



Prevention and Reduction: A review of strategies for intervening early to prevent or reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour

Appendix

Andy Ross, Kathryn Duckworth, David J. Smith, Gill Wyness and Ingrid Schoon

Printing in A3 Recommended

Family-based or individual-centred interventions (International)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA
Life Skills Training							
Life Skills Training is a child skills training programme, designed to directly teach children social, emotional, and cognitive competence by addressing appropriate social skills, effective problem solving, anger management and emotion language	Life Skills Training was designed to address several important cognitive, attitudinal, psychological, and social factors related to tobacco, alcohol, and illicit drug use and violence. Pupils were taught a variety of cognitive-behavioural skills for problem-solving and decision-making, resisting media influences, managing stress and anxiety, communicating effectively, developing healthy personal relationships, and asserting one's rights.	Life Skills Training was universally applied to all children aged 11-12 in the treatment schools. However the sample schools were composed largely of disadvantaged youth (55% received free school meals and 30% living in single parent households), i.e. selective sample	Skills were taught using a combination of interactive teaching techniques including group discussion, demonstration, modelling, behavioural rehearsal, feedback and reinforcement, and behavioural "homework" assignments for out-of-class practice. The programme also taught pupils skills related specifically related to substance abuse and violence, which included the application of general assertiveness skills in situations in which they might experience pressure to use drugs or act aggressively as well as anger management and conflict resolution skills. Handouts were also provided to reinforce norms against substance use and violence. The programme was taught over 15 sessions	Yes: the programme was evaluated at 41 New York City public and parochial schools	Level 5: Students in 20 experimental schools (n=2,374) received the prevention program, and students in 21 control schools (n=2,484) received the standard health education curriculum normally provided in New York City schools.	Violence and delinquent behaviours were assessed by questionnaire asking the number of times the pupil had committed an act in the last year. The violence measures assessed verbal aggression, physical aggression, and fighting, and delinquency questions measured destroying others property, throwing objects at people or cars, shoplifting, stealing from others, taking something from someone by force, or intentionally vandalising a school or other building. For the full sample the intervention reduced delinquency in the past year (OR=.684, 95% CI=.477, .982, p<.039). The intervention also reduced frequent fighting in the past year (OR=.742, 95% CI=.566, .972, p<.030), and frequent delinquency in the past year (OR=.643, 95% CI=.478, .867, p<.004). There were also increased effects for pupils attending at least half of the programme	\$25.61 saved for every \$1 spent (Aos et al., 2004)
Behavioural Parent Training							
Behavioural Parent Training is premised on the idea that antisocial behaviour is learned and sustained by positive and negative reinforcement that children receive from others, especially their parents.	The approach is aimed at changing patterns of parental behaviour so that pro-social behaviours receive positive reinforcement and aversive behaviours are punished or ignored.	Eligible children were all those aged 3 to 8 years who were referred for antisocial behaviour (i.e. indicative sample) to their local multidisciplinary child and adolescent mental health service. Exclusion criteria were clinically apparent major developmental delay, hyperkinetic syndrome, or any other condition requiring separate treatment.	The parents of six to eight children were seen as a group for two hours each week over 13-16 weeks. The programme covered play, praise and rewards, limit setting, and handling misbehaviour. In each session, two group leaders showed videotaped scenes of parents and children together, which depict "right" and "wrong" ways of handling children. Parents discussed their own child's behaviour and were supported while they practised alternative ways of managing it. Each week tasks were set for parents to practice at home and telephone calls made to encourage progress. Intervention sessions were videotaped, and weekly supervision meetings were held	Yes: An evaluation was carried out across four NHS child and adolescent mental health services: Croydon, Brixton/Belgrave/Camberwell, St George's (all south London), and Chichester (West Sussex).	Level 5: In each centre participants were allocated to intervention or control (waiting list) using a permuted block design. Each block consisted of a consecutive three month period, during which all eligible referrals were allocated to one arm of the trial. Participants in the control arm were offered treatment after completion of the trial.	For antisocial behaviour, control children showed no change and intervention children showed a large improvement (Average conduct problems score for control before:1.53, after: 1.57; Treatment before: 1.59, after: 1.16). There were similar results on all other outcome measures including Strengths and Difficulties questionnaire, a child behaviour check list, parent defined problems	No rigorous cost-benefit analysis, however the programme costs just £371 per child
Parenting Wisely							
Parenting Wisely is a behavioural parent training programme which is self-administered using CD ROM	Parenting Wisely teaches adaptive parenting skills in the form of using "I" statements, active listening, contracting, monitoring children's behaviour, problem solving, assertive discipline, parenting as a team, positive reinforcement, speaking respectfully, and contingency management. The program was developed from both cognitive-behavioural and family systems models.	The programme is designed for families at risk with children aged 0-18 years	Parenting skills are presented in a series of videotaped segments showing families attempting to deal with problems, such as children not doing homework or not obeying parental requests. After a case study is presented, the parent is instructed to choose one of three solutions, that is most similar to the way he or she would handle that situation. A videotaped portrayal of that solution is then displayed on the computer screen. The program then critiques the chosen solution, providing feedback to the parent on both the positive and negative consequences of dealing with the problem in the chosen manner.	Yes: the effectiveness of Parenting Wisely has been demonstrated in a number of evaluation studies	Level 4: Randomised control trial comparing programme to a no treatment control group	Gordon and Kacir (1998) examined the effectiveness of the programme when used with 60 court-referred parents of juvenile delinquents. These parents were often resistant to treatment, unmotivated, and had repeatedly demonstrated poor parenting practices in the past. Nevertheless, these parents also showed improvement, in comparison to a no-treatment control group, on both the ECBI Total Problems scale and on a parenting knowledge test. These improvements were demonstrated at three and six-months post-treatment.	No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of Parenting Wisely has been conducted

Family-based or individual-centred interventions (International)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA
<p>Teen Triple P</p> <p>Teen Triple P is a multi-level programme that aims to tailor information, advice and professional support depending on the needs of an individual family, recognising that parents have differing needs and desires regarding the type, intensity and mode of assistance they may require</p>	<p>Interventions range from the provision of media messages on positive parenting, through to brief information resources such as tip sheets and videos, and brief targeted interventions (for specific behaviour problems) offered by primary care practitioners at Levels 2 and 3, to more intensive parent training at Level 4 and Level 5 programs targeting broader family issues such as relationship conflict and parental depression, anger and stress</p>	<p>Depending on the level of intervention this ranges from all parents (i.e. universal) through to parents with children displaying problematic/delinquent behaviour</p>	<p>Level 1: Involves using health promotion and social marketing strategies to make available to parents information about how they can promote their child's development and deal with commonly encountered behaviour issues</p> <p>Level 2: involves primary care professionals in regular contact with families having periodic discussions with parents about developmental and behavioural issues</p> <p>Level 3: Primary Care interventions incorporate brief behavioural counselling as an early detection and brief intervention approach to managing identified problems</p> <p>Level 4: Group or self-directed behavioural parent training</p> <p>Level 5: Intensive home based intervention to include home-based skills training, mood management and stress coping skills for parents, and marital communication skills as required</p>	<p>Although the Triple P programme has been extensively evaluated, Teen Triple P has little evaluation evidence</p>	<p>Level 2 Evaluation of Teen Triple P group parenting programme - RCT attempted, however the sample size was too small to enable comparisons</p>	<p>parent-teenager conflict reduced from a mean of 7.0 to 4.5 post-treatment ($F=9.76$, df 1,25, $p<.01$); parenting styles improved, with reductions on the laxness score from 17.3 to 13.5 ($F=15.99$, df 1,25, $p<.01$), and on over-reactivity from 20.5 to 17.1 ($F=8.91$, df 1,25, $p<.01$); parental beliefs also changed for the better, with parents reporting significant improvements on measures of self-efficacy ($F=14.34$, df 1,25, $p<.01$), self-sufficiency ($F=6.45$, df 1,25, $p<.05$) and self-management ($F=9.05$, df 1,25, $p<.01$), but not on personal agency ($F=2.33$, df 1,25, $p>.05$); and on the measure of parental conflict over their parenting strategies, parents reported an improvement from 5.3 to 3.1 ($F=8.84$, df 1,25, $p<.01$).</p>	<p>No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of Teen Triple P has been conducted</p>

