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1. Background and methodology

1.1 Background

The aim of this report is to produce an early thematic overview of the main findings of the evaluation of the LYRRP (Daedalus). These findings will be considered more fully in the final evaluation report which will be published in summer 2012. In identifying the key themes and presenting them in this report, it is important to acknowledge the methodology and the sources of information that these conclusions are drawn from. Fuller details of both are provided in the annex.

The London Youth Reducing Reoffending Programme (Daedalus)\(^1\) was implemented on 29th September 2009 and is funded until May 2012. The Programme aims to support young people due to be released from custody, by moving them into sustainable education, training or employment (ETE), while also ensuring that they have suitable accommodation upon release. Offering such support is expected to lead to better reintegration into the community and access to mainstream and specialist support services. Consequently, it is hoped a reduction in youth reoffending rates in London will be achieved. Recent performance monitoring data shows that, as of January 2012, 271 young people have started the Programme, with 222 discharged from the Heron Unit.

LYRRP (Daedalus) forms one strand of the Mayor's Time for Action\(^2\) initiative which was developed to tackle serious youth violence in London by improving the opportunities available for young Londoners. Alongside four other projects, the Programme is funded by the Mayor through the London Development Agency and matched by the European Social Fund (ESF), with additional contributions made by the YJB. There are a range of stakeholders involved in the delivery of the Programme. Led by the London Criminal Justice Partnership (LCJP), support is also provided by a number of other agencies, including the Youth Justice Board (YJB), London Development Agency (LDA), Greater London Authority (GLA), Rathbone (youth charity), HMYOI Feltham, Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) and Local Authorities.

The Programme operates under specific ESF funding requirements. In this case, Rathbone (youth charity), supported by St Mungo's and St Giles Trust, had to fulfil a number of obligations in order to put in claims to the contract holders, the LDA. These claims were based on the number of young people who start the Programme, the number who are involved in positive activities and skills development, how many young people enter into ETE, and the number in sustained ETE for 26 weeks.

There are two key elements to the Programme - the placement, by YJB, of young people onto the ‘Heron Unit’ in HMYOI Feltham, with an enhanced regime and staffing, and the provision of a Resettlement Broker to work with young people in custody and on release into the community, with the aim of addressing issues associated with their offending behaviour, namely ETE and accommodation (addressing accommodation issues became less of a focus of the Programme once it was apparent that this was not a problem for most of the young people).

---

\(^1\) Referred to as ‘LYRRP (Daedalus)’ or ‘the Programme’ from here onwards.

\(^2\) The ‘Time for Action’ initiative was officially launched in November 2008, and contains a number of strands of work which aim to address some of the key issues around serious youth violence. Aside from LYRRP (Daedalus), Time for Action also includes targeted projects such as Project Titan (aiming to increase the number of volunteers and the level of community involvement around tackling youth crime) and Project Oracle (which has aimed to provide additional tools for practitioners and commissioners to identify ‘what works’ in tackling serious youth violence).
The YJB placements team were responsible for ensuring that suitable young people, initially from the six 'Diamond boroughs' and then (since May 2010) from across London, were placed on the Heron Unit. Such practices link with the aspirations among stakeholders of ensuring that young people are placed as near to home as possible to allow family links to be maintained and effective resettlement links to be developed. The proximity of young people to their family homes also helped to make a number of specific elements to the provision at the Heron Unit as effective as possible. For example, families were able to see their sons participate in activities such as the LIFE Course (an intensive five-day course offering young people the opportunity to learn fire fighting skills alongside real fire fighters), or to visit them on family days at the Unit. Feedback indicated that such provisions provided good motivation for the young people.

1.2 Methodology

In 2009, the (LCJP) commissioned Ipsos MORI to evaluate the delivery and impact of the Daedalus Programme. The evaluation aimed to identify the extent to which the Programme was successful in meeting the ESF requirements of getting young people into ETE and sustaining this involvement for six months, reducing reoffending and addressing the risk factors associated with offending behaviour. It also sought to determine the role of staff on the Heron Unit, and Resettlement Brokers, working in partnership with Youth Offending Teams (YOTs), in successfully reintegrating young people into the community on release from custody.

This report presents preliminary thematic findings from the final outcome evaluation (including a nine month reoffending rate). The following should be seen as a high-level overview of the key messages from the evaluation; in places only minimal detail can be provided. A final evaluation report will be published in summer 2012 and will explore the findings from this report within greater depth. It will also include a 12 month reoffending rate along with an economic analysis, in providing early evidence on the Programme’s value for money.

The Programme was evaluated using a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods. Full details on the methodological approach designed for this evaluation are provided in the annex (with a brief overview provided in the footnote below): Data and information gathered through the evaluation have allowed the key themes presented in this report to be identified. Statistical representation and more detailed qualitative insight of these findings will be presented in the final report. However, to provide some context to the discussions had within this report, figures from aggregate performance management data gathered for the strategic funding partners are presented.

---

3 The Diamond Initiative is a multi-agency approach designed to break the cycle of reoffending by helping offenders to resettle into their communities. Six boroughs – Croydon, Hackney, Lambeth, Lewisham, Newham and Southwark – have been taking part.

4 A cohort of young people placed on the unit and released into the community in between September 2009 to September 2010 was selected for the reoffending study. The analysis looked at the rate, frequency and severity of offending in the nine months following release from custody. Police National Computer (PNC) data was drawn 15 months after the last young person had been released to allow time for PNC data to be updated.

