

Report to the Thames Valley Police & Crime Panel

Title: Proactive Scrutiny of Criminal Justice

Date: 8 September 2016

Author: Clare Gray, Scrutiny Officer,
Thames Valley Police & Crime Panel



Introduction

The aim of this item is to look at how the PCC is working in partnership with Local Criminal Justice partners. The Prime Minister has commented that 'a number of PCCs have argued, youth justice, probation and court services can have a significant impact on crime in their areas and there are real efficiencies to be had from better integration and information sharing'. A joint inspection of local criminal justice partnerships by HMIC, HMCSI and HMI Probation was undertaken in October 2015 and there was broad consensus that the main barriers to establishing more effective local arrangements are fundamental differences in the drivers, structures, objectives and success criteria of the principal criminal justice agencies, which were seen as inconsistent and misaligned.

<https://www.justicespectorates.gov.uk/hmic/wp-content/uploads/local-criminal-justice-partnerships.pdf>

Information below has been provided by the Thames Valley Local Criminal Justice Board which shows how the Board has been focused on working together and highlight the successes of the Board during the PCC's chairmanship.

In terms of looking at good practice Panel Members agreed that it would be helpful to obtain local evidence through other means and for this item a smart survey was sent to the Local Criminal Justice Board on how the PCC works in partnership. This is attached as an Appendix (Members view on this approach is welcomed). Members of the Local Criminal Justice Board were invited to this meeting and a representative is attending from the Crown Prosecution Service and the Probation Service.

In terms of the survey the responses show that good partnership working is in place and that agencies have similar priorities. 'I think the LCJB within Thames Valley does work effectively as demonstrated by consistently positive outcomes across the partnership' (Quote from survey). However some responses did include comments that the PCC could provide more robust challenge to poor performance or areas where agencies were not committed to joint working.

In previous agendas Members have been given background information on the Criminal Justice System and information is provided below on national research. Attached is a report from the Local Criminal Justice Board showing its priorities and a further report is attached on accommodation for released prisons which is a current concern for the LCJB and the PCC.

<http://sbdc-spider2.southbucks.gov.uk/democracy/documents/s26284/Proposal%20to%20look%20into%20criminal%20justice.pdf>

What is the PCCs statutory duty ?

The **Police and Social Responsibility Act 2011** sets out a duty for PCCs as follows:-

“The PCC and criminal justice bodies (including the police, the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), Court Service, Youth Offending Teams and probation) must make arrangements to provide an efficient and effective criminal justice system for the police area”

Thames Valley Police and Crime Plan

Quote from the Plan

‘The financial cut backs to the other public services, such as local councils, the Crown Prosecution Service and Her Majesty’s Court and Tribunal Service can cause increased workload for the police’.

Related key aims include:-

- Improved recognition across the criminal justice system of mental health distress experienced by both victims and offenders leading to referral pathways into appropriate support agencies and improved access to mental health care for those in contact with the criminal justice system.
- Improvements in criminal justice experience and outcomes for victims of domestic and sexual abuse
- Improved use of technology by police, in order to prevent crime and support earlier intervention with known offenders.
- A review by police and other criminal justice partners on whether processes for identifying and referring individuals in contact with the criminal justice system into substance misuse are as effective as they could be.
- Improved data sharing on gangs with the aim of reducing exploitation of young people through gang membership and reducing and preventing violent crime.
- A modern offender management strategy addressing gaps in existing schemes and tackling offenders across the crime spectrum who pose the greatest risk of threat or harm. (The Integrated Offender Management Scheme has been operating a number of years in the Thames Valley and aims to bring together organisations to prioritise intervention with offenders who commit the most crime)

The OPCC Strategic Delivery Plan 2017/18 (Partnerships section) has an action to utilise the PCC Chairmanship of TV Local Criminal Justice Board and engage with key delivery groups to encourage more joined up criminal justice system. In the OPCC Plan 2016-7 there was also an Objective 4 ‘Identify and implement process for scrutinising individual and collective effectiveness of Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) partners and optimising joint performance.

What does a good criminal justice system look like?