School-centred interventions (International)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA
<p>Student Training Through Urban Strategies (STATUS) STATUS represents the regrouping of high risk or disruptive students for alternative classes for part of the school day</p>		Applied to high risk youths aged 13-15	High risk youths were brought together for 2 hours each day to receive an 'integrated social studies and English program'. This involved a low-related education curriculum, familiarising them with the countries laws, developing an appreciation of the legal process, encouraging responsible political participation, developing moral and ethical values, as well as developing analytical skills, and used an interactive approach to teaching that emphasized student participation. The programme lasted one academic year.	Yes	Level 3: A randomized control trial of the programme was attempted but was unsuccessful leading to non-equivalent experimental and control groups	outcomes post intervention included significantly lower rates of criminal activity in experimental over control groups (18 per cent) and reduced levels of antisocial behaviour (12 per cent). The programme was also associated with lower rates of school drop out and truancy (12 per cent), however these results were not statistically significant	No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of STATUS was conducted
<p>Seattle Social Development Project The Seattle Social Development Project is an example of a classroom or instruction management intervention, which involves the use of instructional methods which increase student participation in the learning process, as well as classroom management strategies, for example the use of rewards and punishments contingent on behaviour</p>	The programme represents a package of instructional methods taught in mainstream classrooms. The idea is that improved instruction is of particular benefit to low achievers in terms of behaviour, attitudes, and achievement.	Applied both universally and to at risk populations	Proactive classroom management that involves establishing classroom routines at the beginning of the year that are conducive to learning, including giving clear and explicit instructions for appropriate pupil behaviour and recognising and rewarding attempts to comply, in addition to strategies for minimising disruption. Interactive teaching that involves the use of frequent assessment, setting clear objectives, checking for understanding, and remediation. Cooperative learning which involves pupils of differing ability and background coming together to master curriculum material and receive recognition as a team for their group's performance. Parent training in family management practices was also provided.	Yes: Several evaluations have been conducted demonstrating consistent significant positive effects on attachment and commitment to school	Level 3: Random controlled trial in which pupils had been randomly assigned to treatment or control	Measures of self-destructive behaviour (and measures of aggressive behaviour) favoured treatment vs. control. Other studies using a less than randomised design demonstrates consistent significant positive effects on attachment and commitment to school	No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of the Seattle Social Development Project was conducted
<p>Positive Action Through Holistic Education (PATHE) PATHE falls under school discipline and management interventions, which are those aimed at changing the decision-making process or authority structures to enhance the general capacity of the school, and often involve teams of staff and sometimes parents, students and community members engaging in and carrying out activities to improve the school.</p>	A distinguishing feature of the programme is the involvement of school staff, students, and community members in revising school policies and designing and managing school change who together change disciplinary procedures, enhance the school programme with activities aimed at increasing achievement, and creating a more positive school climate. There is also a selective component of academic and counselling services for low achieving or disruptive pupils.	Both selective and indicative samples. All staff and students in nine schools (7 in a densely populated depressed area in an inner city, 2 in a rural impoverished area) and 10% of young people showing academic or behavioural problems were selected for further targeted services	Five teams composed of school staff, pupils, parents, and community members who accomplished most of the school wide innovations, which included a curriculum review and revision aimed at increasing teacher competencies and improving curriculum development and delivery, innovations aimed at improving academic performance (e.g. test taking, study skills), interventions to enhance school climate (e.g. school pride campaigns), programmes to prepare pupils for careers, and academic and affective services for high risk individuals	Yes: An evaluation in five middle schools and four high schools in Charleston County, South Carolina	Level 4: Two schools - one high school and one middle school - were selected to match the treatment schools as close as possible received no intervention	The students in the participating high schools reported significantly less delinquent behaviour (ES=-.16) and drug use (ES=-.19), had fewer suspensions (ES=-.27), and fewer school punishments (ES=-.18) after the first year of the program. Students in the comparison high school did not change significantly on these outcomes. A similar pattern was observed for the middle schools after two years. As serious delinquency increased significantly in the comparison school, it decreased (nonsignificantly) in the program middle schools (ES=-.27). Changes in drug use (ES=-.13) and school punishments (ES=-.15) also favoured the program schools.	No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of STATUS was conducted

Neighbourhood / Community Interventions (International)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA
<p>Big Brothers Big Sisters</p> <p>Big Brothers Big Sisters is the world's largest mentoring program helping over 270,000 children around the world reach their potential through professionally supported one-to-one relationships</p>	<p>The BBBS program pairs unrelated adult volunteers with youth from single-parent households using an approach that is intensive in delivery and broad in scope. Both the volunteer and the youth make a substantial time commitment, agreeing to meet two to four times per month for at least one year, with a typical meeting lasting four hours.</p>	<p>Selective: 10 – 16 year olds the large majority of whom were living in a low income, one parent family. Many also came from households with a prior history of family violence or substance abuse</p>	<p>The foremost goal is the development of a relationship that is mutually satisfying, where both parties come together freely on a regular basis. Secondary goals, which are identified in an extensive interview between a case manager, the child and his or her parents/guardians, for example, can include school attendance, academic performance, relationships with other children and siblings, general hygiene, learning new skills, or developing a hobby. The program's success is attributable to the thorough screening of volunteers, weeding out uncommitted or unsafe volunteers; training that includes communication and time limiting skills, and tips on interacting and relationship-building; mentor and mentee matching; and the intensive supervision and support by a case manager who provides assistance as requested or as difficulties arise</p>	<p>Yes: an evaluation was carried out across the USA including programmes in San Antonio, Texas; Columbus, Ohio; Houston; Greater Minneapolis; Philadelphia; Rochester, New York; Wichita, Kansas; and Phoenix, Arizona</p>	<p>Level 5: baseline interviews with all youth at the time they were found eligible for the program, then randomly assigned them either to the treatment group, who were immediately eligible to be matched with adult volunteers, or to the control group, who remained on a waiting list for 18 months</p>	<p>Both groups were interviewed at baseline and then re-interviewed 18 months later. Participants were 46 percent less likely than controls to initiate drug use during the study period, 27 percent less likely to initiate alcohol use, and were almost one-third less likely to hit someone. They also skipped half as many days of school, skipped fewer classes, felt more competent about doing schoolwork, and showed modest gains in their grade point averages. Quality of relationships with parents was better, due primarily to a higher level of trust in the parent. Likewise, there were improvements in relationships with peers.</p>	<p>\$3.28 saved for every \$1 spent (Aos et. al., 2004)</p>
<p>Participate and Learn Skills (PALS)</p> <p>Participate and Learn Skills is an after school recreation programme which helps children build social and practical skills and develops positive pathways for participants and their families by linking them with other activities and services in their local communities.</p>	<p>Participate and Learn Skills enables young people to learn new skills and express non-academic competencies, whilst also reducing unsupervised time for engaging in delinquent behaviour</p>	<p>Children aged 5 – 15 from low income families</p>	<p>young people living in a public housing estate were recruited to participate in after school activities aimed at improving skills in sports, music, dance, scouting and as well as other non-sporting activities. The programme aimed to advance children toward higher skill levels as well as integrate children into activities in the wider community. It was hoped that this skill-development programme would also have positive effects on other areas of life, e.g. developing pro-social attitudes and behaviours.</p>	<p>Yes: In a public housing estate in Ohio, Canada</p>	<p>Level 3: A control trial in which the public housing estate was matched with a similar control site</p>	<p>The monthly average number of young people charged by the police was 80 per cent lower than the control site post-intervention. However, this had reduced to around 50 per cent lower 16 months later, which although suggests no sustained effect, does confirm that the original effect was associated with the intervention</p>	<p>\$2.60 saved for every \$1 spent</p>
<p>LA's BEST After School Enrichment Programme</p> <p>LA's BEST provide a safe and supervised after school education, enrichment and recreation program for elementary school children ages 5 to 12 in the City of Los Angeles</p>	<p>LA's BEST seeks to provide a safe haven for at-risk students in neighbourhoods where gang violence, drugs and other types of anti-social behaviours are common</p>	<p>The programme is housed in selected schools, chosen because they have low academic performance and are located in low income, high crime areas</p>	<p>Educational and enrichment programmes are provided in cognitive/academic activities (homework time, tutoring, academic incentive programs, math and science activities, reading and writing activities, computer activities, and psychological programs addressing conflict resolution skills); recreational activities (arts and crafts, cooking, games, holiday activities, and sports such as aerobics, karate, and team sports); and performing and visual arts (choir and music, dance, drama/theatre, flag/drill team, museum visits, art camps)</p>	<p>Yes: The National Centre for the Research in Educational Standards and Student Testings in UCLA has established a longitudinal database on programme participants (as well as a longitudinal database on a comparison group of control students</p>	<p>Level 3: Multilevel propensity score matching was used to match participants with a suitable control group</p>	<p>Survival analysis was used to estimate the probability of a young person remaining crime free (measured by arrests) over a 10 year period. 93 per cent of participants who were actively and intensely engaged in the programme avoided a criminal record over the period compared to 91 per cent of those who were moderately engaged and 88 per cent of non-participants (controls)</p>	<p>\$2.50 saved for every \$1 spent</p>

