

MERSEYSIDE
Violence
Reduction
Partnership



ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE WHEN CONSIDERING PERMANENT EXCLUSION

PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICAL
SUPPORT FOR MERSEYSIDE SCHOOLS 2020/21



1. BACKGROUND

1.1 - The Merseyside Violence Reduction Partnership (MVRP) is one of 18 Violence Reduction Units across the country established by the Home Office to review and implement the most appropriate ways of tackling serious violence (particularly youth violence) using a public health approach. The MVRP is a multi-agency partnership supporting the five boroughs of Merseyside: Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral.

1.2 - Since its inception, the MVRP has recognised supporting universal and targeted educational activities as one of its key priorities. This is evidenced through funding of an education lead to co-ordinate its educational offer. Professional relationships have been developed with key education leads from each local authority (LA) and links to their Community Safety Partnerships promoted. These leads have had significant input into this guidance and consulted with a small sample of schools during summer 2020.

1.3 - The number of pupils permanently excluded is a major concern for all working in education. Around 4,500 children and young people in Merseyside encountered at least one period of exclusion and nearly 200 pupils were permanently excluded in each of the last two full academic years (2017 – 2019).

1.4 - This guide has been produced as an additional narrative for Merseyside schools and does not replace the Department for Education’s statutory guidance on exclusions (2017). Further guidance has also been issued during the coronavirus outbreak regarding the potential for remote access meetings and the extending of timescales where required for governing boards and independent review panels.*

In this document, elements of the statutory guidance are referred to alongside views which have been formulated from recent reports including ‘Safeguarding Children/Young People in Education from Knife Crime’ (OFSTED 2019), the All Party Parliamentary Group report on Knife Crime (2019), the Children’s Commissioner’s report on ‘Keeping Kids Safe’ (2019) and the Child Safeguarding Practice Review report, ‘It Was Hard to Escape’ (2020).

1.5 - The risk of a further rise in exclusions is a regularly-voiced concern expressed by educational experts as our schools enact their recovery plans in response to the Covid 19 pandemic. Loss of routine, structure, social interaction, opportunity and freedoms for children over recent months may present in schools as challenging behaviours. It has been shown that children who experienced quarantine or social isolation in previous pandemics were far more likely to require mental health interventions. Furthermore, the requirement for additional services is expected to rise following their potential exposure to a range of adversity and trauma including bereavement, anxiety and in some cases increased welfare and safeguarding risks.

* More can be read here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-exclusion>

2. RISKS AND VULNERABILITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE WHEN EXCLUDED

2.1 - Engagement in full-time, quality education is a strong protective factor against the risk of a young person becoming involved in serious violence. Numerous national reports cite exclusion from mainstream school as a trigger point for children becoming at risk of serious harm. The Children's Commissioner for England has presented extensive evidence linking exclusions with gang involvement, stating that young people are more likely to be targeted for county line activities. In recent research into vulnerable teenagers, the Commissioner identified three points in life when all interviewees felt their lives went wrong: waiting for mental health services, going missing and being excluded from school.

2.2 - The effects of permanent exclusion for a child can be long lasting and life-limiting. Exclusion from school has been researched and analysed, (see Deakin, 2020), as a key factor in the stigmatisation of a young person, which results in reduced life chances, limited opportunities for self-development and inhibited engagement in wider society. From a public health approach, the label of having been excluded can socially shape the actions of a child through to adulthood, often resulting in a cyclical reproduction of that stigma.

2.3 - It is important to consider the correlation between exclusions and psychological distress/mental health difficulties. Pupils who are permanently excluded from school often go on to develop mental health difficulties – half of the pupils who are excluded already have a recognised mental health issue. More than half of UK prisoners have previously been excluded from school and there are links between exclusion from school and an increase in the risk of suicidal tendencies later in life.

2.4 - Trauma-informed research has identified that a child's Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) may impact on the way they cope with stresses or interactions with staff and pupils. The school itself can act as a protective environment for a young person and the denial of that setting through exclusion may induce further trauma.

2.5 - Permanent exclusion potentially leads to the criminalising of a child. Once excluded, children have fewer protective factors, including access to trusted adults. Children who are excluded are at risk of disengaging from education. If they are not admitted into another mainstream school or high quality alternative setting, they are clearly vulnerable to potential criminality.

2.6 - The expected minimum requirement of full-time education – ranging from 21 to 25 hours (dependent on age) – is often difficult to achieve following permanent exclusion, either through scarcity of provision, difficulty in identifying appropriate provision or a reluctance for the family or child to access this. Such delays create further risks.

