



Youth Justice: the Scaled Approach

A framework for assessment and interventions

Table of contents

Foreword	3
Introduction	4
Aims and objectives	5
How the Scaled Approach works	5
Assessment for intervention	6
Assessment	6
Intervention framework	6
Assessing likelihood of reoffending	6
Assessing risk of serious harm	7
Assessing intervention level	7
Factors affecting intervention level	7
Professional judgement	7
Children and young people at risk of harm and welfare considerations	7
Proposing interventions for court orders	9
Sentencing context	9
Scaled Approach and sentencing purposes	9
Tailoring court and youth offender panel reports to assessments	9
Supervision levels	12
Packages of intervention	13
Managing an order post-sentence	14
Ongoing case management	14
Review	14
Children and young people at risk of harm and welfare considerations	14
Intervention levels, contact types and breach	15
Breach	15
Prolific and Other Priority Offenders	16
Appendix A: Assessing the likelihood of reoffending	17
How are static factors different to dynamic factors?	17
Why include static factors?	17
Determining static factors score	17
Determining likelihood of reoffending	18
Sample form	18
Likelihood of reoffending	18
Appendix B – List of static factor offences types	20
Offences listed by Youth Justice Board seriousness score	20

Foreword

When determining the particular sentence for an offence under the Criminal Justice Act 2003, the court will take an initial view of seriousness, consider any aggravating and mitigating factors and then consider any personal mitigation. In assisting the court to determine the most suitable method of dealing with a young person who has offended through a pre-sentence report (PSR), it is essential that the youth offending team (YOT) also takes as its starting point the court's view as to the seriousness of the offence and the principal aim of the youth justice system, which is to prevent offending or reoffending by young people under the age of 18 (s37(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998).

The Scaled Approach represents a model for interventions delivered by YOTs with children and young people who have offended, and as a result appear before the courts for sentence. It reflects the statutory aim of the youth justice system to prevent offending, including reoffending, by children and young people and is designed to help YOTs become more effective in delivering this requirement in their local communities.

The resulting PSR should include an assessment of the child or young person and describe the proposed interventions designed to reduce the likelihood of reoffending and/or risk of serious harm to others, in line with *National Standards for Youth Justice Services* and *Case Management Guidance*.

This publication is not intended to represent detailed practice guidance for YOT practitioners in relation to PSR preparation – this is covered in the YJB's *Case Management Guidance*. The Scaled Approach underpins assessment by YOTs and PSR preparation and is also designed to inform the ongoing case management of children and young people subject to YOT interventions.

Sentencing Guidelines Council advice is now available to assist sentencers in their management of the new Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO), introduced as part of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008.

© Youth Justice Board for England and Wales 2010

The material featured in this publication is subject to copyright protection under UK Copyright Law unless otherwise indicated. Any person or organisation wishing to use YJB materials or products for commercial use must apply in writing to the YJB at ipr@yjb.gov.uk for a specific licence to be granted.

www.yjb.gov.uk

Introduction

This document updates and replaces the brochure entitled *Youth Justice: the Scaled Approach*, which was published by the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales (YJB) as a consultation document in November 2007, *Youth Justice: The Scaled Approach – Post-consultation version* published on the YJB website in September 2008 and *Youth Justice: The Scaled Approach – Post-consultation version 2* published on the YJB website in February 2009.

The revised framework outlined in this document has taken into account the consultation responses on the initial proposal and subsequent work to further refine the Scaled Approach model. A separate document containing the consultation feedback and YJB response can be found on the YJB website.¹

More detail about the operation of the Scaled Approach and the Youth Rehabilitation Order is contained within revised *National Standards for Youth Justice Services, Case Management Guidance and The Youth Rehabilitation Order and other Youth Justice Provisions of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008*.

Additional support in the form of resources and briefings has been provided to YOTs to support their preparation for the implementation of the Scaled Approach.

¹ <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/7BB27BAF-25C4-4EFD-85FE-25C67C6D6CB0/0/YouthJusticeTheScaledApproachConsultationSummary.pdf>

Aims and objectives

Youth Justice: the Scaled Approach aims to ensure that interventions are tailored to the individual and based on an assessment of their risks and needs. The intended outcomes are to reduce the likelihood of reoffending for each young person by:

- tailoring the intensity of intervention to the assessment
- more effectively managing risk of serious harm to others.

This concept already applies to young people at risk of anti-social or offending behaviour, where prevention services are targeted at those at highest risk of offending. It also relates to pre-court work, where interventions given to young people subject to a Final Warning are focused on those most at risk of reoffending.