Family-based or individual-centred interventions (England)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA	Current implementation in the UK	International comparison
<p>YOT Parenting Programmes</p> <p>Parenting interventions are designed to develop parents' skills in order to reduce parenting as a risk factor and enhance it as a protective factor.</p>	<p>Parenting programmes provide parents with an opportunity to improve their skills in dealing with the behaviour that puts their child at risk of offending. They provide parents/carers with one-to-one advice, as well as practical support in handling the behaviour of their child, setting appropriate boundaries and improving communication. Parenting programmes have three main aims to teach parents specific parenting skills to improve parent-child relationships; to help parents manage their children's behaviour better.</p>	<p>Most parents are offered a parenting programme because the YOT is already working with their child, and has made an assessment of need. In most cases, parents attend voluntarily, but some are subject to formal Parenting Contracts or Parenting Orders.</p>	<p>In all cases, the YOT first carries out an assessment of need, to decide on the best way of working with the parents, which can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • working with several different parents in a group • one-to-one support (this ranges from in-home visits, to private meetings at the YOT, to telephone support and advice) • working with the whole family (for instance, family therapy). 	<p>Yes: the YJB's evaluation of parenting programmes was carried out by the independent Policy Research Bureau. The research took place between June 1999 and December 2001. Thirty four projects were included in the national evaluation, each of which were also assessed by locally-based research teams. Around 800 parents and 500 young people provided information for the national evaluation. In addition, around 800 project workers provided assessments of parents' progress.</p>	<p>Level 2: Data on parents' attitudes and experiences were gathered at the start of their exposure to the project, and for those who stayed the course, at the end. The key findings on the impact of the Programme are based on a sub-sample of 200. It is, of course, likely that this sample under-represents, at least to some extent, parents who were seriously disaffected with the Parenting Programme, and those with the very highest level of need.</p>	<p>In the short term at least, participation in the Parenting Programme was associated with positive improvements in parenting skills and parent-child relationships, and with high satisfaction levels. There was no difference in the level of benefit reported by parents who were referred voluntarily as opposed to being referred via a Parenting Order. There was some mild (but mostly statistically non-significant) evidence of positive change for young people in various aspects of their relationship with their parent during the time their parent participated in the Programme. And, in the year after their parents left the Parenting Programme, it was also the case that reconviction rates of young people had reduced to 61.5% (a reduction of nearly one third), offending had dropped to 56%, and the average number of offences per young person had dropped to 2.1 (a 50% reduction).</p>	<p>No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of YOT's Parenting Programmes has been undertaken.</p>	<p>There are currently 42 pilot parenting programmes running in England, set up and run by Yots in partnership with other local agencies, both voluntary and statutory.</p>	
<p>Think Family Pathfinders</p> <p>Think Family Pathfinders bring together tailored services and systems reform to ensure that families at risk receive a whole family package of support.</p>	<p>The approaches are building on the successes of existing whole family approaches, such as FIPs.</p>	<p>Pathfinders are intended to reach the most vulnerable families currently not being helped by services, as well as carry out more preventative work aimed at those whose situation may escalate without preventative support.</p>	<p>A key component of Pathfinders work is bringing together adult and children's services.</p>	<p>Yes: three-year evaluation by York Consulting LLP - reporting in March 2011. The evaluation has three broad aims: process; to measure improvements in outcomes for families at risk; economic evaluation to assess the costs and benefits. Preliminary findings will be published as a series of updates.</p>	<p>AWAITING FURTHER DETAIL.</p>		<p>Expected as part of the York Consulting evaluation.</p>	<p>The Family Pathfinder Programme aims to test and develop the 'Think Family' model, which was set out in the Cabinet Office's Report 'Think Family: Improving the Life Chances of Families at Risk'. The Pathfinders are: Blackpool, Bolton, Brighton and Hove, Durham, Gateshead, Islington, Leeds, Salford, Somerset, Southampton, Southend, Sunderland, Walsall, Warrington and Westminster. In addition to the core Family Pathfinder model, six local authority (LA) areas, 'Extended Family Pathfinders', are extending their work to include systems and support services to address the needs of families with young carers. The Extended Pathfinders are: Bolton, Gateshead, Islington, Leeds, Somerset and Sunderland.</p>	
<p>Strengthening Families, Strengthening Communities (SFSC)</p> <p>SFSC aims to facilitate strong ethnic and cultural roots, positive parent-child relationships, life skills, self-esteem, self-discipline, social competence, and to assist families in accessing community resources.</p>	<p>SFSC consists of 12 three-hour sessions (and additionally an orientation session), with children aged three to eight years delivered weekly. Each group includes between eight and 20 parents, and incentives, such as transport, refreshments and/or childcare are typically provided.</p>	<p>Black and minority ethnic parents aged three to eight years</p>	<p>SFSC uses a number of strategies to help achieve its aims, including providing information to parents, developing effective anger management strategies and positive disciplinary techniques, decreasing parental isolation by connecting families to community resources, and providing a cultural framework to validate the experiences of different ethnic groups.</p>	<p>Yes: Pre and post-course assessment. Also included in the national evaluation of Parenting Early Intervention Pathfinders (PEIP) project.</p>	<p>Level 2</p>	<p>Measured outcomes: Positive discipline, parent-child relationships, increased parenting skills and community involvement. Robust evidence of effectiveness for the UK is still awaited, but the programme has shown promising results in an (uncontrolled) evaluation. This found statistically significant increases amongst participants' family activities and discussions, the use of positive discipline and communication strategies, a decrease in the use of negative discipline and communication strategies and an increase in both parents' and children's competence.</p>	<p>No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of SFSC has been undertaken.</p>	<p>SFSC is being piloted as part of the Parenting Early Intervention Pathfinders project</p>	<p>In the US, the programme has been delivered to a diverse range of populations, including African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Pacific Islanders (Vietnamese, Korean, etc) as well as White Americans, mixed heritage and African immigrant populations. In addition, SFSC has been implemented in both rural and urban populations, with mothers as well as fathers, offenders and parents with physical disabilities.</p>

Family-based or individual-centred interventions (England)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA	Current implementation in the UK	International comparison
<p>Functional Family Therapy (FFT)</p> <p>FFT is a family-based intervention designed to help dysfunctional children aged 11 to 18. The programme aims to improve behaviour by helping family members understand how their behaviour affects others. FFT helps children and their families reduce defensive and aggressive communication patterns and promote supportive interaction in the family. It also addresses supervision and effective discipline.</p>	<p>FFT is based on systems approaches which recognise the importance of environmental contexts or systems in determining behaviour. In addition, FFT draws on behaviourism, particularly the social learning variant of the behavioural model, which emphasises concepts such as reciprocity, coercion and the 'functionality' of positive and negative behaviours. FFT is a brief multi-systemic family intervention typically consisting of 12 one to two-hour sessions (although 26-30 hours are offered to particularly problematic families) extending over a three-month period.</p>	<p>Families with children/young people displaying anti-social, delinquent and/or criminal behaviour. Young people are aged 11-18 and at risk for and/or presenting with delinquency, violence, substance use, Conduct Disorder, Oppositional Defiant Disorder, or Disruptive Behaviour Disorder</p>	<p>FFT emphasises factors which enhance protective factors and reduce risk. In order to accomplish these changes in the most effective manner, FFT is a phasic program with steps which build upon each other. These phases consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Engagement, designed to emphasize within youth and family factors that protect youth and families from early program dropout; •Motivation, designed to change maladaptive emotional reactions and beliefs, and increase alliance, trust, hope, and motivation for lasting change; •Assessment, designed to clarify individual, family system, and larger system relationships, especially the interpersonal functions of behaviour and how they related to change techniques; •Behaviour Change, which consists of communication training, specific tasks and technical aids, basic parenting skills, problem solving and conflict management skills, contracting and response-cost techniques; •Generalization, during which family case management is guided by individualized family functional needs, their interface with community based environmental constraints and resources, and the alliance with the FFT therapist/Famil 	<p>The first randomised controlled trial of Functional Family Therapy (FFT) within the UK is currently underway. The SAFE Study (Study of Adolescents' Family Experiences) is being conducted by the National Academy for Parenting Practitioners (NAPP) at the Institute of Psychiatry (King's College London) in partnership with Brighton & Hove Youth offending services (YOS), Targeted Youth Support Services (TYSS), Anti-Social Behaviour Team and West Sussex YOS.</p>	<p>Level 5: The RCT will involve 100 families and allow for a comparison of outcomes between children and young people who receive a range of interventions aimed at reducing crime and antisocial behaviour (treatment as usual) and those who receive TAU plus FFT</p>	<p>In the UK evaluation, the primary outcome measure will be the effect of including FFT on offending/re-offending and Anti-Social Behaviour. The evaluation will also examine mediator effects, specifically changes in amounts of negativity, communication skills and problem solving abilities. In the US, FFT has demonstrated its effectiveness in reducing recidivism (including serious and adult criminality) and foster care utilization in a number of methodologically rigorous studies. In addition, there is evidence of FFT's long-term effectiveness, and positive post-intervention outcomes when delivered by paraprofessionals.</p>	<p>No cost-benefit analysis of FFT in the UK has been undertaken. US CBA: Benefit to cost ratio 7:1</p>	<p>FFT began its first trial in Brighton in 2007.</p>	<p>Functional Family Therapy is a Blueprint Model Program and has been evaluated in the US.</p>