To give the Panel an idea of research undertaken nationally on what good looks like information has been included below from the Crest Report – All on the same side. There is virtually no clarity about what ‘good’ looks like and the information about its performance which is publicly available is limited and uncoordinated. When conducting their research they found that a key problem is the lack of a common view as to what success should look like, which means individual criminal justice agencies often act in ways that run contrary to the best interests of the system as a whole.

- For example, courts staff are measured by HMCTS against the extent to which courts are in use. As a result, more trials are scheduled than can be heard so that there are backups

when one trial cannot proceed. This leads to costs being incurred elsewhere - for example, witnesses who spend a day waiting to give evidence for a trial that is not then heard, and who may then be more likely to disengage from the process.

- The vast majority of respondents said they felt it was important to be informed about criminal justice services (though only a small minority felt well informed in practice). 85% of people felt it was important to be informed about the courts, whilst only 29% feel well informed about them.
- Their poll also shows that the public are much less punitive than often imagined: Asked about the best ways to cut crime; 42% support more police on the streets, 41% better parenting, 33% better discipline in schools, 33% better rehabilitation of offenders. Just 8% say the police arresting more people cuts crime, only 7% say more people in prison does.
- On the most important objective of the criminal justice system, when asked, the public prioritise efficiency in the system (32%) and a fair system that treats everyone equally (26%) over both reducing crime (13%) and looking after the needs of victims (8%).
- Public protection/safety is deemed the most important aspect of criminal justice performance; 65% say keeping public safe from dangerous offenders is the priority, 47% support sentences from judges that both punish and rehabilitate offenders
- In order to communicate with the public about the criminal justice system, PCCs and others need to be able to access basic performance data. Yet despite promises to expand the powers of PCCs, many are still unable to scrutinise how the system is performing as a whole.
- The measures by which individual agencies are held to account are themselves often clunky and poorly designed, driving perverse behaviours. For example, focusing on conviction and/or charge rates in isolation may lead to 'easy' cases being pursued by the Crown Prosecution Service and police. Similarly, holding private community rehabilitation companies (responsible for low to medium-risk offenders) to account for completion of community sentences may lead to breaches being under-reported. Where individual agencies do share performance data locally, it is collected in different formats, according to metrics agreed in Whitehall, rather than locally, making meaningful analysis impossible.
- As a result, PCCs are left in the dark about how local justice services are doing and are unable to hold different parts of the system to account. This is why Crest Analytics has invested in developing a criminal justice dashboard <http://crestadvisory.com/data-analysis-and-tools/> which can bring data from across the system together in one place and produce meaningful analysis for decision makers and the public.
- The full report 'All on the same side', <http://crestadvisory.com/all-on-the-same-side/>

Executive Summary

- They found that the current system for measuring CJS effectiveness is not fit for purpose, characterised by siloed (and often conflicting) objectives, input-oriented measures and a lack of transparency to the public
- New technology presents huge opportunities, but there remain major structural barriers to reform, the most pressing of which is PCCs often lack the ability to access key performance data
- There is a strong appetite for reform, both amongst PCCs and the general public. PCCs feel the system lacks an overall purpose, and a framework for shared outcomes; whilst a clear majority of the public would like more information about the performance of local justice services. The public are also less punitive than often imagined - a large majority think the best way to cut crime is through better prevention, rather than prison and/ or more arrests

- Their report proposes a new framework for measuring effectiveness, with a limited set of shared outcomes set nationally, but local areas given much greater discretion for how those outcomes are achieved.
- In areas with metropolitan mayors, police and crime plans should be replaced by local improvement plans, enabling services to be joined up; and every LCJB in the country should be encouraged to publish force-wide scorecards of CJS performance to enable comparison and encourage data-driven approaches.

(See attached some slides from the report which relate to this national research)

Information provided by the Local Criminal Justice Board on response to HMIC report and what has been achieved in the last two years

Background

The 'Working in Step' report reflects an inspection conducted across 6 Local Criminal Justice Boards / Partnerships during the autumn of 2014. It did not directly review Thames Valley and only Kent partnership was inspected across the South East area. Within the Executive Summary (Pages 15 and 16) it sets out the conclusions and recommendations expected in terms of a national and local response. The national recommendations are set out below for information only and the local recommendations were subject of the self assessment below requested by the Chair of the Thames Valley Criminal Justice Board.

