty of this is that a lot of people do it out of goodwill. They have very little money to run the panel. It is excellent value for money.”

Before the RSP, some agencies had never worked with young people who were involved with the youth justice system. Initially, interviewees reported certain agencies were reluctant to work with the young people. This had since changed, and all of the agencies had put actions in place to improve their resettlement, as outlined by an interviewee:

“No-one wanted to know the young people before because they were high-risk offenders, but now that has changed. It is great now we have everyone's support – it wasn't left [to the YOT] to find the resources.”

Without the resettlement funding, it would not have been possible to deliver the extra support to the participating young people to meet their complex and varied needs:

“We needed to increase the amount of contact time with the young people. That has been particularly difficult.... I think we would have had real difficulty with this cohort providing the increased level of intensity without the funding – we would not have been able to do it.”

While the education sector was represented on the RSP, some participants felt that the attitudes of some individuals from the sector needed to change to facilitate young people’s resettlement to ensure the largest possible positive impact. The extent of the gap between their standpoint and those they believe to exist within the education sector is summarised by the following quotation:

“One of the biggest partnerships...in terms of their core business that hasn’t moved forward is education. There have been lots of initiatives but the core business of education hasn’t changed both for kids who offend and also those who have been excluded or are non-attenders...Nothing has changed since the Black Reports. They are driven by performance indicators like exam results. It is very clear that they see children in three categories; those who are going to achieve, those who with a little bit of additionality can achieve, and those who...they don’t want. That is where the CYPP has put the challenge – what are you doing in terms of your core business for that cohort?”

The CYPP in this Case Study Area had specifically raised the need to make better provision for young people who were excluded from school or on the verge of becoming excluded.

#### **8.4.1 Partnership working around resettlement**

Partnership working around resettlement had been strengthened through the RSP, and the multi-agency approach necessitated by it, according to staff. Information sharing in and out of the meetings was effective. This had helped implement actions in young people’s resettlement support plans.

The RSP involved senior personnel from a range of agencies meeting in person. This enabled direct communication and challenge. It also built on existing links and relationships between agencies.

Through the RSP and training around resettlement (which was supported using the resettlement funding), RSP members had come to understand the

factors influencing offending among young people in the area and more widely. RSP members had also influenced wider partners, such as magistrates, around the sentencing and resettlement of young people. Interviewees felt that this work had raised the profile and priority of young people's resettlement. The following quotation illustrates these points:

“People probably did it [partnership working around resettlement], but it wasn't thought of as it is now. Now, people think more about resettlement. It is not just about the young people coming out of custody. It is about resettlement and giving the extra support...Safeguarding is at the top of everyone's agenda. Service managers are there. That has built relationships fantastically. You have access to everything you need.”

## **8.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

### **8.5.1 Outcomes for young people**

Custody rates in YOT 5 were traditionally very high, relative to the rest of Wales and England. However, these rates had halved over the period of the pilot resettlement scheme. Interviewees stated that this outcome was not just because of the interventions put in place through the scheme, but that it had contributed significantly to it. The following comment is typical of those made by interviewees to this effect:

“Hopefully [the current evaluation] will give us some informed views on [the extent to which the pilot project will have succeeded in securing improved outcomes for young people]. It is hard to answer; hard to isolate the impact. It is almost like saying if we didn't have the [resettlement support worker] what would happen. It is those imponderables. There are probably more questions at this point than answers.”

One interviewee suggested that the resettlement work could make more of an impact by having a dedicated resettlement team. Evidencing, monitoring and evaluating the one-to-one resettlement work separately from the ISS group work could then be done more easily.

Participants felt that decreasing the *severity* as well as the amount of offending was an important outcome of the resettlement work. They saw the

intensive support provided to the young people through the pilot scheme as being at the heart of this, as one interviewee outlined:

“You can’t go wrong. If you are putting in a resettlement package and extra support for a young person who has been through the system who is likely to reoffend, even if they do reoffend it is not wasted because it is still giving them the support. Maybe next time the offence won’t be so serious. Some people might doubt this, but to me, you aren’t going to get a prolific offender who will never offend again, but the seriousness may lessen. That shows that maybe something is working.”

Over the course of the pilot scheme, participating young people had adhered more fully to their resettlement plans, and had engaged with a greater range of support services. Young people had also achieved the following range of outcomes. The work of the resettlement support worker was central to this (as outlined in section 8.2).

- Improved engagement with ETE. Young people engaged well with ETE providers. They had completed a range of work experience, five young people had achieved entry-level qualifications, and others had secured employment in the armed forces and with the local council.
- Improved accommodation status. The RSP had secured funding for a new secure accommodation unit in the area. Since the inception of the pilot project, no young people had been placed in bed and breakfast accommodation. The resettlement worker had also been key to supporting vulnerable young people once in their accommodation, which had enabled them to settle.
- Improved relationships between young people and their parents and families. This was led by the resettlement worker, as two young people explained

“[The resettlement support worker] comes up the house if any problem comes up”.

“It [The resettlement work / diversionary activities] has helped me get back on my feet after coming out of [custody]. I was drinking and taking Valium and I lost my head. I had arguments with my mother and her boyfriend and went out and nicked cars. But I haven’t been in trouble at all since I’ve been with the YOT”.

Young people interviewed who had experienced the resettlement support delivered through the YOT prior to the pilot resettlement scheme compared



the current provision favourably. They felt that it had helped to prevent them from reoffending through occupying their time and helping them to find new interests. The frequent and sustained resettlement support also seemed to be a contributory factor in its effectiveness.

Some comments to this effect made by the young people interviewed were as follows:

“It helps to keep me occupied and keep me out of trouble”.

“Sometimes I would rather be with the YOT because they don’t take the p\*\*\* and they ask you what’s wrong”.

“They keep telling you not to do stuff. They do your head in every day about it. I can’t be bothered to get in trouble any more”.

“I am not in much trouble now. It [the resettlement work] has helped me”.

“When you are with [the resettlement support worker] you don’t feel like it [offending]. When you have been to the gym in the day you don’t feel like going out in the evenings”.

Those interviewed felt that the impact of the work carried out through the pilot resettlement scheme could be increased through there being more viable employment opportunities at the end of ETE placements.

The need for more job opportunities was highlighted by the young people interviewed: “Having a job would be better. Work is great”. This was echoed by YOT personnel. YOT personnel also felt that the ETE work carried out as part of resettlement plans should be extended to those who reached the age of 18 whilst working with the YOT, as these services were currently inadequate.

## 8.6 Asset analysis

This analysis is based on evidence for a total of 7 young people who took part in the intervention. A core comparison group (drawn to reflect the offence histories and characteristics of the intervention group closely) was selected comprising of 10 young people. This means that the total number of young people who are included in the analysis was 17, a sample which is small for reliable conclusions to be drawn. The analysis should therefore be treated with extreme care.

11 of the 17 young people, including 5 of the 7 in the intervention group were aged 16 or over before the intervention (Table 8.1). The only 13-year old in the group was part of the intervention.

**Table 8.1: Sample age profile**

Age	Intervention group	Core comparison group
13	1	0
14	0	1
15	1	3
16	1	3
17	3	1
18	1	2
Not available	-	-
Total	7	10

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

The Asset scores for each category for the sample of 17 young people before the intervention are presented in Table 8.2.

**Table 8.2: ASSET score analysis all young people**

	No with score of 0	No with score of 1	No with score of 2	No with score of 3	No with score of 4
Living arrangements	2	3	6	5	1
Family and personal relationships	1	1	5	7	3
Education, training or employment	1	1	7	4	
Neighbourhood	0	3	10	4	0
Lifestyle	0	0	6	10	1
Substance misuse	0	2	8	6	1
Physical health	4	8	5	0	0
Emotional and mental health	1	2	8	6	0
Perceptions of self	0	0	10	7	0
Thinking and behaviour	0	0	1	14	2
Attitude to offending	0	0	5	10	2
Motivation to change	0	3	6	5	3

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

At least a third and, in five categories, half of the sample had an Asset score of 3 or more before the intervention. The highest Asset scores were recorded in relation to family and personal relationships, lifestyle, thinking and behaviour, and attitude to offending.

The profile of the number of young people is presented in Table 8.3.

**Table 8.3: Number of offences committed by group of young people**

	Intervention group		Core comparison group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
0 offences	0	1	0	4
1 offence	0	2	0	0
2-5 offences	0	4	0	0
6-10 offences	0	0	0	3
10+ offences	7	0	10	3
Total	7	7	10	10

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Of the 7 young people who took part in the intervention for which sufficient data was available, all had committed more than 10 offences before the intervention. 1 of these committed no offences after the intervention and 2 had offended once. The remaining 4 had offended twice. This data has to be interpreted in the light of the nature of the young people included in the intervention group and the fact that all of them had a gravity of offence of 6 (Table 8.4, below). All of the ten young people in the comparison group had committed 10 or more offences before the intervention. After the intervention 4 had committed no offences, but the other 6 had committed more offences than the young people in the intervention group: 3 of the comparison group had committed 6-10 offences and 3 had committed more than 10 offences in the same period.

The maximum gravity of the offences committed by the young people before the intervention is presented in Table 8.4.

**Table 8.4: Maximum gravity of offences by group of young people**

	Intervention group		Core comparison group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
2	0	1	0	0
3	0	3	0	0
4	0	1	0	4
5	0	0	0	0
6	7	0	10	2
Not available	-	2	-	4
Total	7	7	10	10

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Young people in the intervention group were less likely to commit the most serious offences after the intervention. While 6 young people in the comparison group had committed offences with a maximum gravity of 4 or more, only 1 of the young people in the intervention group had done so. This was despite the fact that the maximum gravity of offence committed by both the intervention group and the comparison group was the same (gravity of 6).

## **8.7 Conclusion**

The use of an existing multi-agency forum had prompted engagement from individual stakeholders and this was perceived to have contributed to its effectiveness. In particular, partnership working had been enhanced because of the level of engagement by key stakeholders. The RSP had good attendance by members which therefore facilitated partnership working. This had been made more effective because agencies had committed resources to the work.