<p>Family Intervention Projects (FIPs)</p> <p>Launched in January 2006, FIPs work with the most challenging families to reduce anti-social behaviour, youth crime and school absenteeism and get vulnerable young people back in school, improve their key skills as well as their physical and mental health by helping parents to set boundaries.</p>	<p>Families are supported by a dedicated key worker who coordinates a multi-agency package of intensive, tailored actions and clear sanctions to improve the behaviour of persistently anti-social households. The most common way support is delivered to families is through outreach or floating support, for example challenging anti-social behaviour and one-to-one parenting support. The average length of a completed FIP intervention is just over 12 months and involved 9.2 hours of contact time between FIP staff and families per week at the beginning of intervention and around 7 hours by the end.</p>	<p>There is considerable variation in the types of families being targeted in different areas and several different agencies involved in referrals. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • families with young children and substance misuse problems, • families of prisoners, • families with a Pre-life and other Priority Offenders (PPO), • families engaged in gun and knife related offences. <p>Having areas targeting different families was intentional in order to test out different approaches, underpinned by a common FIPs model. Socio-demographic profile of targeted families indicates that the majority were large, predominantly White families, headed by a lone parent.</p>	<p>- Formal assessment followed up by a detailed Support Plan and contract which is reviewed on a regular basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus on 'most-problematic' families - Multi-agency - Dedicated key worker - Whole-family approach 	<p>FIPs have been extensively evaluated and, on the whole, Evaluations of FIPs are consistently show positive outcomes for families. However, concerns have been raised over results for families who refused to evaluations cannot be used to assess work with the FIP from the outset, those who disengaged with the programme or otherwise failed to complete the intervention. Criticisms have also been made of the 'qualitative' measure of ASB used throughout the FIPs evaluations, for example, there is no quantitative information about the severity or frequency of ASB.</p>	<p>Results for families that complete the intervention show positive improvements across a wide range of measures including in the proportion of families involved in ASB • declines in truancy rates, bad behaviour do and exclusions at school • reductions in concerns about child protection, domestic violence, drug or substance misuse and drinking problems. Early indications suggest that these outcomes are sustained for families who have been followed up 9 to 14 months after they exited a FIP intervention.</p>	<p>Average cost per family ranges from £8,000 to £20,000 per year. One study estimated the cost to the tax payer as £250-350K per family, per year</p>	<p>By October 2009, 3,657 families had been referred to an ASB FIP with 2,734 being offered and 2,655 accepting a FIPs intervention. The original target set was for 20,000 families to receive a FIP by 2011.</p>	
--	---	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

Family-based or individual-centred interventions (England)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA	Current implementation in the UK	International comparison
<p>Intensive Intervention Projects (IIPs) IIPs were introduced alongside Challenge & Support projects through Youth Taskforce Action Plan in March 2008. IIPs are an extension of the Antisocial Behaviour (ASB) Family Intervention Projects (FIPs), using a contract-based approach to engage with 'problem' families. IIPs use the 'triple track' approach and apply lessons learnt from Family Intervention Projects.</p>	<p>YIPs sign a contract for changing their behaviour, outlining the consequences if challenging young people, aged they don't make the change – including between 8 and 19, every year. consequences for their whole families. In return, they get the intensive support they need to give them a real chance of getting over their problems.</p>	<p>IIPs target 1,000 of the most serious young people, aged 10-17 years, who are at risk of out of home placement in either care or custody, due to delinquent and aggressive behaviour, and anti-social attitudes</p>	<p>IIPs target individual young people using a 'triple track' approach of tough enforcement, non-negotiable support and better prevention. Appropriate support such as drug treatment, literacy training. IIPs also address the roots of delinquent and anti-social behaviour: difficult family circumstances, lack of firm boundaries, lack of opportunities. Building on the Family Intervention Project model, IIPs take an assertive and persistent approach, not taking 'no' for an answer, and are co-ordinated by a key worker.</p>	<p>Yes – there are two separate but interrelated evaluation strands: both reporting in March 2011: an Information System (IS) collecting management and evaluation data (National Centre for Social Research), and an individual case study approach (Sheffield Hallam)</p>	<p>IS evaluation: Level 2. The evaluation by Nat Cen proposed capturing data both pre and post intervention to assess the impact of IIP.</p>	<p>Early findings from the qualitative evaluation highlight that YPs and their families have very complex and serious needs, often relatively and pronounced than for many families who had been subject to traditional FIPs. Many cases involve individuals where previous support and/or enforcement have not been effective. SEN is central in many cases. Projects have achieved successes ranging from improving school attendance, reducing ASB, building self-esteem, improving parenting skills and communication within households.</p>	<p>No rigorous CBA of IIPs have been conducted. Internal DfE estimates suggest that the annual average spend per YP expected to be reached by IIP is £400.</p>	<p>IIPs are being piloted in 20 areas running from April 2009 to run until March 2011 to work with up to 50 young people a year. By early May 2010, 1001 YPs had been accepted for an IIP intervention across the 20 projects (in the 13 months of operation).</p>	
<p>Intensive Fostering (Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care in England) Intensive Fostering (based on the MTFC model in the US) is an alternative to custody for children and YPs whose home life is felt to have contributed significantly to their offending behaviour. MTFC is a community-based intervention in which multi-disciplinary team works intensively with young people and their families during a placement with specially trained foster carers, encouraging and reinforcing positive behaviours and diverting young people from delinquent peers.</p>	<p>Holds YPs to account for their crimes while ensuring that they get the support they need within their community to address factors that may have contributed to their offending behaviour, such as mental health issues or substance misuse. The programme provides highly intensive care for up to 12 months for each individual, as well as a comprehensive programme of support for their family, but the aim of the IF programme is that, in most cases, substantial impact on their offending behaviour. criteria for family, where, through the work done with the family, the YP will receive a reasonable amount of consistent and authoritative care and support, and that desired behaviours will continue to be encouraged and reinforced in a positive manner.</p>	<p>The Intensive Fostering model is targeted at serious and persistent young offenders for whom the alternative to fostering would be custody or an Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme (ISSP), see below for further detail). IF is intended for those young people at risk of custody, for whom parenting and lifestyle are perceived to have a programme eligibility are based on the severity scores of two key variables on the YJB's Asset assessment tool: 'family and personal relationships' and 'lifestyle'.</p>	<p>A support team is employed to work with - the child or the young person, in developing their social skills and changing their behaviours and attitudes - the birth family, by offering a range of support, including family therapy, counselling and Fostering in preventing re-conviction. It compared young people in Intensive Fostering placements with a matched group entering secure care (an Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme (ISSP)) or custodial institutions and then discharged to the community. Reconviction data on the IF group were examined at baseline, one year after entry to foster placement, and also one year after they had left foster placement. For the comparison group, reconviction data were examined one year after release from custody or sentence to ISSP. The study also compared a number of secondary outcomes including: emotional and behavioural difficulties; family and peer relationships; participation in education or training.</p>	<p>The study was carried out jointly by the universities of York and Manchester and London School of Economics and evaluated the effectiveness of Intensive Fostering in preventing re-conviction. It compared young people in Intensive Fostering placements with a matched group entering secure care (an Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Programme (ISSP)) or custodial institutions and then discharged to the community. Reconviction data on the IF group were examined at baseline, one year after entry to foster placement, and also one year after they had left foster placement. For the comparison group, reconviction data were examined one year after release from custody or sentence to ISSP. The study also compared a number of secondary outcomes including: emotional and behavioural difficulties; family and peer relationships; participation in education or training.</p>	<p>Level 3. Note, however, small sample N=23 in the IF sample. It is also important to note that, in theory, the young people in IF are more intensively supervised than those receiving the YOT supervised community portion of their DTO sentence, and slightly more intensively supervised than young people on with their foster carers, the reconviction rate for substantive offences rose to 74%, which was virtually equal to that for the comparison group (75%). Twelve months after release from custody, the IF sample were more likely to be engaged in education or training. However, there were no differences between the two groups in terms of continued association with pro-criminal peers (diversion from anti-social peers is a key element of group, and following release from custody the MTFC programme). At follow-up, one year after the start of the IF placements/releases for the comparison group.</p>	<p>YPs in the IF sample had lower rates of reoffending and offences committed were less serious than those in the comparison group: on average, during the year after the IF placements began (and the comparison group left custody or were sentenced to ISSP), the IF placement cost £53,990. Invest to save Analysis from the Centre for Child & Family Research at Loughborough University (2008) showed a reduction in social care costs when children were placed in MTFCE. The social care costs incurred by the sample children in the first six months of MTFCE were about 15% less than those they had incurred in the six months prior to entry. The monthly costs of maintaining MTFCE placements were also substantially less than those of the residential placements that some of the sample would have entered had the service not been available. From the US: Studies by both Chamberlain and Reid (1998, 1991) and Aou et al. (1999), for example, provided evidence that MTFC is considerably more cost effective than residential provision in the USA.</p>	<p>The Intensive Fostering scheme is currently being piloted with foster care providers in Wexnes, Trafford, London and Staffordshire. Placements of young people in homes began in early 2005. In 2008, there were thirteen MTFC-A (adolescents) teams; three under contract with the DCSF and ten in the Network Partnership contract.</p>	<p>The scheme is based on the US Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) model which has been used successfully with offenders in Oregon since the 1980s and has been extensively evaluated.</p>	
<p>Multi-systemic Therapy (MST) MST is an intensive family and community-based treatment for youth with serious behavioural problems that addresses the multiple determinants of serious antisocial behaviour in juvenile offenders. Individuals are viewed as being nested within a complex network of interconnected systems that encompass individual, family, and extra-familial (peer, school, neighbourhood) factors.</p>	<p>MST is a therapy-based programme provided in the home. Duration is approximately 60 hours of contact over 4 months. MST involves work with the whole family on every front, from parenting education to increasing the young people's engagement in education, behaviour, and anti-social attitudes or training to tackling drinking and drug taking and improving mental health. MST addresses the multiple factors known to be related to delinquency and strives to promote behaviour change in YPs' environments by drawing on the strengths of each system on influence – family, peers, school, neighbourhood etc.</p>	<p>MST is used with children and young people aged 11-17 years and their families, where young people are at risk of out of home placement in either care or custody, due to delinquent and aggressive behaviour, and anti-social attitudes</p>	<p>Family therapy - Behavioural Parent Training - Cognitive Behaviour Therapies. MST aims to empower YPs to cope with problems and parents to address difficulties with teenagers and within a context of support and skills building. therapist places appropriate demands on YPs and families for responsible behaviour</p>	<p>Initial findings of the first UK randomised control trial evaluation of MST suggests that in families with multiple problems its use can reduce the risk of re-offending, particularly among boys.</p>	<p>Level 5: over a 5-6 year period, 108 young offenders (aged 13-16) and their parents were randomly allocated (according to gender, ethnicity and severity of offending) to a group receiving MST and YOS services as usual (N=56) or to a group receiving services without MST (N=52). Follow-up offending: 6, 12, 24, 36 months; follow-up custodial sentences; pre/post measures: individual, family and psychosocial risks; school adjustment; CBA (planned) and qualitative interviews re. experiences of MST. NOTE: Sample sizes are small, esp. as follow-up periods increase.</p>	<p>Positive outcomes are being reported in terms of reduced offending, particularly for boys. MST appears effective with all ethnicities. Results also indicate reduced family conflict, increased effective and warmer parenting, reduced aggression and delinquency rates (mother-report). Note however, lack of impact in Sweden.</p>	<p>FROM US ANALYSIS: Approx. \$4,500 per young person. Meta-analysis showed an average of 10.5% reduction in crime - an average saving of \$2.26 for every \$1 spent. A recent policy report concluded that MST was the most cost-effective of a wide range of intervention programs aimed at serious juvenile offenders.</p>	<p>Currently in 10 sites involving approx. 700 of families. Sites are Barnsley, LB of Hackney, LB of Greenwich, LB of Merton and Kingston, Leeds, Peterborough, Plymouth, Reading, Sheffield and Trafford. All sites have now been operational for a year and over 300 families have completed the 3-5 month programme. Joint support from DfE, DH and YJB.</p>	<p>Based directly on US programme. See earlier section of this report for details of these findings.</p>

