

The Transition to Adulthood (T2A) Alliance submission to the Ministry of Justice consultation Strengthening probation, building confidence

About T2A

The Transition to Adulthood (T2A) Alliance evidences and promotes effective approaches for young adults (18-25) throughout the criminal justice process. It is an alliance of 16 leading criminal justice, health and youth organisations: Addaction, Care Leavers' Association, Black Training and Enterprise Group, Catch22, Centre for Crime and Justice Studies, Clinks, Criminal Justice Alliance, the Howard League for Penal Reform, Nacro, The Prince's Trust, Prison Reform Trust, The Restorative Justice Council, Revolving Doors, Together for Mental Wellbeing, The Young Foundation, and Young Minds. T2A is convened and funded by the Barrow Cadbury Trust. T2A has contributed to positive change in policy and practice and at central and local levels, and its evidence has informed service redesign and delivery nationally and internationally. These include welcome changes to recognise maturity in sentencing and CPS guidance, the development of a transitions framework for adult and youth justice services by the Youth Justice Board and HM Prisons and Probation Service, and consultation on the development of a young adults operating model by HM Prison and Probation Service. T2A's work has helped to promote the development of young adult-specific projects and approaches in a growing number of devolved police and crime commissioner and probation areas. T2A and its members have helped to initiate and provide substantive evidence for Parliamentary inquiries into the treatment and conditions of young adults in custody, including the Young Review, the Harris Review and the Justice Committee's inquiry on young adults.

We welcome the opportunity to respond to the Ministry of Justice consultation Stronger Probation, Building Confidence. Our submission begins with a response to question 8, the most relevant question to T2A's concerns. We then answer questions in numerical order which are of particular significance to young adults. A number of T2A's members are members of Clinks, the umbrella body for voluntary organisations working in the criminal justice system. We endorse their overall response to the consultation and refer directly to their submission in our own response, where it is of particular relevance. For further information about this submission contact Mark Day, T2A public affairs lead, mark.day@prisonreformtrust.org.uk

Question 8: How can we ensure that the particular needs and vulnerabilities of different cohorts of offenders are better met by probation? Do you have evidence to support your proposals?

There is an emerging body of evidence to support the development of a tailored and distinct approach towards young adults (aged 18-25) across all criminal justice agencies, including probation. Young adults are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system. 18-24 years olds account for 10% of the total population in

England and Wales but 17% of people in prison and 24% of individuals under probation supervision.¹ Young adults have the highest breach rates for community sentences and are the most likely group to be reconvicted during or following the sentence. Young adults are the most likely age group to desist and grow out of crime, although the wrong intervention at this time can slow desistance and extend the period that a young adult is involved in the criminal justice system. Therefore, getting it right at this critical time is crucial to assisting young adults to make a successful transition to a crime free adulthood. The development of a distinct approach to young adults is supported by the Justice Committee, who in its 2016 inquiry on young adults found that “Research from a range of disciplines strongly supports the view that young adults are a distinct group with needs that are different both from children under 18 and adults older than 25, underpinned by the developmental maturation process that takes place in this age group.”² It concluded that “there is overwhelming evidence that the criminal justice system does not adequately address the distinct needs of young adults” and that “there is a strong case for a distinct approach”.³

As the consultation acknowledges, Transforming Rehabilitation (TR) has created problems for the smooth running of the probation service, including provision for young adults. However, TR itself has not been the principle barrier to the roll out of a distinct approach to young adults in probation and the wider justice system. Indeed, as the Justice Committee highlighted in its inquiry, young adult specific approaches “have flourished under the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms in some CRC areas although there are inconsistencies”.⁴ We share the Committee’s view that it is the lack of a national strategy on young adults that has been a major factor inhibiting the development of a distinct approach to this age group. Although there are good examples of distinct provision for young adults in many probation areas in England and Wales, overall provision is patchy and often contingent on local practitioner and senior management champions, who are not present everywhere.

T2A welcomes the establishment by the Ministry of Justice of a Young Offenders Governance Board with the stated intention: “To work in partnership to deliver an excellent service to young people who offender up to age of 25, in order to change lives, reduce re offending and protect the public”.⁵ ***To take forward the development of a distinct approach to young adults in probation, T2A would like to see all CRCs develop young adult teams (as is the case within some areas already), which would have smaller caseloads and work in collaboration with the voluntary sector. The T2A and Clinks report ‘Going for Gold’ contains detailed guidance on how probation services can deliver a ‘gold standard’***

¹ Table A1.7, Ministry of Justice (2017) Offender Management Caseload Statistics Quarterly: January to March 2017; and Table A4.17, Ministry of Justice (2017) Offender Management Caseload Statistics Quarterly: October to December 2017.