The YJB wishes to see this targeted and tailored approach applied to young people subject to court orders – this document, therefore, sets out expectations for working with those young people.

How the Scaled Approach works

The Scaled Approach should be used by the YOT to determine the level of intervention required when a child or young person is subject to YOT intervention through a Referral Order contract, a YRO, or during the community element of a custodial sentence.²

The level of intervention is informed by the assessment process and should be used to guide:

- sentence proposals made to the court
- reports to youth offender panels
- the intervention provided during the YOT's subsequent management of the order.

It is important that the Scaled Approach is viewed within the context of the wider children's agenda, as successful implementation cannot be achieved without support from mainstream children's services and strong local partnerships with YOTs.

² The Scaled Approach is relevant to young people in custody in that interventions should be tailored to the individual and based on an assessment of their risks and needs. However, it will not be used to determine the intensity of supervision while they are in custody; this applies once they are released.

Assessment for intervention

Assessment

The Scaled Approach is underpinned by good quality assessment, which should form the basis of all subsequent interventions with young people who have offended. When a PSR or youth offender panel report has been requested, practitioners should first complete *Asset – Core Profile* to ensure they have a good understanding of the young person's risks and needs. The *Asset – Core Profile* should be used to assess the likelihood of reoffending, and, if applicable, the *Asset – Risk of Serious Harm* form should also be used to assess the risk of serious harm to others. Where a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) is available, it should be used to inform the *Asset* assessment; this will reduce the need for a young person to repeat the same information to different practitioners.

This information will be used as the basis of the report to court or youth offender panel, and will help to determine the appropriate level of YOT intervention, both at the start and throughout the course of the order as a result of ongoing assessment.

Intervention framework

Where it is determined that some form of YOT intervention will be needed, e.g. through a supervision requirement of a YRO, supervision as part of a referral order contract or supervision/licence when a young person has been released from custody, the Scaled Approach framework will be used to determine the overall intervention level.

Determining the appropriate level of YOT intervention is based primarily on two factors:

- likelihood of reoffending
- risk of serious harm.

This is supported by professional judgement.

Assessing likelihood of reoffending

To assess the likelihood of the young person reoffending, practitioners should add the scores from the 12 main sections of *Asset – Core Profile* (which relate to dynamic factors affecting offending behaviour) and score four 'static' factors, to arrive at a total score between 0 and 64. The inclusion of static criminal history data helps to improve predictive accuracy relating to likelihood of reconviction and also improves the differentiation between levels. Appendix A contains a sample form to show how this should be done. The YJB has also commissioned updates to YOT case management systems to ensure this assessment is supported.

Assessing risk of serious harm

A full *Asset – Risk of Serious Harm* form should be completed if there is a ‘Yes’ response to any of the questions in the ‘Indicators of serious harm to others’ section of the *Asset – Core Profile*.

Assessing intervention level

Following the assessment, practitioners should use the framework below to determine the most suitable level of intervention for managing the young person. This will form the basis of the proposal to the court or the information for the youth offender panel.

Child/young person profile	Intervention level
Low likelihood of reoffending (as indicated by <i>Asset</i> score [dynamic and static factors] between 0 and 14 inclusive) AND Low risk of serious harm (as indicated by no risk of serious harm assessment being required, or low risk of serious harm assessment)	Standard
Medium likelihood of reoffending (as indicated by <i>Asset</i> score [dynamic and static factors] between 15 and 32 inclusive) OR Medium risk of serious harm (as indicated by risk of serious harm assessment)	Enhanced
High likelihood of reoffending (as indicated by <i>Asset</i> score [dynamic and static factors] between 33 and 64 inclusive) OR High or very high risk of serious harm (as indicated by risk of serious harm assessment)	Intensive

Factors affecting intervention level

The initial assessment provides the starting point for considering the intervention level. The following factors must be considered after the initial indication of the most suitable intervention level.

Professional judgement

Practitioners should review the intervention level in the context of all other available information and consider whether there are any factors that indicate the intervention level may need to be increased or decreased. An example of this might be where a young person had committed a particularly serious offence but was assessed by the YOT as low likelihood of reoffending or low risk of serious harm. Any proposed changes to the initial intervention level, by the YOT as responsible officer, should be defensible, discussed and agreed with a manager, and the reasons clearly recorded.