5 While the nine month reoffending study carried out for the preliminary findings report does not follow Ministry of Justice (MoJ) standards (due to the timing of the analysis), the 12 month reoffending figure will follow MoJ standards for reoffending analysis.

6 An emerging findings report was published by Ipsos MORI in June 2010, which particularly focused on the experiences of young people. This was followed by a process evaluation (interim report) which was produced in March 2011.

7 A sample of young people were surveyed while on the Unit and once released. 91 quantitative interviews were conducted with young people on the Heron Unit using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) and 35 interviews were followed-up. In addition 4 young people were followed up who had subsequently been taken back into custody. 26 policy stakeholders were interviewed in total and an additional 5 pro-formas with policy stakeholders were completed. 2 discussion groups were conducted with RBs. 6 qualitative interviews with YOT Champions/YOT workers at the start of the programme and 1 discussion group in stage 2 of the evaluation. In total, 5 family interviews were carried out. Observation work on Heron, including the Friday discussion group and LIFE course.
2. Implementation and delivery

There was a consistent message from interviews conducted with stakeholders, both at the implementation stage and throughout the delivery of the Programme that the governance structure in place from the start greatly informed and aided the delivery of the Programme. The development of a number of strategic and operational boards has provided forums for progress to be reviewed (informed by the ongoing collection of performance management information), concerns addressed and best practice shared.

I have never known such a rigorous process for programme management...so many different layers of meetings. I think there are very clear structure, process, procedure, escalation channels for this programme.

Stakeholder interview

The routine collection of performance management data was also put in place in the early stages of the Programme. Performance management data were used to inform Board level discussions throughout the Programme on the extent to which the targets were being met. Many felt this process had worked well in identifying any changes required to the Programme to ensure its effective delivery. For example, in reviewing the six month ETE sustainability target, it identified issues around a lack of employer engagement and job readiness among young people on the Programme. As a result, efforts to address these issues involved the appointment of an Employer Engagement Manager by Rathbone and more support to young people through the provision of mock interview training and help with writing CVs whilst on the Heron unit.

The responsiveness to issues identified during the implementation and delivery of the Programme were aided by the development of strong multi-agency partnerships. Such working practices were deemed to be one of the main successes of the Programme; however these took time to develop. Stakeholders acknowledged the time that was invested in getting the buy-in of all the key partners. Notably there were criticisms raised at the set up of the Programme about the perceived duplication of work between YOT workers and Resettlement Brokers. There were attempts to address this through the formation of a YOT champions group and greater clarity being provided as to the distinguishing features of both roles, and this was seen to have had some positive impact. However, stakeholders and YOTs questioned why this was not in place from the Programme’s inception. There were also concerns that existing resettlement practice at a local level had not been acknowledged in the design and set up of the Programme. More could have been done in the early stages of the Programme’s development to build on the work of existing services, in ensuring the delivery of more joined-up resettlement provision for young people within the community.

3. The young people on the Programme

The remit of the Heron Unit was to provide a Programme for 15-18 year old offenders who had been sentenced with a Detention and Training Order (DTO). Young people were assessed according to their levels of motivation and readiness to engage, taking into account the complexity of their resettlement needs.

Young people identified as meeting the core criteria of the Programme required an assessment in order to determine their suitability. The original process involved the identification of suitable individuals through several sources, including YOTs, the YJB and YOIs, and the completion of a referral form containing key information about that specific
young person. The evaluation found a number of concerns surrounding this initial referral process. Stakeholders felt that the system for referrals was not robust and lacked consistency and this was echoed by practitioners and young people. There was a feeling that, especially in the formative stages of the Programme, some of the young people who were brought onto the Heron Unit were not suitable given the original criteria. It was acknowledged by a number of stakeholders and staff that the motivation levels of young people on the Programme was sometimes much lower than expected. There had also been instances where young people were removed from the Programme as a result of their lack of willingness to participate and engage. In addressing these concerns, the referral process was revised and as the guidance around referrals improved, stakeholders became confident that there was a greater consistency in suitable young people being placed on the Unit.

The collation of local case management data, gathered from YOTs, provides further detail on the characteristics of the young people going through the Programme. This also served as a useful exercise in exploring whether the concerns above and any possible issues around ‘cherry picking’ were evident in the selection of young people. Analysis of this case management data indicates that the profile and background of the young people who have been on the Programme are broadly reflective of the wider YOI population. The findings from this analysis will be explored in more detail in the final report but overall (as would be expected according to the original aims of the Programme) the majority of young people came from one of the six ‘Diamond boroughs’. Most were aged 17, white or black/black British, had committed a range of offences, such as violence against the person and robbery, and were known previous offenders.

The data also showed young people had received a range of sentence lengths. Qualitative feedback from both young people and stakeholders indicated that most young people on the unit were serving shorter sentences. This was raised as a concern by practitioners working with young people on Heron and Resettlement Brokers, who felt that young people were unable to fully engage with the modules on offer through the Programme due to the short period of time they spent on the Unit.

One of the main aims of the Programme is to address the resettlement needs of young people, namely ETE, family issues and accommodation. It was clear from the analysis of the case management data, that such risks (as measured by Asset) were evident in these young peoples lives. Young people on the programme have broadly comparable levels of risk with the wider young offender population, but when compared to a sample of young people in custody, through the JCS, it is apparent that the Heron group’s level of risk is lower. Further detail on this will be provided in the final evaluation report published in the summer 2012. Young people were also asked to qualitatively self report any difficulties and needs they face. Many voiced concerns around education, getting a job and wider issues such as substance misuse and involvement with gangs.