² House of Commons Justice Committee (2016), The treatment of young adults in the criminal justice system: Seventh Report of Session 2016–17, London: House of Commons. Available at: <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/justice-committee/inquiries/parliament-2015/young-adult-offenders/>

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ <https://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/Justice/correspondence/young-adults-criminal-justice-system-9.pdf>

approach to provision for young adults.⁶ . T2A has also produced guidance for probation services on Effective Approaches With Young Adults.⁷

To support the development of a distinct approach by probation, the government should seek an amendment to the Offender Rehabilitation Act to create a legal duty for probation services to provide a distinct service for all young adults aged 18-25, similar to section 10 of the Act and its requirement to provide a distinct service for women. The requirement to deliver a distinct approach to young adults should be written into all future contracts with probation providers, and form part of any service-level agreement between the government and National Probation Service. Contract Management staff should be provided with training on specific cohorts of offenders to ensure they are able to hold to account the services delivered by the CRCs in relation to specific groups, including young adults, women, and BAME individuals. All of this should take place within an overarching Ministry of Justice strategy for young adults aged 18-25.

As part of a distinct approach, it will be vital to tailor services to specific groups of young adults with particular needs, such as women, Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) young people, those with disabilities and care leavers. T2A's report Effective Approaches With Young Adults⁸ includes information on how to adapt services to meet the needs of these groups. We share the concerns raised by Clinks in its response to this question regarding the lack of attention paid in the proposals to meeting the needs of groups with protected characteristics under equalities legislation. We support recommendation 32 of the Lammy review that "the Ministry of Justice should specify in detail the data CRCs should collect and publish covering protected characteristics. This should be written into contracts and enforced with penalties for noncompliance."⁹

Question 4: What changes should we make to post sentence supervision arrangements to make them more proportionate and improve rehabilitative outcomes?

T2A shares concerns raised by a number of its members regarding the impact of the extension of post-release supervision to short sentenced prisoners on rates of recall to prison. Overall, the number of young adults in prison has decreased significantly in the past few years. However, since the introduction of the TR reforms, the number of young adults serving custodial sentences of less than 12 months being recalled to prison has increased dramatically. In January-March 2015 only seven young adults aged 18-20 serving a custodial sentence of less than 12 months were recalled to prison. By January-March 2018 this number had increased to 268 – a rise of

⁶ Clinks (2012), Going for gold: developing effective services for young adults throughout the criminal justice process, London: Clinks. Available at: <https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Clinks-Going-for-Gold-2013.pdf>

⁷ Clinks and T2A (2015) https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Probation-guide_Ver4_sml.pdf

⁸ Ibid.

⁹

3729%.¹⁰ Research suggests that the risk of non-compliance with order conditions is increased by the young age of the person.¹¹ ***T2A supports the Justice Committee’s recommendation to repeal Section 2 of the Offender Rehabilitation Act in order to remove the 12 month blanket supervision period. Of the alternatives suggested by the committee, we favour an assessment-based approach which would be suitably flexible to respond to an individuals’ needs and support their desistance. Research has shown that “being young” is one of the factors which decreases the likelihood of compliance with licence conditions.¹² We repeatedly hear from practitioners working with young adults, and young adults themselves, that they do not understand the conditions of their license, the potential consequences of not meeting them, when their license period ends, what post supervision means and what happens when they do not meet post sentence requirements. As a minimum, therefore, it is vital that licence conditions are proportionate and adapted to take account of maturity and the distinct needs of young adults. It is essential that clear information is given and that understanding by the young adult is checked.***

Question 5: What further steps could we take to improve the effectiveness of pre-sentence advice and ensure it contains information on probation providers’ services?

Ministry of Justice statistics reveal that only 26% of young adults aged 18-25 received a PSR of any form in 2017.¹³ We share the concerns raised by Clinks in its response to this question regarding the potential impact of ‘speedy justice’ on the number and quality of PSRs being produced by the NPS to inform sentencing decisions. Clinks cites a recent analysis by the Centre for Justice Innovation which found that between 2012/13 and 2016/17 there was a 22% decrease in the number of new Pre-Sentence Reports (PSRs) with the result that an increasing number of sentences (both community sentences and custody) are passed by the courts with no PSR.¹⁴ In parallel there have been significant changes in how PSRs are delivered to court, with an increasing proportion of PSRs delivered orally rather than in writing. The Centre for Justice Innovations conclude that since cases with PSRs are more than ten times more likely to receive a community sentence, the falling number of PSRs is strongly linked to the decline in community sentences.

