



The Association of Youth Offending Team Managers (AYM) response to Youth Custody Service (YCS) Safeguarding Policy

About the AYM

The AYM is a professional association representing the majority of youth offending teams (YOT) and their managers in England.

Section 39 (1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires the co-operation of the named statutory partners to form a YOT. Section 38 (1, 2) identifies the statutory partners and places upon them a duty to co-operate in order to secure youth justice services appropriate to their area. These statutory partners are the local authority, police, the probation service, and health. To support the YOT, additional partners may also be recruited to the joint strategic effort to prevent offending by children and young people.

The Association is able to draw on the wealth of knowledge and the breadth of members' experience to promote public understanding of youth crime issues and to play its part in shaping the youth crime agenda.

Our members run services providing community-based supervision for children and young people who offend. We also work with children in custody and work closely with staff in secure units and young offender institutions to ensure that young people receiving custody experience as smooth a transition as possible into custody and back in to the community.

The AYM welcomes the opportunity to provide a response to the updated YCS Safeguarding Policy.

Having reviewed the document, the following comments have been provided:

Response:

5.2.3 – welcome inclusion of liaison with home area; this may take the form of a regional representative or direct involvement of the home area particularly around the use of restraints and that interlink into home YJS area.

6.0 – suggest to split the section into bullying/peer abuse and exploitation separately – currently it reads as though exploitation is only peer to peer and suggest exploitation should be a standalone section.

6.22 – NRM – include that where a child goes becomes aged 18, then consent is required for the NRM process to continue. I'd suggest that a clear position is needed if secure estate is a first responder, escalation process if community teams do not complete NRM where issues flagged have been flagged by the secure estate, and acknowledge some areas have NRM local pilots (as above).

6.34 -36 – it would be worth distinguishing here between care leavers entitlement regarding qualifying, eligible and so forth. Not all children Section 20 will continue to be a looked after child when sentenced to custody; perhaps, this could be framed as expected best practice.

6.61 – I would suggest a bolstering of the role of LADO here and acknowledge the role of home LADOs versus the one in the locality of the secure estate itself.

Annex – response to incidents of serious peer to peer violence – suggest adding in that where the incident relates to multiple community areas a meeting is convened to discuss and explore community impact.

General:

-Inclusion of flowchart for processes –lots of valuable info, but visual rep will help navigate.

-the strategy needs to include current arrangements of 18 year olds staying in the child estate and how this is managed in the policy context.