

## MINUTES OF SCRUTINY REVIEW – PREVENTING CRIME

5 NOVEMBER 2010

Councillors present : Newton (Chair), Christophides, Engert, Gibson, and Waters

Young Advisers: Derekston James.

Youth Justice Board: John Anthony

Police: Chief Inspector Aidan Gibson

Sgt George Hawthorne

PC Graham Brazier

PCSO Chris West

PCSO Benn Save

PCSO Paul Marshall

Catch 22: Angela Francis

Probation Service: Joe Benmore

Education Welfare: Michael Welton

Linda James: Strategic Manager YOS

Ayten Kiani – Targeted youth service

Catherine Williams- Baffoe – Prevention Team YOS

### **PYC6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Reece.

### **PYC7 .URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **PYC8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **PYC9. PRESENTATION FROM YOUTH JUSTICE BOARD REPRESENTATIVE**

John Anthony from the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales gave a presentation to the Panel on the current position and future challenges in preventing youth crime. He referred to changes to targets that had taken place within the police, which had led to more diversionary activities for young people rather than an attitude of just getting them into the system.

Details of the types of targeted prevention programmes that had previously been adopted by Authorities were given. He stated that, in Haringey the Youth offending service had a well established prevention programme.

Characteristics of best practice for prevention included:-

- a strong needs analysis to ensure that the services provided reflected the needs required,
- a good use of ONSET and an increasing use of the CAF aligned to the assessment process (especially if CAF was embedded in the borough;

## MINUTES OF SCRUTINY REVIEW – PREVENTING CRIME

5 NOVEMBER 2010

- youth prevention closely linked with other prevention activity (looking at the whole family approach);
- strong links with schools;
- Triage in place (whether delivered by the YOS or Integrated Youth Support).

There were a number of future challenges and changes ahead which included amongst others:-

- less central government monitoring and targets with the implication to ensure quality assurance,
- changes and uncertainty to the funding and delivery mechanisms, it was likely that the ring -fenced status of the YJB funding would be maintained but with payment by results,
- delivery opened up to third sector involvement,
- a greater understanding of value for money,
- understanding of unit costs,
- benchmarking and how to link unit costs with outcomes,
- greater links with schools in identification of young people at risk and working jointly with the prevention services.

An issue for the Council was how to align services for children attending out of borough schools. It was noted that some boroughs such as Barking and Dagenham had adopted Multi -Agency locality teams, whereby an officer dealing with prevention was based in the six localities that had been set up in the borough. There was also a need to ensure that the prevention activity matched the characteristics of the first time offenders to ensure that the services were correctly targeted. There was a suggestion that the number of referral Panels could be streamlined.

With regard to the future of the grant received from the Youth Justice Board the meeting was advised that there was likely to be a minimum of a 10% reduction in funding post April 2011 over the next 3 years.

Mr Anthony outlined some issues for further consideration. In particular the meeting noted that the YJB were trying to refine the tool kit which had been produced to be able to identify a unit cost for crime prevention , but at present it was not very effective as borough's were inputting different data. It was noted that boroughs did share good practice but this was more likely to happen on an informal basis.

In response to a question around models of good practice in respect of targeted intervention particularly for young black African or black Caribbean males it was noted that some borough's such as Hammersmith and Fulham and Redbridge have bespoke programmes, details of which would be provided.

Mr Anthony was thanked for his presentation.

**Action:**

5 NOVEMBER 2010

That the Panel be provided with the bespoke programmes for young black African or black Caribbean males in operation at Hammersmith and Fulham and Redbridge.

## **PYC9 DISCUSSION WITH PARTNER AGENCIES**

There was a consensus that the sharing of information between the Authority and partners was effective. However, with regard to the Probation Service work was taking place to improve links. It was noted that the Probation service, was represented on both the Gangs Action group and the YOS partnership board, which helped to ensure any concerns over particular young people were fed into the process.

The Council's child poverty and needs assessment were seen as good tools for identification of vulnerable families. A report on this was due to go to the Children's trust in December 2010/January 2011. The Panel asked to see a copy of this as soon as it was published.

Young people were consulted on the provision offered, although it could take time to engage with the young people in the process. Regarding referral to the prevention teams these came from a variety of sources including CAF, Social Services, police, Triage, School, the family and self-referral. In order to be able to assess the effectiveness of the referrals the Panel asked to be provided with the latest file audit from the prevention team in the YOS.

Whilst currently the teams operated on a borough- wide basis, this had not always been the case, as they had started operating just in Bruce Grove ward. However, as it was considered to be an issue across Haringey the service had been made available borough- wide. In response to a request for a list of services available on a Ward basis, members were advised that the Youth Space website identified where activities were available.

There was some discussion around young people who attended out- of- borough schools and the police spoke of the number of young people whose history was unknown and concerns that the recent housing benefits changes would result in more vulnerable families moving into Haringey. The police advised that they were constantly building links with agencies and schools. YOS had a designated teacher in all Haringey secondary schools and colleges. With regard to any bespoke prevention activity in colleges, a suggestion was made that Haringey could link with neighbouring boroughs on this.

The police spoke about the Junior Citizenship scheme offered to Haringey's primary schools which was currently targeted at year 6 pupils, but it was suggested that it might be better targeted at year 2 and 3 pupils as the propensity to commit crime was now occurring at an earlier age. Also the Council has started to deliver restorative programmes for younger children in schools in any attempt to reduce conflict at a younger age.

## MINUTES OF SCRUTINY REVIEW – PREVENTING CRIME

5 NOVEMBER 2010

The Panel noted that the Gangs Action group was an example of joint working with Enfield and other partners. Although there were already links with Broomfield School, it was suggested that there could be more bespoke links with Enfield's education department. It was noted that West London Authorities appeared to work more closely and jointly commissioned specific work.

The Strategic Manager for the YOS spoke about a non-ring-fenced Early Intervention Grant (EIG) which was to be established by pooling funding from a range of early intervention and preventative services. No firm details as to how much Haringey would receive and there was some concern that the money was to be spread across a range of areas.

The representative from Catch 22, the voluntary organisation that ran the Intensive Intervention programme gave details of the work that they carried out. She explained that their work was needs led, and mainly done on a 1-1 basis. The organisation had received funding of £200,000 but this was due to cease at the end of March 2011.

The Panel heard from the Young Adviser on what he thought was important in relation to youth crime. He explained that he was surprised to hear that crime was in decline. However it appeared there was a discrepancy between what young people perceived as a crime and what was defined as a crime i.e. theft of a mobile phone was not considered to be a crime by a young person. There was an issue of young people not reporting a crime for fear of being seen as a "snitch". A suggestion was made that there should be an increase in the ability to report a crime through the schools. There was a general discussion in respect of the role of the police officers linked to schools and how effective they were.

### **Action:**

1. That the Panel be provided with anonymous case file audit.
2. That the Panel be provided with a copy of the Child poverty and needs assessment report as soon as it becomes available.

MARTIN NEWTON  
Chair