



The Michael Sieff Foundation

Working together for children's welfare

Implementation of the recommendations of the Carlile Inquiry Report and subsequent related inquiries relevant to youth justice

Introduction

This project aimed to promote implementation of the recommendations of the Parliamentary Inquiry into the Operation and Effectiveness of the Youth Court (the Carlile Inquiry Report¹). The Inquiry was sponsored by the Michael Sieff Foundation and the National Children's Bureau. It was launched in September 2013 and published in June 2014. It sought to determine whether the system of criminal courts for children who offend was meeting its stated aim of preventing offending and having regard to the welfare of the children that appear before them.

Implementation has been promoted through meetings with the Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Youth Justice Board (YJB) and other key stakeholders, including the Judiciary, Crown Prosecution Service and criminal defence lawyers.

Wider seminars² were convened in 2016, 2017 and 2018 to discuss how recommendations could be taken forward in light of the Charlie Taylor Report 2016³, the Laming Report 2016⁴ and the Lammy Review 2017⁵, all of which explored issues related to youth justice.

The need for most of the recommendations made in the above three authoritative reports has also been echoed in many other evidence based reviews of reforms needed in the Criminal Justice System relating to children and young people over many years along with persistent exasperation about the failure of government and others to implement such recommendations (See: Bateman 2012⁶).

However, roundtable discussions during the consultation on preparing this report acknowledged the role that practical difficulties, e.g. lack of time and locally available resources, played in the failure to implement many of these recommendations. It was recognised that such practical difficulties should be taken into account when considering delayed implementation of reforms, rather than considering that failures to implement were due wholly to political disinclination for change or to budgetary deficits.

A company limited by guarantee number 05098550; Registered charity number 1103473

www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk

Founder: Lady Elizabeth Haslam

Directors and Trustees: John Tenconi (Chairman), Maggie Atkinson, John Drew, Earl Listowel, Chris Stanley, Dr Eileen Vizard.

Secretary: Richard White

Registered Office: 94 Richmond Park Road, London SW14 8LA

This report now seeks to identify pressing and necessary changes to statute, guidance and practice in order to successfully implement the recommendations from the Carlile Inquiry Report¹. It is hoped that the well evidenced recommendations from this brief report will promote a more positive and “can-do” attitude towards the implementation of our recommendations. Since all the recommendations we make would result in improved functioning within the youth justice system, better safeguarding for victims and more effective risk prevention and public protection measures, the benefits to society could be considerable.

Principles developed

In May 2016, the Michael Sieff Foundation organised a seminar entitled *Developments and Research Needs in Youth Justice*⁷, funded and hosted by the Nuffield Foundation, to bring together a select group of senior policymakers, judges and magistrates, practitioners, researchers and other experts in the field of youth justice to review and update the recommendations of the Carlile Inquiry Report. A report on the seminar is available on the Foundation website⁷.

Our work re-emphasises a number of key principles, not all of which are yet universally implemented across the youth justice system. See: *The Matrix of the Progress in the Carlile Report Recommendations*, July 2019⁸.

- a) Young people who appear before the Youth Court are likely to be children in need, and should be treated as such. It is an apt phrase that they are “children first, offenders second”. Diversion from the court system should be seen as the starting point for young offenders.
- b) The Youth Court has a statutory duty to prevent offending and to have regard to the welfare of the child. Proceedings should be conducted so as to prioritise those outcomes.
- c) A relationship-based approach to working with the young person should be adopted, both in and out of court, which requires consistency of personnel in every part of the system. Local youth justice systems should seek out and implement best practice models of working with young people. Bench continuity should be introduced so at least one member of the bench (likely the bench chair) is present throughout each case.
- d) Young people appearing before the courts have a right to properly trained legal representation. This necessitates improved availability and consistency (and possibly mandation) of training for lawyers working with children. Representation of young people in the Youth Court has improved following publicity of the Carlile Inquiry Report¹ and of the commissioning of a report by the Bar Standards' Board (BSB) on the

subject⁹. This led to BSB establishing a register of barristers undertaking youth work and training being made available for interested lawyers by Just for Kids Law¹⁰. The problem remains in relation to pre-trial advice and representation at the police station where young people could be advised by a solicitor, legal executive or staff authorised by them, and there are no standards required specifically in respect of knowledge of youth law, save professional qualification. We believe that the position could be improved by recognition of the importance of work in and out of court through the provision of an uplift in legal aid fees.