It is important to note that the Programme was introduced during a transitional time for the secure estate. A significant reduction in the number of children and young people entering in custody has also been coupled with an increase in more persistent, serious young offenders coming into establishments. Anecdotal evidence from staff and stakeholders indicated that these changes have also been reflected in the changing profile of young people arriving on to the Heron Unit. This will be explored further in the final evaluation report.

4. Effectiveness of the Heron unit

The Heron Unit is an enhanced resettlement unit, offering increased staffing and modules on behaviour management, skills for living independently, money management, job readiness, domestic tasks, health and safety, and victim awareness, as well as nationally recognised courses such as the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award. A key success of the Unit, as voiced by
stakeholders and young people, was the provision of multiple modules and workshops. There are several rationales underpinning these provisions including the application and integration of cognitive behaviour models (Juvenile Enhanced Thinking Skills - JETS) to help address offending behaviour (alongside victim awareness modules); the provision of purposeful activity to provide constructive occupation for young people, providing activities that help to increase self-esteem while encouraging community spirit and team ethos, and creating opportunities in relation to education, employment and independent living that will provide practical and material assistance in helping young people resettle effectively upon their transition from custody to the community. The work of the Unit is also strongly underpinned by the staff recruited to run the Unit, who spend time developing relationships with the young people in maintaining their motivation to engage in the Programme whilst in custody and into the community.

**I feel like it’s the best possible way I could have spent my time in prison. Compared to all the [other] wings where nothing is changing...on Heron you are progressing towards something.**

Young person

The clear focus of the Programme was to successfully reintegrate and sustain young people’s involvement in ETE. Qualitative feedback from young people, and echoed by Resettlement Brokers, indicates there was more of a willingness to reengage with education than to enter employment on release from custody. Whilst many said they received help with job readiness, young people spoke of favouring a return to education than entering employment. Resettlement Brokers, when interviewed, spoke of the range of needs young people faced on release from custody and the unrealistic expectation that they should be expected to enter full time employment once in the community.

The use of Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL) was spoken of in overwhelmingly positive terms, and was seen as something the Heron Unit had managed to deliver effectively. Recent performance monitoring data shows that more than a third (38%) of young people were given ROTL while on the Heron Unit, and the young people interviewed who did receive ROTL were positive about the experience. Aside from the benefits of being able to visit colleges and do mock job interviews, for example, they said that being able to partake in schemes such as the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award, helped them to develop new skills and broaden their horizons. Stakeholders also echoed the benefits of ROTL helping to increase confidence within young people.

Aside from the modules, young people said other factors such as being given more time out of their cell helped to make life on the Unit more engaging. The structure that the daily routine of Heron provided was seen as important, by stakeholders, to the wider ethos of the Programme; it prepared young people more effectively for their transition into the community. However, it was here that stakeholders pointed out that despite the greater array of modules available on Heron, the short length of time that most young people actually spent on the Unit, as a result of their sentence length, limited the intensity of the service provision that could be afforded to them.

Young people also spoke of having good relations with staff on the Unit and feeling like staff treated them with respect. Young people felt that staff were more dedicated than those on other units they had experienced, and stakeholders praised the fact that young people were treated more like responsible adults. Furthermore, the staffing levels on the Unit meant that young people had more opportunity for one-to-one contact. Stakeholders associated the low numbers of Restrictive Physical Intervention’s (RPIs) with the positive relations staff had with young people. Looking again at recent performance management data, between February
2011 and January 2012 there were 28 recorded incidents on the Heron Unit; this compares with 47 incidents on a comparable Unit at HMYOI Feltham over the same period.

5. Provision in the community and Resettlement Brokers

Whilst the strengths of the Heron unit were clearly voiced, the complexity of working with young offenders in the community was acknowledged by all stakeholders. The transition between custody and the community is potentially a very difficult time for young people leaving custody. Research indicates that the incidence of reoffending is greater in the first month after release from custody.8. Resettlement Brokers were faced with the challenge of trying to secure education or employment opportunities for young people whilst also addressing their wider needs, such as community issues and family relations. Unsurprisingly then, the Resettlement Broker role was seen to be fundamental to the aims of the Programme from its inception.

Resettlement Brokers stressed the importance of building trust in the relationship from an early stage as a key part of their role. They saw themselves as providing a consistent point of contact from custody to the community.

It’s mainly about building the relationship, obviously, because often when we work with them in custody, it’s one way of working with them. And it’s different working with them in the community. If we can build that trust [while] in custody, that helps.

Resettlement Broker

Certainly, young people generally seemed very positive about their Resettlement Brokers, and there was a lot of trust in the relationships, which stemmed from working with their Resettlement Brokers over a significant period of time and having that continuity of care. Young people said that their Resettlement Broker would support them practically with things such as setting up meetings with colleges and organising their ROTL when in custody, whilst also keeping them motivated and building their confidence. Contact and communication with Resettlement Brokers often continued on a voluntary basis and for a significant length of time when the young person was released into the community, signifying that these relationships were proving effective for young people.

Stakeholders acknowledged how key Resettlement Brokers were to the success of the Programme. In particular, the amount of time Resettlement Brokers spent having one-to-one contact on the Heron Unit was seen to be a real benefit to young people, building up a relationship where they would act as mentors to each young person on their journey back into the community. The Resettlement Broker role as seen as being unique in how it provided a consistent, supportive point of contact that was not seen as being directly linked to the criminal justice system through statutory obligations.