It was also clear that the role of the RSW had enabled the YOT to provide additional support to the young people concerned. This had included opportunities to become involved in constructive activities (and therefore reduce the risk of a drift into former habits) and also work focused on rebuilding their relationships with others in their lives.

The experience of YOT 5 may suggest that there is a need for intensive one-to-one support given the suggestions that group work had been less effective as a means of meeting the needs of the young people. This conclusion is reflected in the quantitative data, although the very small numbers involved mean that firm conclusions cannot be drawn. At the same time, the conclusions from this case study emphasise the need for all agencies to be involved and to contribute to resettlement work, including education and training providers.

This case study emphasised the need for resettlement work to be reviewed systematically on a regular basis.

### **Key findings: YOT 5**

#### **The RSP: set up and functioning**

YOT 5 used an existing multi-agency forum to discuss young people's resettlement rather than setting up a new RSP. RSP meetings were used to set up resettlement support packages for young people leaving custody and those at risk of entering custody. Members felt that all of the relevant agencies were on the panel, and that attendance was very good overall. The functioning of the RSP had improved consistently over the course of the pilot project. Plans were in place to expand the resettlement work through introducing a volunteer mentoring scheme.

#### **The resettlement support worker**

YOT 5 employed a full-time resettlement support worker. Their role was to support 10-15 young people at any one time; to work flexible hours to meet young people's needs; to accompany young people on diversionary activities and appointments; and to mediate between them and their families. Upon starting at YOT 5, the resettlement worker did a mix of one-to-one resettlement work and ISS group work due to the increasing ISS caseload. However, from summer 2010 the resettlement worker did only group work. Some respondents felt that this work had less of an impact in terms of improving young people's resettlement support.

#### **The review body**

YOT 5 did not have an enhanced review function. The resettlement work carried out through the pilot scheme was reviewed through ongoing internal and external reviews. Some interviewees felt that more systematic reviews

should be carried out to assist with identifying good practice in resettlement support for young people.

### **Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

All of the agencies involved had contributed resources fairly and equally to support resettlement, according to participants. Some felt that the attitudes of some staff in the education sector could be a barrier to this, however.

### **Partnership working around resettlement**

Partnership working around resettlement had been improved through the RSP, and the multi-agency approach necessitated by it. Members valued the face-to-face communication and challenge afforded through the meetings. The staff training delivered using some of the resettlement funding had helped agencies to learn more about each other's work, and to better understand young people's resettlement.

### **Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Custody rates had halved in YOT 5 over the course of the pilot. Interviewees stated that the interventions put in place through the scheme had contributed significantly to this outcome. Young people had achieved the following outcomes through participating in the scheme: improved engagement with ETE; improved accommodation status; improved relationships with families. The resettlement worker was central to helping them to achieve these outcomes.

## **9. Case study 6**

NFER visited Youth Offending Team (YOT) 6 in June and December 2010. YOT 6 had an enhanced review function.

The Resettlement Support Panel (RSP) was functioning at the time of both case study visits. YOT staff and RSP members were interviewed at each visit. Young people participating in the pilot schemes were also interviewed at each visit.

### **9.1 Resettlement support panels: set-up and functioning**

YOT 6 held a formal 'launch' event for their RSP in November 2009. It involved service managers, YOT staff and some young people who were engaged with the YOT and who would be participating in the pilot resettlement scheme. The event established decision-making and accountability processes, and delivered staff training on the approach to resettlement as embodied in the pilot scheme. Interviewees felt that the launch was successful.

The RSP was part of a combined prevention panel which addressed anti-social behaviour (ASB) and offending. Prior to the pilot scheme, the LA had a separate Youth Inclusion and Support (YISP) panel, and a group tackling youth ASB. The rationale for the RSP's approach was that it:

- integrates resettlement into wider processes around preventing offending
- strengthens multi-agency relationships, planning and service delivery around resettlement
- avoids creating another meeting; the relevant personnel already attend at least one of the other two meetings
- acts as a vehicle for accessing and coordinating diversionary activities and other resettlement actions
- brings in additional resources to support young people's resettlement.



### **9.1.1 Panel structure and membership**

The structure of RSP meetings had not altered much since the start of the pilot scheme. Firstly, members discussed the minutes from the last meeting and the progress made with carrying out agreed actions around young people's resettlement. Young people, who were due to leave custody, were then discussed, along with the progress of those in the community who were already participating in the scheme. Members then planned actions to be taken, and named the agencies responsible for them. Resettlement was the focus of the last hour of the meeting. YOT staff had since expanded the remit of the RSP to include the scrutiny of high-risk offenders.

Sometimes during RSP meetings, agencies gave presentations on aspects of their resettlement work. This helped to share good practice and raise awareness about the work of other agencies.

Senior personnel from the following agencies attended the RSP in YOT 6:

- YOT Manager
- YOT designated social worker
- YOT Education, Training and Employment (ETE) officer
- Housing – homelessness department
- Registered Social Landlord(s)
- Secure estate
- Youth services
- Voluntary sector (several organisations may attend)
- Police
- Anti Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) Coordinator
- Careers Wales
- Education (if appropriate)
- Educational psychologist
- Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) (if appropriate)
- Fire Service (if appropriate).

At the time of this report the Manager of YOT 6 chaired the RSP meetings. The membership of the RSP had not changed significantly since the start of the scheme. The main change was the addition of the YOT social worker. The social worker was included in response to a local review of the RSP.

On the whole, interviewees felt that the right agencies and individuals were involved with the RSP but, during the first case study visit, some said that this had not quite been achieved. They highlighted the need to review RSP membership over time to ensure that it remained appropriate. One interviewee felt that RSP members in YOT 6 were more aware of the pilot scheme and resettlement issues more generally because the RSP included members from the secure estate.

Some RSP members said that individuals who attended the first few RSP meetings did not have sufficient authority to make decisions, about allocating resources to young people's resettlement plans. This had delayed some actions from being carried out. This issue had since been resolved. A typical comment illustrating the importance of having senior personnel on the RSP was as follows:

“It is no good if those who are there can't make decisions and can say we can do this but we can't do that. We need to know there and then - it's no good going away for two weeks waiting for an email.”

Attendance at RSP meetings was good. Some interviewees felt that this reflected the high priority given to the meetings and related resettlement work by RSP members. Substitutes could attend the RSP meetings if the designated person was unable to attend. Several interviewees highlighted this as a positive aspect of the RSP's functioning as it ensured that someone from each agency attended every meeting. This enabled updates to be provided and actions to be planned on a timely basis.

“People could just say that it's a wonderful group, but it is viewed very positively. If someone can't attend, they actually send someone to sub for them. That shows the strength of feeling about the group and how it is viewed. I have sat on other committees where people have just said,

“I’m not going to that one”, and sent their apologies. But with this it is noticeable they send someone in their place and...there is continuity of attendance.”

### **9.1.2 Panel functioning and effectiveness**

All interviewees commented on the effective functioning of the RSP in YOT 6. They felt that meetings were relevant and timely, and met the aims of the pilot resettlement scheme.

Advantages of the panel included:

- having all of the relevant personnel present to focus on priority issues
- getting agencies to take responsibility for different aspects of young people’s resettlement
- being a good forum for sharing information on young people, and sometimes also their peers and families
- learning about the work of other agencies and building relationships with them.

A particularly effective element of the RSP in YOT 6, was sharing information on the young people approaching their release from custody. Some agencies had information which others did not. The RSP enabled a detailed picture of the young people, their circumstances, and factors which affect their resettlement, to be shared. This helped RSP members to design resettlement support plans, which were tailored to meet their individual needs. The following comment emphasises the contribution of information sharing towards the effectiveness of the RSP in YOT 6:

“With one problem family the partners are working with, you get to know the background information which helps you to deal with them appropriately. They can tweak the support that is needed...That makes a difference - sharing the information and each partner really knowing what is going on. There is really good support there.”

The flexibility of the resettlement support also underpinned its effectiveness, as one interviewee outlined:

“It is something different – I can’t put my finger on it. There is no “you have to do this; you have to do that”. You have to set it up yourself. There are no set timelines – it is more flexible. That is what’s effective...The YOT has decided to pick it up and run with it; you have to have some people taking the initiative.”

During the second case study visit to YOT 6, personnel reported that the RSP had gained momentum and clarity. They also felt that the participating young people had achieved better outcomes as a result of the scheme. Panel members had gained a better understanding of the negative impacts of custody on young people, and the benefits of effective resettlement and alternatives to custody.

Several of those interviewed at the second case study visit, thought that the approach to resettlement adopted at YOT 6, was so effective that it should be held up as a model of good practice.

At the time of writing the RSP covered the resettlement of high-risk young people. Specifically, it examined whether the approaches implemented through the pilot resettlement scheme could be adopted with high-risk offenders.

The effectiveness of the resettlement support provided to young people in YOT 6 was seen to be limited by agencies’ lack of time, and the attitudes of some agencies and individuals, in particular, those of some schools.

## **9.2 The resettlement support worker**

YOT 6 did not employ a specific resettlement support worker but did employ a YOT social worker with specific responsibility for resettlement.

## **9.3 The review body**

YOT 6 had an enhanced review function allocated to them through the terms of the pilot resettlement scheme.

YOT staff reviewed the resettlement support delivered to young people through the pilot scheme on an ongoing basis. This aimed to identify 'what works' and gaps in terms of resettlement support. Lessons learned from this process had been shared at the RSP meetings to encourage effective practice.

YOT 6 also undertook an intensive review of the RSP and the associated resettlement work in August 2010. The key findings of this review were:

- A small number of panel members were taking responsibility for a large amount of the resettlement work. As a result, senior staff shared out the work more evenly. Some staff had needed further training on their responsibilities for resettlement. YOT 6 has since provided this training.
- There was a need for the YOT to have a social worker to sit on the RSP with specific responsibility for resettlement. This individual should also attend prison visits, report to the RSP on the resettlement needs of the young people nearing release, and monitor the young people's resettlement progress over time.