Children and young people at risk of harm and welfare considerations

YOT practitioners have ongoing responsibilities for addressing children and young people who may be at risk of harm and welfare issues as part of wider social/children’s services partnerships, and should therefore ensure such issues are assessed. If the child or young person is assessed as being particularly at

risk of harm from themselves or others then the appropriate action to be taken should also be identified. This will not affect the Scaled Approach intervention levels, but should form part of the overall intervention plan and vulnerability plan where one is needed.

The final judgement should be used to inform the proposal made to the court or report to the youth offender panel.

Proposing interventions for court orders

Following the assessment, the YOT will need to propose a suitable order when writing a PSR, or indicate the appropriate level of intervention when completing a report for a youth offender panel. While the primary aim of the Scaled Approach is to prevent reoffending, it must also be viewed within the context of the statutory sentencing framework and take account of the sentencing principles in place.

Sentencing context

As stated in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998,³ the principal aim of the youth justice system is to prevent offending, including reoffending, by children and young people.

When determining the particular sentence for an offence, under the Criminal Justice Act 2003, the court will take an initial view of seriousness, consider any aggravating and mitigating factors and then consider any personal mitigation.

Scaled Approach and sentencing purposes

It is the court's responsibility to sentence a young person, and proportionality in relation to the seriousness of the offence is, and will remain, a critical principle governing the court's sentencing decision. This will influence the length of order and the type of requirements included within the YRO.

It is the YOT's responsibility to assist the court, by means of PSR, to determine the most suitable method of dealing with a young person who has offended.⁴

In discharging this responsibility, the YOT must also consider the seriousness of the offence/s, taking into account mitigating and aggravating factors, and any issues that may go towards personal mitigation. In addition, the YOT must have regard to the principal aim of the youth justice system. The interventions proposed should aim to reduce further offending, including future risk of serious harm to others. Proposing interventions based on individual assessments of likelihood of reoffending and risk of serious harm will invariably address most, if not all, of these principles. In this way the YOT makes an important contribution to the sentencing process while the court has the ultimate responsibility for determining the sentence.

Tailoring court and youth offender panel reports to assessments

The assessments completed using *Asset* to arrive at an overall 'intervention level' will guide the proposal made to court or the type of intervention the youth

³ Section 37(1).

⁴ As defined under s158 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003.

offender panel may consider when agreeing a contract. There are geographical variations in local YOT and partner agency service provision, as well as offending patterns, so it is not appropriate for the YJB to formally link likelihood of reoffending, risk of serious harm or Scaled Approach intervention levels to detailed proposals for individual cases. However, it is possible to provide an indication of the types of sentence or contract components that may be suitable for those needing 'standard, enhanced or intensive' levels of intervention. This can be used as a starting point for YOTs to consider sentence structure for their sentence proposals, or the types of intervention that could be provided within Referral Orders. As a guiding principle, the assessed intervention level will affect frequency of supervision contacts (where proposed) and should also be used to inform the types of interventions for other YRO requirements; for example, the programme or activity requirement.

Table 1: Possible sentence structures by intervention level

Intervention level	Function	Typical case management approach	Possible sentence requirement/component (not exclusive)
Standard	Enabling compliance and repairing harm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Organising interventions to meet basic requirements of order ■ Engaging parents in interventions and/or to support young person ■ Monitoring compliance ■ Enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Reparation ■ Stand-alone unpaid work ■ Supervision ■ Stand-alone attendance centre
Enhanced	Enabling compliance and repairing harm AND Enabling help/change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Brokering access to external interventions ■ Co-ordinating interventions with specialists in YOT ■ Providing supervision ■ Engaging parents in interventions and/or supporting young person ■ Providing motivation to encourage compliance ■ Proactively addressing reasons for non-compliance ■ Enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Supervision ■ Reparation ■ Requirement/component to help young person or change behaviour, e.g. drug treatment, offending behaviour programme, education programme ■ Combination of the above
Intensive	Enabling compliance and repairing harm AND Enabling help/change AND Ensuring control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Extensive⁵ ■ Help/change function plus additional controls, restrictions and monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Supervision ■ Reparation <p>PLUS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Requirement/component to help young person or change behaviour ■ Requirement/component to monitor or restrict movement, e.g. prohibited activity, curfew, exclusion or electronic monitoring ■ Combination of the above

⁵ This is distinct from the most intensive forms of intervention, the Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS) and Intensive Fostering requirements of the YRO, which must be used only as direct alternatives to custody. However, it would be expected that those suitable for ISS and Intensive Fostering would have been assessed as needing an intensive level of intervention.

