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## Family-based or individual-centred interventions (International)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Overview</th>
<th>Type of initiative / Approach</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Program detail in terms of key ingredients</th>
<th>Evaluated?</th>
<th>Quality of evidence / Methodology</th>
<th>Impact / Related outcomes</th>
<th>CBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Wisely</td>
<td>Behavioural Parent Training</td>
<td>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, which 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.</td>
<td>The programme was designed for families of six to eight children aged 6-18 years who were referred for antisocial behaviour (i.e. indicative sample) to their local multidisciplinary child and adolescent mental health service.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The effectiveness of Parenting Wisely has been demonstrated in a number of evaluation studies comparing programme to a no-treatment control group.</td>
<td>$20.61 saved for every $1 spent (Barnes et al., 2004).</td>
<td>$20.61 saved for every $1 spent (Barnes et al., 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills Training</td>
<td>Behavioural Parent Training</td>
<td>Life Skills Training is a child skills training programme, designed to address crucial life skills needed to succeed, such as how to handle peer pressure, manage stress and anxiety, make healthy decisions, and develop assertiveness and communications skills.</td>
<td>The programme was designed to be used in 21 centre schools (3rd-5th grade) in New York City.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Life Skills Training included the prevention of substance use and violence.</td>
<td>$23.00 saved for every $1 spent (Barnes et al., 2004).</td>
<td>$23.00 saved for every $1 spent (Barnes et al., 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Skills</td>
<td>Behavioural Parent Training</td>
<td>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, which 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.</td>
<td>The programme was designed for families of six to eight children aged 6-18 years who were referred for antisocial behaviour (i.e. indicative sample) to their local multidisciplinary child and adolescent mental health service.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Parenting Skills was evaluated in a randomized controlled trial involving 190 New York City public schools.</td>
<td>$20.61 saved for every $1 spent (Barnes et al., 2004).</td>
<td>$20.61 saved for every $1 spent (Barnes et al., 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Wisely</td>
<td>Behavioural Parent Training</td>
<td>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, which 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.</td>
<td>The programme was designed for families of six to eight children aged 6-18 years who were referred for antisocial behaviour (i.e. indicative sample) to their local multidisciplinary child and adolescent mental health service.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Parenting Skills was evaluated in a randomized controlled trial involving 190 New York City public schools.</td>
<td>$20.61 saved for every $1 spent (Barnes et al., 2004).</td>
<td>$20.61 saved for every $1 spent (Barnes et al., 2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above provides an overview of the programs, including their effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. The programs focus on improving parenting skills and educating children on healthy behaviors. The evaluation methods used include randomized controlled trials and observational studies. The programs are designed to be implemented in schools and community settings, targeting families of children aged 6-18 years who exhibit behavior problems. The programs are characterized by interactive teaching techniques, including group discussions, role-playing, and behavioral rehearsal, with the goal of improving behavior outcomes and reducing delinquency.
### Teen Triple P

**Name & Overview**
Teen Triple P is a multi-level programme that aims to provide information, advice, and professional support in a format that suits the needs of an individual family, recognizing that parents have differing needs and desires regarding the type, intensity, and mode of assistance they may require.

**Target population**
Interventions range from the provision of media messages on positive parenting, through to brief information resources, to brief targeted interventions, for specific behavior problems, offered by primary care practitioners at Level 2 and more intensive parent training at Level 3 and Level 4 programs targeting broader family issues such as relationship conflict and parent depression, anger and stress.

**Program details in terms of key ingredients**
Depending on the level of intervention, the range from all parents (universal) to parents with children displaying problematic/behavioural problems.

- **Level 1**: Involves using health promotion and social marketing strategies to make available to parents information about developmental and child behaviour.
- **Level 2**: Involves primary care professionals in regular contact with families having periodic discussions with parents about developmental and behavioural issues.
- **Level 3**: Primary Care interventions incorporate brief behavioural counseling and as an early detection and brief intervention approach to managing identified problems.
- **Level 4**: Group or self-directed parent training.
- **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.

**Evaluated?**
Although the Triple P programme has been extensively evaluated, Teen Triple P has little evaluation evidence.

**Quality of evaluation / Methodology**
- **Level 2**: Evaluation of Teen Triple P group parenting programme - RCT attempted, however the sample size was too small to enable comparisons.
- **Level 4**: Evaluation of Teen Triple P programme: parenting group versus control.