At the national level (extract page 15):

We recommend that, as a priority, the Criminal Justice Board establishes an 'operating framework' that enables local criminal justice agencies to work together more effectively, with the freedom to organise in ways that reflect local circumstances and local and national priorities. As a minimum, the framework should:

- *define the scope for local areas to adapt nationally-determined plans and programmes to meet local need;*
- *promote innovation, through the offer of greater local freedoms and flexibility for the most promising approaches;*
- *establish a forum for local areas collectively to highlight barriers and tensions in the system which inhibit the provision of services;*
- *provide for the identification and dissemination of good practice;*
- *enable access to a national suite of core data against which all local areas can monitor progress and measure success. This should relate to the desired outcomes for the CJS as a whole and be readily understood and accessible to the public; and*
- *provide information and advice to local areas on trends, risks and emerging threats relating to particular crimes requiring an enhanced response. This might be set out in a strategic criminal justice requirement (akin to the Strategic Policing Requirement) to which all LCJPs must have regard in setting their local priorities.*

At the local level (extract page 16):

We recommend that, within six months of the Criminal Justice Board establishing the operating framework, leaders of local criminal justice agencies acting together, and in co-operation with the PCC, should undertake a fundamental review of local partnership arrangements to assess whether they are fit for purpose to lead improvements to the efficiency and effectiveness of the CJS at local level.

Thames Valley LCJB – Self Assessment (SA).

The inspection report suggested as a minimum, a local review (Self Assessment (SA)) should include:

- *an assessment of the health of the CJS locally, including its impact on victims and witnesses, especially the most vulnerable, and the extent to which perpetrators can expect swift justice;*

SA: The LCJB Partnership in Thames Valley works effectively and relationships are healthy, mature and challenging. Performance improvement still alludes the partnership, especially in the Magistrates Court and has done over several years, in all bar a few areas i.e. DV. In this regard the partnership could be seen as failing to deliver improved performance. Crown Court performance however, is much improved and that would align to more serious cases, with higher risk to organisational reputational damage, equally aligned to providing greater support and protection against the harm to victims.

- *a local assessment of risk (informed by national threats, risks and harm) and the views and experiences of the public to inform local priority setting;*

SA: Priority setting is undertaken in cognisance of the Police annual strategic assessment of local threats, harm and risk, which in itself also reflects the national position. The Board equally takes stock at the annual Planning Day and consideration of all CJS agencies national perspectives, local strain and delivery constraints and intentions.

- *the business and analytical support required for effective partnership planning, commissioning and co-ordination;*

SA: See LCJB and PMG Executive Summary Performance Reports for cross agency data. Performance across the Magistrates Courts is fairly weak; however Crown Court performance is strong. Resource for further analysis of the data is contributed by the agencies.

- *identification and clarification of links with related partnerships so that work is co-ordinated and mutually reinforcing.*

SA: The LCJB is linked via the Chief Executive's meetings to the CSP Safer Partnership Boards. There is limited evidence of joint planning with Local Authorities within the LCJB, although an example of mutually supportive planning would be the drafting of the Reducing Re-offending Strategy (currently in consultation). There is a more tenuous link to health strategic governance. However, an example of joint working with Health would be the planning in respect of the Crisis Care Concordat which, although primarily police led, is mutually supportive toward the LCJB Offender Health and Justice priority.

The findings from this review should result in:

- *a set of agreed local collaborative arrangements which have been refreshed and reinvigorated, which are visible to the public and which ensure that the right issue is tackled at the right level by the right agencies;*

SA: the Board's Governance, Structure and Terms of Reference document is refreshed every year based on the annual partnership planning day and the agreed priorities.

- *an evidence-based, multi-agency action plan, with shared priorities, clear objectives and measurable outcomes which should be updated annually;*

SA: the Board and PMG do not hold bespoke action plans. However, both groups receive quarterly updates regarding cross CJS activity, in the form of Delivery Group updates. Also in the Magistrates Court through the TSJ action plan and update reports, plus in the Crown Court, the new BCM delivery plan will demonstrate cross CJS activity. Both the latter plans are directed against nationally specified objectives and expected outcomes. In addition each of the Board's (priorities) delivery groups has a current or developing action plan, with transparent measures, timescales and joint agency responsibility ownership.