YOT 6 planned to implement further review processes in 2011 in relation to young people's resettlement. An intensive case study approach would be adopted to examine the offending and recidivism of two brothers, both of whom are prolific and persistent offenders. Both have received similar interventions, including some delivered through the pilot resettlement scheme, but one had continued to offend, whereas the other had stopped.

#### **9.4 Resettlement support plans: commitment of resources**

Partner agencies had committed resources equally and fairly through the RSP, according to those interviewed. They recognised that agencies had different resources to contribute in terms of both funding and staffing.

They said that more resources were needed to broaden the resettlement work in the following ways:

- to allow greater choice in provider agencies

- to extend the evening and weekend resettlement work to target peak offending times
- to develop more housing suitable for young people leaving custody
- to expand drug and alcohol support services, and family mediation services.

#### **9.4.1 Allocation and distribution of funding**

YOT 6 used some of the resettlement funding to reserve accommodation owned privately but managed by a charitable organisation. Once housed, the young people then accessed additional services supported with the resettlement funding.

Two main types of these services were delivered

**1. Diversionary activities and ETE packages.** These were coordinated by the YOT ETE officer during working hours, evenings and weekends. They included:

- outward-bound sessions such as gorge walking, rock climbing, abseiling, kayaking, and mountain biking, many of which have led to accredited qualifications in first aid, health and safety, and Duke of Edinburgh Awards
- visits to the gym
- singing and dancing instruction sessions
- work placements delivered in partnership with the local college, training providers, employers and businesses.

**2. Support services.** These were coordinated through the youth service, local voluntary organisations, Careers Wales and the YOT. The following support services were delivered, in accordance with need:

- 'Job club' groups during weekdays, delivering careers advice and guidance and employability skills
- structured, individual Careers Wales sessions
- substance misuse support

- advice on sexual health and awareness, relationships and domestic abuse.

#### **9.4.2 Partnership working around resettlement**

Partnership working and inter-agency communication around resettlement had been improved through the work of the RSP. Prior to the RSP's inception, partnership working was in place, but was said to be fragmented and '*tribal*'. It lacked leadership and direction. Communication between agencies was not as good as it could have been prior to the RSP. Actions around resettlement were not put in place as quickly, as the following quotations reflect:

“[Partnership working around resettlement] wasn't joined up as much as it is now. There was not the communication. Nothing got tied up. It has improved through having everyone there which has speeded up the process. That is the most important aspect'.

'Prior to the RSP there was a lot of work going on before but with this it has all pulled together and people have more of a coordinated approach. Before it was all good intentions, but it was a bit left hand-right hand...This has given it more of a central approach; people know more what's going on, and...it is a positive approach”.

While partnerships were already in place before the pilot project around substance misuse and accommodation, new partnerships had been formed around ETE, diversionary activities, and information, advice and guidance provision.

Partnership working around resettlement could be improved through sharing good practice between YOTs in Wales according to a number of interviewees.

### **9.5 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

#### **9.5.1 Outcomes for young people**

The resettlement schemes had fulfilled their aims of reducing offending and recidivism and reducing custodial sentences among young people. By December 2010, custody rates had dropped from 61 per cent to 18 per cent. More young people were complying with the terms of their licence conditions.

However, compliance with community-based Youth Rehabilitation Orders (YROs) had not increased as much.

Most RSP members felt that, on the basis of their involvement with the RSP thus far, the resettlement work had been successful and would be in future. However, a minority believed that some young people would reoffend regardless of the resettlement package in place for them. They said this was because of the complex and multiple factors influencing their offending, which are varied and complex, and the deep entrenchment of this behaviour.

Securing appropriate accommodation for young people leaving custody was one of the most notable outcomes achieved through the pilot resettlement scheme. Since the inception of the RSP, not one young person in YOT 6 had been housed in bed and breakfast accommodation. Those interviewed felt that accommodation had a large bearing on reducing offending, and also on engagement with other support services, as explained below:

“I think housing is the most important one. If you haven't got a base to work from then there is no point you going forward...There is no point telling someone the options they have to choose from if they haven't got anywhere to go from at the beginning of the day or anywhere to go home to at the end of the night. Since the inception of the RSP, there has never been a young person who has come out of custody who hasn't had the opportunity of somewhere to live. That is very important. Once you have that in place everything else can feed off it.”

The diversionary activities and the ETE provision led to the following positive outcomes for the participating young people:

- breaking the cycle of offending, partly through removing them from the area at peak offending times
- reducing substance misuse
- facilitating more positive use of leisure time and fostering new interests
- building supportive relationships with positive role models
- raising self-esteem and confidence
- building more positive relationships with family members.



Young people reflected that the provision had helped them to substitute substance misuse and offending for more positive leisure activities, as the following comments show:

“[The provision has] Helped [me] to stay out of trouble, giving me something to do, keeping me occupied. Before I was doing stupid things like peddling drugs on street corners and doing \*\*\*\* all’.

‘[The provision has] calmed me down. It occupies you. I haven’t been arrested yet. You can’t drink or do drugs when you are here”.

They reported feeling more able to control their emotions as a result of taking up the provision. This improved their relationships with family members. Delivery staff served as positive role models, which the young people might not have in the home environment:

“Before, I was bad and going nuts at home. My family don’t help me but they help you here, they say what’s happening.

My mother wouldn’t speak to me before, so I put a window through, but now she does.”

Young people had started to see their offending differently, and had become more open to engaging with different pastimes:

“I have enjoyed being out, being shown what I could be doing. It shows you what you’re missing out on and stops you \*\*\*\*ing around in the evenings.

I don’t want to do it [offend] any more. I have been in trouble for a long time. [The ETE provision] brings out the best in you and shows you that there’s something other than jail.”

When asked what might deter them from offending in future, most young people were uncertain, but several stated that having a job was important:

“It would be better if there were more jobs out there, giving you more of a chance with work. That would help the most.”

However, staff recognised that there was a lack of suitable job opportunities available to young people with a criminal record. Some RSP members had

written references for young people involved with the pilot scheme, and had offered them voluntary work placements. Gaining skills and qualifications through the ETE provision was seen as an important step towards achieving employment, as a member of staff explained:

“It is hard to gain employment on leaving custody. I don’t mean that derogatory or that it’s never going to happen, but the way the current climate is...Who will employ them? There are 60 people applying for one job. If you take away the employment factor it gives them vocational experience, the training, Duke of Edinburgh. It is things they have never done before. Light skills, activities, opening up a recreation centre somewhere else. It does open it up in a way. It is letting children experience being children.”

## **9.6 Asset analysis**

This analysis is based on evidence for 25 young people who took part in the intervention. A core comparison group (drawn to reflect the offence histories and characteristics of the intervention group closely) was selected comprising 128 young people. A further extended comparison group of 13 young people was also selected, comprising young people with similar offence histories, but who were not necessarily matched on background characteristics such as gender and ethnicity. Therefore, the total number of young people included in the analysis was 166, all of whom had an involvement with the YOT.

**Table 9.1: Sample age profile**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Intervention group</b>	<b>Core comparison group</b>	<b>Extended comparison group</b>
12	-	-	1
13	0	0	4
14	0	0	5
15	2	11	0
16	7	20	0
17	14	49	1
18	2	48	2
Not available	-	-	-
Total	25	128	13

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Most (91) of the 166 were aged 16 or over before the intervention as were all but 2 of those in the intervention group (Table 9.1).

The Asset scores for the sample of 166 young people before the intervention are presented in Table 9.2.

**Table 9.2: ASSET score analysis all young people**

	No with score of 0	No with score of 1	No with score of 2	No with score of 3	No with a score 4
Living arrangements	50	41	45	24	3
Family and personal relationships	33	46	43	33	8
Statutory education	19	17	19	10	0
Training or employment	26	36	42	9	0
Neighbourhood	65	52	28	14	4
Lifestyle	24	31	45	44	19
Substance misuse	32	33	43	39	16
Physical health	93	52	17	1	0
Emotional and mental health	50	53	35	23	2
Perceptions of self	62	35	47	17	2
Attitude to offending	39	38	45	33	8
Motivation to change	54	47	31	22	0

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Most of the sample had an Asset score of 2 or less in each category before the intervention. The highest Asset scores were assessed in relation to family and personal relationships, lifestyle, substance misuse and attitude to offending.

The profile of the number of young people included in the intervention group is presented in Table 9.3.

**Table 9.3: Number of offences committed by group of young people**

	Intervention		Core comparison		Extended comparison	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
0 offences	0	12	0	96	0	9
1 offence	1	3	18	14	3	1
2-5 offences	5	8	71	12	4	1
6-10 offences	7	2	18	5	5	0
10+ offences	11	0	21	1	1	2
Not available	2	-	-	-	-	-
Total	25	25	128	128	13	13

Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)

The total number of offences committed by young people before and after the intervention was analysed. Of the sample of 25 young people who took part in the intervention, 11 had committed more than 10 offences, 7 had committed 6-10 offences and 6 had committed fewer than 5 offences before the intervention. 12 of these had committed no offences after the intervention while 3 had offended once since the intervention and 8 had committed 2-5 offences. None had committed more than 10 offences and 2 had committed 6-10 offences. Before the intervention, a smaller percentage of the core comparison group had committed more than 6 offences and most had committed 2-5 offences. The majority (96) of the 128 had not offended after the intervention. 9 of the 13 in the extended comparison group had not offended after the intervention, although 2 had committed more than 10 offences. Six of these had committed more than 6 offences before the intervention.

The maximum gravity of the offences for the intervention group before the intervention is presented in Table 9.4.