Courts and probation need both the time and resource to develop and utilise pre-sentence reports to better reflect the needs of groups with certain protected characteristics, including young adults. Proper use of PSRs would provide sentencers with better information when making sentencing decisions to match individual offenders with effective interventions. The work of the NPS Effective Practice Division is encouraging and T2A would be happy to share its

¹⁰ Ministry of Justice (2018) Offender Management Statistics Quarterly: January to March 2018, London: Ministry of Justice

¹¹ Jacobson, J et al. (2010) Punishing Disadvantage: a profile of children in custody, London: Prison Reform Trust

¹² Gyateng, T., McSweeney, T. and Hough, M. (2010) Key predictors of compliance with community supervision in London, London Criminal Justice Partnership

¹³ <https://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/Justice/correspondence/young-adults-criminal-justice-system-8.pdf>

¹⁴ <http://justiceinnovation.org/portfolio/changing-use-pre-sentence-reports/>

learning with the NPS as it develops the young adults presentence report toolkit, which is scheduled to launch in Spring 2019. Probation and the courts should also make full use of liaison and diversion services to identify individuals with specific needs for whom it is important to provide a tailored response.

We note that Probation Instruction 04 2016¹⁵ already requires pre-sentence reports to include consideration of lack of maturity of young adults aged 18-24. The instruction cites T2A's 'Taking account of maturity'¹⁶ practice guide: "PSRs completed on 18-24 year old offenders must include consideration of maturity. Guidance for PSR writers is available, Taking account of Maturity, which can inform a maturity assessment. Where the offender has previously been known to the youth offending team, information should be obtained on previous response to supervision and also any relevant information on the offender which could include details of any previous assessments completed. The ASSET would provide background information that could inform suitability for sentencing options and a risk assessment."¹⁷

Question 9: How could future resettlement services better meets the needs of offenders serving short custodial sentences?

T2A notes with concern the findings of HM Criminal Justice Joint Inspectorate's two reports on through the gate services for short sentenced prisoner and prisoners serving sentences of 12 months or more.¹⁸ For both cohorts, the inspectorate found that CRCs were focusing most of their efforts on meeting their contractual targets, to produce written resettlement plans, and not giving enough attention to responding to the needs of prisoners. The inspectorate also found that through the gate services were not well enough integrated into prisons, and that prisons needed to do more to support resettlement, including properly screening for prisoners' needs, assessing the risks a prisoner might pose and planning and delivering rehabilitative work where needed. As a result, too many people were leaving prison without suitable accommodation to go to, proper support into employment, training or education or help with managing their finances, benefits and debt.

T2A supports the intention expressed in the consultation to increase the number of people serving community orders and reduce the numbers in prison on short sentences. All serving a custodial sentence should have resettlement plans in place at least three months prior to their release and a 'through the gate' service should be provided to every young adult in custody. MoJ could look North of the border to practice in Scotland, where a through-the-gate service provided by the statutory authority with support for three months (or more on occasion for particularly vulnerable young adults) post-release is proving effective. Most reoffending by young adults on release from prison occurs in the first three months, but, as the inspectorate highlights, too few prison and probation services are making the

¹⁵ PSI 04 2016

¹⁶ T2A (2013) Taking Account of Maturity: A Guide for Probation Practitioners [online]. Available at: http://www.t2a.org.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2013/07/T2A-MaturityGuide_online.pdf

¹⁷ PI 04 2016, paragraph 8.1

¹⁸ Criminal Justice Joint Inspection (2016) An Inspection of Through the Gate Resettlement Services for Short-Term Prisoners, London: CJI; and Criminal Justice Joint Inspection (2017) An Inspection of Through the Gate Resettlement Services for Prisoners Serving 12 Months or More, London: CJI

necessary resettlement arrangements for a young adult leaving custody. ***A young adult specific approach (with a focus on supporting brain maturation and securing stable accommodation and long-term employment) should be implemented throughout criminal justice service design, commissioning and delivery to ensure that young adults coming out of the criminal justice process are supported to stop offending.***

Question 10: Which skills, training or competencies do you think are essential for responsible officers authorised to deliver probation services, and how do you think these differ depending on the types of offenders staff are working with?