In general terms:

- More requirements will tend to equate to the intensive intervention level – **but** if the risks and needs of a child or young person assessed as requiring the enhanced or intensive level can be adequately dealt with through a supervision requirement, then multiple requirements will not be necessary.
- Where issues such as mental health difficulties or substance misuse are present, it is preferable to engage the young person in interventions to address these needs on a voluntary basis; statutory requirements to address these types of issues should only be proposed where voluntary engagement has previously failed.

Supervision levels

When the YOT is proposing supervision as an element of the order, the practitioner should make clear in the PSR (or stand-down report, where appropriate) that this will be in accordance with their assessment of the appropriate intervention level. They should make clear that the frequency of supervision will be delivered in accordance with the minimum standards⁶ set out in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Supervision levels

Intervention level	Minimum no. of contacts per month for first three months of order	Minimum no. of contacts per month for remainder of order
Standard	2	1
Enhanced	4	2
Intensive	12	4

In the event that a young person is being sentenced for a relatively minor offence, but the YOT has assessed them as needing an intensive level of supervision because the young person is highly likely to reoffend or presents a high or very high risk of serious harm to the public, it is important that this is highlighted at the court hearing. This will allow the court and the young person's legal representative to consider the information. In this instance, the court may make a shorter order that is proportionate to the offence, and may limit the number of requirements to take account of the fact that the YOT will see the young person more frequently in order to address the likelihood of reoffending or risk of serious harm to others.

Equally, there will be situations where a young person is being sentenced for a particularly serious offence but is assessed by the YOT as requiring a standard intervention because of low likelihood of reoffending and low risk of serious harm. In such cases, the court is likely to give a longer order in proportion with

⁶ These are contained in the revised *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*.

the offence, and it may also wish to include specific requirements to address the seriousness of the offence, e.g. those that monitor or restrict movement, such as a curfew or electronic monitoring, in addition to the proposed level of YOT supervision.

Whichever Scaled Approach intervention level a young person is assessed at, the quality of interventions should be of key importance and informed by the YJB's *Key Elements of Effective Practice*. The contact levels set out in Table 2 are the minimum requirements for each intervention level.

Packages of intervention

In the context of the YRO and for Referral Order 'cusp of custody' cases, it is important that a range of 'packages of intervention' is available to courts that give them confidence in sentencing young people, who have varying likelihoods of reoffending or risks of serious harm, to a suitable order. It will also be important for court confidence to be able to use the YRO for the same young person on multiple occasions.

YOTs should work with sentencers to determine how the 'packages of intervention' will operate on a local level, and develop different 'packages' for YROs and Referral Orders that can be tailored for individual cases to take into account level and type of offending. It is recognised that packages of intervention for Referral Orders are likely to be indicative only as the youth offender panel determines the specific content of the Referral Order contract. However, in cases where custody is being considered, it is good practice for the YOT to arrange an informal preparatory meeting involving panel volunteers to consider the likely content of a Referral Order contract and if appropriate an Intensive Referral Order contract to inform the PSR recommendation.

Managing an order post-sentence

Ongoing case management

After sentencing, the Scaled Approach framework should inform the ongoing management of cases. Within the context of the sentence passed in court, or in the case of Referral Orders, the contract agreed at the panel meeting, intervention and risk management plans should be drawn up in more detail, with a careful matching of intervention intensity to the assessed likelihood of reoffending and risk of serious harm to others (if applicable).

Where the proposal for sentence has been followed, i.e. for non-Referral Order cases, this is likely to require minimal additional work, but it will provide an opportunity to ensure that a high quality intervention plan is put in place and delivered. In cases where the YOT's sentence proposal was not followed by the court, the YOT must implement the sentence passed and draw up an intervention plan in accordance with it.

Review

In accordance with the National Standards' requirements, reviews should take place at least every three months – or sooner where there has been a significant change in circumstances. At this stage, the YOT practitioner as responsible officer has the discretion to amend the level of supervision where there is clear evidence of a change in circumstances that would lead to an amended risk assessment. Any proposed changes to the initial intervention level in place at the start of the sentence must be based on an updated assessment of the likelihood of reoffending and risk of serious harm to others using *Asset*. The outcome of the assessment must be clearly recorded. Where it is proposed to increase the intervention level, this should be discussed with the young person and where appropriate their parents/carers, before it is implemented, to facilitate their engagement.