Family-based or individual-centred interventions (England)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA	Current implementation in the UK	International comparison
<p>Persistent Young Offender Project (PYOP) PYOP is a Portsmouth city council initiative and was set up in 1998. The police identified a number of juvenile offenders were committing some 70% of crime in the city. The project is a multi-modal intervention incorporating a variety of skills training and therapy for young people who offend and their families and aims to reduce criminality and recidivism in young offenders. The project is funded and supported by the police, social services and other voluntary agencies.</p>	<p>PYOP is a multi-modal intervention described as 'holistic' that is based on existing evidence from meta analysis of 117 interventions with non-institutionalised young people who offend. There is no standard dosage or intervention formula. PYOP is highly responsive with continual assessment of each young person's risks and needs and refinement of the type and intensity of individual treatment programmes. The average length of time a family is involved with PYOP is six months, although individuals can remain on the programme for over a year.</p>	<p>Persistent/prolific young people aged between 8 - 16 years (though in theory no lower age limit) who offend and their families, living in the heart of Portsmouth, Paigebrove and Wymering. However, participants needed no formal link with the criminal justice system in order to participate, allowing fast, less stigmatizing access for children in need.</p>	<p>The programme incorporates individual counselling, one-to-one mentoring for reintegration into education, anger management, group work on anti-social behaviour, problem-solving, victim awareness, interpersonal skills, substance misuse and cognitive-behavioural therapy, music, art, drama workshops and outdoor activities. Siblings are included in much of the provision and parents are also offered a range of help ranging from one-to-one support to group work or family work.</p>	<p>Yes - based on the first 30 months of the project using experimental (N=41) and control group (N=19), Level 4</p>	<p>Level 4</p>	<p>Measured outcomes: Recidivism (LSI-R). Significant improvements for youth on PYOP in relation to emotional and personal problems, accommodation problems and broader family problems and engagement with education, including attitudes towards peers and authority figures while at school. Significant reductions in police charges with some young people ceasing to reoffend completely. PYOP also appears to have increased offenders' 'participation in an organized activity' and 'good use of time'. These positive results all contrast clearly with the comparison group, where there was no change.</p>	<p>No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of PYOP has been undertaken.</p>	<p>PYOP has been running in Portsmouth and the surrounding areas since 1998.</p>	
<p>Intensive Supervision and Support Programmes (ISSP) ISSP is a multi-systemic, non-custodial intervention for persistent young offenders delivered jointly by police, social services and education. ISSP is multi-modal, including a variety of components such as assessment, close monitoring, education and training, tracking (regular contact), tagging and restorative justice. It is also highly intensive, combining supervision with surveillance in an attempt to ensure programme completion, and to bring structure to young people's lives. The ISSP was devised following evidence that suggested 3% of young offenders were responsible for 25% of all youth crime. (There are approx. 2.5 persistent offenders per 10,000 young people per annum).</p>	<p>ISSP is a mixture of punishment and positive opportunities, available 365 days a year, providing the courts with a robust alternative to custody. It is designed to ensure that the young person makes recompense for his/her offences - addresses the underlying causes of the offending - put in place structures that will allow the young person to avoid offending in the future - manage the risks posed by the young person to the community - stabilise what is often a very chaotic lifestyle - reintegrate the young person into the community, particularly through activities that can be continued when supervision by the YOT has ended - help the young person lead an independent life free of offending.</p>	<p>To qualify, YPs need at least 3 convictions or cautions, to be aged 15-17 and to have experienced custody or a failed community sentence.</p>	<p>The intervention has seven components including close supervision by police, family group conferences, multi-agency reviews and opportunities for reparation and mentoring. Intensive Supervision should always contain the following core elements: education, training or employment restorative justice - offending behaviour - family support - interpersonal skills.</p>	<p>Yes. 1) Little et al 2004: candidates were randomly assigned to either ISSP or two control groups. Four measures were assessed: the number of court appearances resulting in a conviction during follow-up; the total number of arrests during follow-up; the number of arrests per month during follow-up; the number of arrests committed in the follow-up period as a ratio of arrests in the two years prior to recruitment.</p> <p>2) Centre for Criminology, University of Oxford (2004, 2005): YJB National Evaluation of ISSPs: evaluation of the first 41 pilot schemes after 12 & 24 months. Descriptive report of profiles of YPs on ISSPs, completion rates, before and after ISSP change in risk factors such as emotional and mental health, substance misuse and criminal attitudes, frequency and seriousness of reoffending.</p>	<p>(1) Little et al (2004): Level 5; (2) Centre for Criminology, University of Oxford (2004; 2005): Level 3.</p>	<p>Little et al: There were no significant differences between the three groups in terms of reconviction rates. There were, however, fewer ISSP arrests and a lower arrest rate during the follow-up period. The ratio of arrests indicates that ISSP case rates were 30-35% lower than for the two control groups. Sensitivity analysis further suggests that the ISSP to be slightly better with violent as opposed to non-violent offenders. The evaluation also notes that it is important to recognise that all of the cases studied, particularly the ISSP recipients, were subject to greater than usual levels of scrutiny by police and youth justice workers. Much tightening up of the programme and a boosting of sample sizes or several repeat evaluations would be required to get an authoritative perspective as, at present, the data seems to suggest that the general placebo effect of participation in ISSP is stronger than any specific component of the programme.</p> <p>Waters et al: No difference in frequency or seriousness of offending between ISSP and comparison groups in fact, young people on a DTO without ISSP committed significantly fewer offences</p>	<p>From National Evaluations: Basic CBA indicated that the average cost of supervision per completion was just over £25,000, while the appear-overall cost of ISSP per completion was almost £32,000. Taking into account wider social costs, their analysis suggested that the value of benefits of ISSP was three times higher than the value of its costs. Average savings over 24 months amounted to £80,000 per ISSP start, while the comparison sample achieved a lower figure of £72,000 per start. Savings were shown to increase over time, with almost a doubling of crime cost savings between the 12 and 24-month periods, in line with the findings of the continuing reductions in the frequency of reoffending over two years.</p>	<p>A variation of the original Netherlands programme has been widely adopted in England and Wales. The YJB has invested approximately £80 million to establish ISSP across England and Wales as an alternative to custody for prolific and serious young offenders.</p>	<p>ISSP is based on a Netherlands programme</p>

