



House of Commons
Justice Committee

Young adults in the criminal justice system

Eighth Report of Session 2017–19

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 12 June 2018*

Justice Committee

The Justice Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration and policy of the Ministry of Justice and its associated public bodies (including the work of staff provided for the administrative work of courts and tribunals, but excluding consideration of individual cases and appointments, and excluding the work of the Scotland and Wales Offices and of the Advocate General for Scotland); and administration and expenditure of the Attorney General's Office, the Treasury Solicitor's Department, the Crown Prosecution Service and the Serious Fraud Office (but excluding individual cases and appointments and advice given within government by Law Officers).

Current membership

[Robert Neill MP](#) (*Conservative, Bromley and Chislehurst*) (Chair)

[Mrs Kemi Badenoch MP](#) (*Conservative, Safron Walden*)

[Ruth Cadbury MP](#) (*Labour, Brentford and Isleworth*)

[Alex Chalk MP](#) (*Conservative, Cheltenham*)

[Bambos Charalambous MP](#) (*Labour, Enfield, Southgate*)

[Mr David Hanson MP](#) (*Labour, Delyn*)

[John Howell MP](#) (*Conservative, Henley*)

[Gavin Newlands MP](#) (*Scottish National Party, Paisley and Renfrewshire North*)

[Victoria Prentis MP](#) (*Conservative, Banbury*)

[Ellie Reeves MP](#) (*Labour, Lewisham West and Penge*)

[Ms Marie Rimmer](#) (*Labour, St Helens South and Whiston*)

Powers

The committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Publication

Committee reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/justicecttee and in print by Order of the House.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Rhiannon Hollis (Clerk), Danielle Nash (Second Clerk), Gemma Buckland (Senior Committee Specialist), Nony Ardill (Legal Specialist), Claire Hardy (Committee Specialist), Christine Randall (Senior Committee Assistant), Su Panchanathan (Committee Assistant), and Liz Parratt and Simon Horswell (Committee Media Officers).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Justice Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 8196; the Committee's email address is justicecom@parliament.uk.

Contents

Summary	3
1 Background	5
The previous Committee's report	5
The then Government's response	6
Summary of subsequent developments	7
Reasons for our follow-up report	8
2 The Government's approach to young adults in the criminal justice system	10
Governance	10
Policy and practice	11
Cross-government work	14
3 The Government's progress	16
Young adult specific work	16
Assessment of maturity	16
Building the evidence base	18
Appropriate custodial options	19
Transition between the youth and adult justice systems	22
Care leavers	22
BAME young adults	23
Prosecution and sentencing	24
Young adult courts	25
Generalised initiatives which may benefit young adults	26
Conclusion	29
Conclusions and recommendations	30
Formal minutes	34
Witnesses	35
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	36

Summary

Our predecessor Committee published a report on the treatment of young adults aged 18 to 25 in the criminal justice system in October 2016. The Committee's conclusions were produced in the form of a draft strategic approach which it wished to see the Government adopt. It proposed this because of the failure of consecutive Governments to act on the weight of evidence that dealing effectively with young adults, while the brain is still developing, is crucial to enable them to make a successful transition to a crime-free adulthood. There was also overwhelming enthusiasm within the sector for change. The Committee wished to see universal screening for maturity by prisons and probation services, and the adoption of a distinct approach to young adults up to 25 with trained, specialist staff, with emphasis on developing and testing dedicated approaches.

The then Government's response, published in January 2017, committed to further developing operational practice in response to maturity but did not accept that the bold approach advocated by our predecessors was necessary to improve outcomes for young adults.

Having agreed with our predecessor Committee that the response was disappointing and did not pay sufficient attention to the strength of the evidence for more significant change, we have taken evidence and engaged in correspondence with the Ministry to examine the rationale and efficacy of their approach. We produced this report as, 18 months after the response, we are not persuaded that the narrow approach adopted has had any positive impact on outcomes for young adults. Responding to young adults appropriately and effectively is important because, while young adults offend the most, they have the most potential to stop offending and are also resource intensive as they are challenging to manage.

In chapter one, we summarise the conclusions and recommendations of our predecessor Committee and the then Government's response. In chapter two, we review the Government's overall approach to governance, policy and practice for young adults in the criminal justice system, which it says is guided by limited resources, practicality, and other priorities in the system. While we have some sympathy for these constraints, it is nevertheless important for the Ministry to reflect on the potential benefits of targeting scarce resources at those prisoners for whom there may be greatest impact; we did not find evidence of such reflection. We make recommendations for ensuring that the distinct needs of young adults up to the age of 25 are considered in various aspects of the Ministry's activities, including the cross-departmental Reducing Reoffending Taskforce and efforts to address racial inequalities in response to the Lammy Review. In chapter three, we also welcome the creation of a probation service board to oversee work on young offenders and young adults, which we would like to see replicated for prisons.

In chapter three, we review in more detail the Ministry and HMPPS' progress in implementing its preferred approach. This includes piloting: a screening tool for maturity; work with people with brain injury; and, a resource pack to support staff working with people with low maturity, some of which has been delayed. We are encouraged to see much greater weight being given to maturity in the treatment of

young adults, but found no evidence of a defined approach for what should happen once maturity screening has been done or of the impact this is having, even in pilot areas. It is also not clear to us how the Ministry is assessing the impact of its approach, so we call on them to specify the measures by which they intend to monitor improvement in outcomes for young adults in custody and in the community.

We were similarly disappointed to find limited progress on addressing gaps in the evidence base for effective practice with young adults. Our predecessor Committee recommended these gaps be addressed as a matter of urgency, as misdirected interventions can serve to increase criminality. We found little evidence of progress on specific pieces of research mentioned in the Government's response, or on our predecessor's recommendations for the Crown Prosecution Service and Sentencing Council to undertake further research. HMPPS had seemingly made no progress on understanding the relative effectiveness of custodial options for young adults. Its focus had rather been on trying to make prisons which hold young adults alongside older adults work as well as they can. There is no clear assessment of how that is working either. This is in sharp contrast with the investment and concerted activity towards improving the treatment of under 18s, including reward schemes and work to address the trauma many of them have experienced in their lives, which is showing promising results. We also consider in this chapter the Offender Management in Custody model, designed to ensure that all prisoners get support and guidance from a dedicated prison officer. We recommend that consideration be given to providing additional support to those assessed as lacking maturity.

Welcome progress has been made by HMPPS and the Youth Justice Board in improving the attention paid to the "cliff-edge" transition between the youth and adult systems and the particular needs of people who have been looked after by the local authority (care leavers) and we are keen to see the results of this. We are pleased too that the Sentencing Council and the Crown Prosecution Service have undertaken to continue to review their guidance in the light of the evidence on maturity. We also hope to see progress on the idea of testing young adult courts.

Finally, we call on the Ministry to take decisive action on more fundamental reform. We advocate revisiting urgently our previous recommendations for a new framework for the disclosure of criminal records for children and young adults. In addition, by 2030 we expect prison and probation services to have developed approaches which properly assess and address young adults' needs, recognise their strengths, and support them to develop non-criminal identities, resulting in better outcomes both for them and society at large.

1 Background

The previous Committee's report

1. Our predecessor Committee published a report on the treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system in October 2016 following a year-long inquiry. It concluded that:

- Research strongly supports the view that young adults, particularly young men, are a distinct group with needs that are different both from children under 18 and adults older than 25, and there is a strong case for a distinct approach to, and additional investment in, this cohort;¹
- Existing policy and operational arrangements were unsatisfactory as they failed to take account of the distinct needs of young adults, and there was no clearly defined strategy;
- Most adult and youth justice policy and legislation define adulthood as commencing at age 18, with some parts of the system adopting different approaches towards young adults up to the age of 21, for example, the sentence of detention in a young offender institution for 18 to 20-year olds, and others to age 25 or older;²
- There was inconsistent application of the definition of young adults in practice across Government;
- The Ministry's commitment to developing a maturity assessment was welcome, but there was no routine screening and limited action taken to treat young adults appropriately in accordance with the development needs identified;
- There was limited evidence of which interventions worked effectively, and most focused on managing risk rather than enabling positively young people's progression to maturity as the brain fully develops up to the mid-20s.

2. The Committee produced the conclusions to its report in the form of a draft strategic approach which it wished to see the Government adopt. It did so because of the failure of consecutive Governments to act and in recognition of the weight and wealth of evidence provided to its inquiry, as well as the overwhelming enthusiasm within the sector for change.³

3. The report was one of a succession which have highlighted longstanding failures of the state in achieving positive outcomes for young adults, in prison in particular, although

1 Those parts of the brain influencing maturity that are the last to develop are responsible for controlling how individuals weigh long-term gains and costs against short-term rewards. As the system to regulate 'reward seeking' is still evolving this affects how young adults judge situations and decide to act, including consequential thinking, future-oriented decisions, empathy, remorse, and planning. ([Justice Committee, The treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system, Seventh Report of Session 2016–17, HC 169, para 8](#))

2 Some prisons hold young men up to the age of 25, and others up to the age of 30. HMPPS' guidance Achieving better outcomes for young adult men is targeted at those commissioning prison and probation for young men aged 18 to 20, despite that age distinction not being used for probation services. This publication acknowledges that the application of the guidance could make a difference to young men over 20, particularly those aged up to 25.