YOT stakeholders, by contrast, had concerns as to whether Resettlement Brokers actually added value to the Programme. In particular, they were worried that a greater number of services and people trying to provide support for a young person meant there was, in fact, more likelihood that the services would fail to provide the right support. However, there were positive stories from young people and parents about the way that YOT workers and Resettlement Brokers linked together in the support they provided, and YOT practitioners

8 Reoffending of juveniles: results from the 2009 cohort, Ministry of Justice Statistics bulletin, Published 17th March 2011
seemed positive about the role itself and the fact that young people received extra support around the statutory requirements. They felt the role Resettlement Brokers played in the first few weeks a young person was out of custody was important in helping with practical tasks such as signing on or getting medical check-ups.

Indeed, in reviewing the Programme's community provision, both Rathbone and YOTs believed that offering even more structured assistance within the first few weeks of a young person’s release would help further with this transitional phase in the future. For example, that a more structured, targeted contact be in place during the initial few weeks after release from custody.

Stakeholders also felt that getting young people into employment on release was also limited by the late introduction of elements such as the Employer Engagement Manager, and delays in delivering job readiness provision. Efforts to address these concerns have appeared fruitful with anecdotal evidence indicating that a number of employers are now actively engaged with young people on Heron and the support around job readiness is improving young people’s confidence around employment opportunities. Further detail on these developments will be presented in the final evaluation report.

There was a view amongst stakeholders that the Resettlement Broker role had been too “client-focussed” under the guidance of Rathbone, and they could have been more strategic in fostering relationships with employers to get them involved in the Programme in the early stages. By contrast, providers and Resettlement Brokers felt that GLA or other board-level organisations were in a far stronger position to get access to employer information to support strategic engagement and communication, and greater intervention early on would have minimised the impact of this. However, the wider acknowledgment of needing to gain the engagement of employers led to a number of successful strategic events being run which have helped foster good links and provide young people with assistance in exploring employment opportunities.

6. Funding requirements

LYRRP (Daedalus) is one of a range of programmes that have been financed by the European Social Fund (ESF), with funds being matched and distributed at the regional level by the LDA in its role as a ‘Co-financing Organisation’ (CFO). Rathbone has had to fulfil a number of obligations so that it meets the criteria set out by the Payment by Results (PbR) model that the Programme operates under. As such, Rathbone put claims in to the contract holders, the LDA. Rathbone is then audited by the LDA to ensure that it is meeting the Programme aims and receives payment according to a range of outcomes. Claims can be made to the LDA based on the number of young people who start the Programme, the number who are involved in positive activities and skills development, how many young people enter into ETE, and the number in sustained ETE for 26 weeks. Rathbone has to meet agreed targets around these criteria in order to claim for its own funding towards the Programme.

The claims process, set by the funding requirements, was felt by most stakeholders to hold value within the LYRRP (‘Daedalus’). It was argued there should be some kind of risk and reward element for providers engaging in such a project, and that targets set, such as those by ESF in this instance, can help to motivate and make providers more focused, in turn pushing value for money. A number of frustrations were voiced in relation to the funding targets set by the PbR model. Resettlement Brokers said that they would at times feel conflicted in their working practice; there was an uncertainty as to whether their key concern at any one time should be meeting targets, or meeting the needs of young people.
Further analysis on the value for money provided by the Programme will be presented through a cost analysis of the money spent in the implementation and delivery of the Programme in the final report.

6.1 ETE funding targets

In addition to the impact made on reoffending, the Programme was also required to successfully reintegrate young people into ETE and ensure sustained employment for 26 weeks.

Stakeholders thought that outcomes around sustained ETE were not meeting the agreed targets, and that this was a concern. The LYRRP (Daedalus) performance report from January 2012 shows that, of the 222 young people discharged from the Heron Unit, 54.1% have entered ETE, with 32.1% of young people having sustained ETE for 6 months, based on all entries into ETE from September 2009 to July 2011. Whilst the general feeling was that the performance against outcomes had been improving, it was felt that results should have been more positive early on in the Programme. However, some questioned whether these were in fact the right targets to have in the first place. It was seen as unrealistic to assume that young people, often with multiple and complex needs, could enter employment on release from custody and sustain this engagement for up to 6 months. This is also coupled with a declining job market as a result of the current economic climate, which was limiting the availability of suitable jobs for young people on the Programme.

Many of these issues were echoed by young people who mentioned how positive outcomes around employment were very difficult given some of the issues they face when leaving custody. They mentioned how the fact they now have a criminal conviction holds them back, and that it can take a lot of work to persuade employers they are safe people to work with. For some it was hard to keep their motivation levels up when faced with such challenges. The importance of getting the right job was also emphasised; one young person was on an apprenticeship, but the hours and distance he had to travel meant that he decided the experience was not worth any of the other potential benefits.

It was felt that job readiness was an area that still required development and was still affecting ETE sustainability figures. However considerable efforts have been made, both in custody and in the community, to improve the job readiness of young people. Specific courses, delivered by key employers, are being delivered on the Heron Unit aimed at getting young people ready for interviews and also developing their CVs.