**Table 9.4: Maximum gravity of offences by group of young people**

	Intervention		Core comparison		Extended comparison	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1		1		2		0
2		0		3		0
3	2	1	14	4	3	2
4	4	2	13	5	4	0
5	9	3	46	9	1	0
6	6	2	33	5	3	2
7	3	3	22	3	2	0
Not available	1	13	-	97	-	9
Total	24	25	128	128	13	13

*Source: YOT data extract, NFER analysis (2011)*

Most (18) of the intervention group had committed offences of a gravity of 5 or more before the intervention, but after the intervention this number was 8. The number of the core comparison group who committed offences ranked as having a gravity of 5 or more was 101 of whom 17 committed offences of a gravity of 5 or more after the intervention. However, the data was not available about 97 of the core comparison group after the intervention. 6 of the extended comparison group committed offences of a gravity of 5 or more before the intervention; 2 did so after the intervention.

## 9.7 Conclusion

Effective practice had been evident in this YOT because of the way information was shared and decisions reviewed on a regular basis. This had enhanced the quality of the multi-agency work that was undertaken and had enabled stakeholders in YOT 6 to build on the existing strength of the partnerships. It was noted that matters were dealt with in ways which were less 'tribal' and that the resettlement work benefited from this broader culture within the locality. This was reflected in the way bodies other than the YOT had decided to allocate staff to resettlement work which had contributed to its effectiveness.

The evidence from YOT 6 also emphasised the importance of the role of RSW and the way this had facilitated one-to-one work with the young people. This work had included providing opportunities for the young people to engage in positive activities alongside brokerage, advocacy and other support for the young people. This had contributed to the outcomes in YOT 6.

The fact that the work of the RSP had been added to an existing panel meant that it was able to build on existing relationships. At the same time this had avoided creating an additional forum which members were required to attend. The experience of YOT 6 emphasised the need for those taking part in meetings to have sufficient authority to take decisions and to commit resources.

Because of the enhanced review function, the effectiveness of the approaches used in this YOT had been subject to rigorous scrutiny. Examples were given where this had led to changes in practice and approach.

### **Key findings: YOT 6**

#### **The RSP: set up and functioning**

YOT 6 integrated resettlement into an existing panel meeting dealing with anti-social behaviour and offending. The RSP discussed young people in the community and those in custody. It had been expanded to scrutinise high-risk offenders. Issues were present at initial meetings due to some members lacking decision-making authority. These had since been resolved. Information-sharing at the RSP was particularly effective, as was the flexibility of the resettlement support put in place through it.

#### **The resettlement support worker**

YOT 6 did not employ a resettlement support worker, but did put in place a social worker with specific responsibility for resettlement.

#### **The review body**

YOT 6 had an enhanced review function. As a result of the intensive reviews, responsibility for arranging and delivering resettlement support had been spread out more evenly among responsible agencies and individuals. In 2011,

YOT 6 were planning to conduct a case-study of two local brothers which examined their offending and recidivism against the resettlement support received by them.

### **Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

The resettlement funding was used by YOT 6 to deliver diversionary activities, ETE packages, and support services. Commitment of resources through the RSP from partner agencies had been equal and fair, according to participants. They felt that more resources were needed to broaden the resettlement work, however.

### **Partnership working around resettlement**

All YOT 6 interviewees emphasised the strength of the partnership working around resettlement since the inception of the pilot scheme. Prior to the scheme, it had been fragmented and 'tribal'. Partnership working could be improved through sharing good practice in young people's resettlement between the YOTs in Wales, according to some interviewees.

### **Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Custody rates had dropped significantly in the YOT 6 area over the course of the pilot scheme. The improvements in achieving secure accommodation for young people leaving custody was at the heart of this, interviewees said. The diversionary ETE and support activities also helped through breaking the cycle of offending, reducing substance misuse, encouraging more positive use of leisure time, raising self-esteem and confidence, and helping to improve relationships with family members.



## **10. Summary of findings: all case studies**

The pilot resettlement schemes in each of the six YOTs embodied a distinctive approach to resettlement work. This reflected the YJB's intention that the funding could be used flexibly to meet local young people's needs, within the parameters outlined in the guidance document.

### **10.1 The resettlement panels: set-up and functioning**

RSPs had been established in all of the case study areas. In four areas, resettlement was added to the remit of an existing panel. In the other two areas, panels were set up to deal with resettlement only. One YOT had reduced the number of young people referred to the panel to prioritise those with the most acute needs.

Most of the YOTs had held 'launch' events for the RSPs. At these events, they gave presentations to senior staff on the RSP's role, function and potential contribution to reducing the use of custody and improving young people's resettlement support.

Most of those interviewed across all of the case study areas felt that the right agencies were represented on the RSPs. These usually included YOT staff, the resettlement worker where they existed, housing agencies, the police, Careers Wales, health services (most often Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services [CAMHS]), and social services. Two RSPs also included representatives from Young Offender's Institutions (YOIs), and a further two were soon to include YOI membership. Youth service and voluntary sector representatives were involved in three RSPs.

In four of the case study areas it was felt that relevant agencies had engaged with the RSP and that this contributed to its effectiveness. However, in two areas there was concern about the attendance record of many members, something which was attributed to two main factors:

- The pressure of work on those agencies and the fact that they were unable to give priority to the resettlement panel.
- A feeling on the part of some organisations that the resettlement work was a matter for the YOT and that the YOTs, as multi-agency bodies, did not require any further input. This was particularly the case in relation to social service representatives.

In four case study areas, interviewees felt that RSP members had the required level of seniority. In two cases, however, although senior staff had attended initial meetings, operational-level staff had attended subsequently. In the cases where senior staff, were not present, the panel's work was less effective and had less impact because members lacked the authority to come to firm decisions and to commit resources.

## **10.2 Panel functioning and effectiveness**

On the whole, interviewees felt that RSPs were well-run and effective. RSPs had facilitated information-sharing between agencies. This enabled informed decisions to be taken regarding young people's resettlement. The resettlement panels also served a useful purpose in promoting partnership working and reducing a 'silo mentality' which was felt by some participants to have existed in the past.

In YOTs which covered two local authorities (LAs), respondents noted the need to ensure that both authorities were equally committed to the success of the pilot and that they were both willing and able to provide the relevant resources. This was not always the case and it was found that some LAs had a different concept of the scale and the resources that would be required than others.

The involvement and commitment of different agencies in the resettlement work, including their participation in resettlement panels, was uneven across the case study areas. These variations were attributed to historic levels of engagement with the YOTs, the attitudes of senior personnel, and capacity issues.

### 10.3 The resettlement workers

The model adopted to support resettlement work varied in each YOT.

- one YOT had not employed a resettlement worker but used some of the resettlement funding to provide additional hours for existing sessional workers to support resettlement work
- another YOT had also not appointed a resettlement worker and used the funding to help meet young people's needs and deliver diversionary activities
- In the other four case-study areas, resettlement workers had been appointed. In one of these areas the appointment had been on a part-time basis.

Where appointed, resettlement workers' roles had not been constant throughout the pilot projects. In one area, the resettlement worker carried out work alongside a YOT officer in specific and defined ways. In other cases, the funding allowed existing post holders to be released to undertake resettlement work. A further YOT had not appointed a resettlement worker, and existing YOT staff did the resettlement work.

Resettlement workers' roles normally involved providing bespoke resettlement support to young people. The specific tasks performed by resettlement support workers in each area varied.

Advocating on young people's behalf was a key aspect of the resettlement worker's role across the case study YOTs, however. Usually, the resettlement worker did so by accompanying them to appointments with service providers to help them secure the support they needed. In one YOT, the advocacy support provided by the resettlement worker was more specialised. For example, they attended court hearings and presented options to magistrates as alternatives to custody.

In three of the YOTs, the resettlement worker mainly did one-to-one work with young people. In one YOT, the worker only did group work, after having been

taken off the one-to-one work at the management's discretion. This was seen by some of those interviewed to reduce the impact of the resettlement work.

#### **10.4 The review bodies: role and effectiveness**

Two of the pilot areas had established an enhanced review function. They consulted with YOT staff and RSP members to evaluate which aspects of the resettlement support delivered to the young people through the pilot scheme had worked well and less well. YOT staff led less formal reviews of the resettlement work in all other areas. These reviews had led to changes to the ways in which the resettlement work was carried out.

Examples of these changes included:

- the point at which the resettlement workers made contact with the young people
- decisions about who would attend meetings within the secure estate to identify young people's needs and to ensure they were met on release
- delivering staff training on the nature and focus of resettlement work and on the underpinning legislation, policy and strategy
- allocating responsibility for resettlement activities to different staff members
- changes in the focus of the resettlement worker's role.

One of the pilot areas intended to use a case study methodology to identify the impact of the resettlement work undertaken on individual young people for whom the resettlement work had very different outcomes.

#### **10.5 Commitment of resources**

The participating YOTs used the resettlement funding in a range of ways, including:

- to secure more appropriate housing; this had largely stopped the use of unsupported bed and breakfast accommodation in which young people were vulnerable

- purchasing items such as clothing, household furniture and equipment
- paying for staff training in specialist areas
- supporting resettlement workers and existing staff to deliver enhanced resettlement support
- providing diversionary activities, either through on-going courses or one-off ad-hoc events which presented more positive use of young people's leisure time, and opportunities to nurture positive attitudes and self-esteem.

RSPs in each area had encouraged agencies to commit resources to young people's resettlement. This had taken more time in some areas than in others. Many Interviewees felt that the resettlement support given to the young people through the pilot resettlement scheme had brought added value through better planning and coordination of the way resources and support were provided'.

Those involved in planning and delivering the resettlement work across the case study areas emphasised the need to ensure that YOTs were able to use the resettlement funding flexibly. This enabled them to respond to young people's needs in a tailored and timely manner, before problems escalated.

## **10.6 Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Offending among young people participating in the pilot schemes had reduced significantly in all of the case study areas. The seriousness of their offending had also decreased. Many interviewees stated that it was not possible to relate these changes solely to the enhanced resettlement work done with the young people through the schemes, but that it had contributed to them.