• *an agreed system for reporting progress nationally and to the public.*

SA: At present the national CJB does not require LCJB/P reporting, other than direct updates via the individual agencies at the national level. There is no direct line of accountability or communication either up or down between the two.

A local weakness is the lack of a public facing website that the Board can use to provide greater transparency or insight into local business activity. Discussions are underway with the OPCC to see how we could create a link in this regard, especially related to support for victims and witnesses.

NB: The self assessment document was discussed and accepted at the TV LCJ Board meeting on 20th November 2015.

Conclusion The review report highlights ongoing good work within the Thames Valley Criminal Justice Board. Partnership relations are strong and the Board is supported by a wide range of partners across the spectrum. Scrutiny of performance and management of programmes of work, relating to its priorities, receives good oversight and progress is being made, albeit performance improvement has still some way to go. The Board will consider updates from the national Criminal Justice Board in terms of setting any future 'operational framework' or providing further direction in terms of expectations or local requirements.

Achievements identified at the Planning Day 2016

TVCJB Priorities 2015 - 2016

- Victims and Witnesses
- Promoting a Digital CJS
- Reducing Re-Offending (IOM)
- (Offender) Health & Justice
- Restorative Justice
- Children & Young People

Victims and Witnesses Group – Chair; Emma Garside.

- Continued to deliver against a **Victim and Witness Delivery Plan** which has coordinated the work across all agencies and brought a degree of ownership and accountability to the process.
- **Victims Journey Workshop** (28th January 2016) plotted the victims / witness CJS journey across a number of thematic issues; Intermediaries, Interpreters, VPS, Special Measures and Witness Withdrawals. This had excellent 'buy in' from all agencies and has identified a number of gaps in current provision/services which are now being reviewed and filled.
- Support to the **PCC's Victims Services Commissioning** process, working with the new contract providers, sharing victim feedback and assisting with the contract management and quality assurance.
- Provided a monitoring and oversight function as CJ agencies embed the **New Victims Code**, accepting that evidencing compliance still proves difficult.

Reducing Re-Offending (IOM) Group – Joint Chairs; Paul Gillbard / Alan Baldwin.

- Drafted and presented a **new Reducing Re-Offending Strategy** with an Integrated Service Delivery model. The TV Chief Executives group have given provisional support to the initial draft and local consultation has commenced.
- Successfully evaluated and extended the **Offender Electronic Monitoring arrangements** across key areas of TV which has greatly supported the supervision and monitoring of offenders and in some cases of non compliance has supported prosecutions. Secured funding for 2016-17.
- Supported the introduction, transitional arrangements and integration of the **new Community Rehabilitation Company**.
- Continuous **local review of Offender Resettlement & Rehabilitation Pathways** including Drugs and Alcohol, Accommodation, Education, Training & Employment and Health. These are now being supported by the new prison Through the Gate services.

Digital CJS Group – Chair; Philip Densham.

- Case material for both Magistrates and Crown Courts are now provided by digital means. Work has continued to plan for the imminent implementation of **Overnight Remand work**.
- Embedded **Live Link at Slough Police Station** has enabled Police Officers to give their evidence to Reading Magistrates Court by remote Video Links. New sites at **Abingdon, Bicester and Aylesbury** have come on line this year and are adding to costs and time saved by the Police, which is being redirected into operational activities and not impacted on the quality of the evidence given.
- New **Remote Video Link** sites for vulnerable or intimidated victims and witnesses have been located at **West Berkshire Local Authority** offices at Newbury. A Service Level Agreement and Operational Working Protocol have been drafted to support their use. Amersham and Bicester sites will come on line shortly.
- A cross agency Court Digital Implementation Group has supported the installation of **'In court WiFi** and **Magistrates in Court Presentation** equipment across all courts in the Thames Valley. Crown in Court Presentation equipment is in the process of being installed.
- **Digital Case System** has been installed in the Crown Courts to support Better Case Management.