**Impact / Achieved outcomes**
Parents reported less parent-teenager conflict reduced from a mean of 7.2 to 4.3 post-treatment (F=9.76, df 1,25, p<.01); parenting styles improved, with reductions on the laxness score from 16.0 to 13.5 (F=15.99, df 1,25, p<.01); and 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) 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).

**CBA**
No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of Teen Triple P has been conducted.
### Student Training Through Urban Strategies (STATUS)

**Program description:**
High risked youths were brought together for 2 hours each day to receive an 'integrated social studies and English program'. This involved a law-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.

**Applicable to:**
High risked youths aged 13-15

**Key ingredients:**
- Applied to high risk youths aged 13-15
- High school youths were brought together for 2 hours each day.

**Outcomes post intervention:**
- Significantly lower rates of criminal activity in experimental over control groups (18 per cent)
- Reduced levels of antisocial measures of self-destructive behaviour (and measures of aggressive behaviour)

**Cost-benefit analysis:**
No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of STATUS was conducted.

**Full sample:**
-.demostrates consistent significant positive effects on attachment and commitment to school

**Sample size:**
- Five high schools in Charleston County, South Carolina

**Type of evaluation:**
- A randomized control trial

**Level:**
- Level 4: Two schools - one high school and one middle school - were selected to match the treatment schools as close as possible. The other schools in the district served as control schools.

**Efficacy:**
- Recent evaluation has been conducted in five middle schools and four high schools in Charleston County, South Carolina.

**Impact / Achieved outcomes**
- There is also a selective component of academic and counseling services for low achieving or disruptive pupils.
- There is also a selective component of academic and counseling services for low achieving or disruptive pupils.

**Limitations:**
- No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of STATUS was conducted.

---

### School-wide Innovation Project

**Program description:**
The School-wide Innovation Project is an example of a comprehensive school discipline and 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 in the form of rewards and punishers contingent on behavior.

**Applicable to:**
- School-centred interventions (International)

**Key ingredients:**
- Applied to high risk youths aged 13-15
- Applied to high risk youths aged 13-15

**Outcomes post intervention:**
- Students in the participating high schools reported significantly less delinquent outcomes. A similar pattern was observed for the middle schools after two years. As serious delinquency increased...status schools (ES=-.27). Changes in drug use (ES=-.13) and school punishments (ES=-.15) also favoured the program schools.

**Cost-benefit analysis:**
No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of the Seattle Social Development Project was conducted.

**Full sample:**
- 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 many of staff and volunteer groups, students and community members engaging in service or advisory activities to improve the school.

**Sample size:**
- 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 targeted services.

**Type of evaluation:**
- A randomized control trial

**Level:**
- Level 4: Two schools - one high school and one middle school - were selected to match the treatment schools as close as possible.

**Efficacy:**
- Involves both school-wide (e.g. non-academic, non-athletic, non-curricular) and classroom-based (e.g. classroom rules, procedures) interventions.

**Limitations:**
- No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of the School-wide Innovation Project was conducted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Type of initiative</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Program details in terms of key ingredients</th>
<th>Evaluated?</th>
<th>Quality of evaluation</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Achieved outcomes</th>
<th>EBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Children aged 5 – 15 from low income families</td>
<td>The programme is housed in selected schools, chosen because they have low academic incentive programs addressing conflict resolution (drill team), psychological programs addressing stress, academic activities, arts and crafts, music, performing and visual arts, and sports</td>
<td>Yes: In a public housing estate in Ohio, Canada</td>
<td>Yes: In a public housing estate in Ohio, Canada</td>
<td>Yes: In a public housing estate in Ohio, Canada</td>
<td>Level 3: The monthly average number of young people charged by the police was 80 per week lower than the control site per year. However, this effect was not sustained. Level 4: The monthly average number of young people involved in a taped crime was 70 per week lower than the control site per year. The second year’s effect was not sustained.</td>
<td>$2.60 saved for every $1 spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate and Learn Skills</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Children aged 5 – 13 from low income families</td>
<td>The programme is housed in selected schools, chosen because they have low academic performance and are located in low income, high crime areas. Educational and enrichment programmes are provided to support academic incentives, as follows: Music, drama and ethnic, dance, performing and visual arts, and sports.</td>
<td>Yes: The National Centre for the Research to Educational Standards and Student Testing in UCLA has established a complemented database of educational and enrichment programmes. Level 3: The monthly average number of young people charged by the police was 80 per week lower than the control site per year. However, this effect was not sustained. Level 4: The monthly average number of young people involved in a taped crime was 70 per week lower than the control site per year. The second year’s effect was not sustained.</td>
<td>$2.50 saved for every $1 spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA’s BEST After School Enrichment Program</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Children ages 5 to 12 in the City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>The programme is housed in selected schools, chosen because they have low academic performance and are located in low income, high crime areas. Educational and enrichment programmes are provided to support academic incentives, as follows: Music, drama and ethnic, dance, performing and visual arts, and sports.</td>
<td>Yes: The National Centre for the Research to Educational Standards and Student Testing in UCLA has established a complemented database of educational and enrichment programmes. Level 3: The monthly average number of young people charged by the police was 80 per week lower than the control site per year. However, this effect was not sustained. Level 4: The monthly average number of young people involved in a taped crime was 70 per week lower than the control site per year. The second year’s effect was not sustained.</td>
<td>$2.50 saved for every $1 spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Family Pathfinder Programme aims to test and develop the ‘Think Family model, which was set out in the Cabinet Office’s 2006 paper ‘Strengthening Families, Strengthening Communities’ – ‘Improving the Life Chances of Families at Risk’. The Pathfinders are: Blackpool, Bolton, Brighton and Hove, and ....