In addition, young people had achieved the following improved outcomes as a result of the improved resettlement support provided to them through the pilot scheme:

- reduced substance misuse, or seeking help for substance misuse issues
- better relationships with families and peers

- developing new and more positive leisure interests
- securing safe and appropriate accommodation on release from custody
- securing places in colleges or with training providers, or entering paid employment
- increased self-esteem and self-confidence.

The personnel interviewed overwhelmingly felt that these outcomes would not have been achieved were it not for the additional resettlement support provided to the young people through the pilot resettlement schemes. The intensive, bespoke nature of the support provided to them was seen to be largely responsible for the improvements.

They felt it was essential that YOTs and RSPs were able to plan such work in line with the needs and interests of the young people. The importance of the work on accommodation needs was emphasised by respondents in the majority of the pilot areas. They referred to previous practices in which young people had been placed in unsuitable accommodation without support, often alongside adult ex-offenders.

Stakeholders were convinced of the need to begin the resettlement work early on in young people's involvement with the YOT to maximize the benefit for young people.

Opinions varied among interviewees around whether young people should take part in the resettlement schemes as a compulsory condition of their license, or whether participation should be voluntary. Those who felt it should be compulsory did so because they thought young people would not participate otherwise. However, some young people did not wish to be associated with the YOTs in any way after they had been released from custody.

Participants recognised that the pilot schemes supported only a very small number of young people. The cost of providing this support was noted. However, this needed to be considered against the greater cost incurred

through young people being re-arrested, tried, and possibly returning to custody, and the wider cost of crime and anti-social behaviour, which is harder to quantify.

### **Key findings: all case studies**

#### **The RSPs: set up and functioning**

RSPs were set up in all 6 case study areas. Four areas added resettlement to existing panels, whereas two set up separate resettlement panels. In most areas, members felt that the right agencies were represented on the panel, and that they had the necessary seniority. Two areas had initial issues with members lacking decision-making powers. Overall, the RSPs were well-run and effective. The commitment and involvement of partner agencies was uneven across the 6 YOTs. In YOTs functioning across two LAs, some issues were encountered because of differential involvement by individual authorities.

#### **The resettlement support worker**

Four of the six case study YOTs had employed resettlement workers and two had not. Where appointed, their roles varied substantially. Advocating on young people's behalf was a common feature, however. In three YOTs, the resettlement worker mainly did one-to-one work with young people, but in the other, the worker had moved from doing individual work to solely doing ISS group work. Only doing group work had lessened the impact of their role, according to some interviewees.

#### **The review bodies**

Two of the six YOTs had an enhanced review function. Less formal reviews were carried out by the other YOTs. These had led to changes in the resettlement work, such as the point at which the resettlement workers engaged with the young people; which staff visited secure estates; implementing staff training; changes in the distribution of responsibility for resettlement work; and changes in the resettlement worker's role.

#### **Resettlement plans: commitment of resources**

Each YOT used the resettlement funding differently. Some used it to employ resettlement workers. Others used it to support sessional workers to deliver resettlement support. One YOT bought items such as furniture and clothing for participating young people. Others paid for staff training and provided diversionary and support activities. Interviewees emphasised the need for YOTs to be able to use the funding flexibly to meet the needs of the young people participating in the pilot scheme. On the whole, partner agencies had

committed resources to resettlement equally, but this had taken more time to embed in some areas than others.

### **Partnership working around resettlement**

Partnership working around resettlement had improved as a result of the pilot schemes and the RSPs in each area. Less 'silo' working was apparent between agencies, and communication had improved. The schemes had prioritised resettlement among partner agencies, and had facilitated their understanding of others' roles. In two areas, although partnership working had got better, improvements were less marked than in the other areas.

### **Resettlement schemes: improving outcomes for young people**

Custody rates had dropped significantly across all of the participating YOTs, although it was hard to link this directly to the resettlement work carried out under the schemes. Re-offending fell in both intervention and comparison groups. This is not surprising, since comparison groups also received support (but not that provided under the RSP scheme). Analysis of reoffending was also hampered by missing data. The pilot schemes in each area had improved a range of other outcomes for young people. Interviewees emphasised that the intensity of the resettlement support provided could not have been delivered were it not for the resettlement funding. The improved outcomes achieved by the young people included reduced substance misuse; greater engagement with ETE; improved family relationships; securing appropriate accommodation; developing positive leisure interests; and improved self-esteem and confidence.



## 11. Conclusions

### **Resettlement workers and their role**

In all case studies a member of staff worked with the young people to lead on resettlement related work and in the majority of cases this was a dedicated resettlement worker. The role of RSWs varied, and the post-holders were drawn from different backgrounds. However, the most effective practice was observed where they had developed a positive relationship with the young people, where they understood and identified the young people's needs, and where they were able to put in place effective strategies to meet those needs.

The exact models by which this was delivered varied according to local decisions. They included using experienced YOT personnel and new appointees. Most were from a youth justice background although some were trained social workers and youth workers. As is noted in Chapter 10, the staff leading on resettlement played key roles in supporting young people, for example through providing advocacy, brokerage and mediation. Both the qualitative and quantitative data suggests that the young people concerned benefited from the intervention under each of the different models adopted. It did not matter whether the member of staff leading the resettlement work was a dedicated RSW, provided the post-holder undertook one-to-one work to support the young people, taking an interest in their welfare, signposting services, advocating on their behalf, and mediating with families or carers.

The role of the staff leading the resettlement work was distinct and should not be confused with that undertaken by Supervision and Support Workers or DTO officers. The latter performed roles that were directly related to the sentence issued by the justice system and their relationship with the young people were very different from those which resettlement officers needed to develop in order for their work to be effective. For resettlement to be successful, it needed to be perceived as something that was distinct from a sentence. The person leading on resettlement needed to develop a relationship with the young person, free of any role relating to the enforcement of a requirement imposed by the justice system.

However, successful resettlement work built on the work undertaken by Supervision and Support Workers and DTO Officers, recognising the contribution which their support functions had made to the welfare of the young people, and helping them to move forward into the resettlement process. Resettlement work:

- offered a means of ensuring that appropriate support for young people continued for some time as was appropriate to the circumstances of each young person after their sentences came to an end
- meant that they were supported by individuals with whom they had built a relationship during their sentence
- meant that they were not left without support at a crucial period after their involvement with the justice system had formally ended.

Some young people did not take up resettlement support as they perceived it to be part of a sentence or involvement with the justice system. Much depended on the quality of the relationship built up by the member of staff leading resettlement. This relationship needed to start early during the young person's involvement with the justice system (for example at PSR stage) and to develop from there. In most cases this involved maintaining a relationship with young people throughout their involvement with the justice system, including visiting young people within the secure estate. Careful management of workload was required to enable such contact to be maintained.

The challenges of fostering the distinct relationship that was needed were significant and called for flexibility on the part of the staff leading on resettlement and a willingness to engage on the part of each young person. This required an approach to resettlement that motivated young people, gave them a sense of purpose and opened their eyes to their own potential. The role of resettlement support in overcoming negative, even fatalistic feelings, was therefore essential if it were to impact on the lives of the young people.

### **Effective multi-agency working**

Effective planning of resettlement support depended on the extent to which all relevant agencies took part in discussions of individual cases and whether those attending meetings had an understanding of what resources needed to be committed. They also needed to have the authority within their organisations to ensure that decisions were implemented. Achieving 'buy-in' from relevant stakeholders at a sufficient level of seniority was a key aspect of the success of the resettlement work. The case studies indicated that the higher the level of engagement, the more effective those involved perceived it to be. This was the case irrespective of whether YOTs worked in a single LA or whether they worked across two authorities. There was no set pattern in the extent to which LAs (or other agencies in those areas) were engaged with the resettlement process. Staff in one LA department might engage more than their counterparts in another LA; however, the opposite might be the case in respect of another department in the same LA. It was important to convince each organisation (LA, Local Health Boards, Social Housing Providers, the police and so on) at the very highest level of the importance of resettlement work. Agreements to contribute needed to be understood and enforced within organisations.

To be effective this should be underpinned by a commitment to multi-agency working that was translated into practice through agreed protocols. This required a willingness to be open, to share information and to be prepared to be flexible about which agencies or departments took the lead in meeting a young person's needs. Those taking part in discussions needed to agree on issues such as who was responsible for paying for specific services and for implementing those agreements. This required individuals with sufficient seniority to commit their organisations to a particular course of action, matched by resources.

### **Organisational structure**

Each pilot area had developed an RSP or equivalent body in response to local circumstances. As is noted in Chapter 10, these varied but the models can be categorised as:

- Using an existing forum
- Creating a new body
- Using an existing body alongside a new one
- Creating a new body and integrating it to other structures.

The evidence indicates that each model was perceived to respond to local needs but that no model was entirely free of any difficulty. For example, in one area it had been found that the creation of a new structure had not been effective and the work had been divided between an existing panel and a new entity; elsewhere, the use of an existing forum had been unsuccessful and a new body had been created. However, while there was no compelling evidence to suggest that one model was more effective than another, the experience of the case studies would suggest that there were common attributes of effective RSPs. These included a need for flexibility and that structures should be developed in response to what worked in a particular locality. Moreover, the structures were only effective if the input from the YOT was matched by a commitment from other stakeholders to play a full part in the work. Structures needed to be reviewed and amended if they were shown not to work.

### **Composition of the RSP**

The composition of the RSPs (or equivalent bodies) varied across the six areas although there was a common 'core' membership that included the YOTs themselves, the police, and LA housing departments. It was also usual to have CAMHs, community safety, LA education and youth service representatives on the panels. The number of representatives from each organisation and their seniority varied according to local circumstances, and the internal structures used by each of the stakeholders represented. The evidence suggested that RSPs were effective where their core membership also included CAMHS, and social services. The inclusion of representatives from the secure estate was more problematic; while it was beneficial for staff to be involved in discussions about individual cases, it would not be practical to include representatives of each secure institution where a young person

was located as standing members of each Resettlement Panel. LA Youth Services might be more involved in some areas than others because they worked with the YOT on a particular theme.