In particular circumstances, there may be a need to amend the level of intervention before the formal review stage, for example, where there is intelligence that a young person has become involved in dangerous behaviour that would present a high risk of serious harm to the public, and this information was not available to the court at the time of sentencing. Again, any changes to intervention levels must be supported by defensible evidence-based decisions that are clearly recorded. In the event of a substantial change occurring in assessment and resulting intervention levels within days of sentence, it may be appropriate to advise the court accordingly.

Children and young people at risk of harm and welfare considerations

As part of ongoing case management, welfare needs should be addressed in a scaled manner, initially through targeted youth support and other voluntary engagement, for example, through access to positive leisure activities. Where the child or young person is assessed as being particularly at risk of harm from themselves or others and where there are welfare concerns, these should be addressed in line with local safeguarding, CAF and Lead Professional procedures in England, or in line with Children and Young People's Partnership

arrangements in Wales. A referral should also be made to children's services in England or social services in Wales for an s17 assessment.⁷

Intervention levels, contact types and breach

Given the range of YRO, Referral Order contract and DTO community supervision requirements that children and young people may be subject to, it is important that consideration is given to the sequencing of these to ensure that the interventions are manageable. Where children and young people are subject to supervision, the amount of contact they should receive is determined by the Scaled Approach intervention levels, as set out in Table 2.

Further guidance will be provided on what constitutes a contact in relation to the Scaled Approach and the YRO.

Breach

In encouraging and enabling compliance with the order and scaled approach supervision levels, YOT staff should seek to engage the young person in their intervention. They should be aware of the *Key Elements of Effective Practice – Engaging Young People who Offend*, as well as *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*. As per existing the National Standards, where a young person has failed to attend a scheduled contact, they should determine whether the failure to attend was reasonable by ascertaining the stated reasons for the failure to attend and then applying their professional judgement to take into account, in addition to the explanation given, the following factors:

- the overall level of contact required
- overall compliance with the order and its requirements
- the maturity of the young person
- *Asset and Asset – Risk of Serious Harm* assessments
- any other relevant factors, such as whether there are chaotic circumstances in the young person's life.

If a failure to attend is deemed unacceptable then a warning must be issued to the young person in writing. Where a third unreasonable failure to comply occurs within a 12-month warned period, the YOT should issue breach proceedings in accordance with relevant legislation⁸ and *National Standards for Youth Justice Services*. Breach action can only be stayed in exceptional circumstances with the authorisation of the YOT manager.

⁷ An assessment carried out by children's services under s17 of the Children Act 1989 to determine whether young people are 'children in need' and therefore eligible for a wide range of services.

⁸ Section 2 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 includes requirements in relation to breach of a YRO. This is covered in more detail in the *The Youth Rehabilitation Order and other Youth Justice Provisions of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008*.

Prolific and Other Priority Offenders

The Scaled Approach offers an opportunity for alignment with the process for identifying young people eligible for the 'Deter' cohort within the Prolific and Other Priority Offender Strategy. Within the Scaled Approach framework, those who are assessed as requiring intensive intervention will automatically be eligible for the 'Deter' cohort. This will enable targeting of services from the partners within the Community Safety Partnerships in England and Wales to one priority group through a single process. However, local adaptation may be needed to suit local circumstances; for example, if the numbers in the high intervention level category are very small, the cohort may need to be expanded. These variations should be agreed at a local level.⁹

⁹ Guidance on selecting those eligible for the 'Deter' cohort is available on the YJB website at www.yjb.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/5EDD1469-D5FD-4A55-9124-79C311617704/0/PreventandDeterforYOTs.pdf

Appendix A: Assessing the likelihood of reoffending

The information used to make the assessment of a young person's likelihood of reoffending is taken from *Asset*. The 'static' factors listed opposite and explained below are contained within *Asset – Core Profile*. The 'dynamic' factors are taken from the 12 sections normally scored within *Asset*.

How are static factors different to dynamic factors?

Dynamic factors relate to the elements of a young person's life to which the YOT can affect change during the course of an order. Static factors, by their nature, will remain as they are for the duration of a young person's order. It is possible that a young person will score 0 on their static factors.

Why include static factors?

Research¹⁰ has indicated that the inclusion of static factors alongside the existing dynamic factors to determine a young person's likelihood of reoffending has increased the predictive accuracy of *Asset* and provides a more accurate prediction of a young person's likelihood of reoffending in the subsequent 12 months.