3 [HC 169](#), para 140

those serving community sentences also have high reoffending rates.⁴ Others included Lord Harris of Haringey's July 2015 report on his inquiry on self-inflicted deaths in custody of 18 to 24-year olds, which made 108 recommendations for reform, and Baroness Young's December 2014 review of outcomes for young black and Muslim men.⁵

The then Government's response

4. The then Government's response to our predecessor Committee's report, was published in January 2017 when the Rt Hon Liz Truss MP was Secretary of State for Justice.⁶

Box 1: Key commitments and observations from the Government response

The Government made the following commitments and observations:

- Stated that developing a criminal justice system response to maturity is key to improving results for young adults, rather than determining responses based on chronological age
- Committed to early intervention to prevent young adults from entering the system
- Noted that broader changes proposed in the *Prison Safety and Reform* White Paper, published in November 2016, would benefit young adults in prison, including:
 - creating dedicated officers for all prisoners;
 - making governors responsible for education and established the 'Unlocked' leadership development programme to seek the best graduates for officer and governor roles; and;
 - improving data on numbers of prisoners in suitable accommodation on release.
- Noted that maturity is already taken account of in guidance that supports decision making and commissioning, including in:
 - NOMS' evidence-based guidance for commissioners;
 - The Code for Crown Prosecutors in 2012;
 - Sentencing guidelines where age and lack of maturity is listed as a mitigating factor, and;
 - Pre-sentence reports for 18 to 25-year olds.

4 Ibid, paras 6; 11

5 [Harris Review: self inflicted deaths in custody of 18 to 24 year olds](#), 1 July 2015; [The Young Review: Improving outcomes for young black and/or Muslim men in the Criminal Justice System](#), December 2015

6 Ministry of Justice, [Government response to the Justice Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2016–17: The treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system](#), 20 January 2017

- Committed to further research including
 - a review by the National Probation Service of what works best for 18 to 25-year olds in the community;
 - gathering information on the effectiveness of DYOI sentences and holding young adults in mixed settings; and;
 - a review of accredited programmes to determine how well they specifically target barriers for young adults.
- Stated that existing data, such as the October 2016 *Characteristics and needs of young adults in prison custody* (published since the Committee’s report) and routine statistical publications (including proven re-offending, safer custody and the annual equalities report) provide sufficient evidence of the needs of 18–20 year olds and 21–25 year olds.
- Committed to continue to develop a screening tool for psycho-social maturity, to enable prisons and probation to understand their populations and commission accordingly and to producing a resource pack to improve provision.
- Stated that it had continue to make progress to improve the movement between the youth and adult justice systems, including implementing a transitions protocol agreed in 2012.

Source: Ministry of Justice, [Government response to the Justice Committee’s Seventh Report of Session 2016–17: The treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system](#), 20 January 2017

Summary of subsequent developments

5. Since our predecessor Committee published its report there have been several important developments which provide context to our assessment of the Government’s progress in implementing the report’s recommendations. Stabilising prisons necessarily continues to be a high priority for the Ministry and HMPPS due to the ongoing decline in safety, living conditions, and in access to purposeful activity in many parts of the estate.⁷ The Ministry has recently met its target for the recruitment of 2,500 more prison officers who once fully deployed, and provided they are retained, are expected to build better working relationships with prisoners through the implementation of the Offender Management in Custody model. We consider this in chapter three.

6. The previous Government recognised in its November 2016 White Paper, *Prison Safety and Reform*, that outcomes for young adult men in prison were poor. It both agreed with our predecessor Committee that there was “a fresh imperative to re-assess our treatment of this group” and committed to “consider carefully” the recommendations in the report “within [their] wider efforts to provide a greater focus to young adults’ safety, their experience of rehabilitative activities and their education.” Several general measures

⁷ See for example [HM Inspector of Prisons Annual Report 2016–17](#) and [Safety in Custody quarterly statistics](#).

which would benefit young adults were identified in their response to the Committee's report. We discuss these in chapter three. The structural reforms stemming from the White Paper are examined in chapter two.

7. Progress in implementing prison and probation reforms which may have benefitted young adults has undoubtedly been hindered by the turnover in Secretaries of State for Justice. For example, we were promised in the Government response in January 2017 the publication of a review of the plans set out in the White Paper, accompanied by an action plan but, two Justice Secretaries later, following changes of Secretaries of State in June 2017 and January 2018, this has not materialised.⁸ Reviews of Transforming Rehabilitation reforms to probation services are also ongoing and on these we have recently carried out a separate inquiry. On the other hand, in recognition of the importance of a cross-government approach to those involved in the criminal justice system, one of the first steps of the present Secretary of State was to establish a Reducing Reoffending Taskforce, comprising senior Ministers and backed by the Prime Minister.⁹ Launching this, in March 2018, he said “re-offending is not solely a justice problem for my department, but it is a wider issue about social justice and ensuring that offenders, many of whom have complex backgrounds, are not dismissed as part of society.”¹⁰

8. There have been other relevant developments. The Lammy Review renewed focus on the disproportionate numbers of BAME people in the justice system with the challenge to “explain or reform” disparities.¹¹ Tackling this is part of the Prime Minister's stated aim to address social and racial injustice. The Ministry has responded by establishing a Race and Ethnicity Board—one of the priorities for which is the youth justice system (for the under 18s) where disparities were of greatest concern to Mr Lammy—and by embedding the principle of “explain or change”. We discuss this in chapter three. The Ministry has also embarked on a project to develop a long-term strategy for its future operating environment: Justice 2030.¹²

9. We welcome the Government's commitment to social justice and the establishment of the Reducing Reoffending Taskforce in recognition of the importance of a cross-government approach to those involved in the criminal justice system. We also commend the commitment to address racial inequality, which David Lammy found to be particularly acute in parts of the criminal justice system.

Reasons for our follow-up report

10. On publication of the Government's response to our predecessor's report in January 2017, our Chair Bob Neill said:

This is a disappointing response which adds little to what we already knew. It is largely a recital of the Government's existing plans and policies and pays inadequate attention to the powerful evidence which we received of the many failings of the current system and the need for a bolder and

8 The Rt Hon David Lidington MP was Justice Secretary from June 2017 to January 2018, replacing the Rt Hon Elizabeth Truss MP. Since January 2018, the role has been fulfilled by Rt Hon David Gauke MP.

9 Rt Hon David Gauke letter to Chair, [Evidence session follow-up](#), March 2018

10 Rt Hon David Gauke MP, [Prison Reform Speech](#), Royal Society for the Arts, 6 March 2018

11 I.e. If governments cannot provide an evidence-based explanation for apparent disparities, then reforms should be introduced to address them.

12 Letter [Secretary of State for Justice to Committee](#) March 2018

more focused approach to this particularly challenging but also vulnerable category of offenders. I shall be recommending to my committee colleagues that we pursue this matter much further with Ministers.¹³

11. The previous Committee had intended to adopt this approach when the election was called.¹⁴ We, as the new Committee, were supportive and we asked for a Minister to give evidence to enable us to review progress on this agenda since the publication of the report. On 7 November 2017, we took evidence from Dr Phillip Lee, then Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Youth Justice, Victims, Female Offenders and Offender Health, accompanied by Michael Spurr, Chief Executive of HMPPS and Claire Toogood of the Youth Custody Service. While Mr Spurr explained that HMPPS had tried to turn a lot of what our predecessors' report said into effective practice,¹⁵ we found the responses we received to our questions to be thin on examples of impact. For example, when we asked about progress in implementing a screening tool for maturity and in evaluating interventions tailored to young adults which had been in development at the time of our predecessor's report, there had been seemingly little progress or evidence of outcomes.¹⁶ This did not persuade us that sufficient progress had been made in the year since our predecessor's report.

12. We are grateful to the Ministry and HMPPS for subsequently setting out their activities more fully in response to our request to answer detailed follow-up questions. Notwithstanding this, we continue to regard progress as inadequate so we decided to publish a further Report examining both the oral evidence and the letter.¹⁷ We also wrote to the Sentencing Council and Crown Prosecution Service to ask them for updates on our recommendations about their work.

13. There was widespread support for our predecessor's recommendations from criminal justice, health and youth organisations. Barrow Cadbury Trust—which has amassed significant evidence on the treatment of young adults over the last 10 years—wholeheartedly welcomed the “landmark and visionary” report, stating that it “... includes a bold blueprint for a distinct approach to young adults throughout the criminal justice system”. It stated that the Transition to Adult Alliance (a coalition of 16 criminal justice, health and youth charities, led by Barrow Cadbury) welcomed our predecessor Committee's conclusion that “all 18–25-year olds should be recognised as a distinct group” and agreed that there should be a “cross-governmental responsibility to enable young adults, particularly those who have faced challenge and difficulty to thrive”.¹⁸

13 Justice Committee press notice, [Chair comments on government response to young adults report](#), 20 January 2017

14 Justice Committee, Fifteenth Report of Session 2016–17, Justice Committee: unfinished business from the 2015 Parliament, [HC1143](#), para 26

15 [Q7](#)

16 See for example, [Qq7; 63–67](#)

17 Letter [Dr Lee to Justice Committee](#), 27 February 2018, Justice Committee Oral evidence: [Young adults in the criminal justice system and youth custodial estate](#), HC 419, Tuesday 7 November 2017

18 [Transition to Adulthood Alliance, MPs' “landmark and visionary report” on Young Adult Offenders should be implemented in full and without delay, says T2A Alliance](#), 26 October 2016

2 The Government's approach to young adults in the criminal justice system

14. Our predecessor Committee looked at the current approaches of the Ministry of Justice, the National Offender Management Service (NOMS, now Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service, HMPPS) and other criminal justice agencies towards young adults, examining questions of governance, policy and practice. They examined evidence on the needs and characteristics of young adults in the criminal justice system, including propensity to criminal behaviour arising from factors such as their social background, and research into young people's psychological and neurological maturation and issues such as brain development, learning disability and acquired and traumatic brain injury. Their conclusion was that "there is a strong case for a distinct approach to the treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system" and that "[d]ealing effectively with young adults while the brain is still developing is crucial for them in making successful transitions to a crime-free adulthood".¹⁹

Governance

15. On the issue of governance, the Report concluded that existing arrangements were "unsatisfactory". For example, in both the Ministry (which has responsibility for strategy) and NOMS, now HMPPS, (which is responsible for operations) while there was designated responsibility for an individual with oversight of young adults, this was part of a wider portfolio which included other specific groups.²⁰ There were differences too in NOMS' categorisation of young adults, for example, they defined them variously as aged 18 to 20, as 18 to 24, and as "adults" for different purposes. The Committee found that this was "confusing and [did] not inspire [a] coherent approach".