School-centred interventions (England)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA	Current implementation in the UK	International comparison
<p>Safer School Partnerships (SSPs)</p> <p>SSPs were introduced in 2002 to promote the safety of schools and students attending them and aim to reduce victimisation, criminality and ASB within schools and their communities. They are a joint initiative between DfES, YJB, Home Office and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). Police are more proactively involved with schools, often in conjunction with other support workers.</p>	<p>Projects take various forms depending on how they are funded and the local police's schools' strategy. Three projects funded by YJB have a wholly operational police officer and supporting team located 1/3 in a secondary school. Other SSP models include a more 'light touch' with one police officer covering several schools and more intensive Behaviour and Education Support Team approaches in which a police officer is part of a multi-agency partnership attached to a cluster of schools.</p>	<p>Whole-school approach.</p>	<p>Tackling key behavioural issues in schools such as bullying, truancy, antisocial behaviour & offending by: introducing whole-school approaches to behaviour & discipline 'identify which an SSP intervention had been implemented and a and work with young people at risk of becoming victims or offenders' ensure the full-time education of young offenders 'create a safer environment in schools.</p>	<p>Yes, by University of York on behalf of the YJB. Comparison of outcomes for a sample of 15 schools in which an SSP intervention had been implemented and a further 15 schools, matched by truancy and exam pass rates in which it had not.</p>	<p>Level 3: Possible regression to the mean effect - absence rates fell in all schools.</p>	<p>Measured outcomes: Exclusions and truancy rates; exam performance; (offending in three YJB/ACPO schools and comparisons). Indications of a positive net benefit based - for example, the scheme has been effective in significantly reducing absence rates in intervention schools. In YJB/ACPO schools, average truancy rates fell by 0.97 percentage points compared with a 1.13 per. pt rise in comparison schools over the same period. No impact on exam performance. Weak baseline data available on offending and safety in schools, but an indication that offences were prevented across the three YJB/ACPO schools relative to trends observed in matched schools. The evaluation also notes, however, that many schools remain reluctant to develop SSPs due to a perception that such a partnership would stigmatise the school, marking them out as being a 'problem' establishment. Customer Voice research on SSPs also indicates that parents need more information from the school about the SSP officer, particularly so in areas without a perceived crime problem.</p>	<p>Limited CBA owing to weak data and small sample of schools, however, economic evaluation indicates that SSP has a positive net benefit on reductions in truancy and absence rates; reductions in current and future offending; improvement in examination results.</p>	<p>Blended in 2002 and mainstreamed in 2006. There are approximately 5,000 SSPs in England and Wales, representing 20% of primary schools and 45% of secondary schools.</p>	
<p>After School Patrols</p> <p>After School Patrols are designed to tackle ASB and disorder at school closing time, on problematic school bus routes and at transport interchanges. The visibility of the patrols reassures local schools and communities in areas where crime and disturbances occur while helping to prevent problems and enforce laws as required.</p>	<p>After School Patrols also make links with Street Teams, truancy sweeps and positive activities</p>	<p>Universal, area-based initiative.</p>		<p>No robust evidence on how this intervention impacts on youth offending. There is monitoring data on how many YPs are reached but not what happens to them after that.</p>				<p>In 2008/09 the police undertook almost 40,000 after-school patrols engaging almost 150,000 young people. By March 2009, 43 local authorities were delivering After School Patrols and by July 2009 all 69 YCAP areas will be doing so.</p>	

Neighbourhood / Community Interventions (England)

Name & Overview	Type of Initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA	Current implementation in the UK	International comparison
<p>Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP) PAYP was a three year programme for young people at risk of social exclusion or of being involved in community crime</p>	<p>PAYP was a cross government programme involving the Department for Education and Skills, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, the Home Office and two non-departmental bodies, the Big Lottery Fund and the Youth Justice Board. The aim of PAYP was to provide diversionary activities that enabled young people across the country aged 8 and 19, at risk of social exclusion and community crime to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in positive activities during the school holidays. Access out of school activities throughout the year. Be supported to engage in learning and/or employment with Key Worker support for those most at risk. 	<p>PAYP was a targeted programme, aimed at those young people aged 8-19 years most at risk of social exclusion, committing crime or being a victim of crime. Unlike previous Summer Activity Programmes, PAYP was designed to be a year-round programme, providing participating young people a range of diversionary and developmental activities during the holiday periods which would hopefully encourage them to engage in 'mainstream' i.e. non-PAYP funded activities, during term time.</p>	<p>Yes – national evaluation by CRG research. However, the evaluation shows that only 32% of young people who participated in PAYP have an outcome recorded against them limiting the strength of the findings. Evidence of the impact of PAYP on crime has therefore been drawn primarily from the PAYP II outcome data, self-report by the young people on their criminal behaviour and anecdotal evidence from Key Workers, community representatives etc</p>	<p>Level 2 - some before and after, but also much at Level 1 which is simple cross-sectional detail</p>	<p>Outcome data from the PAYP MI shows that levels of re-offending while on PAYP were very low, with 197 (0.1%) being arrested in the last 3 months, 610 (0.2%) receiving an ASBO in the last 3 months, 1,104 (0.4%) receiving a conviction within the last 3 months, and only 551 (0.2%) receiving a custodial sentence. Over 50% did not re-offend, with 82% reducing their offending. Only 12.8% were found to have increased their offending. The pattern is very similar to that for the number of offences committed, i.e. over 83.2% who had offended before starting PAYP reduced their total gravity score, with over 71% reducing it by 50% or more. Increases in total gravity score were very low, with only 7.6% increasing their total gravity score.</p> <p>Key findings are that PAYP was successful in delivering a targeted programme to a hard-to-reach client group and in doing so achieved a range of positive outcomes for participating young people. The introduction of the key worker role significantly contribut</p>	<p>No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of PAYP was conducted.</p>	<p>ENDED. Delivery of PAYP was via a network of 52 Lead Delivery Agencies (LDAs), Lead Delivery Partners (LDPs) and Activity Providers (APs) across the country. LDAs were responsible for delivery of PAYP locally, contacting with LDPs and APs to provide Key Worker support and activities to young people on PAYP. Approximately 290,000 young people participated in PAYP between 2003 and 2006, of which 88% met the 'at risk' criteria set for the programme, and 39% received Key Worker support</p>		
<p>Challenge and Support (CS) Projects CS projects were introduced through the Youth Taskforce Action Plan (YTAP) in March 2008 with the aim of stopping poor behaviour from escalating. CS projects ensure that YPs whose behaviour is serious enough to attract formal warning letters –ABCs or ASBOs – get support to address the causes of their behaviour</p>	<p>Area-based initiative to deliver a coordinated response to ASB by ensuring appropriate support is provided alongside all ASB enforcements issued to YPs. Areas are delivering a range of models, with some concentrating on the support needs of specific groups to others applying CS&S system-wide to all enforcements - throughput is extremely varied.</p>	<p>YPs issued with ASB enforcements</p>	<p>Appropriate escalation of enforcements. The CS programme Yes. Process Evaluation (started at the end of 2008) and Impact Evaluation (started at the beginning of 2010), both The Matrix Knowledge Group) due to report Spring 2011. The evaluations set out to determine whether offering appropriate supportive interventions alongside enforcements for anti-social behaviour is more effective than enforcement alone. For the impact evaluation across the 10 areas, data is expected on over 5,000 anti-social behaviour enforcements and will be able to provide comparison between areas.</p>	<p>Level 1: Process evaluation. Level 2: Impact evaluation.</p>	<p>Other work by the National Audit Office found that the majority of people who received an intervention did not re-engage in ASB: 65% of people desisted after the first intervention; 85% after the second and 93% after the third. Warning letters had most effect with YPs with around 62% of under 18 year olds receiving no further interventions.</p>	<p>DfE estimates suggest that the annual average spend per YP expected to be reached by CS projects is £260. Warning letters are the cheapest intervention costing approx. £66 compared to £290 for an ABC and £3,100 for an ASBO.</p>	<p>CS projects have been established in 52 areas across the country backed by £3m funding from 2008 to 2011. CS is based in a variety of locations across the 52 areas, from ASB teams to Community Safety Partnerships, YOTs and other partnerships. From the start of the project to the end of September 2009, the 52 areas have offered support alongside enforcement to over 26,000 young people.</p>		
<p>Open Drive For YPs, having nothing to do can trigger ASB. Open Drive tries to ensure that activities are available to YPs when they are most needed, i.e. on Friday and Saturday nights. Open Drive aims to contribute to developing social skills; increasing emotional resilience; increased educational attainment and helps to keep young people out of trouble.</p>	<p>Part of Aiming High strategy to deliver the statutory duty to secure access, publicise and promote positive activities.</p>	<p>Universal</p>	<p>Open Drive's aim is to improve the Friday & Saturday night offer by: Increasing amount of provision available; Increasing the number of YPs participating in positive activities, particularly those at risk of involvement in criminal or ASB. Involve & empower YPs in design and running of youth provision; Ensure wider support services.</p>	<p>No evaluations identified. National Youth Agency to publish a Friday & Saturday good practice document.</p>					
<p>Tackling Knives Action Programme TKAP, launched in 2008, was a response to increasing concerns about teenage victims of violence. TKAP aimed to reduce the carrying of knives, related homicides and serious stabbings among teenagers (aged 13-19) in ten police force areas.</p>	<p>The programme includes activities to engage young people, including developing specific educational packages for schools and events informing young people of the dangers of carrying knives. TKAP is an end to end approach: prevention to enforcement which works closely with schools to educate YP about dangers of knives, give more custodial sentences for knife and offensive weapon possession, increase targeted stop and searches to deter YPs from carrying knives, and ensure those sent to jail for such offences are serving longer sentences.</p>	<p>TKAP was originally aimed at 13-19 yr olds in ten police force areas, but was extended to other areas and to cover all forms of serious violence amongst 13 to 24 yr olds.</p>	<p>Step up enforcement; Target the most dangerous young people; Carry out home visits to parents of knife-carriers; Share information with A&E departments; Set up or expand trends to inform the TKAP initiative. youth forums; Clamp down on knife retailers.</p>	<p>Ward & Diamond (2009): A monitoring evaluation which presents key findings and an overview of the TKAP initiative.</p>	<p>Ward & Diamond (2009): Level 2. Key findings are compared to non-TKAP areas, however, it is clear that the extent and nature of knife crime prior to TKAP differed between TKAP and non-TKAP areas, and between the ten areas. This limits the quality of the evaluation to Level 2.</p>	<p>Findings from the Ward & Diamond report indicate an overall decline in recorded knife crime and hospital admissions in the target age group (aged 19 and under) during the TKAP period. The findings in this report emphasise the importance of taking a force-specific approach to assessing the effect of police enforcement activities, and in developing strategies to tackle knife crime.</p> <p>Discussions and observations of the YJB's Knife Possession Prevention Programmes (KPPP, already live in Southwark, Haringey, Leeds and Manchester) indicate that YPs participating in the programme felt it was having a positive impact on their thinking behaviour. No evaluation of this programme, however, has been identified.</p>	<p>It is estimated that in phase 1 for every £100 spent there were benefits amounting to £140. However, a degree of caution needs to be applied when interpreting these trends and attributing change directly to TKAP because of the potential impact on non TKAP initiatives and the limitations of the evaluation methodology.</p>	<p>TKAP is set to receive around £19m over the next three years (Source: DfE, July 2010). Phase 1, launched in June 2008 in 10 police forces with high crime rates, targeted knife crime amongst 13-19-year-olds. Phase 2 of the programme, was launched in April 2009 and is aimed at tackling all serious violence among young people aged 13 to 24 in 16 areas. Phase 3 was launched in April 2010 and has been expanded to tackle serious youth violence in 52 CSAs.</p>	