2.7 - Exclusion inadvertently creates additional free time for a vulnerable child, which in turn allows further opportunities for them to be criminally exploited. This was recently evidenced in the Serious Case Review of Child C in Waltham Forest (2020).



Young person by Abbas Tehrani - Unsplash.com

3. THE RIGHT TO EXCLUDE

3.1 - It is absolutely appropriate for head teachers to use exclusion as a sanction where warranted.

3.2 - Permanent exclusion should be used as a last resort i.e. in response to a serious breach, or persistent breach, of the school's behaviour policy and where allowing the pupil to remain in school would seriously harm the education or welfare of the pupil or others in the school.

3.3 - The decision to exclude a child must be lawful, reasonable and fair.

3.4 - The behaviour of a child outside school can be considered grounds for an exclusion.

3.5 - While exclusion may be deemed an appropriate sanction, the head

teacher should take account of any contributing factors that are identified after an incident of poor behaviour. Consideration should include:

- Their vulnerability – for example, bereavement, mental health concerns, bullying; exploitation.
- Special Educational Needs (SEN) and disability issues and, in particular, whether they have an Education Health Care (EHC) plan.
- Whether it is their first offence?
- Behaviour history.
- Known affiliation with gangs.
- The reason behind carrying a blade (protection/harm) and the nature of weapon.
- If they are looked-after.
- History of violence or criminality in family or family friends.
- School’s relationship with child or parents.
- Prior attainment.

3.6 - The threat of exclusion must never be used to influence parent/carers to remove their child from the school or to electively home-educate.

3.7 - The head teacher does not need to postpone taking a decision on an exclusion solely because a police investigation is underway and/or whether any criminal proceedings may be brought. In such circumstances, the head teacher will need to take a decision on the evidence available at the time. Where the evidence is limited by a police investigation or criminal proceedings, the head teacher should consider additional steps they may need to take to ensure the decision to exclude is fair. However, the final decision is for the head teacher to make.*

3.8 - When establishing the facts in relation to an exclusion decision, the head teacher must apply the civil standard of proof, i.e. ‘on the balance of probabilities’ it is more likely than not that a fact is true, rather than the criminal standard of ‘beyond reasonable doubt’. This means the head should accept something happened if it is more likely that it happened than that it did not.

3.9 - Where practical, the head teacher should give the child and parent/carers an opportunity to present their case and any mitigating circumstances before deciding on an exclusion sanction.

*The Department for Education statutory guidance on Keeping Children Safe makes reference to investigations in further detail and includes a case study: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/keeping-children-safe-in-education-2>

4. KEY ISSUES AND PRINCIPLES TO CONSIDER

4.1 - Early intervention is clearly key to supporting vulnerable children and to avoiding a crisis situation from emerging. Schools should be supported to focus on prevention and early intervention as their central role within multi-agency plans in keeping children safe.

4.2 - Disruptive behaviour can be an indication of unmet and undiagnosed needs which may include inadequate provision. Where a school has concerns about a child's behaviour, it should identify those causal factors and intervene early in order to reduce the need for subsequent punitive action. In a situation of persistent disruptive behaviour, a multi-agency assessment might identify mental health or family issues beyond the child's educational needs.

4.3 - The head teacher and governing board must comply with their statutory duties in relation to Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) when administering the exclusion process. As well as the SEND cohort having disproportionately high rates of exclusion, there are other groups of children with additional needs who are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of exclusion. This includes those with Education Health Care (EHC) plans and looked-after children. The head teacher should, as far as possible, avoid permanently excluding any pupil with an EHC plan or a looked-after child. If a pupil with an EHC plan is at risk of exclusion, the school may wish to seek a review of this plan.

4.4 - Some LAs have their own risk assessment guides for schools to use and the Department for Education previously published a 'Specimen Risk Assessment Proforma for Assessing and Managing Foreseeable Risks for Children who Present Challenging Behaviours'. It can be found online by searching the title.

4.5 - Even if the links with improving overall academic outcomes are not immediately apparent, it should be a priority to encourage school investment in effective pastoral support for those at risk of exclusion. The latest OFSTED framework separates out behaviour, attitudes and personal development from academic achievement, and encourages a focus to support young people's wellbeing. A good or outstanding rating is unlikely if outcomes are at the expense of failing to support vulnerable pupils. OFSTED is also clear that pressuring a parent to remove a child from the school, (including encouraging home education), is a form of off-rolling. An inadequate rating is possible if off-rolling is seen to have been used as an alternative to exclusion.