16. The Committee called for a distinct strategy for young adults "founded on the clear philosophy that the system should seek to acknowledge explicitly [young adults'] developmental status, focus on [their] strengths, build their resilience and recognise unapologetically the degree of overlap of their status as victims and offenders" a blueprint for which was outlined in their report.²¹ This included: universal screening by prisons and probation services for mental health needs, neuro-developmental disorders, maturity and neuro-psychological impairment; prisons and probation services adopting a distinct approach to young adults up to 25 with trained, specialist staff; and developing the evidence base by expanding promising approaches and testing different ways of holding young adults in custodial institutions.

17. Our predecessors found that while young adults offend the most, they have the most potential to stop offending; they are also resource intensive as they are challenging to manage. The Report concluded that a strong case could be made for recognising that expenditure to make the system more developmentally responsive would pay dividends in reduced costs to the system.²² To facilitate a dedicated approach, the Committee therefore proposed that the MoJ adopt an invest-to-save approach, and examine the creation of an equivalent to the pupil premium for prisons and Community Rehabilitation Companies.

19 [HC169](#), para 24

20 [HC169](#), para 29

21 [HC 169](#), chapter 4

22 [HC 169](#), para 138. See for example, the Centre for Mental Health and Nacro [Beyond Youth Custody Programme](#)

18. In its response to the Report, the Government did not address directly our predecessor's observations about governance and said that it did not agree that a strategy was necessary, as the principle that young adults mature up into their mid-twenties already informed operational practice. The response stated:

... we want to take pragmatic measures to ensure that the services and interventions related to maturity will be available to the widest number of offenders based on their need. By targeting services in this way, we should see an efficient use of resources, and the most effective outcomes for those who need them. We do not accept the recommendation to specifically attach additional resources to this age group in a way similar to a "pupil premium".²³

19. The MoJ has since reformed "the whole framework through which the prison system is run" so as to create a system in which accountabilities are no longer "blurred and unclear". From 1 April 2017:

- the respective responsibilities of MoJ and HMPPS were clarified with the former taking over commissioning public and private sector prisons, policy development, standards and performance scrutiny, and the latter focusing on operations;
- responsibility for the operation of custodial establishments for under 18s and over 18s was unified in HMPPS following changes to the remit of the Youth Justice Board;²⁴ and
- the management of prisons within HMPPS has been reorganised geographically, with small clusters of prisons including YOIs and dual designated establishments (i.e. which hold both adults and 18 to 21-year olds) being overseen by executive governors, and functional directors being created for foreign national prisoners, females and high security and long-term prisoners.

The result of this appears to us to be that there is no longer a central lead or focus on young adults for prisons within HMPPS. The Ministry explained that each of the practices that were being developed for young adults had their own governance and reporting arrangements, although they did not give examples.²⁵ More visibly, the National Probation Service (NPS) has created a National Young Offender Governance Board comprising regional representatives of NPS divisions and the Youth Justice Board overseeing seven strands of work: governance, disproportionality, looked after children and care leavers, health, management information, transitions, courts and maturity assessments.²⁶

Policy and practice

20. The previous Committee recommended that both age and maturity should be taken into significantly greater account within the criminal justice system. It found that policies did not give sufficient weight to the evidence that young adults' brains mature up to

23 [Government response](#), para 11.

24 [Q6](#) [Mr Spurr]

25 [Letter from Dr Lee](#), 27 February 2018, p.4

26 [Ibid. Letter from Rory Stewart to Chair](#), 21 May 2018. See also attached delivery plan for Young Offenders Board.

their mid-20s, especially in relation to 22 to 25-year olds. For example, NOMS guidance documents on achieving better outcomes for young men and young women²⁷—which identify principles for developing maturity and potentially effective interventions and activities—had not translated systematically into practice, particularly in prisons, where the Committee found no evidence of a strategy for the management of young adults, either in dedicated or mixed institutions, even for those aged up to 21 who NOMS recognised were a distinct group. There was also no routine screening of maturity prior to sentencing or on the commencement of a community order or prison sentence. The prevalence of neuro-disabilities, mental disorders, and learning and communication needs among those in prison and under the supervision of probation services was not known. The Committee found that this resulted in inconsistent treatment, few dedicated approaches, a lack of sentence planning and, of utmost concern to them, very poor outcomes.²⁸

21. In relation to outcomes, young adults are over-represented in incidents of violence in prison, both as perpetrators and victims, and in adjudications used for behaviour management. In 2017, they accounted for 17% of the prison population, yet in the quarter to December 2017 they perpetrated 38% of assaults and were the victims of 31% of them. During the same period, they received 30% of disciplinary hearings, and represented 37% of prisoners having additional days added to their sentence as a result.²⁹ The validation of the screening assessment highlighted that those who were assessed as less mature were a higher risk of proven reoffending than those who were more mature.³⁰

22. The Ministry favours the development of criminal justice responses which take account of maturity as the “key to improving results for young adults” rather than also devising dedicated approaches based on chronological age (i.e. up to 25) as recommended by our predecessor. Their justification for this was the need for their policies to be guided by limited resources, practicality, and other priorities in the system.³¹ Mr Spurr told us that dedicated services would be “significantly more expensive” as there would be a need to replicate other forms of specialist service.³² Dr Lee described the system as “remarkably responsive” to “the challenges around maturity” which he saw as the “central thrust” of our predecessor’s report. He explained “[we] recognise that young adults require additional support and assessment and understanding of how to communicate, how to reward and how to sanction. All of that has to respond to their level of maturity.”³³

23. Dr Lee did not see it as intellectually coherent for the criminal justice system to raise to 25 the age at which young adults ceased to be treated as immature by default, as had been recommended by our predecessor.³⁴

27 National Offender Management Service, [Better Outcomes for Young Adult Men: Evidence Based Commissioning Principles](#), August 2015, London: NOMS; National Offender Management Service, [Better Outcomes for Women Offenders](#), September 2015, London: NOMS.

28 [HC 169](#), para 67

29 [Offender management statistics](#): Adjudications in October - December 2017; [Prison safety statistics](#), Prisoner assaults in 2017

30 [Letter from Rory Stewart to Chair](#), 21 May 2018; Barnett, G and Wakeling, H. (2017) [Development and validation of a screening assessment of psychosocial maturity for adult males convicted of crime](#). National Offender Management Service.

31 [Q5](#) [Dr Lee]

32 [Q12](#)

33 [Q16](#); [Q2](#)

34 [Q16](#)

He said:

Personally, I think where we are is defensible. We could go to 21, but wherever we draw the line we would still have problems with some people. Ultimately, if we live in an age where people can vote at 18 and get married at 18, it strikes me that 18 is where society has placed where you can take decisions for yourself. Therefore, if you are making a decision to commit a crime, you should take responsibility for that.³⁵

24. The previous Committee did not suggest that young adults should not take responsibility for committing crime. They recognised that young adults both commit serious crime and have often themselves been victims of it; and that it could be difficult to disentangle the two. For example, the effect of trauma in childhood and adolescence compounds issues with maturation: those affected by trauma experience heightened levels of flight or fight reactions, and hence have increased chances of risk-taking behaviour. Young adulthood is also a period in which self-identity is developing and when criminal behaviour can reduce rapidly under the right conditions.³⁶ This is therefore a crucial time for young adults—who may not have been exposed to pro-social role models in their childhood—to be supported to find their identities and learn to manage their own behaviour while their brains are still developing. Desistance from crime can be slowed and the creation of negative, criminal identities reinforced through treatment which is not developmentally appropriate. Having a criminal conviction can compound this and create practical difficulties in accessing education, employment and housing. Our predecessors also found inconsistencies in the various ways that other public services defined young adults and treated them. We discuss these in the next section.

25. The challenges of driving forward work on young adults in the absence of a dedicated approach were reflected in our efforts to secure evidence on the Ministry's progress. Dr Lee did not have Ministerial responsibility for prisoners over 18, but held the brief for offender health across the entire custodial estate, the Lammy Review, and female offenders. His observations in defence of the status quo on approaches towards young adults appeared to us to be in contrast to those on matters within his remit, on which he stated decisively the need for a change in approach, for example:

There is clearly an issue in the provision of mental health care, the proper diagnosis of mental health problems and the subsequent treatment and appropriate location of people once they have been diagnosed. [...] I think it is an area where we can do better, but I recognise that other Departments have their own pressures and their own challenges. Fundamentally, if we address that issue—I would ally to it addiction and the appropriate treatment of addiction—we will go some way to improving our recidivism rates.

Governments of all political colours have done some good work in terms of reducing the numbers of people [under 18] we are holding. But we have been left with a very challenging cohort of individuals, and the Department

35 [Q15](#)

36 [HC 169](#), Paras 8–14

recognises that. [...] There is some extremely good work going forward to try to develop the type of institutions that everybody knows we need, to try to give these people a second chance in life.³⁷

26. We are sympathetic to HMPPS' existing priorities and appreciate that action to address the Committee's recommendations has taken place in the context of both budget cuts and significant challenges in the prison estate, alongside concerted activity both to improve safety and reform prisons. Nevertheless, it remains important to reflect on the effectiveness of their current approach and the potential benefits of targeting scarce resources at those prisoners for whom there may be greatest impact. We have seen no evidence that the argument made by our predecessor about the potential for savings to be made by investing in more developmentally appropriate practices has been considered, which may be short-sighted. The restructuring of the Ministry and reconfiguration of HMPPS represented opportunities to re-think the strategic approach to young adults and to develop dedicated funding and governance arrangements which have the potential for significant improvement in outcomes that are urgently needed.