As is noted above, there were differences in the way YOTs used the allocated funding and these related to the way individual teams perceived the needs within their areas. The qualitative and quantitative evidence suggests that expenditure to support diversionary activities and to purchase materials for the young people occurred in areas where the percentage of the intervention group who re-offended after the intervention was among the lowest. There was also evidence from stakeholders within YOTs, including the young people themselves, that diversionary activities were perceived to promote engagement and positive behaviour. It is unclear whether such activities would be sustainable without additional funding obtained through resettlement. It is also necessary to question whether funding should be used to support such provision, rather than be focused solely on the personal support, brokerage and mediation which formed the key features of effective resettlement.

At the same time, some individual YOTs had used the funding to support staff training in areas which were related to the characteristics of the young people involved in the resettlement work. This developed their understanding of the issues confronting the young people with whom they worked, but again was not directly related to supporting resettlement.

The two YOTs who had an Enhanced Review Function (ERF) monitored the reasons why a child ended up in custody as they were required to do in order to meet the requirements of the ERF. They also focused on cases where a custodial sentence was avoided in order to monitor processes and identify good practice. The ERF was being used to support evidence-based reflective practice that informed the YOT's work across the board. Other areas reviewed the way in which the Resettlement Panel operated and changes in the way they operated were attributed to these processes. This was an area which most YOTs intended to develop further.



## 12. Recommendations

### **Functioning of RSPs and commitment of resources**

Effective multi-agency working is necessary to underpin resettlement work. This should be based on the engagement of all relevant agencies and the involvement of staff with sufficient seniority in order to:

- commit their organisations to a particular course of action
- commit resources to implement those actions.

YOTs, the police, social housing providers, social services, CAMHS and education providers should be represented on RSPs. Liaison is needed with the secure estate and this should be led by a dedicated member of staff.

Dedicated resettlement funding should be used in ways that meet the needs of each individual young person. However, it should not be used to replace support which the young people are entitled to receive from other sources.

RSPs' work should be structured to ensure optimum use of members' time. This could, for example include structuring the agenda so that members are only required to attend for those items which are pertinent to their areas of responsibility.

### **The Resettlement Support Workers and the Supervision support Workers**

Individual one-to-one work with young people should underpin resettlement work. The exact model by which this is done and the nature of the personnel involved should be a matter to be determined locally. However, this should be within a national framework of expectations about the function and purpose of resettlement work.

The focus of resettlement work should continue to be to ensure that the individual needs of the young people are met. This should include brokerage, assisting young people to access services and ensuring that practical needs are met.

YOTs should continue to ensure that the work of the member of staff leading on resettlement is, and is perceived to be, distinct from that of personnel whose roles are related to the sentence imposed on a young person. While the support role of Supervision and Support workers is central to their remits, they are distinct from the work of the person leading on resettlement after a sentence had ended.

Staff leading on resettlement should engage with the young people early during their involvement with the justice system, starting at the PSR stage. This should lead to the development of a structured resettlement plan which takes account of the young people's aspirations and identifies the resources/support they need to enable them to resettle. The contact should include visiting young people held in the secure estate as part of the structured resettlement programme, where relevant.

A focus on promoting self-confidence and self-worth among the young people should be integral to the role of the resettlement process.

### **The review body**

The effectiveness of resettlement work, including that of the RSP or relevant body should be reviewed on a systematic basis by each individual YOT. Specific cases should be reviewed in order to learn lessons and identify effective practice. The evidence from such reviews needs to be collected and analysed on a systematic basis and should be used to improve delivery across all agencies. Specifically the work should include examining whether all relevant agencies are meeting their full responsibilities.

### **Outcomes for young people**



YOTs should examine the existing range of diversionary activities offered in their areas to avoid duplication. Where diversionary activities are funded from resettlement funding, strong and clear evidence of need should be identified.

YOTs should collect Asset and other data in a more systematic and comprehensive basis. Full completion of the assessments is essential if evidence-based decisions and effective review is to take place in future.

## 12. Appendix: Interview schedules used in the evaluation



### Evaluation of the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects

#### Case Manager interview schedule

NFER has been asked by the WAG and the YJB to carry out the current review. Thank you for agreeing to take part in an interview in relation to it. Your contribution will form an important part of the research, and will help to inform the processes involved in young people's resettlement.

The research aims to examine the setting up and functioning of the resettlement panels, particularly, the role and impact of the key personnel involved with the panels. It will also evaluate the effectiveness of the panels in improving outcomes for the young people involved. You have been selected to take part in the research because of your related role and remit.

All of the information you provide during the interview will be kept anonymously and will be passed back to YJB and WAG in an aggregated form along with the data from other interviews in this pilot area. You will not be named in any of our reports, your personal details will not be seen by or passed on to anyone outside the project team, and will be destroyed at the end of the project.

Our discussion should take approximately 30 minutes, if that is OK?

Do you have any questions, or is there any aspect of the research that you would like me to clarify?

#### **1. Background**

1.1 Name:

1.2 Position / job title:

1.3 Organisation:

1.4 Resettlement Panel involved with:

1.5 Could you please outline briefly how your work relates to resettlement and your links with the resettlement panel?

#### **2. Roll-out and delivery**

- 2.1 What do you understand to be the aims and objectives of the pilot project in [your area]?
- Prompt: What input, if any, did you have into deciding the aims and objectives? What is the general level of awareness among colleagues of the panel of the pilot project's aims and objectives?*
- 2.2 How exactly does your work link with the resettlement panel?
- Prompt: What has been your level of involvement with the panel? Has your work been affected in anyway by the panel? Awareness of referral procedures? Number of referrals made to the panel?*
- 2.3 In your view, to what extent is the resettlement panel fully operational?
- Prompt: If not fully operational, what further work needs to be done? What, if any, further support is required?*
- 2.4 Have there been any issues around the functioning of the resettlement panel since its inception?
- Prompt: If so, what are/were they? Have they been resolved? If not, how could these issues be resolved?*
- 2.5 Have you identified the factors likely to influence the success of the pilot project in providing improved support to the young people involved?
- Prompt: What were the key factors? What evidence do you have for this?*

### **3. Partnership working**

- 3.1 How effective was partnership working around resettlement before the pilot?
- Prompt: How effective it is now?*
- 3.2 In your view are all relevant agencies involved in the panel? (List panel member agencies if necessary)
- Prompt: Should there be any other agencies involved?*

### **4. Role and impact of Support Workers**

- 4.1 How do you link with the Resettlement Support Worker?
- 4.2 What impact(s) has/have the Resettlement Support Worker had?
- Prompt: Has the Resettlement Support Worker had any other impacts of which you are aware? How could the Resettlement Support Worker role be improved to have greater impact?*

4.3 How do you link with the Supervision Support Worker?

4.4 What impact(s) has/have the Supervision Support Worker had?

*Prompt: Has the Supervision Support Worker had any other impacts of which you are aware? How could the Supervision Support Worker role be improved to have greater impact?*

## **5. Impact**

5.1 What, if any, would you say are the emerging impacts of the resettlement panel to date?

*Prompt: On what basis do you arrive at that judgement?*

5.2 To what extent do you believe that the project has, thus far, succeeded in providing improved support to:

a) young people at risk of a custodial sentence?

b) young people given a custodial sentence?

*Prompt: Why do you say that?*

5.3 To what extent do you anticipate that the project WILL, once completed in 2011, have succeeded in providing improved support to the participating young people?

*Prompt: What factors will influence this?*

5.4 How far has the pilot project succeeded in improving each of the following outcomes for the participating young people?:

[Note to researcher: please ask about each outcome in turn]

a) reoffending/attitude to offending

b) accommodation status or living arrangements

c) employment, education or training status

d) involvement with alcohol and/or substance misuse

e) access to other support services.

5.5 How has the pilot project contributed towards reducing offending and re-offending to date? (and in the future?)

*Prompt: For example, through addressing alcohol/substance misuse issues; addressing other needs and vulnerabilities; working with parents, families and peers; developing more positive use of leisure time; developing life skills, budget management, healthy living, and diet; improving self-esteem and confidence to make positive decisions.*

- 5.6 What other local initiatives and activities are the young people participating that might also impact on outcomes? (Which services deliver those?)
- 5.7 What may have happened in the absence of this pilot?
- 5.8 Has this pilot enabled you to do things that you wouldn't have been able to do otherwise?
- 5.9 How could the effectiveness of the pilot project be increased?

## **6. Summing up**

- 6.1 What have been the key barriers and facilitators to the pilot so far?
- 6.2 In what way(s) could the resettlement panel be improved?
- 6.3 Do you have any recommendations so far (particularly in terms of project set up) for others wishing to implement a similar approach in other authorities?
- 6.4 Is there anything else you would like to add about your work so far that we have not covered?

**Thank you very much for your cooperation**



## Evaluation of the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects

### Key contact interview schedule

NFER has been asked by the WAG and the YJB to carry out the current review. Thank you for agreeing to take part in an interview in relation to it. Your contribution will form an important part of the research, and will help to inform the processes involved in young people's resettlement.

The research aims to examine the setting up and functioning of the resettlement panels, particularly, the role and impact of the key personnel involved with the panels. It will also evaluate the effectiveness of the panels in improving outcomes for the young people involved. You have been selected to take part in the research because of your related role and remit.

All of the information you provide during the interview will be kept anonymously and will be passed back to YJB and WAG in an aggregated form along with the data from other interviews in this pilot area. You will not be named in any of our reports, your personal details will not be seen by or passed on to anyone outside the project team, and will be destroyed at the end of the project.

Our discussion should take approximately one hour, if that is OK?

Do you have any questions, or is there any aspect of the research that you would like me to clarify?