Most parents are offered a parenting programme because the 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.

Parenting programmes provide parents,

In all cases, the YOT first carries out an assessment of need, to decide on the right approach to work with the parents, which may include Parenting Programme. The research took place between June 1999 and December 2001. Thirty four projects were included in the national evaluation, each of which was assessed and graded.

Positive discipline, parent-child relationships, increased parenting education and training, and parental isolation by connecting families to community resources, and participating in culturally appropriate activities to validate the experiences of different ethnic groups. Between eight and 20 parents, and incentives, such as transport, refreshments and/or childcare are typically provided.

SFSC is being piloted as part of the Parenting Early Intervention Pathfinders project. For further information on SFSC, please contact the SFSC team at the Social Development Agency on 0116 263 5650 or via email at info@sfsca.co.uk.

The Family Pathfinder Programme area in the US, the programme has been delivered to a diverse range of populations, including African Americans, Asian Pacific Islanders (Vietnamese, Korean, etc) as well as White Americans, mixed heritage and African americans, in both rural and urban populations, with mothers as well as fathers, offenders and parents with physical disabilities.
Family-based or individual-centred interventions (England)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Details</th>
<th>Type of initiative / Approach</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Program details in terms of key ingredients</th>
<th>Evaluated?</th>
<th>Quality of evaluation / Maryland grading</th>
<th>Impact / Achieved outcomes</th>
<th>CBA</th>
<th>Current implementation in the UK</th>
<th>International comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFT</td>
<td>Family-based intervention</td>
<td>Families with children/youth displaying anti-social, delinquent and/or criminal behaviour</td>
<td>FFT family therapy is a short-term intervention designed to help families improve their capacities in managing children's behaviour by: understanding family systems and social contexts; developing communication skills; increasing family cohesion; and promoting effective behaviour management strategies.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RCT: Benefit to cost ratio</td>
<td>Decreases serious offending, recidivism, and negative outcomes for children and youth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPs</td>
<td>Individual-centred intervention</td>
<td>Families 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 and/or violent young people</td>
<td>The FIPs are delivered by a dedicated key worker who works closely with families to develop a tailored action plan, including clear sanctions and support measures.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative designs are used to assess outcomes.</td>
<td>Decreases serious offending, recidivism, and negative outcomes for children and youth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FFT: Functional Family Therapy. FIPs: Family Intervention Project.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; House</th>
<th>Type of initiative / Approach</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Progress done in terms of key objectives</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Qualitative vs. Quantitative</th>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Impact / Affected customers</th>
<th>EFA</th>
<th>Contextualisation in the UK</th>
<th>International companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Intervention Projects (IIPs)</td>
<td>High-intensity intervention for young people aged between 8 and 19, with particular focus on reducing serious offending</td>
<td>Young people who are at high risk of serious offending</td>
<td>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 £4,000.</td>
<td>Yes, there are areas for improvement including evaluation. Strategic work has been done in March 2013 at the Information and Strategy Group (IAG) with a commitment to a national evaluation of the IIPs.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Grade B</td>
<td>High-risk young people</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>IIPs are being piloted in 20 areas running from April 2009 to run until March 2011. No areas have been accepted for DfE demonstration areas for the IIPs projects (to the 12 months of operation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early findings from the Intensive Intervention Programme (IIPs)</td>
<td>Intensive Intervention Programme (IIPs) target 1,000 of the most challenging young people, aged between 8 and 19, every year.</td>
<td>Young people who are at high risk of serious offending</td>
<td>IIPs are being piloted in 20 areas running from April 2009 to run until March 2011 to work with the most seriously offending young people, aged between 8 and 19, every year.</td>
<td>The study was carried out jointly by the universities of York and Manchester and London School of Economics and evaluated the costs and outcomes of Intensive Fostering versus maintaining young people in secure accommodation. It compared young people in Intensive Fostering placements with a comparison group and showed that those in Intensive Fostering had lower rates of reoffending and their offences committed were less serious than those in the comparison group.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Grade B</td>