Neighbourhood / Community Interventions (England)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA	Current implementation in the UK	International comparison
<p>Tackling Gangs Action Programme YCAP was a six-month programme launched in 2007, covering neighbourhoods in London, Greater Manchester, Liverpool and Birmingham</p>	The initiative included a tailored package of enforcement, action and community reassurance work, including covert operations and surveillance of known gang members, high visibility police presence, use of civil orders to restrict gang members, safe houses for victims, witnesses and people trying to leave gangs, mediation services to stop disputes between gang members, greater witness protection, community forums and additional activities and support for young people.			AWAITING FURTHER DETAIL		Whilst the programme has ended, the strategies that the programme highlighted as being effective in reducing gun and gang crime continue			
<p>Operation Stay Safe Operation Stay Safe aims to remove vulnerable YPs from the streets late at night and take them to a designated "safe place".</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use Police intelligence to sweep ASB 'hotspots' areas late at night - Remove children and YPs from the streets if they are at risk of significant harm - Take them to a designated 'safe place' where a multi agency team risk assess - Return children and YPs to parents/guardians when possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OSS identifies YPs who are out late at night and either at risk of becoming a victim of crime or of committing criminal acts - Types of behaviour that may lead to young people being taken to the place of safety include possession of alcohol or being very drunk; drug use; being out late at night with nowhere to stay; large group behaving anti-socially; out far too late without an adult 	No evaluations identified. There is monitoring data on how many YPs are reached and referred on to other services but not what happens to them after that.					Part of the YCAP intensive package operating in 69 local authorities most blighted by youth crime and ASB	
<p>Street Teams Street Teams seek to divert these YPs in positive activities, training or work</p>	Street Teams comprise youth workers working with police and youth support providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Street teams tackle youth offending and ASB by engaging disaffected YPs on the streets - YPs who have rejected previous offers of support are prioritised 	No evaluations identified. There is monitoring data on how many YPs are reached and referred on to other services but not what happens to them after that.					Part of the YCAP intensive package operating in 69 local authorities most blighted by youth crime and ASB	
<p>Triage in custody suites Triage aims to prevent young people from reoffending and slipping deeper into the criminal justice system by assessing them much earlier than before. Youth Offending Officers work with police officers to, where appropriate, keep YPs out of criminal justice system. A professional assessment is given to ascertain whether YP is likely to benefit from non-custodial alternatives. Triage aims to prevent the unnecessary criminalisation of YPs and improve information sharing across YOTs, Police and JCS.</p>	Triage aims to bring a YOT worker's expertise into police stations to make early and rapid assessments of young people, and offers an opportunity for parents and carers to get support earlier	Triage takes place at the point that a young person enters police custody following arrest (low gravity offences). The concept, taken from the hospital triage model, seeks to use custody areas as a 'gateway' whereby all young people entering custody can be rapidly assessed to ensure that they are dealt with swiftly and effectively.	First pilots in London were in Lewisham and Greenwich Level 1 in June 2008 and were funded by the YJB and London Criminal Justice Board and have been independently evaluated.			The Lewisham and Greenwich pilots suggest that the number of FTEs decreased while the number of FTEs for London as a whole has remained constant. However, while promising, this positive result cannot be attributed fully to the role of Triage. YJB research also suggests that most victims who have taken part in restorative justice are glad that they have been so closely involved, had a say and can move on in life.	DfE estimates suggest that the annual average spend per YP expected to be reached by Triage projects is £959. Economic analysis for the Barrow Cadbury Trust suggests that diversion from community orders to pre-court RJ conferencing schemes (following a police triage service in which police officers make an immediate assessment of the need and likely benefit from a community intervention) is likely to produce a lifetime cost saving to society of almost £275 million (£7,050 per offender). The costs of RJ conferencing are likely to be paid back within the first year of implementation.	Funded as part of the Youth Crime Action Plan in 69 local authority areas	

Neighbourhood / Community Interventions (England)