#### **1. Background**

1.1 Name:

1.2 Position / job title:

1.3 Organisation:

1.4 Resettlement Panel involved with:

1.5 Could you please outline briefly your role in relation to the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects?

*Prompt: How does this fit in with your other responsibilities? Amount of time dedicated to the pilots per week/month?*

## **2. Roll-out and delivery**

2.1 What are the aims and objectives of the pilot project in [your area]?

*Prompt: How and why were the aims and objectives decided? What input, if any, did you/your organisation have into deciding the aims and objectives?*

2.3 Could you please outline the process involved in setting up the resettlement panel?

*Prompt: Who has been involved? What was the nature of their involvement? Any issues or challenges?*

2.4 How exactly is the resettlement panel operating?

(Prompt each if not covered)

- *Are panel meetings added on to a pre-existing panel meeting or do they stand alone?*
- *Who/which organisations is/are involved? (strategic personnel/operational level staff)*
- *How is the panel administered?*
- *What are the referral routes into and out of the panel? How do the panels identify young people? (both those going into and coming out of custody)*

2.4 In your view, to what extent is the resettlement panel fully operational?

*Prompt: If not fully operational, what further work needs to be done? What if any, further support is required?*

*Prompt: How many young people so far have been discussed by the panel/received support from the panel (Is this more/less/as expected?)*

2.5 To what extent is this resettlement panel based on the guidance document provided by YJB?

*Prompt: If the panel has varied from the guidance why is this? How useful was the guidance? Was there any further support required at this stage?*

2.6 Have there been any issues around the functioning of the resettlement panel since its inception?

*Prompt: If so, what are/were they? Have they been resolved? If not, how could these issues be resolved?*

2.7 Have you identified the factors likely to influence the success of the pilot project in providing improved support to the young people involved?

*Prompt: What were the key factors? What evidence do you have for this?*

## **3. Partnership working**

3.1 How effective was partnership working around support for resettlement before the pilot?

*Prompt: How effective it is now?*

3.2 To what extent has your pilot project succeeded in securing the involvement of every relevant agency?

*Prompt: What issues have arisen around securing the involvement of the relevant agencies? How have any challenges been overcome? What have been the impacts on the pilot project of any differences in involvement between agencies?*

3.3 How has the involvement of partners been secured?

*Prompt: What has been put in place to facilitate effective partnership working?*

3.4 Have all of the partners involved been equally involved with and committed to their work with the resettlement panels?

*Prompt: If not, why do you think that is? If not, what has been the impact of this on the overall functioning of the pilot project?*

3.5 To what extent have each of the partners involved committed resources to resettlement support plans?

*Prompt: What has influenced those decisions? What has been the impact of any differences in the extent to which partners have committed resources to the resettlement support plans on the pilot project?*

#### **4. Review processes**

**[Background information: Wrexham and Bridgend are the only two pilot projects to have enhanced review functions, whereby past and current custody cases are examined to determine if local processes and services might have been better deployed in order to offer a credible community-based alternative]**

4.1 Does your resettlement panel have a review body?

**[Note to researcher: please only ask questions 4.2-4.4 if interviewee states that there IS a review body in their area]**

4.2 What is the role of the review body in [your area]?

4.3 Is the review body linked to any other structures within the local authority area(s)?

*Prompt: Children and Young People's Partnership? Local Safeguarding Children Board?*

4.4 How effective is the review body [in terms of determining whether local processes and services might have been better deployed in order to offer a credible community-based alternative]?



*Prompt: Why do you say that? How has their effectiveness been measured/determined? What have they contributed to the success of the pilot project?*

4.5 How could the effectiveness of the review body be increased?

## **5. Role and impact of Support Workers**

(NB: Depending on the interviewees role these questions will be tailored accordingly)

5.1 What is the role of the Resettlement Support Worker in your pilot project?

*Prompt: What is their background?*

5.2 What impact(s) has/have the Resettlement Support Worker had?

*Prompt: Has the Resettlement Support Worker had any other impacts of which you are aware? How could the Resettlement Support Worker role be improved to have greater impact?*

5.3 What is the role of the Supervision Support Worker in your pilot project?

*Prompt: What is their background?*

5.4 What impact(s) has/have the Supervision Support Worker had?

*Prompt: Has the Supervision Support Worker had any other impacts of which you are aware? How could the Supervision Support Worker role be improved to have greater impact?*

## **6. Impact**

6.1 What would you say have been the emerging impacts of the pilot project to date?

*Prompt: On what basis do you arrive at that judgement?*

6.2 To what extent do you believe that the project has, thus far, succeeded in providing improved support to:

a) young people at risk of a custodial sentence?

b) young people given a custodial sentence?

*Prompt: Why do you say that?*

6.3 To what extent do you anticipate that the project WILL, once completed in 2011, have succeeded in providing improved support to the participating young people?

*Prompt: What factors will influence this?*

6.4 How far has the pilot project succeeded in improving each of the following outcomes for the participating young people? :

[Note to researcher: please ask about each outcome in turn]

- a) reoffending/attitude to offending
- b) accommodation status or living arrangements
- c) employment, education or training status
- d) involvement with alcohol and/or substance misuse
- e) access to other support services.

6.5 How has the pilot project contributed towards reducing offending and re-offending to date? (and in the future?)

*Prompt: For example, through addressing alcohol/substance misuse issues; addressing other needs and vulnerabilities; working with parents, families and peers; developing more positive use of leisure time; developing life skills, budget management, healthy living, and diet; improving self-esteem and confidence to make positive decisions.*

6.6 What other local initiatives and activities are the young people participating that might also impact on outcomes? (Which services deliver those?)

6.7 What may have happened in the absence of this pilot?

6.8 Has the funding associated with this pilot enabled you to do things that you wouldn't have been able to do otherwise?

6.9 How could the effectiveness of the pilot project be increased?

## **7. Summing up**

7.1 What have been the key barriers and facilitators to the pilot so far?

7.2 In what way(s) could the resettlement panel be improved?

7.3 Do you have any recommendations so far (particularly in terms of project set up) for others wishing to implement a similar approach in other authorities?

7.3 Is there anything else you would like to add about your work so far that we have not covered?

**Thank you very much for your cooperation**



## Evaluation of the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects

### Panel Member/Key Partner interview schedule

NFER has been asked by the WAG and the YJB to carry out the current review. Thank you for agreeing to take part in an interview in relation to it. Your contribution will form an important part of the research, and will help to inform the processes involved in young people's resettlement.

The research aims to examine the setting up and functioning of the resettlement panels, particularly, the role and impact of the key personnel involved with the panels. It will also evaluate the effectiveness of the panels in improving outcomes for the young people involved. You have been selected to take part in the research because of your related role and remit.

All of the information you provide during the interview will be kept anonymously and will be passed back to YJB and WAG in an aggregated form along with the data from other interviews in this pilot area. You will not be named in any of our reports, your personal details will not be seen by or passed on to anyone outside the project team, and will be destroyed at the end of the project.

Our discussion should take approximately one hour, if that is OK?

Do you have any questions, or is there any aspect of the research that you would like me to clarify?

#### **1. Background**

1.1 Name:

1.2 Position / job title:

1.3 Organisation:

1.4 Resettlement Panel involved with:

1.5 Could you please outline briefly your role in relation to the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects?

*Prompt: How does this fit in with your other responsibilities? Amount of time dedicated to the pilots per week/month?*

## **2. Roll-out and delivery**

2.1 What are the aims and objectives of the pilot project in [your area]?

*Prompt: What input did you/your organisation have into deciding the aims and objectives?*

2.2 Why is your service involved in the panel?

2.3 How did you become involved with the panel?

2.4 What has been your level of involvement in setting up the resettlement panel?

2.5 What is the level and nature of your involvement in panel meetings now?

*Prompt: Nature of attendance face to face/remote? Frequency of attendance?*

2.6 How exactly is the resettlement panel operating?

*(Prompt each if not covered)*

- *Are panel meetings added on to a pre-existing panel meeting or do they stand alone?*
- *Who/which organisations is/are involved? (strategic personnel/operational level staff)*
- *How is the panel administered?*
- *What are the referral routes into and out of the panel? How do the panels identify young people? (both those going into and coming out of custody)*

2.7 In your view, to what extent is the resettlement panel fully operational?

*Prompt: If not fully operational, what further work needs to be done? What if any, further support is required?*

*Prompt: How many young people so far have been discussed by the panel/received support from the panel (Is this more/less/as expected?)*

2.8 Have there been any issues around the functioning of the resettlement panel since its inception?

*Prompt: If so, what are/were they? Have they been resolved? If not, how could these issues be resolved?*

2.9 Have you identified the factors likely to influence the success of the pilot project in providing improved support to the young people involved?

*Prompt: What were the key factors? What evidence do you have for this?*

## **3. Partnership working**

3.1 How effective was partnership working around support for resettlement before the pilot?

*Prompt: How effective it is now?*

3.2 To what extent has your pilot project succeeded in securing the involvement of every relevant agency?

*Prompt: What issues have arisen around securing the involvement of the relevant agencies? How have any challenges been overcome? What have been the impacts on the pilot project of any differences in involvement between agencies?*

3.3 Have all of the partners involved been equally involved with and committed to their work with the resettlement panels?

*Prompt: If not, why do you think that is? If not, what has been the impact of this on the overall functioning of the pilot project?*

3.4 To what extent have each of the partners involved committed resources to resettlement support plans?

*Prompt: What has influenced those decisions? What has been the impact of any differences in the extent to which partners have committed resources to the resettlement support plans on the pilot project?*

#### **4. Review processes**

**[Background information: Wrexham and Bridgend are the only two pilot projects to have enhanced review functions, whereby past and current custody cases are examined to determine if local processes and services might have been better deployed in order to offer a credible community-based alternative]**

4.1 Does your resettlement panel have a review body?

**[Note to researcher: please only ask questions 4.2-4.4 if interviewee states that there IS a review body in their area]**

4.2 What is the role of the review body in [your area]?

4.3 Is the review body linked to any other structures within the local authority area(s)?

*Prompt: Children and Young People's Partnership? Local Safeguarding Children Board?*

4.4 How effective is the review body [in terms of determining whether local processes and services might have been better deployed in order to offer a credible community-based alternative]?