Despite these concerns, young people spoke of the Programme influencing their attitudes towards employment, with greater aspirations to start earning money through full-time work being evident. Young people already in work described a real sense of accomplishment and personal achievement that they were able to get a job and stay in employment, whilst a young person who had not found full-time work but had been able to find a volunteering role also spoke positively about the experience he had gained from this. Young people spoke a lot about the work they had done with writing CVs, applying for jobs, and meeting with colleges or employers that all helped to work towards the eventual ETE targets. They also mentioned how they were able to take some of the structure from their daily routines on the Unit and apply this to their daily lives when they went back into the community.
I feel, like, they really helped me get a job...and the motivation as well, ‘cause when I first came out I really wanted to get a job and then after I was looking I felt that, like, this isn’t really going to work and I lost motivation, but my Resettlement Broker helped me keep up with it.

Young person

Stakeholders believed the outcomes around education had been good but they also felt that a number of issues hindered young people’s successful reintegration back into college and training. Most notable were the difficulties young people faced when their release from custody did not link in with course admission dates. Efforts to address this have seen Rathbone working with a number of colleges to agree more flexible entrance points onto courses during term time.

Qualitative interviews with young people indicated that those involved in education were motivated and engaged in the courses they were attending. Some of the young people we spoke to now wanted to progress to University, and they generally seemed positive about the fact that their current course would be of significant help to future education and employment opportunities.

Stakeholders echoed the concerns of Resettlement Brokers to some extent, as they felt that a lot more was being done to meet and address the needs of young people than was actually recognised by the targets. It was emphasised how the ‘softer’ outcomes are still very important within a Programme such as this.

6.1.1 Proven re-offending

This section presents early findings on the level of proven re-offending of a sample of young people released from the Heron unit at HMYOI Feltham. The re-offending analysis presented has been peer reviewed by Ministry of Justice (MoJ) Analytical Services.

Interpreting findings
The following limitations should be noted when interpreting these early results presented:

- It is too early to conduct a full re-offending analysis which is in line with MoJ standards.

- The number of young people discharged from the Heron unit is too small to conduct a robust evaluation and it is not possible to draw any firm conclusions based on the available data.

- Even if the numbers discharged were larger, these young people are likely to be motivated to change their offending behaviour due to the referral process to go on the specialist Heron unit. Also, some young people were removed from the programme due to their lack of compliance; this may have introduced some bias to the sample.

\[\text{For example, comparing Asset risk/need assessment scores of 153 young people at the start of their sentence at the Heron unit with those of a sub-sample of 303 young people included in the Juvenile Cohort Study (JCS) who were who were sentenced to Detention and Training Orders (DTOs) between 1 February 2008 to 31st January 2009, suggests that the level of risk/need related to the likelihood of re-offending is lower for young people in the Heron unit. For example, total Asset scores (i.e. ranging from 0 to 64) were as follows: 33 to 64 (intensive intervention level or high likelihood of re-offending) = 37% for JCS vs. 11% for Heron unit; 15-32 (enhanced intervention level or medium likelihood of re-offending) =}\]
• Due to the lack of a meaningful (matched) comparison group it is not possible to attribute change to the intervention as some of these young people may have changed their offending behaviour without this intervention.

• In the absence of a comparison group and to place the findings in context, broad-brush comparisons can be made to the national published re-offending statistics for under 18 Young Offender Institutions (Y0Is) and for those young people released from Feltham YOI. The next national figures which are broadly aligned to the timeframe used in this chapter are due to be published in July 2012.¹⁰

• As with all proven re-offending analysis this may not reflect the true level of offending by these young people.

Methodology
This analysis is based on a small sub-sample of all young people released from the Heron unit. In maximising the size of the sample available for follow up, a one year cohort was identified, however this limited the reoffending analysis to a nine month follow up, which is not in line with standard MoJ 12 month period.¹¹

A final evaluation report is planned to be published in summer 2012. This will include a 12 month re-offending rate calculated in accordance with MoJ standards. However, it is anticipated that these findings will also be limited due to the small number of young people discharged and the absence of an adequately matched comparison group.

As not enough time has passed to conduct a full re-offending analysis, this analysis is based on those young people who had been released from the Heron unit during the following time period (the follow-up period set the timeframe during which re-offending is measured):

• Releases from the Heron unit in the 12-months from 1st September 2009 to 31st August 2010 and followed up for nine months: 63 young people released.¹²

A nine month follow-up period is not in line with the standard MoJ 12-month period. A shorter follow-up period allows less time to re-offend so slightly lower levels of re-offending should

---


¹¹ A 12 month reoffending analysis was conducted by MoJ on a smaller nine month cohort (the standard MoJ follow-up period for calculating proven re-offending statistics). Young people released from the Heron unit from 1st September 2009 to 31st May 2010 and followed up for 12 months (n=42). 18 out of the 42 young people discharged from the Heron unit re-offended in the 12 months following release giving a re-offending rate of 43%. These 18 offenders committed a total of 44 re-offences in this 12-month follow-up period. Of those 18 who re-offended within 12 months, 6 received an immediate custodial sentence. The total number of re-convictions was 33.

¹² Of the 64 young people released between 1st September 2009 and 31st August 2010, one young person could not be matched to the Police National Computer (PNC) and was removed from the subsequent analysis.
be expected. In particular this is likely to under-estimate the number of serious offences which can take longer to be sentenced at court.

The data was matched to the MoJ’s extract of the Police National Computer (PNC) to obtain proven re-offending for those young people who had been discharged from the Heron unit and to calculate a proven re-offending rate.\(^{13}\)

**Proven re-offending: early findings**

It is important to note that the findings presented are indicative and no firm conclusions can be drawn.