4.6 - It is complex for schools considering appropriate sanctions when the child expresses genuine remorse. Labelling incidents as 'poor behaviour' equates to punishment, whereas seeing a person's actions as the 'poor handling of a difficult situation' elicits a restorative justice response. Using the latter approach is more likely to support an individual through their distress.

4.7 - Everyone working in the education sector should be trained to understand

vulnerability, trauma, stigmatisation and the effect of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs). In a trauma-informed school, the questions focus on what has happened to a person when they are not handling challenging situations well rather than what is wrong with them. This encourages a positive environment for a dialogue to support children in keeping them safe, ideally using a multi-agency response.

4.8 - When a child's behaviour does not pose a risk to others, a balance should be met in weighing up the impact on, and the risks of imposing any sanction to, the child.

4.9 - In relation to knife crime, schools should work in partnership to both safeguard perpetrators and victims – a child may be both at the same time. A common denominator of children who are found carrying bladed objects in school is their vulnerability. Almost invariably, these children have experienced poverty, abuse or neglect or are living within troubled families.

4.10 - When a decision to permanently exclude is made, best practice indicates schools should ensure the appropriate LA has all the relevant educational and safeguarding information to address the needs of what is essentially a vulnerable child. An action plan should clearly be in place to support the child in the short-term and school should choose to be actively involved in this transition, regardless of any legal responsibilities lessening beyond the fifth day of exclusion. The new education setting will need to draw together a risk assessment using all this information.

5. RESPONSES OTHER THAN PERMANENT EXCLUSION

5.1 - Following an incident or catalogue of concerns, a number of actions should take place before deciding on a permanent exclusion. This may include meeting with partners to discuss the child, carrying out a trauma-informed intervention at the child's home, and a school risk assessment. It must be noted that the law does not allow for extending a fixed-period exclusion, or 'converting' a fixed-period exclusion, into a permanent exclusion unless further evidence has come to light.

5.2 - If it is in the best interest of the child, moving a child's education offer to another setting may be considered. Maintained schools have the power to direct a pupil off-site for their education to improve their behaviour. If all parties involved consent, including the parents and the admission authority of the school, a child at any type of school can also transfer to another school as part of a 'managed move'. This must never be as a result of coercion or threats to exclude permanently if the 'managed move' is not taken up.

5.3 - With the onus on not excluding a looked-after child or child with an Education Health Care (EHC) plan, if an incident takes place which has the potential to prompt an exclusion sanction, professionals need to urgently review the child's education plans to ensure current provision matches emerging needs.

5.4 - Best practice suggests establishments should have a school protocol in place for managing blades if they are brought into school. Consideration should be given to distinguish a child carrying a blade as a perceived safety measure from one who carries or produces it with the intent to use on another child or member of staff. Understanding the root cause behind such a choice is pivotal to any next steps.

5.5 - An automatic exclusion period is an understandable default position if a blade is brought into school whatever the scenario, but permanent exclusion should be considered sensitively. As part of this process, there should be engagement with the child about the dangers/consequences of knife crime; discussions with parents; a multi-agency meeting in conjunction with youth justice colleagues if appropriate; and a risk assessment should be completed.

5.6 - At multi-agency meetings, consideration should be given to options which enable the child to remain in school. In considering such responses, reference should be made to the potential increased risks of exploitation, re-offending and increased free time spent with peers that an exclusion could create. When a child is carrying a knife or drugs as a result of exploitation, it is the exploitation that needs addressing, not punishing the individual.

5.7 - In a further response to those carrying, or thought to be carrying, knives, Knife Crime Prevention Orders (Offensive Weapons Act 2019) may be an option, which intend to steer children, aged 12 and above, away from violent crime. Although this police-led initiative can be applied following a conviction of a knife-related offence, it can also be used as a preventative intervention for those children who may be, or are thought to be, carrying knives, or who are at greatest risk of being drawn into serious violence. Both processes would require consultation from the Police and local Youth Offending Services (YOS). Requirements of such an order for children include the accessing of educational courses, potential geographical restrictions and curfews. Although the pilot areas do not include Merseyside, this may be another option for the 2021/22 academic year if launched nationally.