Health & Justice Group – Chair; Sunita Sturup-Toft.

- Development of the **network of Offender Health Commissioners** with Criminal Justice partners and stakeholders to help deliver more cohesive processes for referral and treatment for those offenders who have Mental Health and Learning Disabilities.
- **Liaison & Diversion (Mental Health) Services** now operate across all custody and courts sites in Thames Valley, except Milton Keynes. This Thames Valley daytime service now provides screening and assessment for a high number of offenders in all main Police custody suites and for those appearing in court.
- **Oxfordshire Liaison & Diversion Services** for both young people and adults has now been extended to cover 24 / 7.
- **Milton Keynes MHTR** (Mental Health Treatment Requirements) Initiative has operated successfully throughout 2015. Over 100 MHTR orders have been directed by the court and the intervention and client support have delivered a hugely impressive 90% compliance rate. The initiative has been successfully nominated for several national and local awards.
- Published the (second) Thames Valley **Statistical Analysis of the Health & Well-being of Offenders supervised by Probation Report**. An offender health needs assessment which is helping to influence local commissioning. .

Restorative Justice Group – Chair; Stephen Czajewski.

- The Restorative Justice Group have taken forward and **developed clear pathways for accessing RJ** by both victims and offenders.
- The Office of the PCC has let the contract for **victim led RJ** and the Community Rehabilitation Company commission the **offender led RJ** work.
- A successful conference was held in October to highlight the **use of Restorative Justice in Domestic and Sexual Violence cases**. The event brought together key stakeholders and professionals to hear about some excellent case studies and good practice examples.

Children & Young People – Chair alternates; YOT(S) Managers

- The YOT(S) Managers have continued to meet this year to manage Youth Justice services, where **lower rates of First Time Entrants** and much **reduced Youth Remand cases** have been reported.
- Many of YOT(S) are considering implementation of the De-Criminalisation of Looked After Children agreement. The report is being considered by the Heads of Children & Social Care across the Thames Valley.

Programme Management Group (PMG) – Chair Adrian Foster.

- The **Fast Track Domestic Violence Trials Initiative** continues to operate across the Thames Valley delivering much faster trials for DV victims in recognition of the vulnerability of these cases and the negative impact high numbers of failing cases was having on performance. Improved conviction and early guilty plea rates are typical across the three counties.
- Comprehensive planning and agency engagement delivered a three week **National Trial Backlog Initiative** (30 were extra trial courts) which took place across Berkshire and Buckinghamshire during June / July 2015. In total 222 trials were delivered in Berkshire and 87 in Bucks throughout the three weeks. Effective Trial Rates considerably improved and Ineffective Trials were much reduced. An evaluation report submitted to the Chief Magistrates Office reflected the positive performance and several areas of learning which have been taken forward into a current 2 week trial backlog initiative in Berkshire.
- **Transforming Summary Justice (TSJ)** was implemented through the spring and summer with clear oversight and accountability provided by the PMG. The initiative is subject to regular reporting with notable improvements to File Quality, Case Management and delivery of Probation Pre-Sentence Reports.

Out of Court Disposals Group - Chair; Rory Freeman/Nigel Doak

- Have continued to operate as a multi agency partnership providing key scrutiny to Police and Youth Offending Team delivery of **Out of Court Disposals**. The group completed detailed **scrutiny of 26 adult and youth cases**. In 18 (69%) cases the decision recorded was agreed with by the panel members. In 8 cases (31%) the decision did not convince the panel. Guidance and feedback have been provided to those involved.