Name & Overview	Type of initiative / Approach	Target population	Program detail in terms of key ingredients	Evaluated?	Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading	Impact / Achieved outcomes	CBA	Current implementation in the UK	International comparison
<p>Restorative Justice (RJ)</p> <p>RJ is a process whereby parties with a stake in a specific offence collectively resolve how to deal with the aftermath of the offence following mediation (direct and indirect); repairation (direct and to the community) and victim awareness. RJ is an important underlying principle for all offence and its consequences youth justice disposals.</p>	<p>The YJB's RJ projects offer the following: family group conferencing; mediation (direct and indirect); repairation (direct and to the community) and victim awareness. RJ is an important underlying principle for all offence and its consequences youth justice disposals.</p>	<p>RJ provides opportunities for those directly affected by an offence – victim, offender and members of the community – to communicate and agree how to deal with the consequences of their actions and make use of the opportunity to show remorse, make reparation and sign up to a plan for their restoration in the community.</p>	<p>RJ covers a range of different models, however, generally people are diverted from the CJIS and do not get a criminal record. A restorative justice process is widely understood to be consensual among all participating parties, including the offenders, who accept responsibility for causing harm and agree to the terms and conditions of 'trying to 'renew' victims to their pre-crime status. RJ processes require the active engagement of the young person who has offended so they can learn about the full consequences of their actions and make use of the opportunity to show remorse, make reparation and sign up to a plan for their restoration in the community.</p>	<p>Yes - there are a lot of evaluations across the 5 major RJ democracies. The most rigorous UK evaluation identified was by Shapland et al. 2008 who evaluated whether RJ affects recidivism rates across three RJ schemes (London, Northumbria, Thames Valley) : a total of 342 cases where a face-to-face meeting took place between offenders, victims and their supporters were examined using Randomised Control Trials. This study examines RJ across all adults - from 18 to 59 - however, there was no significant effect of any demographic or offence variable (age, ethnicity, gender, offence type) on recidivism rates or frequency of recidivism. A <u>national evaluation of the YJB's Restorative Justice projects</u> was carried out by Oxford University in 2004-42 of the 46 projects were and the report includes a description of the projects and of the characteristics of the YPs on these projects, a discussion of the implementation problems, and an assessment of the outcomes of the RJ interventions in terms of completion rates, recidivism and feedback from participants. The YJB <u>evaluation of the Youth Restraint</u></p>	<p>Shapland et al. (2008): Level 5, YJB evaluation of RJ projects: Level 2 Restorative Justice in Schools: Level 3</p>	<p>Measured outcome: the extent to which an offender has been reconvicted (or received another official disposal, such as a caution, reprimand or final warning) during a period of two years for an offence committed since sentence for the original offence. (Re-offending to 19 was saved in lowering the cost of offending, cannot be measured directly, because it is not possible to know exactly how many offences the trials alone saved the Criminal Justice System someone has actually committed in a particular period). Shapland et al. (2008) RJ reduced the frequency of recidivism on average by 27% - by 33% when delivered to prisoners just prior to release; and by 55% when delivered to prisoners serving community sentences. There were no significant differences between the RJ and the control groups in terms of severity of recidivism. For the YJB's <u>evaluation of RJ projects</u>, the design and implementation of the projects did not permit an experimental approach to the evaluation and so the results of this study were therefore compared to a Home Office sample of young offenders sentenced in 2000: weighted comparison of the two groups found that the overall recidivism rate within 12 months was 46.6% compared to a rate of 28.6% for participants. The YJB <u>evaluation of the Youth Restraint</u></p>	<p>Shapland et al. (2008) For every £1 spent on RJ is currently being used by youth offending teams, across the secure estate and in other settings such as Safer Schools Partnerships. It builds on the Restorative Justice in School programme launched in 2000 and piloted in two schools in Lambeth. <u>Matrix Knowledge Group</u> of alternative interventions for young adult offenders concludes that, for all offenders aged 18-24 sentenced in a Magistrate's court for a non-violent offence in a given year: Diversion from community orders to pre-court RJ conferencing schemes is likely to produce a lifetime cost saving to society of almost £7.5 million (£7,050 per offender). For the <u>YJB RJ projects</u>, the total financial cost of the 46 projects was around £13.3m (over half of which was provided by the Board), which equated to over £280,000 per project. The data on costs were not sufficiently detailed to allow for a calculation of unit costs.</p>	<p>RJ is currently being used by youth offending teams, across the secure estate and in other settings such as Safer Schools Partnerships. It builds on the Restorative Justice in School programme launched in 2000 and piloted in two schools in Lambeth.</p>	<p>There are RJ schemes in Canada, Northern Ireland, New Zealand and the US.</p>
<p>Youth Inclusion and Support Panels (YISPs)</p> <p>YISPs were designed to identify and support young people aged 8-13 (up to 17 in some areas) who are at high risk of offending and antisocial behaviour before they enter the youth justice system. YISPs are multi-agency planning groups that offer early intervention based on assessed risk and need.</p>	<p>Provision of integrated support services tailored to individual needs through an Integrated Support Plans (ISP). Parenting support in the form of contracts and programmes is offered as part of the range of interventions. YISPs have several responsibilities: first, to ensure that the most appropriate services are available at the earliest opportunity to each YP/family referred to a YISP; second, to monitor changes in risk and protective factors during YISP intervention; third, to ensure that the YP and their families are satisfied with the help they receive; and fourth, to make sure that YPs are maintained in full-time education.</p>	<p>Referral. Assessment (ONSET) must indicate 4 or more risk factors present. The YP's behaviour should be of concern to two or more of the partner agencies and/or the parents/carer, all of whom consider that a multi-agency response is called for. YPs should not have passed the police reprimand stage and should be judged to be at very high risk of offending.</p>	<p>Dedicated Key Worker. Family group conferencing. Voluntary involvement. Focus on provision of mainstream services.</p>	<p>Yes, short term outcomes of the 13 YISP pilot areas – Walker et al 2007 - but focuses more on implementation and processes than outcomes.</p>	<p>Level 2</p>	<p>Measured outcomes: Change in ONSET score. Results suggest that i) the higher the YP's starting risk the greater the likely level of risk reduction; ii) older children are less likely to experience large risk reduction; iii) the gender of the child and the level of deprivation in the home neighbourhood are not statistically related to risk reduction levels. Evaluation also found that YPs receiving mentoring saw a risk reduction averaging over two points. Satisfaction and reflections of YPs and their parents were also explored. The evaluation noted that there was a considerable degree of flexibility in the way in which YISPs were being implemented locally, with some pilots starting from scratch in developing panels while others were building on existing initiatives and that pilot YISPs were not all targeting the same groups of children, making overall comparison problematic.</p>	<p>No rigorous cost-benefit analysis has been undertaken for YISPs. The Walker evaluation estimated that, on average, a pilot area dealt with 129 children each month, and another 93 undertook activities, with the financial costs (excluding staff) amounting to less than £6,000. However, by far the greatest element of cost was the staff time input, which amounted to 306 days a month, of which 56 related to the input of senior staff. DfE estimates put the annual average spend per young person expected to be reached by YISPs as £1,333.</p>	<p>There are currently around 220 YISPs nationally.</p>	
<p>Youth Inclusion Programme (YIPs)</p> <p>YIPs, launched in 1999, are tailor-made for 8 to 17 year olds at high risk of involvement in crime or antisocial behaviour, but are YOTs, police, children & family also open to other young people. The focus of YIPs is to change services, LEAs and schools, attitudes to crime and antisocial behaviour, and address factors that put them at risk of offending and ASB people in the local area.</p>	<p>A number of different agencies, including YOTs, police, children & family neighbourhood wardens, & ASB teams identify individuals for the programme.</p>	<p>The YIPs programme identifies and works with 50 of the young people deemed by local agencies to be most at risk of offending in each neighbourhood. In addition to working with this core 50, projects also seeks to engage a wider group of young people in the area. Participation is entirely voluntary. A number of different agencies, including YOTs, police, children & family services, LEAs and schools, neighbourhood wardens, & ASB teams identify individuals for the programme.</p>	<p>The programme gives young people somewhere safe to go where they can learn new skills, take part in activities with others and get support with their education and careers guidance. Positive role models – the workers and volunteer mentors – help to change young people's attitudes to crime and anti-social behaviour, and address those factors that put young people at risk of involvement in offending or anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>The first two phases of YIP, up to 2006, have been independently evaluated.</p>	<p>Phase 1: Level 2; Phase 2: Level 2</p>	<p>Phase 1: Independent national evaluation of the first three years of the programme found that arrest rates for the 50 young people considered to be most at risk of crime in each YIP went down by 65%. Of those who had offended before joining the programme, 73% were arrested for fewer offences after engaging with a YIP. And of those who had not offended previously, but were at risk, 74% did not go on to be arrested. Phase 2: Measured outcomes: <i>engagement</i> (82% of the core 50 were engaged by projects at some stage in Phase 2 - exceeds 75% target); <i>mentor</i> (just 17% of the core 50 attended interventions for an average of five hours per week, well short of the target that all 50 should receive this level. Note, however, that this "dosage" is up from 4% of the core 50 in the first quarter of 2001); <i>arrest rates</i> (for the core 50 who were engaged at any time, there was a decrease in the average rate of offending of 66.3%); <i>attendance/employment participation</i> (59% of the core 50, engaged in Phase 2, were in full-time ETE, which was 31% short of the 90% target). Note however, that these headline figures conceal much of</p>	<p>No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of YIPs has been undertaken. DfE estimates put the annual average spend per young person expected to be reached by YIPs at £1,920.</p>	<p>YIPs operate in 114 of the most deprived, high crime areas of England and Wales.</p>	