As highlighted above, T2A would like to see all CRCs develop young adult teams, which would have smaller caseloads and work in collaboration with the voluntary sector. The T2A and Clinks report 'Going for Gold' contains detailed guidance on how probation services can be tailored to deliver a 'gold standard' approach to provision for young adults.¹⁹ T2A has also produced guidance for probation services on Effective Approaches With Young Adults.²⁰

Question 12: Do you agree that changes to the structure and leadership of probation areas are sufficient to achieve integration across all probation providers?

We welcome the recognition in the consultation that there needs to be better alignment between NPS and CRCs. However, we are not convinced that the proposed measures will ultimately resolve the problems created by the initial decision to split the supervision of low/medium- and high-risk offenders between two separate sets of providers. The proposals to better align CRC and NPS areas and to ensure probation regions do not cut across police force areas are welcome and have the potential to increase opportunities for co-commissioning and improve the strategic coordination of services. However, it is unclear how one individual, in the guise of the HMPPS senior leader, will have the authority and capacity to support this integration, meaningfully hold CRCs to account, and have meaningful engagement with the number of voluntary sector and statutory partners across a potentially large CPA.

The split in supervision arrangements between low/medium- and high-risk offenders is especially problematic for young adults given the particularly dynamic nature of risk in this age group. Under current arrangements, risk can only be escalated between CRCs and NPS, and once an individual is under NPS supervision they cannot move back to CRCs. We know that one factor which has inhibited the successful roll out of a distinct approach to young adults by some CRCs has been a lack of sufficient numbers to make such an approach viable, with larger numbers of young adults than expected being transferred from CRC to NPS supervision. ***If the division between the NPS and CRCs is to remain in place, then the Ministry of Justice should consider ways in which risk can be deescalated as well as***

¹⁹ Clinks (2012), Going for gold: developing effective services for young adults throughout the criminal justice process, London: Clinks. Available at: <https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Clinks-Going-for-Gold-2013.pdf>

²⁰ Clinks and T2A (2015) https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Probation-guide_Ver4_sml.pdf

escalated between CRC to NPS supervision, to prevent a disproportionate number of young adults ending up under the supervision of the NPS.

The proposed reduction in the number of probation areas may result in a larger cohort of young adults in each region, making the development of young adult specific services more viable. However, significant concerns have also been raised by Clinks in its response to this question over the increased size of CPAs, and their potential impact on the delivery of services by small voluntary organisations. Many of these organisations provide tailored services for young adults in the CRC areas which do offer a distinct approach to this age group. Clinks highlights concerns that “increased CPA size could have a negative impact on localised services and that for many voluntary sector organisations delivering across such large areas would be impossible.” **Therefore, T2A endorses Clinks recommendation that the “MoJ should make it a clear expectation of CRCs that locally responsive services are subcontracted.”**

Transition arrangements between youth and adult justice

We are further concerned that the current consultation makes no mention of arrangements for the safe and effective transition of young people from children to adult justice services. In 2016, more than 50% of 18 year olds in youth custody were transferred to the adult estate, and the highest proportion of people aged 18 were transferred from YOT to adult probation supervision. Following the Criminal Justice Joint Inspection first inspection of transition arrangements in 2012,²¹ we welcomed the development by the YJB and the National Offender Management Service (now HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS)) of a joint Youth to Adult Transitions Framework to manage the transfer process. However, we were concerned to read in the 2016 report that the framework was not sufficiently well known or fully implemented at the time of the inspection.²² In relation to the national leadership provided by the YJB and NOMS, the inspectorate noted:

... inconsistencies in practice and a lack of knowledge of the effectiveness of local arrangements across England and Wales. Moreover, despite the intention of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) that monitoring would be via the 21 Senior Contract Managers and via the NPS Deputy Directors for the 7 NPS divisions, there was no evidence of ongoing and effective national monitoring, or review, of the effectiveness of local arrangements for the transfer of young people from youth based to adult based services, and retention of young adults in youth based services.²³

²¹ Criminal Justice Joint Inspection (2012) Transitions: An inspection of the transitions arrangements from youth to adult services in the criminal justice system, London: CJI. Available at: <http://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/probation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2014/03/cji-transitions-thematic.pdf>

²² HM Inspectorate of Probation (2016) Transitions arrangements: a follow-up inspection, London: HMIP. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/01/Transitions-arrangements-follow-up-report.pdf>

²³ Ibid.