<td>High-risk young people</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>IIPs are being piloted in 20 areas running from April 2009 to run until March 2011. No areas have been accepted for DfE demonstration areas for the IIPs projects (to the 12 months of operation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2: Status, young people, small sample N=210 for the sample. It is also important to note, however, that the sample was not representative of the population of young people in the IIPs. The study showed that those children who were selected for the IIPs were more likely to have a history of offending and a wider range of problems.</td>
<td>Young people who are at high risk of serious offending</td>
<td>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). These differences in the level of supervision must be taken into consideration when reviewing the findings.</td>
<td>Intensive Fostering 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 shown to be effective in reducing reoffending. Studies by both the US and UK have found that MTFC is considerably more cost effective than residential provision in the USA.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Grade B</td>
<td>High-risk young people</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>IIPs are being piloted in 20 areas running from April 2009 to run until March 2011. No areas have been accepted for DfE demonstration areas for the IIPs projects (to the 12 months of operation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST is an intensive family and community-based treatment for young offenders and their families.</td>
<td>Young people who are at high risk of serious offending</td>
<td>MST is an intensive family and community-based treatment for young offenders and their families.</td>
<td>MST is an intensive family and community-based treatment for young offenders and their families.</td>
<td>MST is an intensive family and community-based treatment for young offenders and their families.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Grade B</td>
<td>High-risk young people</td>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>IIPs are being piloted in 20 areas running from April 2009 to run until March 2011. No areas have been accepted for DfE demonstration areas for the IIPs projects (to the 12 months of operation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family-based or individual-centred interventions (England)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Overview</th>
<th>Type of initiative / Approach</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Program details in terms of key ingredients</th>
<th>Evaluated?</th>
<th>Quality of evaluation / Level of evidence</th>
<th>Impact / Subsidiary outcomes</th>
<th>FBA</th>
<th>Centre implementation in the UK</th>
<th>International companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistent Young Offenders Program (PYOP)</td>
<td>Family-based or individual-centred interventions (England)</td>
<td>Portsmouth and the surrounding areas since 1998. No rigorous cost-benefit analysis of PYOP has been undertaken.</td>
<td>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,</td>
<td>Yes, based on the first 3 years of the project using Level 4 (Little et al. 2004) and control group (N=15), involving a multi-modal intervention made up of young people referred, assessed and accepted onto the project, but who dropped out within the 2 weeks. No measures for methodological and ethical reasons (an ‘incidental’ matched group; Marshall &amp; Sidanius, 2003).</td>
<td>High-quality evidence (1) Level 4; (2) Centre for Criminology, University of Oxford (2004; 2005); (3) ISSP Research Group, Eindhoven University of Technology (2004; 2005); (4) Little et al. (2004); (5) ISSP Research Group, Eindhoven University of Technology (2004; 2005); (6) Marshall &amp; Sidanius, 2003).</td>
<td>Significant improvements for youth on PYOP</td>
<td>PYOP has been running in Portsmouth and the surrounding area since 1998.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PYOP** is a multi-modal intervention, designed to ‘help’ but not to ‘control’ or ‘treat’ young people who offend, involving young offenders and their families, and is delivered in a variety of settings, including in schools, mental health services, youth justice and voluntary agencies. PYOP is a multi-modal intervention, designed to ‘help’ but not to ‘control’ or ‘treat’ young people who offend, involving young offenders and their families, and is delivered in a variety of settings, including in schools, mental health services, youth justice and voluntary agencies.
### School-centred interventions (England)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Overview</th>
<th>Type of initiative / Approach</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Program detail in terms of key ingredients</th>
<th>Evaluated?</th>
<th>Quality of evaluation / Evidence grading</th>
<th>Impact / Achieved outcomes</th>
<th>CBA</th>
<th>EBA</th>
<th>Current implementation in the UK</th>
<th>International comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safer School Partnerships (SSPs)</td>
<td>Project take various forms depending on the nature of the problem they are tackling and the local context. For example, a SSP in one area might involve a whole school operation while another might involve only part-time school presence.</td>