Cross-government work

27. Our predecessor Committee found that young people who decide no longer to commit crime can have their efforts to achieve this frustrated: both by their previous involvement in the criminal justice system due to the consequences of having criminal records; and by limitations in achieving financial independence due to lack of access to affordable accommodation or well-paid employment as wages and benefits are typically lower for this age group.³⁸ While young adults continue to be at high risk of reoffending, support services which can act as protective factors, such as mental health, education and youth offending services, fall away at the age of 18. In addition, changes to societal norms have prolonged the age at which people reach key markers of adulthood i.e. becoming settled in relationships, employment and accommodation; they typically occur five to seven years later today than they did a few decades ago.³⁹ The Committee recommended:

Cross-government recognition must be given to the need to promote desistance among those involved in the criminal justice system by offering the possibility of extending statutory support provided by a range of agencies to under 18s to up to 25-year olds, including through legislative change if necessary. Young adults are treated distinctly by a range of other Government departments, including some which preside over dedicated policies which can hinder the chances of young adults who do not have support networks from desisting from crime. If young adults are to be given the best opportunities to become law-abiding there is a need for a coherent cross-departmental approach that recognises this and seeks to remove structural barriers to gaining sustainable employment, affordable

37 [Q88](#)

38 A quarter of those aged 18 to 24 in the UK are not engaged in employment, training or education; 18 to 20-year olds have a lower minimum wage than those who are aged over 21; most young people under the age of 21 do not qualify for housing benefit; and 18 to 25 year olds are specifically excluded from receiving the 'living' wage. [HC 169](#), Para 12.

39 [HC 169](#), Para 10

accommodation and developmentally appropriate mental health services, for example, the lower minimum wage and housing and employment benefit entitlements.

28. There has been some progress on this. For those young adults who have been in local authority care, the Children and Social Work Act 2017 now extends entitlement to statutory support up to the age of 26. We consider this in the next chapter. In November, Dr Lee explained that cross-departmental work had been one of his priorities:

I have been having more meetings with other Departments, and we continue to try to build momentum within Government to recognise that if we are going to properly address reoffending, it is a cross-departmental challenge. The MOJ suffers from being done to, to a certain extent; it is at the bottom of the food chain.⁴⁰

29. Since then, in March 2018, the Secretary of State announced plans to establish the Reducing Reoffending Taskforce in recognition that re-offending costs society £15 billion annually. He told us that “only by constructive cross-government working” will Government “be able to help ex-offenders secure employment, appropriate accommodation, access to treatment for drug addictions and support for their mental health issues.”⁴¹ We understand that the Taskforce has not yet met and were advised that further announcements would be made in due course.⁴²

30. We welcome the Secretary of State’s recognition of the need for a cross-departmental approach to reducing reoffending. *The Ministry should draw to the attention of the Reducing Reoffending Taskforce research demonstrating that young adulthood is a distinctive period of development and how this relates to desistance from crime. Having reviewed this, the Taskforce should, by 31 December 2018, develop a cross-departmental programme of action for those up to the age of 25 as a priority group. This should include commissioning work on the potential cross-departmental cost-benefits of adopting a coherent approach which explicitly reflects young adults’ developmental status and extends statutory support, provided to under-18s by a range of agencies, to people up to the age of 25.*

40 [Q58](#)

41 Rt Hon David Gauke letter to Chair, [Evidence session follow-up](#), March 2018

42 Ibid

3 The Government's progress

Young adult specific work

31. Our predecessors believed that the approach to young adults should be founded on the clear philosophy that the system should seek to acknowledge explicitly their developmental status, focus on young adults' strengths, build their resilience and recognise unapologetically the degree of overlap between their status as victims and offenders. The Committee argued that this would involve:

- developing a common understanding of maturity, brain development and neuro-disabilities;
- trauma-informed approaches being mandatory within basic prison and probation officer training; and,
- a specialised approach to staffing prison and probation services' work with young adults, underpinned by more in-depth training.

Assessment of maturity

32. Our predecessor Committee recommended universal screening by prisons and probation services for mental health needs, neuro-developmental disorders, maturity and neuro-psychological impairment.⁴³ HMPPS has continued to develop its maturity screening tool which has now been tested and made available to prison and probation service providers to help them determine how many young adults under their care are likely to require services or interventions to promote maturation. This tool identifies whether individuals have low maturity. The Ministry believes that better screening will help providers determine how many young adults are likely to require services or interventions to promote maturation. The intention is that this will aid commissioning decisions as well as identify individuals most in need of support.⁴⁴ It should be noted that the tool has not been validated for use on an individual level and it is recommended that further, more in-depth assessment should be conducted for any individual screened as having maturity issues.⁴⁵ We have not found any evidence that this is occurring.

33. Our predecessor heard that traumatic brain injury (TBI) is also prevalent among young adults in the criminal justice system. It is estimated that as many as 60% of the prison population could be affected, although this is not known as there is no systematic assessment.⁴⁶ Brain injury is associated with earlier onset, more serious, and more frequent offending and those with TBI typically present with especially complex needs and can be particularly challenging to manage. We were told that the Disabilities Trust, a charity providing specialist care for people with acquired brain injury, is continuing work on identification and support of brain injury which is being piloted in five prisons and

43 [HC 169](#), para 143

44 [Letter from Rory Stewart to Chair](#), 21 May 2018

45 *Ibid* re validation research

46 [HC 169](#), para 15–18

an Approved Premises.⁴⁷ Provision elsewhere was described as patchy and when asked whether there were plans to extend this work Mr Spurr agreed to look at it in the context of its value against other priorities across the system.⁴⁸

34. We heard that HMPPS now has a more detailed knowledge of young adults' individual needs although they were unable to say what issues are being identified.⁴⁹ The maturity screening was equated to a risk management tool by Mr Spurr, rather than a means of measuring need and supporting change as our predecessors had hoped.⁵⁰ This approach does not accord with criminological understanding about the conditions necessary for young adults to stop offending and develop non-criminal identities.⁵¹

35. A maturity resource pack—containing exercises to support staff working with young adults—was due to be piloted in four establishments holding young adult men.⁵² HMPPS planned to learn from this and roll it out, however one of the pilot sites, HMP Nottingham, subsequently had young adults removed, following HM Inspectorate of Prisons' urgent notification about its performance.⁵³ The piloting will now be limited to three sites, and there have been delays in its commencement; the process review which we were told would be completed at the end of February has also been delayed.⁵⁴ The Ministry plans for later reviews to investigate whether any behavioural changes occurred, including reductions in the use of disciplinary measures (adjudications), improved engagement in education and other prison-based activities, and improved emotional management. HMPPS has also continued to promote the implementation of guidance on effective practice for young adults. We asked at both the evidence session and in subsequent correspondence for the Ministry's assessment of the impact of this guidance; we did not receive a response on either occasion.⁵⁵

36. We are encouraged to see much greater weight being given to maturity in the treatment of young adults. Nevertheless, neither the Ministry nor HMPPS appeared to have a defined approach for what should happen once maturity screening has been done. The focus has been on identifying needs when there is also a need for unrelenting attention to improving outcomes. It is unfortunate that there have been delays in implementing the screening tool and resource pack, and in assessing their impact. It is also not clear to us whether, where screening for low maturity is positive, it is followed by in-depth assessment. Accordingly, there is not yet any evidence which can convince us of the efficacy of the Government's approach. *We expect the Government in response to our report to explain whether in-depth assessments are provided for individuals 'screened' as having maturity needs. We also wish to see a definitive timetable for when the screening tool, maturity pack, and in-depth assessments will be available across the estate, when Government expects to see evidence of their impact, and the specific measures by which they intend to monitor improvement in outcomes for young adults*

47 [Letter from Dr Lee](#), 27 February 2018, p3

48 [Q72](#) [Mr Spurr]

49 [Q6](#); [Q69](#) [Mr Spurr]; See also [Letter from Rory Stewart to Chair](#), 21 May 2018

50 [Q68](#)

51 See for example, the work of the [Beyond Youth Custody](#) programme which recognises that effective and sustainable resettlement facilitates a shift in the way that a young person sees themselves, from an identity that promotes offending to one that promotes a positive contribution to society.

52 [Letter from Dr Lee](#), 27 February 2018, p3

53 *Ibid*; HM Chief Inspector of Prisons [news release](#) January 2018

54 [Q7](#); [Letter from Dr Lee](#), 27 February 2018, p.5; [Letter from Rory Stewart to Chair](#), 21 May 2018

55 [Q67](#); [Letter to Dr Lee](#), 29 November 2017; [Letter from Dr Lee](#), 27 February 2018,

in custody and in the community. We also wish to be informed at the end of the piloting of what proportion of young adults aged 18 to 25 screened were identified as having low maturity.

Building the evidence base

37. The previous Committee found that the Ministry and NOMS had not actively sought to understand what interventions work best with this cohort in relation to actions by prison staff or prison regimes, disciplinary measures, activities, or offending behaviour programmes. For example, there was a tension between practices which sought to manage violence by reducing time out of cell and others which improved behaviour by increasing access to education and training. They called for these gaps in the evidence base to be addressed urgently as misdirected interventions can serve to increase criminality in young adult offenders, for example, by further reinforcing criminal identities or a sense of unfair treatment by “the system”. The latter is known to reduce compliance.⁵⁶ They also concluded that:

... reforms to governor autonomy and the delivery of probation services should not release the MoJ and NOMS from responsibility for stimulating centrally developments in potentially effective practice, expanding the availability of promising programmes, and of robustly evaluating them. A strategic approach should be adopted to collating and analysing existing data, developing the evidence base, identifying gaps in knowledge about how best to treat young adults, providing incentives to governors and probation services for devising and testing new approaches, and disseminating good practice.⁵⁷

38. Michael Spurr explained that HMPPS was seeking to turn what the Committee had said into effective practice and that they had a specific aim to have targeted interventions for the different cohorts of offenders, including young people.⁵⁸ We asked for an update on research plans outlined in their response including:

- an NPS review of what works best for 18 to 25-year olds in the community;
- an evaluation of the ‘Identity Matters’ programme, a 1:1 intervention to address gang or group-related violent behaviour piloted in 2014; and,
- an analysis of the impact of accredited programmes in prisons on violence and self-harm, by age.