5.8 - Alongside statutory responsibilities, (in relation to permanent exclusions, Fair Access Protocols and SEND), local authorities can provide preventative and additional support for schools to deal with pupils' challenging behaviour. Annexe A (p11) provides a précised description for the five Merseyside local authorities. There is an expectation that these additional resources have been fully explored before making a decision to permanently exclude.

5.9 - All Youth Offending Teams (YOT) have a statutory responsibility for managing young people aged 10-18 who have committed a criminal offence resulting in a pre-court disposal or a court order. All children undergo full

assessments and an intervention plan is created to meet their specific needs and reduce their risks. This may include support for a child who is at risk of permanent exclusion or has attendance issues, particularly if there is a criminal element to these concerns. Multi-agency Risk Meetings are convened for children assessed as High Risk to identify partnership plans to support the child and reduce any risks regarding re-offending, harm to others or safety and wellbeing. All teams are keen to ensure children are recognised and treated according to their age, rather than in response to their offending behaviour and build on strengths rather than focusing entirely on risk. Preventative support varies across each YOT, see examples in Annexe B (p14).

5.10 - During 2020/21, MVRP is piloting 1:1 intensive mentoring support for a small cohort of pupils on the cusp of permanent exclusion in eight schools across Merseyside and is also working in conjunction with St Giles Trust to offer similar support for a mainstream, special and PRU setting in St Helens. Academic evaluation of these activities is taking place to help guide future initiatives.



Courtesy of Tim Mossholder On Raw Pexels

ANNEXE A

- LA BEHAVIOUR SERVICE SUPPORT (5.8)

KNOWSLEY

Covid 19 has resulted in a number of additional packages made available to support schools and pupils on returning in September 2020 and to help prevent permanent exclusions. This includes the design of social stories to help younger children with understanding what is happening at present and support them to express any worries or concerns.

The Council is keen to promote a multi-agency approach, which includes an early help/prevention level 2 offer, further including School Family support workers.

Knowsley's behaviour framework enables schools to access outside expert behavioural support and advice, and gives a clear path for schools to follow to access the right support or provision for the pupil, with a trauma-based approach. Advice and Guidance Officers offer this service through the Council's Inclusion Team.

Trial placements can also take place between schools following serious one-off incidents or when pupils exhibit persistent disruptive behaviour despite high-level school support. The Council is informed of these arrangements and any failed placements are presented at the fortnightly Fair Access Panel to consider further options.

Contact Mark Strevens on 0151 443 3454 for further details.

LIVERPOOL

A strategic lead for inclusion has been appointed to work with schools, education settings and commissioned services to help support the drive for inclusion central to the LA's Education Improvement Plan.

The Social Inclusion Operations Team (SIOT) provides services which aim to support students who are permanently excluded, or at risk of exclusion, and/or disengaged by providing early intervention strategies and alternative support packages. Where schools have exhausted these strategies and students are permanently excluded, SIOT will ensure statutory guidelines and procedures are adhered to, and offer accurate advice and guidance to parents, schools and other partners.

Inclusion Development Workers (IDW) support the development of efficient and effective city-wide support to schools, young people and families where behaviour is impacting on school placements.

The In Year Fair Access Panel (FAP) works with all schools and academies (secondary weekly, primary fortnightly) to make educational provision for 'hard to place' children in a fair and equitable manner.

Many initiatives flow from the FAP. Year 10 and 11 pupils may be referred to the Alternative Provision Team (APT) team, which supports and manages placements and support for young people. A pilot in the secondary sector to reduce exclusion and pupil movement is currently being reviewed.

Liverpool Education and Employment Partnership (LEEP) has provided Key Stage 4 provision as a pilot initially for two years (2019 – 21). In year one the LA offer placements for 30-35 students building to 70 in year 2. All pupils will be on a Liverpool school roll and will be identified as benefiting positively from a core curriculum of English, Maths and Science (minimum of 5 GCSEs) and will also access a range of vocational or industry specific qualifications. This is built around a cohesive work-based learning programme and support network from local and national employers. Students will have a Permanent Move designation. Additionally, New Heights High Schools provide placements for young people at Key Stage 3 and manages the Primary Education Centre which caters for children at Key Stage 2. Both provisions provide outreach and reintegration via external funding.

Contact Paul Dagnall on 0151 233 0393 for further details.

SEFTON

Schools have the opportunity to access LA training to embed trauma-informed practice within their school. Sefton works collaboratively with schools to find suitable alternatives to permanent exclusion by using a multi-agency approach, creating a holistic package, including whole family support.