<td>Whole-school approach. Tackling key behavioural issues in schools such as bullying, truancy, antisocial behaviour &amp; offending</td>
<td>Yes, by University of York on behalf of the YJB. Comparison of outcomes for a sample of 15 schools in which a SSP intervention had been implemented and a further 15 schools where it had not.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Level 3: Possible regression to the mean.</td>
<td>Measured outcomes: Exclusions and truancy rates; exam performance; reductions in truancy and absence rates; reductions in current and future offending; improvement in examination results.</td>
<td>Limited CBA owing to weak data and small sample of schools, however, economic evaluation indicates that SSPs have a positive net benefit on reductions in truancy, absence and offending. Pilot in 2002 and mainstreamed in 2006. There are approximately 5,000 SSPs in England and Wales, representing 85% of primary schools and 65% of secondary schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Patrols</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Universal, area-based initiatives. No robust evidence on how this intervention impacts youth offending. There is examining data from some YPLA schools but not what happens to them after. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood / Community Interventions (England)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type of initiative / Approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target population</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program detail in terms of key ingredients</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact / Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAYP</strong></td>
<td>Area-based initiative to deliver a coordinated response to ASB</td>
<td>Young people at risk of involvement in community crime (8-19 years old)</td>
<td>PFP was a three-year programme for young people at risk of involvement in community crime</td>
<td>Over-time data from the PAYP Evaluation shows that levels of re-offending while on PAYP were very low, with 197 (0.1%) being re-assessed but only 23 (0.0%) being re-assessed due to ASBO</td>
<td>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 MI. The evaluation also shows that 1,104 (0.4%) receiving a conviction within the last 3 months, and only 551 (0.2%) receiving an ASBO in the last 3 months. In addition, the evaluation shows that the number of ASBOs recorded as part of PAYP has decreased by 30% since the start of the programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neighbourhood / Community Interventions (England)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Hosts</th>
<th>Type of initiative / Approach</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Progress detailed in terms of key ingredients</th>
<th>Evaluated?</th>
<th>Quality of evaluation / Methodology</th>
<th>Impact / Achieved outcomes</th>
<th>CBA</th>
<th>Context implementation in the UK</th>
<th>International comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TGAP</td>
<td>Operation Stay Safe: Suggests that the number of FTEs decreased while the programme has ended, the strategies that the programme highlighted as being effective in reducing gun and gang crime continue to be implemented.</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>AGS remains unidentified. There is some monitoring data on how many YPs are reached and referred on to other services, but not what happens to them after that.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is no evidence of impact.</td>
<td>Within the programme has ended, the strategies that the programme highlighted as being effective in reducing gun and gang crime continue to be implemented.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tackling Gangs Action Programme: Provides a tailored package of enforcement, action and community reassurance work, including covert operations and surveillance of known gang members, support to victims, sentences and people leaving to help young offenders to turn away from gang membership, greater witness protection, community ties and additional activities and support for young people.</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>No evidence identified. There is some monitoring data on how many YPs are reached and referred on to other services, but not what happens to them after that.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is no evidence of impact.</td>
<td>Within the programme has ended, the strategies that the programme highlighted as being effective in reducing gun and gang crime continue to be implemented.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland Partnership:-derived 'safe space' model, seeks to use custody units as a 'gateway' whereby all young people entering custody can be rapidly assessed to ensure that they are dealt with swiftly and effectively.</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>AGS remains unidentified. There is some monitoring data on how many YPs are reached and referred on to other services, but not what happens to them after that.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is no evidence of impact.</td>
<td>Within the programme has ended, the strategies that the programme highlighted as being effective in reducing gun and gang crime continue to be implemented.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operation Stay Safe:**