A small-scale process evaluation of Identity Matters is underway and the Ministry has plans to submit the programme for accreditation, but no data are available on outcomes, four years after the pilot. We have been unable to determine what has happened to the other two pieces of research, which we consider important.⁵⁹ There is no mention within the NPS Board’s workstreams of developing understanding of effective practice for young adults more broadly.

56 [HC 169](#), See for example, para 109

57 [HC 169](#), para 146

58 [Qq 7; 67](#) [Mr Spurr]

59 [Q63](#)

39. **The Ministry aims to be a data-driven department. We are keen to be convinced of the efficacy of its approach to young adults, so it is disappointing not to see indicative evidence of improvement in outcomes some 18 months after its response to our predecessor's report. *In order to incentivise improvements and to enable us to scrutinise effectively their commitment to be data-driven with respect to young adults, we shall review on an annual basis HMPPS' outcomes against the performance measures we call on the Ministry to set out. These should include reconviction, compliance with community orders, levels of offending in custody, the use of adjudications and indicators of well-being. The Ministry must also assure us that existing quarterly safety and offender management data will be published in a form that allows the data therein to be assessed for 18 to 20-year olds and 21 to 24-year olds by ethnicity.***

40. **The creation of the National Probation Service Board provides a welcome driver for action for young adults. *We would like clarification of how progress against its workstreams will be measured and ask that the Board keep us informed of its outcomes on an annual basis. We recommended to HM Chief Inspector of Probation in our response to her consultation on work priorities that they conduct research on effective practices with young adults aged 18 to 25. The Board should consider adopting a further workstream to examine gaps in the evidence base and how best to fill them.***

41. **We welcome HM Inspector of Prisons' introduction of a new expectation for prisons to ensure that the specific needs of young adults 18–25 are met which should provide the impetus for prison governors and directors to develop dedicated strategies for young adults. *To ensure this leads in practice to a coordinated approach being taken by HMPPS to driving improvements in outcomes for young adults across the prison estate, which we consider necessary in the absence of a central lead, we recommend the creation of a young adults Board for prisons, akin to that established by NPS. The Board should comprise all executive governors holding young adults up to the age of 25 in their establishments and should oversee the implementation of an action plan designed to understand, address and reduce poor outcomes for young adults.***

Appropriate custodial options

42. A matter of concern to us, as it was to our predecessors, is understanding the effectiveness of HMPPS's various approaches to holding young adults in custody. Prisons have been operating a de facto policy of dispersal for those serving a sentence of detention in a young offender institution (DYOI, a dedicated custodial sentence for 18 to 20-year olds) by designating many institutions as YOIs as well as prisons. This has the effect of mixing under 21s with older adults without credible or definitive research on the impact on outcomes of this, either for young adults or for the older prisoners they are mixed with. The Committee concluded that NOMS had neither ensured that mixed establishments have strategies for dealing with young adults, nor addressed the distinct needs of 22 to 25-year olds, resulting in a lack of robust evidence on which to improve outcomes. It recommended that the Government conduct research on the subject.

43. The Ministry committed to gather further information, which would be used as the basis on which prisons should determine how best to manage young adults group day-to-day, and to evaluate the lessons learned from the six reform prisons which piloted

giving greater operational and financial freedoms to prison governors.⁶⁰ They stated that this would inform the Ministry’s thinking on the future of the DYOI sentence, which our predecessor had recommended should be extended to young people up to their 25th birthday. The Ministry did not accept the Committee’s view, citing the large proportion of prisoners who fall into that age bracket—roughly 14,400 prisoners or 17% of the prison population⁶¹—and the fact that a previous consultation on the sentence in 2013 had been inconclusive.⁶²

44. We asked, in November 2017, what more was now known about the relative effectiveness of custodial options for young adults. Mr Spurr described it as “a very difficult evaluation and analysis to bring together”, while Dr Lee noted that there has been an issue about proper audit of interventions, the collection of data and proper assessment and use of it which, however, he said had now improved immeasurably.⁶³ Mr Spurr did not think that there was anything to be learned about the treatment of young adults from the reform prisons, four of which were dual-designated sites.⁶⁴ We understand that an evaluation—which will include consideration of how governors can adapt their freedoms to help meet the rehabilitative needs of young adults—will be published in Summer 2018.⁶⁵

45. We asked, both during the evidence session and in subsequent correspondence, whether the sentence of detention in a young offender institution remained under review, as it had been since the 2013 consultation. We did not receive a definitive response but were given the impression by Dr Lee that its abolition was not an active consideration.⁶⁶ When we asked him whether he had been party to any discussion, he said “No”, and stated that he “would hope to be” party to such a discussion, should there be one.⁶⁷

46. HMPPS’ focus has been on trying to make dual-designated establishments work as well as they can.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, there is no clear picture of how that is working. HM Inspectorate of Prisons defines young adults as aged 18 to 21. They found in their inspections in the year to March 2017 that 30% of young adults held in adult establishments spent less than two hours a day out of their cells and that most prisons made little distinction in the treatment of this age group.⁶⁹

47. HMIP has been advocating in its reports for prisons to take a more strategic approach to provision for young adults, and its revised criteria for inspections expect that the specific needs of young adults aged 18 to 25 are met.⁷⁰ Some recent inspection reports indicate that there are pockets of improvement. For example, HMP YOI Parc now holds young adults predominantly on one wing where staff have been trained specifically to deal with this age group and dedicated activities have been developed.⁷¹ In dedicated young adult

60 [Government response](#); four of the reform prisons held young adults

61 [Prison population at 31 December 2017](#)

62 [Government response](#), para 22

63 [Q80](#)

64 [Q82](#)

65 [Letter from Dr Lee](#), 27 February 2018, p6

66 [Q83 \[Dr Lee\]](#); [Letter to Dr Lee](#), 29 November 2017

67 *Ibid.*

68 [Qq81–82](#)

69 HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales, [Annual Report 2016–17](#), July 2017, p8

70 See for example, HM Inspectorate of Prison reports on [HMP YOI Altcourse](#) and [HMP YOI Hindley](#)

HM Inspectorate of Prisons, [Criteria for assessing the treatment of and conditions for men in prisons](#), July 2017

71 HM Inspectorate of Prisons, Report of an unannounced inspection of [HMP YOI Parc](#)

institutions there is also a mixed picture. For example, in HM YOI Brinsford, violence has not increased but self-harm has risen “severely”.⁷² HM YOI Aylesbury has reportedly recently had incidents of disorder, allegedly after the regime was changed.⁷³

48. Adverse life circumstances can impact on young adults’ maturity and affect typical brain development, which can be compounded by experiences in the criminal justice system.⁷⁴ Our predecessors heard that many young adults have a history of being exposed to violence, including in the home, abuse, neglect, bereavement relating to the deaths of parents, siblings and other close relatives, and criminal behaviour by parents and siblings. Our predecessor Committee heard that the brain can heal to an extent up to the age of 25 if taken out of adverse circumstances, for example, separation from family and friends and exposure to punitive conditions; while the brain is continuing to develop there is a risk that problems will be compounded by involvement in the criminal justice system itself, or developmentally inappropriate interventions provided by its agencies, and that opportunities will be missed to repair in a timely manner the developmental harm caused by brain injury or other forms of trauma.⁷⁵

49. Training for prison staff on trauma-informed approaches—which identify and take account of emotional trauma and other adverse events in people’s lives—has been concentrated largely in the under 18’s and women’s estates.⁷⁶ The decision not to adopt a distinct approach to the treatment of young adults can be contrasted with the Government’s approach to improving safety in youth justice institutions for children. Following the Chief Inspector of Prisons’ declaration in February 2017 that all YOIs for children were unsafe,⁷⁷ the Government has invested £64 million in training staff, developing trauma-informed approaches, violence reduction and changing rewards and sanctions to take a more positive approach to behaviour management,⁷⁸ leading to what the Chief Inspector has described as dramatic improvements in safety.⁷⁹ In the six months prior to the inspection of Feltham in December and January 2018 there was an 80% reduction in assaults on staff. The Chief Inspector observed that the prison had changed its “unremittingly negative approach to behaviour management”, introduced meaningful incentives and an improved regime and had a much-improved response to violence.⁸⁰ Similarly, in October 2017, the Chief Inspector of Probation commended the trauma-informed practices that had been adopted by a small number of youth offending teams for dangerous and violent young offenders aged under 18.⁸¹

50. The previous Committee also considered the practical implications for young adults of some operational prison policies. They regarded the prison disciplinary system and the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) scheme—both of which are mechanisms to manage behaviour, including violence—as inappropriate to the developmental status of young

72 HM Inspectorate of Prisons, [Report of an unannounced inspection of HM YOI Brinsford, March 2018](#)

73 BBC News, [HMP Aylesbury: Prisoners ‘trash wing’ in riot, 15 April 2018](#)

74 [HC 169](#), paras 18–20

75 [HC 169](#), para 23

76 [Q59](#)

77 HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for England and Wales [Annual Report 2016–17](#), p9

78 [Q18](#) [Dr Lee]

79 See for example, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons Reports on [HMYOI Feltham A](#), 9 May 2018 and [HMYOI Werrington](#), 5 June 2018

80 HM Inspectorate of Prisons, [Report on an unannounced inspection of HMYOI Feltham \(Feltham A – children and young people\)](#), May 2018. This inspection took place in December 2017 and January 2018. The [previous inspection](#) took place in January and February 2017.