**Young people released from the Heron unit from 1\textsuperscript{st} September 2009 to 31\textsuperscript{st} August 2010 and followed up for 9 months (n=63)**

- 26 out of the 63 young people discharged from the Heron Unit re-offended in nine months following release giving a re-offending rate of 41\(^{\%}\). These 26 offenders committed a total of 60 re-offences in this nine month follow-up period.

- Of those 26 who re-offended within nine months, 10 received an immediate custodial sentence. The total number of re-convictions was 48.\(^{15}\)

- In the absence of a comparison group, which means that change cannot be attributed to the intervention, broad-brush comparisons can be made to national level re-offending statistics adjusted to the nine month follow-up period. Figures for releases from custody in the time period 1\textsuperscript{st} September 2009 to 31\textsuperscript{st} August 2010 are not routinely available. So the nine month re-offending rate was calculated based on releases for the calendar year 2009. Analysis for 2009 based on all 15 to 17 year olds released from the juvenile
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\(^{13}\) For young people (aged 10 to 17), the term proven re-offending describes offences which result in either a court conviction or a reprimand or final warning.

Two concepts are used as proxies to measure actual proven re-offending:

**Re-conviction** — where an offender is convicted at court for an offence committed within a set follow up period and convicted within either the follow up period or a subsequent waiting period; and,

**Proven re-offence** — where an offender is convicted at court or receives some other form of criminal justice sanction for an offence committed within a set follow up period and disposed of within either the follow up period or subsequent waiting period.

For the purposes of the statistics in this chapter, the re-offence must have been committed within the **nine-month and the conviction or out-of-court disposal must follow either within that nine-month follow up period, or in a further six months. This six month period allows time for the offence to be proven at court.**

Standard MoJ practice is a one-year follow up period with a further six month period to allow time for offences to be proven at court, a month for records to be entered onto the PNC database and also time for the MoJ extract of the database to be updated. For further details see: [http://www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending](http://www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/reoffending/proven-re-offending)

It is likely that the actual amount of proven re-offending may be underestimated. In particular, serious cases may take longer to process, so this analysis may have underestimated the amount of serious re-offending.

The analysis was based on data recorded on the Police National Computer (PNC) as of 2 December 2011. MoJ receives an extract from NPIA each month so analysis calculated on a different PNC extract at a later date could result in different numbers.

\(^{15}\) Some young people received more than one court conviction.
secure estate showed that of the 1,846 young people who were discharged in this time period, 61% re-offended.

- The latest MoJ published 12-month re-offending rate for young people released from custody from April 2009 to end of March 2010 is 70%. The re-offending rates for individual under 18 YOIs ranged from 59% to 82% for the same time period. For Feltham YOI, where the Heron unit is located, the re-offending rate for the small number of sentenced young people (62) released was 66%, with 122 re-offences to the 12-months ending March 2010.

- It is important to note that these national statistics are based on a different time period with a full 12 months follow up for re-offending and, on the whole, much larger numbers of young people. Also, the characteristics of these offenders, including their motivation to change their re-offending behaviour, are likely to be different to young people released from the Heron unit.

These early findings should be treated with caution as sufficient time has not passed to conduct a full re-offending analysis, which meets MoJ standards. The small number of young people released from the unit, their potential motivation to change their offending behaviour, and the lack of an adequately matched control group mean that no firm conclusions can be drawn.

After the final report has been published, the feasibility of creating a comparison group to undertake an evaluation of at least two years of releases from the Heron unit may be considered, although the number of discharges may still be too low for a robust assessment. Also, finding an adequate comparison group will be challenging as young people were selected to be on the Heron unit and are therefore more likely to be motivated to engage with the regime.

7. Going forward

The aim of this report was to provide a thematic overview on the progress made by the Programme on the lives of the young people it seeks to work with. There is general consensus from stakeholders and young people spoken to during the evaluation that the Programme had been a success in changing the lives of the young people engaged with.

In particular the custodial element of the Programme was deemed to be effective, with stakeholders recommending that the enhanced Unit be maintained within HMYOI Feltham
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and be extended to other establishments. Stakeholders spoke positively about possible replication of the Programme outside of London.

The role of the Resettlement Brokers was seen as being an important element of the Programme. All the young people interviewed were positive about the relationship they had with their Resettlement Brokers. However it was felt that the move to a pan London approach had impacted on the time Resettlement Brokers had been able to spend with young people and the numbers that could be seen within a given day due to travel time. In light of this and going forward stakeholders questioned whether this problem would become more of an issue where young people are released into large urban and rural areas, making it difficult for Resettlement Brokers to maintain contact in the community.

Stakeholders spoke of one of the key successes of the Programme being the strong multi-agency relationships that had been formed and how these effective working relations had helped shape and maintain the delivery of the Programme. It was felt that a large-scale debrief would be useful between the partners to discuss what has been achieved and lessons learnt. Such a forum would also allow links to be made with other resettlement initiatives running in across the country, to ensure clear evidence of effective practice is identified.