Achievements identified at the Planning Day 2017

TVCJB Priorities 2016 - 2017

- Victims and Witnesses
- Promoting a Digital CJS
- Reducing Re-Offending (IOM)
- (Offender) Health & Justice

- Restorative Justice
- Children & Young People

Victims and Witnesses Group – Chair; Emma Garside. (Ruth Bowskill, CPS)

- Improved guidance has been provided to officers in their use of **Interpreters and Intermediaries**. The number of occasions where these are now correctly used is consequently improving.
- **Victim and Witness Complaints** - Locally we responded to the national report from the Victims Commissioner; Information from all agencies regarding their individual complaints processes and points of contact were collated. A composite complaints information sheet was produced, circulated to all for use by all agencies and as a point of reference for complainants. This document is routinely available in witness rooms at court. The process for multiple agency complaints was consequently made more robust.
- In relation to **Victim Personal Statements** processes have been improved following a review of the MET Police guidance; received and adapted for TVP use, including the need for VPS inclusion at 1st Hearing File. The guidance is regularly sent to officers as part of VPS requests from the Evidential Review Officers and Witness Care Unit. It is also available on the force 'Knowzone'.
- A Victims Workshop (3rd Nov 2016) reviewed **Special Measures requests and Witness Notifications**. Long delays had been acknowledged through the year and a new CPS case allocation process was introduced, with clear escalation routes for Witness Care Officers. This has enabled faster turn-around and earlier decision making for these requests, which ensures witnesses are informed of the outcome in a timelier manner.
- Local agencies have supported the CPS in delivery of their '**Speaking to Witnesses at Court**' initiative. Recent survey shows 95% happy with CPS Service and almost 9 out of 10 (89.5%) felt they were given enough information or support by the CPS to prepare them for the court experience.

Reducing Re-Offending (IOM) Group – Joint Chairs; Jason Hogg / Gabriel Amahwe.

- Continuous **local review of Offender Resettlement & Rehabilitation Pathways** including Drugs and Alcohol, Accommodation, Education, Training & Employment and Health. These are now being supported by the new prison Through the Gate services in addition to IOM teams.
- The Reducing Re-Offending Strategy has been consulted on with local CSPs and **new partnership approaches** are developing to implement packages of support for a wider cohort of offenders. The focus on Serious Acquisitive Crime has been expanded to include Domestic Abuse perpetrators, Organised Crime Group members and Sex Offenders.
- **Offender Electronic Monitoring arrangements** continue to be evaluated and extended across key areas of TV, which has greatly supported the supervision and monitoring of offenders. In some cases non-compliance evidence has supported prosecutions. Funding is secured for 2017-18.
- The **Community Rehabilitation Company** have embedded their transitional arrangements and integrated further into Probation Service delivery both in the community and in prison.

Digital CJS Group – Chair; Philip Densham.

- Case material for both Magistrates and Crown Courts is now provided routinely by digital means. Work has been completed in delivery of digital **Overnight Remand work** in Bucks since the summer of 2016 and now planned is the imminent implementation in Berkshire and Oxfordshire.

- In 2016 the group oversaw the embedding of **Single Justice Procedures** in Thames Valley; a back office court process which has successfully taken over the vast majority of local Traffic prosecutions, enabled by Postal Requisition and supported by the new national **Make a Plea on line** system. The process has significantly reduced local court waiting time for traffic matters from 205 days down to just 35 days.
- **Live Link** continues to enable Police Officers to give their evidence to local court by remote Video Links. Sites at Slough, Abingdon, Bicester and Aylesbury are reducing costs and time spent by the Police giving evidence at court. **New funding** from the force has been agreed to supply 13 additional sites across the force and to join a more robust Video Link Network to ensure a more stable link and improve the quality of the evidence given.
- The **Remote Video Link** sites continue to support vulnerable or intimidated victims and witnesses, located at West Berkshire Local Authority offices at Newbury and the Law Courts at Amersham. Changes to the Bicester site will mean moving the equipment to Banbury Magistrates Court.

Health & Justice Group – Chair; Linda Stent.

- **Liaison & Diversion (Mental Health) Services** now operate across all custody and courts sites in Thames Valley. **New services at Milton Keynes** have come on line and this Thames Valley daytime service now provides screening and assessment for a high number of offenders in all main Police custody suites and for those appearing in court.
- **Milton Keynes MHTR** (Mental Health Treatment Requirements) Pilot continues to operate successfully. Orders directed by the court are supported by the services and the intervention and client support has delivered a highly regarded compliance rate. Further national pilots are being considered, although funding at Milton Keynes is under some risk.
- The work of this group has been acknowledged by the World Health Organisation and a presentation was delivered to an international Law Enforcement and Public Health (LEPH) conference in Amsterdam, highlighting the report; **Statistical Analysis of the Health & Well-being of Offenders supervised by Probation** which was commissioned by the group.