The inspectorate also highlighted specific concerns regarding the impact of the Transforming Rehabilitation reforms on transition arrangements between youth and adult justice services:

With the exception of the operational level Probation Instruction PI 05/2014, which is clear regarding transfers in from YOTs, we saw insufficient evidence of the Youth Justice Board (YJB) or NOMS working to ensure that, following the changes instigated by Transforming Rehabilitation, there would be effective cooperation between the NPS, the new CRCs and the YOTs. Therefore, effective local arrangements for the transfer of young people depended on the work of local organisations. The YJB and NOMS have failed to fully consider the impact of Transforming Rehabilitation on links between youth and adult services. The national and local organisations need to address these issues.²⁴

While the inspectorate identified a number of examples of good practice at the local level, it found that the majority of cases had not been identified as possible transfer cases. Overall, the inspectorate found a lack of consistency in managing the transfer process and that, in many cases, there had been little or no preparation, a failure to use existing information and a lack of planning. We are concerned that transition arrangements were not given adequate consideration in the original consultation on TR. There is a danger that the proposals in the current consultation could increase the barriers to effective transitions between youth and adult services. For instance, given that youth justice services in the community are overseen by local authority-based youth offending teams (YOTs), the move from 21 to 10 CPAs could increase the problems of transitions between youth and adult services which the inspectorate has highlighted. ***The Ministry of Justice will want to give urgent consideration to how it will meet the recommendations of the inspectorate to improve transition arrangements between youth and adult justice services as part of its proposed reforms.***

Question 14: How can we better engage voluntary sector providers in the design and delivery of rehabilitation and resettlement services for offenders in the community?

We refer the Ministry of Justice to Clink's response to this question

Question 15: How can we support greater engagement between PCCs and probation providers, including increasing the co-commissioning of services?

We welcome the recognition in the consultation of the important role PCCs can play in integrating services at a local level. The consultation also recognises the valuable contribution PCCs can make to coordinating and delivering effective services for specific cohorts of offenders, including young adults. PCCs are responsible for the 'totality of policing in their force area', covering the policing of both children and young adults, and the transition between. PCCs are therefore uniquely placed to take a lead in bringing partners together to bridge the gap between youth and adult justice, and design a specific strategy to tackle young adult reoffending.²⁵

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/T2A_PCC-briefing-Ver3.pdf

As the consultation highlights, both London and Manchester have agreed justice devolution deals with the Ministry of Justice. Both deals include proposals to work in partnership with other agencies to develop specific approaches to young adults. The consultation cites the development by Greater Manchester of “a whole system approach to female offenders and intensive community order for 18-25 year old males at risk of a custodial sentence, both of which have demonstrated positive outcomes.” Similarly, in its memorandum of understanding with the Ministry of Justice, the London Mayor’s Office of Policing and Crime states its intention to provide “holistic services to young people at risk of offending, young offenders, and young adults in transition from the youth justice system to the adult service, that address the root causes of offending behaviour, whilst ensuring justice continues to be served.”²⁶

We welcome the commitment in the consultation to continue to explore opportunities for testing the benefits of co-designing new arrangements within PCC regions. Particular approaches that have proved successful in reducing reoffending among young adults include Integrated Offender Management (IOM), which provides an effective, locally tailored approach to dealing with priority offenders, many of whom are in the young adult age group; and Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC), which provides a credible and effective alternative to custody for offenders who would otherwise receive a short-prison sentence of under 12 months. A specific approach for overseeing youth to adult transitions should form part of police and crime plans. PCCs should map services that support young adults locally, and establish what links already exist between youth and adult criminal justice agencies. PCCs should take a lead locally in addressing the challenge of transitions, and link closely with Youth Offending Services and Probation, who should be developing transitions protocols in every local area based on a National Transitions Protocol.

Summary of recommendations

Question 8

To take forward the development of a distinct approach to young adults in probation, T2A would like to see all CRCs develop young adult teams (as is the case within some areas already), which would have smaller caseloads and work in collaboration with the voluntary sector. The T2A and Clinks report ‘Going for Gold’ contains detailed guidance on how probation services can deliver a ‘gold standard’ approach to provision for young adults.²⁷ . T2A has also produced guidance for probation services on Effective Approaches With Young Adults.²⁸

To support the development of a distinct approach by probation, the government should seek an amendment to the Offender Rehabilitation Act to

²⁶ https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_justice_mou_final.pdf

²⁷ Clinks (2012), Going for gold: developing effective services for young adults throughout the criminal justice process, London: Clinks. Available at: <https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Clinks-Going-for-Gold-2013.pdf>

²⁸ Clinks and T2A (2015) https://www.t2a.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Probation-guide_Ver4_sml.pdf

create a legal duty for probation services to provide a distinct service for all young adults aged 18-25, similar to section 10 of the Act and its requirement to provide a distinct service for women. The requirement to deliver a distinct approach to young adults should be written into all future contracts with probation providers, and form part of any service-level agreement between the government and National Probation Service. Contract Management staff should be provided with training on specific cohorts of offenders to ensure they are able to hold to account the services delivered by the CRCs in relation to specific groups, including young adults, women, and BAME individuals. All of this should take place within an overarching Ministry of Justice strategy for young adults aged 18-25.