Determining static factors score

*Offence type*¹¹

At the time the research was undertaken, young people whose primary index offence was burglary or motoring offences were more likely to be reconvicted in the subsequent 12 months than those young people whose primary index offence was another offence type. As such, when determining the young person's score for this static factor category, YOTs will need to ensure that this is adhered to.

The offence type refers to the *current* offence. Future offending episodes will not continue to count any previous burglary or motoring offences unless the new primary index offence is one of offences. If their current primary index offence is not one of these offences then they will score 0.

Age at first Reprimand/Caution/Final Warning

If the young person does not have previous reprimands/ cautions or a final warning they will score 0 in this category.

Age at first conviction

If the current conviction is their first conviction the young person will score a 0 for this category as the assessment is in relation to their *current* offence.

¹⁰ <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/Publications/Resources/Downloads/ASSETReport2003.pdf>

¹¹ See Appendix B.

Number of previous convictions

YOTs should not count the current conviction to this score as the assessment is in relation to the current offence. All previous convictions will count even if there has been a significant gap in offending.

Determining likelihood of reoffending

The total static factor score (no more than a score of 16) should be added to the total dynamic factor score (no more than 48) with the final score being no more than 64.

Sample form

Likelihood of reoffending

Static factors	Scoring	Initial score
Offence type ¹²	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Motoring offences/vehicle theft/unauthorised taking = 4■ Burglary (domestic and non-domestic) = 3■ Other offence = 0	
Age at first Reprimand/Caution/Warning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ 10 to 12 = 4■ 13 to 17 = 2■ No previous Reprimand/Caution/Warning = 0	
Age at first conviction	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ 10 to 13 = 4■ 14 to 17 = 3■ No previous convictions = 0	
Number of previous convictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ 4 or more = 4■ 1 to 3 = 3■ No previous convictions = 0	
Total static factors score (0–16)		0

¹² See Appendix B.

Dynamic factors/Asset section	Scoring	Initial score
Living arrangements	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Family and personal relationships	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Education, training and employment	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Neighbourhood	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Lifestyle	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Substance use	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Physical health	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Emotional and mental health	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Perception of self and others	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Thinking and behaviour	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Attitudes to offending	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Motivation to change	0, 1, 2, 3, 4	
Total dynamic factors score (0–48)		0
Total score (0–64)		

Overall assessed likelihood of reoffending

Rating
Low (score 0–14 inclusive)
Medium (score 15–32 inclusive)
High (score 33–64 inclusive)

Appendix B – List of static factor offences types

Offences listed by Youth Justice Board seriousness score

STATIC SCORE 4 – Motoring Offences (gravity score in blue)	
Counted	Not counted
Dangerous driving 5	Driving without due care and attention 2
Driving under the influence of drinks/drugs 3	Driving on a footpath or/and common land 2
Driving whilst disqualified 5	Driving defective motor vehicle 2
Interfering with a motor vehicle 3	Exceeding speed limit 2
Refusing to give breath test 4	Failure to wear a seatbelt 2
	Failure to comply with a road traffic sign 2
	Failure to give particulars after an accident 2
	Failure to produce documents 2
	Failure to report an accident 2
	Failure to stop when requested by a constable 2
	Failure to stop after an accident 2
	Forge vehicle records/licence 2
	No insurance 2
	No L plates 2
	No licence 2
	No MOT 2
	Not wearing protective headgear 2
	Not well maintained indicators/stop/hazard and light reflectors 2
	Pedal cycle offences 2
Other/unspecified motoring offences 3	
STATIC SCORE 3 – Domestic Burglary (gravity score in blue)	
Counted	Not counted
Aggravated burglary of a dwelling 7 • Burglary with violence or threat of violence	
Burglary in a dwelling 6 • Conspiracy to commit burglary of a dwelling	
Other/unspecified domestic burglary 6	
STATIC SCORE 3 – Non-Domestic Burglary (gravity score in blue)	
Counted	Not counted
Aggravated burglary of a non-dwelling 7 • Burglary with violence or threat of violence	Found on enclosed premises 3
Burglary in a non-dwelling 4 • Burglary with intent • Conspiracy to commit burglary of a non-dwelling	
Other/unspecified non-domestic burglary 4	
STATIC SCORE 3 - Vehicle theft/unauthorised taking (gravity score in blue)	
Counted	Not counted
Aggravated vehicle taking 5 • Injury to person, damage to property or car	
Being carried 3	
Being carried (aggravated) 4	
Vehicle taking 4 • Theft of motor vehicle • Unauthorised vehicle taking (TWOC/TADA)	
Other/unspecified vehicle theft/taking 4	