Restorative Justice Group – Chair; Stephen Czajewski. (James Hahn, TVP)

- The Restorative Justice Group has continued to support the work of Thames Valley RJ Services in **developing clear pathways for accessing RJ** by both victims and offenders.
- **Victim led RJ** is increasing, supported by an Information Officer embedded in the Witness Care Unit. The Community Rehabilitation Company have commissioned the **Offender led RJ** work which is equally increasing. An initiative has commenced at Oxford Crown Court to capture some **Pre-sentence RJ** referrals. Finally, the prison governor for Springhill/Grendon prison has successfully introduced use of **RJ in Prison** and this approach is being shared across other prisons in Thames Valley.
- A successful conference was held in November to highlight the use of Restorative Justice and **celebrate 15 years of TVRJ Services**. The event brought together key stakeholders and professionals to hear about some excellent case studies and good practice examples, which has helped place them as a leading provider of RJ services.

Children & Young People – Chair alternates; YOT(S) Managers

- The YOT(S) Managers have overseen significant changes to structures and funding this year. They continue to manage Youth Justice Services, where **First Time Entrants and Youth Remand cases continue to reduce**. The Taylor Report and the Govt. Response will provide some further challenges throughout the forthcoming year.

- YOT(S) and Local Authorities have implemented the **De-Criminalisation of Looked after Children agreement**. Equally, YOT(S) have supported Thames Valley Police in agreeing to work within the **Concordat on Children in Custody** which ensures more appropriate (post charge) overnight accommodation; reducing these from 45 in 2015 to only 1 since Sept 2016.

Programme Management Group (PMG) – Chair Adrian Foster.

- **Better Case Management and Transforming Summary Justice (TSJ)** continue to support performance improvement. Recent TSJ Q3 data showed across the year that the Effective Trial Rate improved 4%. Ineffective, Vacated and Cracked Trials equally all reduced in the Magistrates Court.
- The **Fast Track Domestic Violence Trials Initiative** continues to operate across the Thames Valley. More work has been done to reserve capacity for short notice court appearances particularly in Bucks and MK. This approach is being considered in Berkshire and Oxfordshire to further improve the delivery of much faster trials for DV victims.
- A new **National File Quality Assessment** was introduced in September.

Out of Court Disposals Group - Chair; Nigel Doak.

- This multi-agency partnership provides key scrutiny of Police and Youth Offending Teams delivery of Out of Court Disposals. The group completed **detailed scrutiny of 54 adult and youth cases** across 4 meetings. In 41 (76%) cases the decision recorded was agreed with by the panel members. In 13 cases (24%) the decision did not convince the panel. Of these 13 cases members either took the view that they disagreed with the outcome entirely 5 (9%) or in the other 8 (15%) cases members were not happy leading to the requirement for further clarity. A system of feedback was agreed through the year and now **in each case officers receive commentary on the outcome**.

Background documents

Criminal justice system near breaking point May 2016

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-36394842>

Youth Custody Centres 'so unsafe a tragedy is inevitable) July 2017

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-40644383>

Police failing to disclose crucial evidence about defendants July 2017

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/police-crown-prosecution-service-disclosure-lawyers-trial-a7846021.html>

More than two thirds of thefts are never solved – Victim Support said victims should be able to review police decisions not to investigate crimes

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-40131277>

Charlie Taylor review

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-the-youth-justice-system>

Police Foundation Reports

<http://www.police-foundation.org.uk/news/197/15/Victims-at-the-heart-of-the-criminal-justice-system>

https://social.shorthand.com/the_police_fdn/jCfipdqJcn/delivering-justice-for-the-digital-age

National Audit Office

<https://www.nao.org.uk/report/efficiency-in-the-criminal-justice-system/>

<http://www.thamesvalley.police.uk/aboutus/aboutus-depts/aboutus-depts-cj.htm>

<https://www.mix96.co.uk/news/local/1886765/thames-valley-polices-pcc-against-court-closures/>