81 HM Inspectorate of Probation, [The Work of Youth Offending Teams to Protect the Public](#), 26 October 2017

adults because they respond more positively to immediate rewards than to punishment. Dr Lee accepted that young adults “respond to reward and punitive action in different ways depending on their maturity.”⁸² Nevertheless, both of these are still in place. Governors are not yet able to implement IEP schemes flexibly, despite an urgent redesign of the scheme initiated by Rt Hon Mr Gove in early 2016.⁸³ We understand that this will soon be possible, within certain parameters, enabling governors to devise more developmentally appropriate schemes.⁸⁴ Recent *Safety in Custody* and *Offender Management* statistics highlight that existing policies may not be effective: assaults continue to rise, along with the use of disciplinary hearings (known as adjudications).⁸⁵

51. We note the complexity of determining the relative effectiveness of custodial placements for young men and welcome the Ministry’s indication that research will be conducted, which is long overdue. Nevertheless, we share our predecessor’s grave concerns that in the absence of such research existing approaches to holding young adults in custody may be doing more harm than good. We do not think the Ministry’s plans to gather evidence amounts to the robust research our predecessor concluded was required. The Ministry must set out in its response how it intends to demonstrate definitively that HMPPS’s operational practices are appropriate to young adults’ development needs and report within the next year.

Transition between the youth and adult justice systems

52. Every year there are over 2,000 movements of young people under 18 across services within the community, or in custody, or into the adult system. The Government said in its response that it had “continued to make progressive improvements to the transitions process”, explaining that the Transitions Protocol agreed in 2012 was becoming a policy framework setting out procedures and policies for the effective management of transfer of supervision from youth offending teams to probation services. Michael Spurr told us that this had resulted in stronger transition arrangements operating across the custodial estate.⁸⁶ Our discussions during our visit to HM YOI Cookham Wood, which holds young men under 18, and HMP YOI Rochester, a dual-designated site, indicates that these arrangements still need strengthening in some places: we were told by governors that other pressures and priorities meant that there was limited focus by the two establishments on the transition between them.

Care leavers

53. It is estimated that nearly half of young men and two thirds of young women in custody aged between 16 and 21 have recently been in statutory care.⁸⁷ Our predecessors heard that these young people face particularly acute challenges in desisting from offending and making an effective transition to adulthood; they do not typically have family to rely on for support and frequently continue to struggle with feelings of rejection

82 [Q16](#)

83 [Letter from Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice](#), to the Chair, Justice Committee, 19 May 2016

84 Rt Hon Rory Stewart MP letter to Chair, [Statutory Instrument to amend the Prison Rules 1999](#), 27 April 2018

85 [Offender management statistics quarterly: October to December 2017](#), 26 April 2018; [Safety in custody statistics quarterly: update to December 2017](#), 26 April 2018

86 [Q7](#) [Mr Spurr]

87 [HC 169](#), Para 22

and abandonment and the loss of family members, into their early twenties.⁸⁸ HMPPS has established a National Care Leavers Forum and a network of regional leads to coordinate efforts to support care leavers in prison and probation. Within custody, HMPPS has focused on identifying former looked-after children—who, under the Children and Social Work Act 2017, are now entitled to statutory support by local authorities up to the age of 26—and promoting staff understanding of the problems that they face, for example, being without the support of family. While this has led to improvements in knowing who has been through the care system, the Ministry acknowledged that there was a “great deal” more to do. For example, there is still limited understanding within HMPPS of the entitlements and needs of care leavers; access to local authority provision is not routine. HMPPS were also unable to evidence how this has improved, although processes are in place to do so.⁸⁹ The Offender Management in Custody model will extend probation officer support to all looked-after children and the Ministry is working with the charity Catch 22 to engage with local authorities and ensure that the required support is provided.⁹⁰

BAME young adults

54. 18 to 24-year olds are the age group in which there is the greatest level of black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) overrepresentation in the adult prison estate. If the prison population reflected the population, there would be 2,850 fewer BAME young adults in prison.⁹¹ The racial and ethnic disproportionalities for under 18s and adults identified by David Lammy MP in his September 2017 review echoed Baroness Lola Young’s findings three years earlier on ways to improve results for young black and Muslim men and on which the previous Committee noted in its report there had been little change. These also repeat the findings of the Home Affairs Committee which, over ten years ago, in June 2007 called for a coherent cross-departmental strategy to reduce these disproportionalities.⁹²

55. Mr Spurr highlighted specific initiatives that had arisen from the Young Review in Isis and Feltham and with CRCs.⁹³ The Ministry told us it is taking forward almost every recommendation made by Mr Lammy in some way, although as Dr Lee recognised, much of the disproportionality found has its origins outside the criminal justice system.⁹⁴ Additional analysis on trends in associations between ethnic background and being sentenced to custody in under 18s between 2009 and 2016 was undertaken for the Review.⁹⁵ This found that the proportion of BAME young people in custody had increased as the overall numbers in youth custody had fallen. We assume that the same is likely to be true of young adults. The NPS young offender Board has an objective to develop and implement a plan to reduce disproportionality of BAME young offenders.⁹⁶

88 Ibid and para 18. See also Howard League (2010) [Young, Adult and No Support](#): The entitlements of young adults to care in the community, London.

89 [Q62](#) [Mr Spurr and Dr Lee]; [Letter from Dr Lee](#), pp7–8

90 [Qq7,62](#) [Mr Spurr]

91 Ibid; [Young Review](#); Prison Reform Trust, [Bromley Briefing Autumn 2017](#), p 40, citing Table 11, Kneen, H. (2017) [An exploratory estimate of the economic cost of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic net overrepresentation in the Criminal Justice System in 2015](#), London: Ministry of Justice

92 Home Affairs Committee, [Young Black People and the Criminal Justice System Second Report of Session 2006–07](#), [Young Black People in the Criminal Justice System](#), [HC 181-I](#), 15 June 2007

93 [Q59](#)

94 [Q58](#)

95 [Trends in associations between ethnic background and being sentenced to custody for young offenders in England and Wales between 2009 and 2016](#), Ministry of Justice, November 2017

96 [Letter from Rory Stewart](#), 21 May 2018 appendix

56. While we welcome the Ministry's commitment to implement as far as possible the recommendations of the Lammy Review, the strikingly slow progress that has been made on improving outcomes for young black and Muslim men in the four years since the Young Review which the Government were also committed to implementing, illustrates the scale of the problem and resulting action required. *The MoJ's Race and Ethnicity Board should therefore develop, as a priority, a meaningful programme to address disproportionalities for young BAME adults aged 18 to 25. As disproportionalities are likely to originate outside the criminal justice system addressing them must also be a high priority for the Reducing Reoffending Taskforce. The NPS young offenders Board should also extend its workstream to reduce disproportionalities to young adults up to the age of 25.*

Prosecution and sentencing

57. The consideration of maturity is included in guidance for prosecutors in assessing culpability (in the Code for Crown Prosecutors since 2012) and for sentencers in assessing mitigation (in sentencing guidelines). However, our predecessors were unable to determine the impact of these measures and concluded that:

Neither CPS investigating prosecutors nor sentencers have a sufficiently sophisticated understanding of maturity to weigh up how it may affect young adults' culpability. In addition, they do not routinely have the necessary information on which to make robust assessments about an individual's maturity and hence take account of this in their reasoned prosecution and sentencing decisions. It is likely therefore that maturity is considered primarily in cases where there is extreme immaturity.⁹⁷

58. In response to the Committee's recommendation that further research be conducted to assess the impact of the Code and guidance on young adults, the Government stated that it could not require the Sentencing Council to conduct further research as it is an independent, non-departmental public body.⁹⁸ While the Sentencing Council considered conducting further research, it did not then have the resources to do so.⁹⁹ The Council now plans to consult on a general guideline that will contain a fuller explanation of the 'age and/or lack of maturity' factor; this will include conducting research interviews with sentencers on the guideline's likely impact.

59. The Ministry committed to including consideration of maturity in all pre-sentence reports for young adults. The NPS Board has an objective to "ensure that all court assessments and reports have regard for the maturity issues presented by young adults to support proportionate recommendations and access to interventions".¹⁰⁰ We sought to establish in the evidence session what proportion of young adults receive a pre-sentence report and were told that courts now received more 'on-the-day' reports.¹⁰¹ We have been told that approximately a quarter of those receiving pre-sentence reports are young adults

97 [HC 169](#), para 77

98 [Government response](#), para 72

99 [Letter from Rt Hon Lord Justice Treacy](#), 14 May 2018

100 [Letter from Rory Stewart](#), 21 May 2018 appendix

101 [Q66](#)

and that it is not possible to determine the exact proportion of young adults who receive a pre-sentence report due to way in which data are collected.¹⁰² Nevertheless, in 2017, 45,791 people aged 18 to 24 were sentenced and 34,223 people aged 18 to 25.¹⁰³

60. The Ministry told us that the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) committed to: consider whether specific investigation could be made in relation to prosecutors' consideration of age and maturity when charging and reviewing cases; assess the impact of mandatory training for youth prosecutors which covers age and maturity; and provide additional written guidance to assist prosecutors in their consideration of age and maturity. Progress has been made on raising awareness of considering young adults' maturity in training and guidance.¹⁰⁴ We wrote to the Director of Public Prosecutions to update us directly on CPS' progress on this. She responded that: youth prosecutors do not have a formal requirement to review cases involving young adults; no specific research has been conducted on the impact of the Code as it would be impracticable and disproportionately costly and compliance with it is monitored through case reviews; guidance took the form of a reminder in September 2017 of the importance of considering age and maturity; CPS would include specific reference to age and maturity in future updates to guidance; and a forthcoming review of the Code will consider whether amendment to the existing wording on age and maturity is necessary.

61. We welcome the Crown Prosecution Service's progress on training and guidance for prosecutors and its intention to keep this under review. The Sentencing Council's intention to strengthen its guidance to sentencers on consideration of age and maturity is also welcome. We remain of the view that research on sentencers and prosecutors understanding of maturity, as well as on the impact on young adults of assessments of maturity made during prosecution, pre-sentence and sentencing, is necessary. We urge the Ministry, in its endeavour to be data-driven, to conduct this research using data from the National Probation Service, Sentencing Council and Crown Prosecution Service. We ask that the Crown Prosecution Service keeps us informed on its decision regarding possible amendments to the Code related to consideration of age and maturity. The CPS should consider piloting the use of youth prosecutors who are specifically trained in understanding maturity for decisions involving young adults up to the age of 25.