*Prompt: Why do you say that? How has their effectiveness been measured/determined? What have they contributed to the success of the pilot project?*

4.5 How could the effectiveness of the review body be increased?

## **5. Role and impact of Support Workers**

(NB: Depending on the interviewees role these questions will be tailored accordingly)

5.1 What is the role of the Resettlement Support Worker in your pilot project?

*Prompt: What is their background?*

5.2 What impact(s) has/have the Resettlement Support Worker had?

*Prompt: Has the Resettlement Support Worker had any other impacts of which you are aware? How could the Resettlement Support Worker role be improved to have greater impact?*

5.3 What is the role of the Supervision Support Worker in your pilot project?

*Prompt: What is their background?*

5.4 What impact(s) has/have the Supervision Support Worker had?

*Prompt: Has the Supervision Support Worker had any other impacts of which you are aware? How could the Supervision Support Worker role be improved to have greater impact?*

## **6. Impact**

6.1 What would you say have been the emerging impacts of the pilot project to date?

*Prompt: On what basis do you arrive at that judgement?*

6.2 To what extent do you believe that the project has, thus far, succeeded in providing improved support to:

a) young people at risk of a custodial sentence?

b) young people given a custodial sentence?

*Prompt: Why do you say that?*

6.3 To what extent do you anticipate that the project WILL, once completed in 2011, have succeeded in providing improved support to the participating young people?

*Prompt: What factors will influence this?*

6.4 How far has the pilot project succeeded in improving each of the following outcomes for the participating young people? :

[Note to researcher: please ask about each outcome in turn]

a) reoffending/attitude to offending

b) accommodation status or living arrangements

- c) employment, education or training status
- d) involvement with alcohol and/or substance misuse
- e) access to other support services.

6.5 How has the pilot project contributed towards reducing offending and re-offending to date? (and in the future?)

*Prompt: For example, through addressing alcohol/substance misuse issues; addressing other needs and vulnerabilities; working with parents, families and peers; developing more positive use of leisure time; developing life skills, budget management, healthy living, and diet; improving self-esteem and confidence to make positive decisions.*

6.6 What other local initiatives and activities are the young people participating that might also impact on outcomes?

*Prompt: Which services deliver those?*

6.7 What may have happened in the absence of this pilot?

6.8 Has the funding associated with this pilot enabled you to do things that you wouldn't have been able to do otherwise?

6.9 How could the effectiveness of the pilot project be increased?

## **7. Summing up**

7.1 What have been the key barriers and facilitators to the pilot so far?

7.2 In what way(s) could the resettlement panel be improved?

7.3 Do you have any recommendations so far (particularly in terms of project set up) for others wishing to implement a similar approach in other authorities?

7.4 Is there anything else you would like to add about your work so far that we have not covered?

**Thank you very much for your cooperation**



## Evaluation of the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects

### Young people interview schedule

My name is ---- and I work for a company which has been asked to speak to some young people like yourself who are involved with the Resettlement Project to find out what you think about it and how it might have helped you.

I'm only asking you your name for the purpose of us having a conversation today. Everything you tell me will be kept confidentially, and I won't pass on any of your details to anyone who isn't on the team doing this research.

I really appreciate you giving up your time today, and can assure you that what you tell me will be used to help other young people in your position.

I have some questions prepared here that I'd like to ask you. [**Note to researcher:** give a brief overview of the topic areas covered by the questions]. Is there anything you'd like to ask me before I ask you my questions?

#### **Background**

- Name:

- Pilot Project involved with:

- Length of time on the Project:

1. What do you think of the Resettlement Project?

*Prompt: What have been the best things about the Resettlement Project? What have been the worst things about the Resettlement Project?*

2. How, if at all, has the Resettlement Project helped you since you came out of custody?

[Note to researcher: please ask question 2.2 and record the open response, then ask each of the following probes].

Has the Resettlement Project:

- Helped you to find a place to live or to go back to your old place?
- Helped you to get clean/stay off drugs/drink less?
- Helped you to find work/go to college/get work experience?



- Helped you to find new interests?
  - Helped your family/friends?
  - Helped you to feel better about yourself?
3. Has the Resettlement Project helped you in any other ways?
  4. Has your involvement with the Resettlement Project made any difference to your offending?  
*Prompt: What is it about the Project that has made the difference?*
  5. If YES, why do you say that?  
*Prompt: Why do you say that?*
  6. If NO, why do you say that?
  7. Has the Resettlement Project made any difference to how you feel about your offending?  
*Prompt: Why do you say that?*
  8. How could the Resettlement Project be improved?  
*Prompt: Is there anything you would change about the Project to make it better for other young people in your position?*
  9. Can you think of anything else that might prevent you from getting into trouble in future?
  10. Is there anything else you would like to say about the Resettlement Project?

**Thank you very much for answering these questions**



# Evaluation of the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects

## Strategic personnel interview schedule

We at NFER have been asked by the WAG and the YJB to carry out the current review. Thank you for agreeing to take part in an interview in relation to it. Your contribution will form an important part of the research, and will help to inform the processes involved in young people's resettlement after their involvement with the youth justice system.

The research aims to examine the setting up and functioning of the resettlement panels, particularly with regard to 'buy in' from member agencies and partnership working, the role and impact of the key personnel involved with the panels, and the role and effectiveness of the review body. It will also evaluate the effectiveness of the panels in improving outcomes for the young people involved, and the extent to which partners commit resources to resettlement support plans.

You have been selected to take part in the research because of your related role and remit. All of the information you provide during the interview will be kept anonymously. Your personal details will not be seen by or passed on to anyone outside the project team, and will be destroyed at the end of the project.

Further to that, would you mind if I recorded our interview today? It is solely for the purpose of backing up my notes.

The interview will take around one hour. Do you have any questions, or is there any aspect of the current project that you would like me to clarify?

### **1. Background**

1.1 Name:

1.2 Position / job title:

1.3 Organisation:

1.4 Could you please outline briefly your role in relation to the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects?

*Prompt: How does this fit in with other responsibilities? Amount of time dedicated to the pilots?*

## **2. Aims and objectives of the pilot projects**

2.1 Could you please briefly outline the aims and objectives of each YJB pilot project?

*Prompt: How were they decided? What was the process for determining the aims and objectives? Who was involved in the process? What needs were being addressed?*

2.2 How do the aims and objectives of each pilot project vary?

*Prompt: Why do the aims and objectives vary? Balance between national strategies and local needs? What has been the impact of this variation in terms of a) policy and focus b) managing the pilots?*

## **3. Management**

3.1 Could you briefly describe how the pilot projects are managed by the YJB?

*Prompt: Who is involved? What is their role? What issues have arisen?*

3.2 How effective do you think the management of the pilot projects has been?

## **4. Roll-out and delivery**

4.1 Could you please outline the process for setting up the resettlement panels?

*Prompt: What is their remit? How do they function on the ground? Who is involved? How are they serviced/administered?*

4.2 Have you identified the factors likely to influence the success of the pilot projects in providing improved support to the young people involved?

*Prompt: If so, on what basis? What were the key factors? What evidence do you have for this?*

4.3 If not, what should be the components of effective pilot projects?

*Prompt: Why do you say that?*

## **5. Partnership working**

5.1 To what extent have each of the pilot projects succeeded in securing the involvement of every relevant agency?

**[Note to researcher:** discuss each pilot project in turn: 1) Blaenau Gwent and Caerphilly; 2) Gwynedd and Ynys Mon; 3) Conwy and Denbighshire; 4) Wrexham; 5) Merthyr Tydfil; 6) Bridgend]

*Prompt: What issues have arisen around securing the involvement of the relevant agencies? How have any challenges been overcome? What have been the impacts on the pilot projects of any differences in involvement between agencies?*

5.2 How effective has multi-agency working been within the resettlement panels?

*Prompt: How has that contributed to the functioning of the pilot projects?*

5.3 To what extent have partners committed resources to resettlement support plans?

*Prompt: What has influenced those decisions? What has been the impact of any differences in the extent to which partners have committed resources to the resettlement support plans?*

## **6. Review processes**

6.1 How many review bodies have been established?

6.2 What has/have been their role/s?

6.3 How effective have they been?

*Prompt: How has their effectiveness been measured? What have they contributed to the success of the pilot projects?*

6.4 How could the effectiveness of the review bodies be increased?

## **7. Impact**

7.1 What have been the impacts of the pilot projects to date?

*Prompt: On what basis do you arrive at that judgement?*

7.2 What monitoring data has been collected about the pilot projects?

*Prompt: Any challenges with managing them?*

7.3 To what extent do you believe that each project has, thus far, succeeded in providing improved support to young people at risk of a custodial sentence?

**[Note to researcher:** discuss each pilot project in turn: 1) Blaenau Gwent and Caerphilly; 2) Gwynedd and Ynys Mon; 3) Conwy and Denbighshire; 4) Wrexham; 5) Merthyr Tydfil; 6) Bridgend]

*Prompt: What evidence do you have for this?*

7.4 (Where relevant) To what extent do you believe that each project has, thus far, succeeded in providing improved support on release to young people given a custodial sentence?

**[Note to researcher:** discuss each pilot project in turn: 1) Blaenau Gwent and Caerphilly; 2) Gwynedd and Ynys Mon; 3) Conwy and Denbighshire; 4) Wrexham; 5) Merthyr Tydfil; 6) Bridgend]

*Prompt: What evidence do you have for this?*

## **8. Other comments**

- 8.1 Is there anything else you would like to add about the YJB Resettlement Pilot Projects or the evaluation being conducted?

**Thank you very much for your cooperation**