The final evaluation report to be published in the summer 2012 will provide further detail on the delivery and effectiveness of the Programme. While this preliminary thematic findings report is intended to give an overview of the main themes and conclusions from the evaluation, the final evaluation report will go into greater detail on these and other findings. More contextual data will be provided based on all the quantitative and qualitative data that Ipsos MORI has gathered, as well as providing further analysis from the performance management data and case management data that has been obtained for LYRRP (Daedalus). Greater attention will be given to exploring the distance travelled of young people who have engaged with the programme, assessing the effectiveness of the programme in addressing the issues associated with their offending behaviour. This will all be supplemented with a 12 month reoffending figure in line with MoJ standards and a detailed economic analysis on the cost effectiveness of the programme.
Case study 1

In total Toby* spent 10 months on the Heron Unit. This was his second time in custody.

A year after release, Toby felt that his time spent in custody was well spent and that it allowed him to see what he wanted to do so that he had a goal to aim for on release.

While on the unit Toby participated in the majority of the modules available and enjoyed all of them, although felt that not all of them were particularly relevant to him. He was also released on temporary licence (ROTL) for the Eden Project and for work experience placements. He particularly enjoyed the Eden project as he felt that it was a good way to learn team building skills and also to give something back to the community. Toby’s mother also felt that he benefitted from the ROTL experience as it gave him more confidence and experience of working.

Toby was particularly positive about the role of the Resettlement Broker and said that it was his favourite thing about being part of the Programme. Toby met with his Broker weekly after being released from the Heron Unit although this became less frequent over time. His first Resettlement Broker left and he was given a new one who he felt he bonded less well with. Toby said he felt it was a luxury to have someone who could help both in custody and in the community and felt that his Resettlement Broker was able to put the skills he learnt in Heron to good use in the community. Toby’s mother also felt that he was fully supported by his Resettlement Broker

Although in college prior to going into custody, Toby felt that this was not something he had wanted to be doing and had just gone because he had friends there. While in custody Toby decided that he wanted to get into games development and this was something his Resettlement Broker helped him to start training towards while in custody. They also helped set up a college place for him to continue after release. Toby was tentative at first as the course wasn’t initially something that he wanted to do but while in custody his Resettlement Broker explained that in order for him to achieve his end goal he would need to gain some related qualifications. After completing the initial course Toby went on to start a 2 year course where he continues to study and reports having a good attendance rate.

Between colleges placements Toby also participated in a 4 week work experience placement which he found really helpful as he had never worked before. Although he has faced some difficulties with being able to make money while in full time education, he is not currently looking into employment. His mother feels that he has the skills required for employment when the time comes.

Toby was able to go home to live with his parents so did not require any help with this aspect. However, his mother feels that relationships within the home have improved since leaving Heron.

Since his release from custody, Toby reports that he has not reoffended and that the Unit helped with this a great deal. He participated in the victim awareness module while on the unit; something that his mother feels has been a key contributor as to why he has not reoffended.

Toby hopes to continue studying towards his dream to be a games designer. Both Toby and his mother are positive about his future.

*Toby is a pseudonym
Case study 2

Jake* had a string of little offences, but the Heron Unit was his first time in custody. Prior to the Programme he had problems with drugs.

11 months after release Jake was positive about his time on the Heron Unit, particularly the way staff treated him. Although not on the Unit for a long period of time, Jake participated in a number of modules including money and budgeting module, victim awareness and a module on looking for work (writing cover letters, interview skills, etc). Jake was particularly positive about the victim awareness module he participated in. He was unable to be released on temporary licence due to the length of time he was on the unit for but thought that it would have been useful for sorting out college placements.

Jake spoke positively of his relationship with his Resettlement Broker who he found to be really helpful. They continue to meet weekly at his mum’s house although he feels that he would like to meet up more regularly as they keep him motivated to look for jobs and says that it’s harder when they are not around. Jakes mother also felt that his Resettlement Broker has given him the confidence he needed by helping him sort out finances, helping with CVs and job applications and by giving him encouragement.

As his licence ended Jake is no longer in contact with his YOT worker but says that when they were in contact the relationship was good and that they got on well.

After his release from the Heron Unit Jake went back to college for a few months as he was in college prior to going into custody. The college placement was arranged by his YOT worker at the time but the placement only lasted 3 months as he got into an argument and decided not to go back. Following that he started an apprenticeship but didn’t feel it was for him. He has also started some other jobs that only lasted for short periods of time. Jake felt that the work module on the Heron Unit helped him to get into employment and his attitude to getting into work has changed but he hasn’t found something he wants to do. He had never worked prior to Heron but now knows how to live independently using his own money. Jake has faced difficulties finding a job in the current economic climate and feels that his criminal record holds him back, but he has had some interviews. He has been looking for a job with help from his Broker and they continue to meet weekly to discuss job applications on the computer together. According to Jakes mother he had little interest in educating himself or working prior to Heron but since he has been released his attitude towards employment has changed and he is now keen to work.

Jake was offered help to find accommodation by his Resettlement Broker if needed but it wasn’t required as he moved back to live in his family home. He would like to have own place eventually but is happy living where he is for the time being.

Since his release Jake says that he hasn’t offended and has stayed out of trouble. He reports that since leaving custody he has found himself in situations where before he may have offended but he now thinks more about the victim. Jakes mother felt that prior to the Programme he has little interest in stopping offending but feels that he left the unit a different person and reports that he has stayed away from drugs (which she attributes to work about drug addiction). She also feels that the Programme has given him more self-esteem and confidence which has given him hope for the future.

Jake continues to look for work but is confident about his future. Ideally he would like to have a well paid and full time job.
*Jake is a pseudonym
Summary of data sources

Outlined below is an overview of the data sources implemented as part of the evaluation.