All schools have a linked Early Help Worker from the Family Wellbeing Centres. Direct work will seek to safeguard young people, particularly those who are vulnerable. Schools also engage with the locality multi-agency huddle to discuss cases of individuals who are at risk from exclusion and/or anti-social behaviour to enable appropriate joint working.

A Multi-Agency Panel set up in light of Covid-19 will address school concerns for pupils at increased risk of exclusion; the panel encourages families to access support.

Safer Schools' Police Officers are being reintroduced in the autumn term 2020, with PCSOs working closely with Family Wellbeing Centres and Community Safety, supporting an early intervention approach for those pupils at risk of permanent exclusion and/or criminalisation.

Managed moves will continue to be an option for pupils who exhibit persistent disruptive behaviour through the Multi-Agency In Year Fair Access Panel. From the autumn term, the senior practitioner from the Troubled Families Programme will join the panel. The LA continues to build and expand its alternative provision network, which includes a range of alternative providers who can offer bespoke packages and offer suitable alternatives to permanent exclusion for pupils at risk.

Contact Tracy McKeating on 0151 934 3359 for further details.

ST HELENS

The Behaviour Improvement Team are actively involved in Pastoral Support Programmes (PSP), a supportive tool used in schools over a 16-week period for pupils displaying challenging behaviour.

Managed Transfers can take place when pupils continue to exhibit persistent disruptive behaviour despite high-level school support. They can also be used following serious one-off incidents, which would normally warrant a permanent exclusion.

When school-based strategies have been exhausted, schools are also able to refer to Pupil Referral Units (PRU) in KS1/2 and KS3 for respite, assessment and intensive support.

The secondary Fair Access Panel meets every three weeks with all secondary schools represented working in a collegiate way. Recent introduction of Early Help Service colleagues provides a helpful preventative focus.

The LA encourages Restorative Justice approaches as part of any school support offered to its pupils.

Contact Anne Houghton on 01744 673377 for further details about transfers.

WIRRAL

The LA has appointed an Inclusion Strategy Manager to work with schools collaboratively to find suitable alternatives to permanent exclusion including a multi-agency approach where appropriate. Focus groups for continued support in managing behaviour have been established in all age ranges.

Managing behaviour is shifting from punitive, sanction-led punishment and rewards systems to a trauma-informed approach. There will be opportunities to access training to become trauma-informed schools. This links to an early intervention approach for those presenting with distressed behaviour, and increased access to training on whole school approaches to mental health.

Safer Schools' Police officers are being reintroduced in the autumn term 2020 with four locality officers supporting an early intervention approach for those pupils at risk of permanent exclusion and/or criminalisation.

The inclusion strategy manager is working closely with other stakeholders to have a joined-up approach to offering advice and support to schools to try to re-engage the most hard to reach.

Wirral continues to build and expand its alternative provision network, which includes a range of alternative providers who can offer bespoke packages and offer suitable alternatives to permanent exclusion for pupils at risk. The LA has its own pre-exclusion checklist for schools available on request.

Contact Anna Dollard on 07785 915449 for further details.

ANNEXE B

– LA YOUTH OFFENDING SUPPORT (5.9)

GENERAL

All Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) have a statutory responsibility for managing young people, aged 10-18, who have been charged with committing a criminal offence. It is addressed through pre-court disposals and court orders with the intention to prevent reoffending. These orders can be within the community or they may combine a custodial and community sentence. Some sentences may include the use of an Electronically Monitored Curfew ('tag') if the criteria is met to prevent further offending at certain times of the day/night.

YOTs provide an Appropriate Adult service to ensure that every young person who is interviewed under caution has an adult with them when parents or carers are unable to attend the custody suite. The service also provides a Pre-Court Service which includes statutory Youth Cautions and Youth Conditional Cautions. Merseyside Police work with YOTs under the Merseyside Out of Court Disposal Protocol to ensure effective pre-court interventions for children.

Children engaging with YOTS are assessed using the ASSET+ tool and interventions put in place to help the young person move forward include support with housing, ETE, substance use, health, mental health, thinking and behaviour, relationships and supporting reparation to pay back to the community. It is the YOT's responsibility to return the young person to court when they don't adhere to an order. YOTs also manage children who are on bail in the community or remanded in custody awaiting court hearings.

YOTs also provide a service to Merseyside Youth Court by providing information to assist in decision-making – primarily through reports for sentencing but also through progress updates for the child in question.