As part of a distinct approach, it will be vital to tailor services to specific groups of young adults with particular needs, such as women, Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) young people, those with disabilities and care leavers. T2A's report *Effective Approaches With Young Adults*²⁹ includes information on how to adapt services to meet the needs of these groups. We share the concerns raised by Clinks in its response to this question regarding the lack of attention paid in the proposals to meeting the needs of groups with protected characteristics under equalities legislation. We support recommendation 32 of the Lammy review that "the Ministry of Justice should specify in detail the data CRCs should collect and publish covering protected characteristics. This should be written into contracts and enforced with penalties for noncompliance."³⁰

Question 4

T2A supports the Justice Committee's recommendation to repeal Section 2 of the Offender Rehabilitation Act in order to remove the 12 month blanket supervision period. Of the alternatives suggested by the committee, we favour an assessment-based approach which would be suitably flexible to respond to an individuals' needs and support their desistance. Research has shown that "being young" is one of the factors which decreases the likelihood of compliance with licence conditions.³¹ We repeatedly hear from practitioners working with young adults, and young adults themselves, that they do not understand the conditions of their license, the potential consequences of not meeting them, when their license period ends, what post supervision means and what happens when they do not meet post sentence requirements. As a minimum, therefore, it is vital that licence conditions are proportionate and adapted to take account of maturity and the distinct needs of young adults. It is essential that clear information is given and that understanding by the young adult is checked.

Question 5

²⁹ Ibid.
³⁰

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/643001/lammy-review-final-report.pdf

³¹ Gyateng, T., McSweeney, T. and Hough, M. (2010) Key predictors of compliance with community supervision in London, London Criminal Justice Partnership

Courts and probation need both the time and resource to develop and utilise pre-sentence reports to better reflect the needs of groups with certain protected characteristics, including young adults. Proper use of PSRs would provide sentencers with better information when making sentencing decisions to match individual offenders with effective interventions. The work of the NPS Effective Practice Division is encouraging and T2A would be happy to share its learning with the NPS as it develops the young adults presentence report toolkit, which is scheduled to launch in Spring 2019. Probation and the courts should also make full use of liaison and diversion services to identify individuals with specific needs for whom it is important to provide a tailored response.

Question 9

A young adult specific approach to resettlement (with a focus on supporting brain maturation, securing stable accommodation and long-term employment) should be implemented throughout criminal justice service design, commissioning and delivery to ensure that young adults coming out of the criminal justice process are supported to stop offending.

Question 12

If the division between the NPS and CRCs is to remain in place, then the Ministry of Justice should consider ways in which risk can be deescalated as well as escalated between CRC to NPS supervision, to prevent a disproportionate number of young adults ending up under the supervision of the NPS.

T2A endorses Clinks recommendation that the “MoJ should make it a clear expectation of CRCs that locally responsive services are subcontracted.”

The Ministry of Justice will want to give urgent consideration to how it will meet the recommendations of HM inspectorate probation to improve transition arrangements between youth and adult justice services as part of its proposed reforms to probation.

Question 15

We welcome the commitment in the consultation to continue to explore opportunities for testing the benefits of co-designing new arrangements within PCC regions. Particular approaches that have proved successful in reducing reoffending among young adults include Integrated Offender Management (IOM), which provides an effective, locally tailored approach to dealing with priority offenders, many of whom are in the young adult age group; and Intensive Alternative to Custody (IAC), which provides a credible and effective alternative to custody for offenders who would otherwise receive a short-prison sentence of under 12 months. A specific approach for overseeing youth to adult transitions should form part of police and crime plans. PCCs should map services that support young adults locally, and establish what links already exist between youth and adult criminal justice agencies. PCCs should take a lead locally in addressing the challenge of transitions, and link closely with Youth Offending Services and Probation, who should be



(T2A) Alliance submission to the Ministry of Justice consultation
Strengthening probation, building confidence

developing transitions protocols in every local area based on a National Transitions Protocol.