Quantitative research with young people

Ipsos MORI conducted quantitative research with a sample of young people while on the Heron Unit.

Between February 2010 and January 2011, Ipsos MORI carried out 91 face-to-face interviews with young people on the Heron Unit using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI).

These young people were then surveyed again six to nine months after their release (also using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI)). In total 35 young people were followed-up in the community between November 2010 and November 2011. As would be expected a higher attrition rate (drop out rate) is inevitable with follow up work among this audience (i.e. young offenders) as they are notoriously hard to reach. It must also be noted that a significant number of young people declined to be contacted again for follow-up.

Presentation and interpretation of quantitative data

It should be remembered at all times that only a sample of young people were interviewed as part of the quantitative survey, not everyone who had been through the Programme. The use of sub-group analysis has not been possible given the small base sizes.

Given the small sample size, findings are presented as absolute figures for this element of the quantitative study. Where figures do not total the base size, this is due to multiple answers, computer rounding and/or the exclusion of neutral responses.

Qualitative research with young people

In addition to the quantitative interviews carried out with young people, Ipsos MORI also conducted qualitative research with a number of young people who had participated in the Programme. In total, 13 in-depth interviews were carried out with young people while in custody. 12 young people were additionally interviewed following their release from the Heron Unit, of which only 2 were those previously interviewed in custody.

Four additional semi-structured interviews were carried out with young people who had been released from the Heron Unit but who had subsequently returned to custody.

Supplementary qualitative interviews were conducted with five parents of young people who had been through the Programme. These helped to develop case studies and build a more in-depth picture of the transition from custody to community for the young people involved.

Qualitative research with stakeholders

In addition to research with young people, Ipsos MORI carried out qualitative research with stakeholders. Interviews were conducted over two stages of the evaluation, in order to capture stakeholder views at both an early implementation stage and then towards the end of the Programme.

The following table shows a breakdown of the total number of stakeholders interviewed as part of the evaluation.
## The process evaluation (early implementation)

| Qualitative work undertaken with stakeholders | 15 qualitative interviews with policy stakeholders. |
| Qualitative work undertaken with staff on the Heron Unit | 6 qualitative interviews with Heron staff. |
| Qualitative work undertaken with Resettlement Brokers | 1 discussion group with Resettlement Brokers |
| Qualitative work undertaken with Resettlement Brokers | 1 telephone interview with a Resettlement Broker |
| Qualitative work undertaken with YOT workers | 6 qualitative interviews with YOT Champions/YOT workers |

## The outcome evaluation

| Qualitative work undertaken with stakeholders | 16 qualitative interviews with policy stakeholders |
| Qualitative work undertaken with Resettlement Brokers | 1 discussion group with Resettlement Brokers. |
| Qualitative work undertaken with YOT workers | 1 discussion group with YOT workers and 1 interview with a YOT worker |

Across the evaluation, Ipsos MORI also carried out observations of Board Operations and YOT Champions meetings and a review of meeting minutes.

### Presentation and interpretation of qualitative data

Different versions of discussion guides (to reflect the different audiences) were developed for the qualitative work to ensure that key issues were covered and all the research questions were addressed. The discussion guides were not a list of questions to be strictly adhered to, but acted as an *aide mémoire*, allowing the moderator to cover the key topics, but also to probe for additional information and to explore new issues that arose.

Qualitative research involves an interactive process between the moderators carrying out the research and those being researched. It provides a way of probing the underlying attitudes of participants, and obtaining an understanding of the issues of importance. The real value of
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19 Nominated resettlement leads who act as an operational liaison point for the Programme.
qualitative research is that it allows insight into attitudes, and the reasons for these, which could not be probed in as much depth with a structured questionnaire. It produces richer information and more depth and detail around particular areas.

However, it must be remembered that qualitative research is designed to be **illustrative rather than statistically representative**. In addition, it is important to bear in mind that qualitative findings presented throughout the evaluation deal with perceptions rather than facts.

**Case management data**

Case management data on young people released from the Heron Unit between the commencement of the Programme in September 2009 and July 2011 were collected for the purpose of the evaluation. In total, 160 young people were included in the case management data (based on the total number of young people who had been through the Programme at the time the data was extracted). It must be noted that the data collected is based on a sample of young people on the Programme rather than all Programme starts.

The case management data, provided by London YOTs, is used in the preliminary findings report to build a profile and background of young people going through the Programme. For example, data on general demographics such as age and ethnicity, offence history, current offence type and sentence length are included.

**Performance management data**

As part of the performance monitoring process, management data was routinely collected. This data was used to inform Board level discussions throughout the Programme on the extent to which the targets were being met. Produced monthly, these reports (also known as ‘Dashboard’ data) are based on data provided by a number of sources;

- Youth Justice Board
- Rathbone
- Youth Offending teams
- HMYOI Feltham

The reports are used to monitor all starts on the Programme rather than a sample of young people.

Data from September 2009 and January 2012 (most up to date data at the time when the report was published) was reviewed as part of the evaluation. The data is based on 271 Programme starts. Specifically the preliminary findings report looks at the following data collected:

- Throughput of young people on the Programme (accumulative Programme starts and monthly starts)
- Education, training and Employment (ETE) outcomes (% of young people into ETE on release and % of young people in sustained ETE)
- Number of Programme starts released on temporary license (ROTL)
- Incidents (Heron Unit compared to Jay Unit – both at HMYOI Feltham)
LYRRP (Daedalus) is funded and supported by the following;