KNOWSLEY

Knowsley Youth Offending Service (YOS) provides a multi-agency service for young people aged 10-18 involved in offending behaviour. Children are referred by the Police for out of court disposals (OCD) or by the court for reports or Court Orders (community or custody).

All children have full assessments to ensure intervention is needs-led, addressing their specific risks and welfare issues. Knowsley YOS uses trauma-informed approaches to focus on the child's history (including ACEs) and current circumstances to fully understand presenting behaviours and risks in a wider contextual, systemic approach.

Knowsley YOS does not deliver a prevention service for school or other agencies referrals. Children and families can access support through local early help or youth provision. Knowsley YOS does provide a Community Resolution service for children who have been arrested for low-level offences – Merseyside

Police refers into this service. This diversion service assists to address the child's needs and divert them from the criminal justice system when seen as a more appropriate option.

Children at risk of exploitation should be assessed using the Merseyside Protocol and referred through to the Shield Team, via MASH, where suitable.

Contact Knowsley YOS office on 0151 443 3079 for more information.

LIVERPOOL

Targeted Services in Liverpool consists of the Youth Offending Service (YOS), Targeted Youth Support and the Protect Team. These include both statutory and voluntary teams working with children, young people and their families from age 10–17 (and up to 24 for young people with additional needs).

The Targeted Support team of youth workers can engage on a voluntary basis with young people who are either NEET, looked-after, disabled, struggling with their emotional health and wellbeing or coming from new communities.

There is a Prevention team which can work on a voluntary basis with young people showing indicators of criminality involvement – referrals come from professionals or from meetings such as the Local Integration Team (LIT).

Contact the duty manager on 0151 233 0693 for more information.

SEFTON

Sefton Youth Offending Team (YOT) works with young people sentenced in court and those referred by the police for out of court disposals (OCCD). Sefton YOT offers Community Resolution Plus as a further programme, which provides an additional layer of intervention aimed to divert young people from further arrest and first-time entry into the Youth Justice System.

Sefton YOT sits within Communities. This enables the team to access some additional resources from other parts of the service, enhancing the YOT offer and providing positive opportunities within the local community.

Several early help workers have been embedded into the YOT to help promote the whole family approach and strengthen links with targeted early help services, as well as strengthening out of court interventions. Trauma-informed approaches are being embedded within Sefton, enabling additional focus upon the factors that contribute to exclusions.

Sefton YOT provides Restorative Justice training and interventions to targeted partners such as key schools and care home providers to prevent exclusion and criminalisation.

Contact 0151 934 2565 for more information.

ST HELENS

The Prevention Team from the Youth Justice Service takes referrals from Merseyside Police and the combined youth courts. They work with children and young people aged 8-18 who have offended, or are at risk of offending, with a view to reducing the risks of getting into further trouble. The team now also has a re-engagement mentor, (pre-16), to address barriers for children on the cusp of permanent exclusion.

The team provides a 1:1 prevention programme on a voluntary basis for up to 3 months to support a young person, (aged 8 or over), if they are at risk of committing a crime; arrested with no further action; involved in anti-social behaviour in the community; if there are concerns they may be criminally exploited; if there are significant concerns about carrying and using of weapons. Group-based prevention, including the delivery of Restorative Justice training to staff is also available.

Contact 01744 677990 for more information.

WIRRAL

The Youth Justice Service engages with young people and their families for up to three months with the intention of deterring them from involvement in offending and anti-social behaviour. Restorative Practices are used to support young people to change their thinking and make good choices about future behaviour.

To be eligible for voluntary intervention, the young person needs to be involved in persistent anti-social or offending behaviour; behaviour which could have prompted a prosecution (including regularly carrying weapons); violence against parents/carers; concerning (not harmful) sexual behaviour.

Additional factors include: school factors such as NEET, exclusion or risk of, very low school attendance; drug/alcohol use; peers or family committing offences; risk of child criminal exploitation (CCE) or Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs).

Referrals for the YJS Prevention Services are via the Youth Justice Service referral form. Contact 0151 666 3466 for more information.

ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS GUIDANCE SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO MERSEYSIDE'S VRP EDUCATION LEAD BY USING THE 'CONTACT US' FORM ON WWW.MERSEYSIDEVRP.COM. THANK YOU.



Courtesy of Ivanna Kykla on Raw Pexels

Intentionally left blank

Intentionally left blank



Produced by Merseyside Violence Reduction Partnership (VRP)
September 2020. © Merseyside's VRP