Operation Stay Safe aims to remove vulnerable YPs from streets late at night and take them to a designated "safe place." It does this by first identifying young people at risk, either at risk of becoming a victim of crime or of committing criminal acts. The initiative includes a range of activities aimed at preventing YPs from engaging in criminal behaviour, such as drug use, being out late at night, and being in contact with known gang members. The programme also provides support to YPs who have been identified as being at risk, including access to additional activities and support for young people.

**Tackling Gangs Action Programme:**

The Tackling Gangs Action Programme offers a tailored package of enforcement, action, and community reassurance work, including covert operations and surveillance of known gang members, support to victims, sentences, and people leaving to help young offenders turn away from gang membership. The programme includes greater witness protection, community ties, and additional activities and support for young people.

**Maryland Partnership:**

The Maryland Partnership is a six-month programme launched in 2007, covering London, Greater Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham. It includes a range of activities aimed at preventing YPs from engaging in criminal behaviour, such as drug use, being out late at night, and being in contact with known gang members. The programme also provides support to YPs who have been identified as being at risk, including access to additional activities and support for young people.
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Name & Overview Type of initiative / Approach Target population Program detail in terms of key ingredients Evaluated? Quality of evaluation / Impact / Achieved outcomes CBA Current implementation in the UK International comparison

Restorative Justice (RJ)

RJ is a process whereby parties with a stake in a specific offence come together to collectively resolve how to deal with the aftermath of the offence. People are diverted from the CJS and do not get a criminal record or reparation (direct and to the victim). 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 Schools programme launched in 2000 and piloted in a number of schools in Lambeth.

Objectives

- To enable young people to take responsibility for the harm caused by their actions and to make amends to victims and the community.
- To reduce the likelihood of reoffending by young people and to assist in reducing the number of people who come into contact with the CJS.
- To develop a greater awareness of the norms and values of the community.

Programme

The programme gives young people somewhere safe to go where they can learn new skills, take part in activities with support from trained mentors – help to change young people’s attitudes to crime and anti-social behaviour, and address factors that put them at risk of offending and ASB people in the local area.

Phase 1: YIPs

- YIPs have been designed to identify and treat young people aged 8-17 who are at high risk of offending and emotional behavioural problems before they come to the youth justice system. YIPs are multi-agency planning groups that deliver intervention/behavioural treatment aimed at reducing the level of offending.

Phase 2: Yisps

- YISPs were launched in 2000 and piloted in tw

Phase 3: Yisps

- YISPs were designed to identify and treat young people aged 8-17 who are at high risk of offending and emotional behavioural problems before they come to the youth justice system. YISPs are multi-agency planning groups that deliver intervention/behavioural treatment aimed at reducing the level of offending.

YIP'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 their home neighbourhood will impact on the risk reduction achieved. Evaluation also found that YPs receiving mentoring saw a risk reduction averaging over 50% (59% of the core 50, engaged in Phase 2, were in full-time ETE, which was 31% short of the 90% target). The data on costs were not sufficiently detailed to allow for a calculation of unit costs.

YIPs were designed to identify and treat young people aged 8-17 who are at high risk of offending and emotional behavioural problems before they come to the youth justice system. Youths are multi-agency planning groups that deliver intervention/behavioural treatment aimed at reducing the level of offending.

Roland: Assessment (INTERVIEW) was conducted to assess the pre and post measurement of the behaviours of 8-17 year olds.

Boughey: Assessment of the program. The YIP intervention is part of the YIP process and intervention, which includes the development of an individual action plan for each young person, with the support of a volunteer, who will help them to overcome any barriers they may be facing.

Impact / Achieved outcomes

- Significant changes in levels of offending and reoffending have been observed. For example, in 2000, 37% of those young people participating in YIPs were in contact with the CJS, compared to 20% in 2001. This corresponds to a reduction of almost 50%.

Quality of evaluation / CBA

- Evaluation of YIPs was carried out by Oxford University in 2004: 42 of the 46 projects were evaluated, and the report included a comparison of the characteristics of the YIPs with other social interventions, and an assessment of the effectiveness of the YIP process in terms of completion rates, reconviction and feedback from participants. The YIP intervention was found to be effective in reducing the likelihood of reoffending and in increasing the likelihood of successful completion of educational programmes.

Current implementation in the UK

- YIPs are currently being implemented in 114 of the most deprived, high crime areas of England and Wales.

International comparison

- YIPs have been implemented in a number of countries, including Canada, Northern Ireland, New Zealand and the US.