Young adult courts

62. The Government committed to examine the result of a feasibility study which had been undertaken to proposed improvements in the treatment of young adults during their passage through courts—which our predecessor considered there was merit in testing—and to discuss with the senior judiciary the potential to use the skills of its members who hear cases involving young people. The Transition to Adulthood Alliance had been intending to fund pilots of five young adult courts with the Centre for Justice Innovation. Following our evidence session, the Centre wrote to update us on these pilots.¹⁰⁵ We were told that while good progress had been in developing the model and local partners were ready to implement it, they had not yet been granted permission to proceed. The Ministry stated that “[t]hrough these feasibility studies have not gone on to being tested in practice, we have learned a great deal and may find opportunities to use this learning in

102 [Letter from Rory Stewart](#), 24 May 2018.

103 See letter for more details on caveats in using this data.

104 [Letter from Dr Lee](#), p4; Q84 [Ms Toogood]

105 [Letter from the Centre to Justice Innovation](#), 15 November 2017

the future”.¹⁰⁶ The Mayor of London has agreed with HMCTS and the Ministry of Justice that it can consider with the judiciary establishing a young adult appropriate court.¹⁰⁷ The Lord Chief Justice, The Lord Burnett of Maldon, has endorsed courts’ consideration of maturity in sentencing young adults.¹⁰⁸ Court staff in Wales have received training in brain injury awareness, funded by HMPPS.¹⁰⁹

63. It is regrettable that young adult court pilots have not yet materialised; this seems inexplicable, given that they had local support and funding and potential to positively impact on adherence to court decisions. We would like to see the Lord Chief Justice’s recent observations about young adults’ maturity and MOPAC’s commitment to establish such a court in London give fresh impetus to the Minister and HMCTS to endorse such pilots. We welcome training in brain injury awareness in Welsh courts. This should be extended to English courts.

Generalised initiatives which may benefit young adults

64. The Ministry stated in January 2017 in its response to our predecessor’s report that its priority was providing effective and credible community sentences where appropriate that keep young adults in the community, and integrated into local education, employment or health services. It stated it would shortly set out plans for such sentences. But these have not been published. In February 2018, we heard that the Ministry was working with the Royal Society of the Arts’ New Futures Network, to provide advice and support to governors about employment availability in their localities, and support employers, with emphasis on getting young adults into employment.¹¹⁰

65. In May 2018, the Ministry published its Education and Employment Strategy for adult prisoners and launched this network, although no specific mention is made of young adults.¹¹¹ The Government refers in the strategy to its support for Ban the Box, an initiative which encourages employers to remove the tick box from application forms which ask about criminal convictions. Our predecessor Committee welcomed this approach, but concluded that enabling young adults to form non-criminal identities following their involvement in the criminal justice system would require a change in the treatment of their criminal records, if necessary through legislation.¹¹² In our inquiry on youth criminal records, we recommended a new statutory framework for the treatment of criminal records gained by those who commit offences under the age of 18 and asked the Government to conduct comprehensive research on a new approach to the disclosure of criminal records for young adults up to the age of 25.¹¹³ The Government has committed to considering criminal records disclosure for children and young adults, following the conclusion of related litigation in the Supreme Court.¹¹⁴

106 [Letter from Dr Lee](#), 27 February 2018, p.5

107 Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, [Memorandum of Understanding Between the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, the Ministry of Justice and London Councils](#), 26 March 2018

108 The Times, [Immature offenders don’t deserve jail, says law chief](#), Frances Gibb, 3 May 2018

109 [Letter from Dr Lee](#), 27 February 2018, p 3

110 [Q64](#) [Mr Spurr]

111 Ministry of Justice, Education and Employment Strategy 2018, [Cm 9621](#), 24 May 2018

112 [HC169](#), para 149. For example, the Committee suggested the possibility of expunging records, providing incentives for employers to employ ex-offenders, and deferring prosecutions.

113 Justice Committee, First Report of Session 2017–2019, Disclosure of Youth Criminal Records, [HC 416](#), 27 October 2017, paras 71–74

114 Government response to the Justice Committee’s First Report of Session 2017–2019: Disclosure of youth criminal records, [Cm 9559](#), January 2018, para 74–75

66. We are encouraged by the Ministry's approach to the disclosure of criminal convictions on job applications under the Ban the Box scheme. We see no reason why the judgment of the Supreme Court should delay the Ministry of Justice and Home Office's preparation for a substantive response to our report on the disclosure of youth criminal records. *We urge them to revisit with urgency our recommendations on new statutory frameworks for disclosure for children and young adults, on which they are yet to respond. We expect to see this response within a month of the Supreme Court judgment.*

67. In relation to health, since April 2017 prison governors in England have greater input into decision-making with NHS commissioners to ensure that knowledge of their cohort's particular needs inform the provision of prison health services.¹¹⁵ The Health and Social Care Committee's inquiry on healthcare in prisons may assist in highlighting the impact this has had on provision in practice.¹¹⁶

68. We have not been able to determine the extent to which the prison governor empowerment and Transforming Rehabilitation agendas have facilitated more dedicated approaches towards young adults. While the Government's response noted examples of CRCs which were providing distinct responses to young adults, the cohort model adopted initially by London CRC proved complex and unsustainable.¹¹⁷ The Transition to Adulthood Alliance recently confirmed that the majority of Community Rehabilitation Companies (private probation services) have developed strategies for managing 18 to 25-year olds as a distinct group.¹¹⁸ While HM Inspectorate of Probation does not explicitly examine practices for young adults, its standards include consideration of whether models of delivery and staff expertise are appropriate to meet identified needs and risks and provide high-quality and personalised services.¹¹⁹

69. Our predecessors concluded that relationships with trusted, credible, and understanding practitioners and with supportive families and other networks are of critical importance in comprehending as fully as possible the nature of young adults' risks and vulnerabilities and in supporting them to stop offending and developing their resilience and maturity. In response to the Committee's recommendations concerning the need for specialist and dedicated staff to support young adults, as proposed by Lord Harris in July 2015, HMPPS is implementing the Offender Management in Custody model.¹²⁰ This has two distinct, but interconnected parts: key work and case management. Key workers will "develop constructive, motivational relationships" with people in prison (on a 1:6 ratio) through 1:1 sessions, supporting them "to make appropriate choices" and "giving them hope and responsibility for their own development".¹²¹ The case management element will differ depending, for example, upon the length of sentence and assessed risk, among other factors. More specialist cases, which will include care leavers, will have a dedicated

115 [Letter from Dr Lee](#) February 2018, p6

116 Health and Social Care Committee press release, [Prison healthcare inquiry launched](#), 27 April 2018

117 [Q65](#) [Mr Spurr]. See also HM Inspectorate of Probation, [Quality & Impact inspection: The effectiveness of probation work by the London Community Rehabilitation Company](#), March 2018

118 Barrow Cadbury Trust, Comprehensive summary from the Ministry of Justice on its approach to young adults is published, Press notice issued via email, 16 March 2018 (Not online)

119 HM Inspectorate of Probation, [Standards for inspecting probation services](#), March 2018

120 [Qq 6;67](#) [Mr Spurr]

121 [Letter from Dr Lee](#), p5

case manager. Mr Spurr told us that this will strengthen the targeting of interventions to particular cohorts, including young adults.¹²² The assessment of maturity does not appear to be a factor in determining eligibility for specialist case management.

70. HMPPS must evaluate the effectiveness of the Offender Management in Custody model in a sample of establishments one year after its implementation. This should include a review of i) the extent to which young adults identified as lacking maturity benefit from enhanced case management and ii) the potential benefits of including lack of maturity in the criteria for enhanced case management.

Conclusion

71. The Ministry has adopted a narrow approach to reform due to cuts to its wider budget and the need for practicality. In the absence of evidence that it has had any positive impact on outcomes for young adults in the 18 months since the Government responded to our predecessor's carefully considered, evidence-based, and well-received Report, we are not persuaded of the efficacy of this approach.

72. The remarkable improvements in outcomes for under 18s in custody strengthens our conviction that our criminal justice system is failing their young adult counterparts. The waste of young adults' talents and energies is one of the great social challenges of our time. The lack of decisive action is also failing society at large as citizens continue to experience crimes which should be preventable and which would gain from these young adults' contributions should they be given the right opportunities. *The Ministry must commit to more fundamental reform in its Justice 2030 project. By 2030 we expect prison and probation services to have developed cultures which recognise young adults' strengths, address the trauma many of them have experienced, and support them effectively to develop non-criminal identities and for this to be reflected in improvements in outcomes.*

Conclusions and recommendations

Background

1. We welcome the Government's commitment to social justice and the establishment of the Reducing Reoffending Taskforce in recognition of the importance of a cross-government approach to those involved in the criminal justice system. We also commend the commitment to address racial inequality, which David Lammy found to be particularly acute in parts of the criminal justice system. (Paragraph 9)

The Government's approach to young adults in the criminal justice system

2. We are sympathetic to HMPPS' existing priorities and appreciate that action to address the Committee's recommendations has taken place in the context of both budget cuts and significant challenges in the prison estate, alongside concerted activity both to improve safety and reform prisons. Nevertheless, it remains important to reflect on the effectiveness of their current approach and the potential benefits of targeting scarce resources at those prisoners for whom there may be greatest impact. We have seen no evidence that the argument made by our predecessor about the potential for savings to be made by investing in more developmentally appropriate practices has been considered, which may be short-sighted. The restructuring of the Ministry and reconfiguration of HMPPS represented opportunities to re-think the strategic approach to young adults and to develop dedicated funding and governance arrangements which have the potential for significant improvement in outcomes that are urgently needed. (Paragraph 26)
3. We welcome the Secretary of State's recognition of the need for a cross-departmental approach to reducing reoffending. *The Ministry should draw to the attention of the Reducing Reoffending Taskforce research demonstrating that young adulthood is a distinctive period of development and how this relates to desistance from crime. Having reviewed this, the Taskforce should, by 31 December 2018, develop a cross-departmental programme of action for those up to the age of 25 as a priority group. This should include commissioning work on the potential cross-departmental cost-benefits of adopting a coherent approach which explicitly reflects young adults' developmental status and extends statutory support, provided to under-18s by a range of agencies, to people up to the age of 25.* (Paragraph 30)

The Government's progress

4. We are encouraged to see much greater weight being given to maturity in the treatment of young adults. Nevertheless, neither the Ministry nor HMPPS appeared to have a defined approach for what should happen once maturity screening has been done. The focus has been on identifying needs when there is also a need for unrelenting attention to improving outcomes. It is unfortunate that there have been delays in implementing the screening tool and resource pack, and in assessing their impact. It is also not clear to us whether, where screening for low maturity is positive, it is followed by in-depth assessment. Accordingly, there is not yet any

evidence which can convince us of the efficacy of the Government's approach. *We expect the Government in response to our report to explain whether in-depth assessments are provided for individuals 'screened' as having maturity needs. We also wish to see a definitive timetable for when the screening tool, maturity pack, and in-depth assessments will be available across the estate, when Government expects to see evidence of their impact, and the specific measures by which they intend to monitor improvement in outcomes for young adults in custody and in the community. We also wish to be informed at the end of the piloting of what proportion of young adults aged 18 to 25 screened were identified as having low maturity.* (Paragraph 36)

5. The Ministry aims to be a data-driven department. We are keen to be convinced of the efficacy of its approach to young adults, so it is disappointing not to see indicative evidence of improvement in outcomes some 18 months after its response to our predecessor's report. In order to incentivise improvements and to enable us to scrutinise effectively their commitment to be data-driven with respect to young adults, we shall review on an annual basis HMPPS' outcomes against the performance measures we call on the Ministry to set out. These should include reconviction, compliance with community orders, levels of offending in custody, the use of adjudications and indicators of well-being. The Ministry must also assure us that existing quarterly safety and offender management data will be published in a form that allows the data therein to be assessed for 18 to 20-year olds and 21 to 24-year olds by ethnicity. *In order to incentivise improvements and to enable us to scrutinise effectively their commitment to be data-driven with respect to young adults, we shall review on an annual basis HMPPS' outcomes against the performance measures we call on the Ministry to set out. These should include reconviction, compliance with community orders, levels of offending in custody, the use of adjudications and indicators of well-being. The Ministry must also assure us that existing quarterly safety and offender management data will be published in a form that allows the data therein to be assessed for 18 to 20-year olds and 21 to 24-year olds by ethnicity* (Paragraph 39)
6. The creation of the National Probation Service Board provides a welcome driver for action for young adults. *We would like clarification of how progress against its workstreams will be measured and ask that the Board keep us informed of its outcomes on an annual basis. We recommended to HM Chief Inspector of Probation in our response to her consultation on work priorities that they conduct research on effective practices with young adults aged 18 to 25. The Board should consider adopting a further workstream to examine gaps in the evidence base and how best to fill them.* (Paragraph 40)
7. We welcome HM Inspector of Prisons' introduction of a new expectation for prisons to ensure that the specific needs of young adults 18–25 are met which should provide the impetus for prison governors and directors to develop dedicated strategies for young adults. *To ensure this leads in practice to a coordinated approach being taken by HMPPS to driving improvements in outcomes for young adults across the prison estate, which we consider necessary in the absence of a central lead, we recommend the creation of a young adults Board for prisons, akin to that established by NPS. The Board should comprise all executive governors holding young adults up to the*

age of 25 in their establishments and should oversee the implementation of an action plan designed to understand, address and reduce poor outcomes for young adults. (Paragraph 41)

8. We note the complexity of determining the relative effectiveness of custodial placements for young men and welcome the Ministry's indication that research will be conducted, which is long overdue. Nevertheless, we share our predecessor's grave concerns that in the absence of such research existing approaches to holding young adults in custody may be doing more harm than good. *Nevertheless, we share our predecessor's grave concerns that in the absence of such research existing approaches to holding young adults in custody may be doing more harm than good. We do not think the Ministry's plans to gather evidence amounts to the robust research our predecessor concluded was required. The Ministry must set out in its response how it intends to demonstrate definitively that HMPPS's operational practices are appropriate to young adults' development needs and report within the next year. (Paragraph 51)*
9. While we welcome the Ministry's commitment to implement as far as possible the recommendations of the Lammy Review, the strikingly slow progress that has been made on improving outcomes for young black and Muslim men in the four years since the Young Review which the Government were also committed to implementing, illustrates the scale of the problem and resulting action required. *The MoJ's Race and Ethnicity Board should therefore develop, as a priority, a meaningful programme to address disproportionalities for young BAME adults aged 18 to 25. As disproportionalities are likely to originate outside the criminal justice system addressing them must also be a high priority for the Reducing Reoffending Taskforce. The NPS young offenders Board should also extend its workstream to reduce disproportionalities to young adults up to the age of 25. (Paragraph 56)*
10. We welcome the Crown Prosecution Service's progress on training and guidance for prosecutors and its intention to keep this under review. The Sentencing Council's intention to strengthen its guidance to sentencers on consideration of age and maturity is also welcome. We remain of the view that research on sentencers and prosecutors understanding of maturity, as well as on the impact on young adults of assessments of maturity made during prosecution, pre-sentence and sentencing, is necessary. *We urge the Ministry, in its endeavour to be data-driven, to conduct this research using data from the National Probation Service, Sentencing Council and Crown Prosecution Service. We ask that the Crown Prosecution Service keeps us informed on its decision regarding possible amendments to the Code related to consideration of age and maturity. The CPS should consider piloting the use of youth prosecutors who are specifically trained in understanding maturity for decisions involving young adults up to the age of 25. (Paragraph 61)*
11. It is regrettable that young adult court pilots have not yet materialised; this seems inexplicable, given that they had local support and funding and potential to positively impact on adherence to court decisions. *We would like to see the Lord Chief Justice's recent observations about young adults' maturity and MOPAC's commitment to establish such a court in London give fresh impetus to the Minister and HMCTS to endorse such pilots. We welcome training in brain injury awareness in Welsh courts. This should be extended to English courts. (Paragraph 63)*

12. We are encouraged by the Ministry's approach to the disclosure of criminal convictions on job applications under the Ban the Box scheme. We see no reason why the judgment of the Supreme Court should delay the Ministry of Justice and Home Office's preparation for a substantive response to our report on the disclosure of youth criminal records. *We urge them to revisit with urgency our recommendations on new statutory frameworks for disclosure for children and young adults, on which they are yet to respond. We expect to see this response within a month of the Supreme Court judgment.* (Paragraph 66)
13. *HMPPS must evaluate the effectiveness of the Offender Management in Custody model in a sample of establishments one year after its implementation. This should include a review of i) the extent to which young adults identified as lacking maturity benefit from enhanced case management and ii) the potential benefits of including lack of maturity in the criteria for enhanced case management.* (Paragraph 70)

Conclusion

14. The Ministry has adopted a narrow approach to reform due to cuts to its wider budget and the need for practicality. In the absence of evidence that it has had any positive impact on outcomes for young adults in the 18 months since the Government responded to our predecessor's carefully considered, evidence-based, and well-received Report, we are not persuaded of the efficacy of this approach. (Paragraph 71)
15. The remarkable improvements in outcomes for under 18s in custody strengthens our conviction that our criminal justice system is failing their young adult counterparts. The waste of young adults' talents and energies is one of the great social challenges of our time. The lack of decisive action is also failing society at large as citizens continue to experience crimes which should be preventable and which would gain from these young adults' contributions should they be given the right opportunities. *The Ministry must commit to more fundamental reform in its Justice 2030 project. By 2030 we expect prison and probation services to have developed cultures which recognise young adults' strengths, address the trauma many of them have experienced, and support them effectively to develop non-criminal identities and for this to be reflected in improvements in outcomes.* (Paragraph 72)

Formal minutes

Tuesday 12 June 2018

Members present:

Mrs Kemi Badenoch	Gavin Newlands
Bambos Charalambous	Victoria Prentis
Ruth Cadbury	Ellie Reeves
David Hanson	Ms Marie Rimmer
Robert Neill	

In the absence of the Chair, David Hanson was called to the Chair.

Draft Report (*The treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system: follow-up*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 70 read and agreed to.

Robert Neill resumed the Chair.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 13 June at 9.30am]

Wednesday 13 June 2018

Members present:

Robert Neill, in the Chair

Ruth Cadbury	John Howell
Alex Chalk	Victoria Prentis
David Hanson	

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, that the Report be the Eighth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available (Standing Order No. 134).

[Adjourned till Tuesday 19 June at 9.30am]

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry page](#) of the Committee's website.

Tuesday 7 November 2017

Question number

Dr Phillip Lee MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Justice,
Michael Spurr, Chief Executive Officer, HM Prison and Probation Service, **Clare Toogood**, Director of Youth Justice Policy, Ministry of Justice.

[Q1-88](#)

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website. The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2017–19

First Report	Disclosure of youth criminal records	HC 416 (Cm 9559)
Second Report	Draft Sentencing Council guidelines on intimidatory offences and domestic abuse	HC 417
Third Report	Pre-legislative scrutiny: draft personal injury discount rate clause	HC 374
Fourth Report	Draft Sentencing Council guidelines on manslaughter	HC 658
Fifth Report	HM Inspectorate of Prisons report on HMP Liverpool	HC 751
Sixth Report	Draft Sentencing guideline on terrorism	HC 746
Seventh Report	Small claims limit for personal injury	HC 659
First Special Report	The implications of Brexit for the Crown Dependencies: Government Response to the Committee's Tenth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 423
Second Special Report	Government Responses to the Committee's Reports of Session 2016–17 on (a) Prison reform: governor empowerment and prison performance (b) Prison reform: Part 1 of the Prisons and Courts Bill	HC 491
Third Special Report	The implications of Brexit for the justice system: Government Response to the Committee's Ninth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 651