- e) Youth Courts should adopt an outreach service model, able to convene outside court buildings. This would promote localism, improve physical accessibility and support more collaborative decision-making. The Foundation has made submissions to the Ministry of Justice Consultation Paper¹¹ on this subject and continued to raise it at seminars.
- f) Criminal records imposed during childhood should not extend into adulthood so as to be a lifelong prejudice to the wellbeing and employment prospects of the young person without good and sufficient cause. The Standing Committee for Youth Justice leads on necessary improvements to the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) filtering rules regarding cautions and convictions given to under-18s. We continue to support their work.
- g) Youth Scrutiny Panels have been developed in some areas to examine cases prior to prosecution to ensure consistency in courts and to focus on local use of diversionary and out-of-court measures with under-18s. This model needs to be developed, standardised and rolled out further in other local areas. One issue to be clarified is which Government Department should “own” these panels, given that they potentially tackle a range of issues including: the appropriateness of disposals (Ministry of Justice / Judiciary); the approach taken by the police (Home Office); and the extent to which proceedings put the child first (Department for Education).
- h) There continue to be cases reaching court in which the decision to prosecute is not clearly and demonstrably in the public interest. There is a desire for courts to be able to take robust action where they see such cases before them. This might include being given a power to request that prosecution in such cases is reconsidered. This would necessarily require the Judiciary to issue guidance to Youth Courts on how to respond to such cases.
- i) There could be mechanisms to increase the transparency and accountability of decisions made by the Regional Chief Crown Prosecutor and CPS staff. CPS Youth

Court prosecutors should be fully trained and have control of their cases at hearings. This is an area for the Director of Public Prosecutions to consider reform.

- j) Children are still likely to appear in adult magistrates' courts following overnight police detention, owing to the reduction in Youth Court sittings. This is unacceptable. HMCTS should consider directing all magistrates' courts to introduce a rota system, to ensure that a senior youth magistrate or youth ticketed District Judge is always sitting in the adult magistrates' court when the Youth Court is not in session. The hearing should take place in a Youth Court room.
- k) A looked after child should appear in court only with an allocated social worker who knows him or her.
- l) The Department for Education and Ministry of Justice should revise guidance so that the allocated social worker is required to give an oral report in court regarding the child's circumstances.
- m) Youth courts should consider using the existing power contained in Section 9 of the Children and Young Persons Act 1969¹² to request a local authority to investigate and provide information relating to the home surroundings, school record, health and character of the young person before the court. Following work with the Magistrates' Association, there is some anecdotal evidence that more use has been made of this provision. However, this has yet to be empirically demonstrated and there is, in all likelihood, still much progress to be made.
- n) The Foundation remains of the view, and has consistently argued¹³, that Youth Courts should be afforded the power (as under s.37 Children Act 1989¹⁴) to order the local authority children's service to investigate whether a child is at risk of suffering significant harm, and whether the local authority should intervene to safeguard and promote the child's welfare (s.47 investigation under the Children Act 1989¹⁵). This power would be available in cases where there are welfare concerns and the outcome of this investigation should be reported back to the Youth Court prior to sentencing.
- o) Schedule 1 paragraph 35 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008⁹ should be brought into force to enable courts to review youth rehabilitation orders to check on children's progress, amend sentences where necessary and ensure partner agencies are providing the required support to aid desistance.

Specific achievements

In December 2014 a Senior Judicial Lead for Youth Justice was appointed; an entirely new position and a key proposal of the Inquiry.

In October 2014, the Bar Standards Board, in partnership with CILEx Regulation, commissioned the Institute for Criminal Policy Research to conduct a review of advocacy in youth proceedings, to determine whether a competency framework should be introduced. This follows the Inquiry proposal that all legal practitioners in youth proceedings should be specially trained. It led to the Youth Proceedings Advocacy Review (November 2015)¹⁶, which encouraged legal training to take account of the need to improve competence.

Problem solving approaches

The Carlile Inquiry Report¹ recommended that problem solving approaches in the Youth Court should be explored. The Foundation set up a Working Group in 2016 to consider how this might be taken forward. The concept was adopted in some courts, notably Northampton, following a conference held there in November 2016¹⁷, at which the Foundation presented their thinking.

As a direct development of the work undertaken by the Foundation in 2016, a seminar was held in July 2018 in Northampton to explore the problem solving principles established in their Youth Court. Chris Stanley attended on behalf of the Foundation. A consensus developed that the next step to try to progress a wider rollout along the lines of the Northamptonshire model would be a high level meeting of people with authority to either commit or, at least, influence their respective agencies. It is understood that action is being taken to move this forward. A “starter pack” including templates and training materials, is available to assist discussions in local areas between Youth Offending Teams, Youth Panels and HMCTS to develop localised processes that will work for their area.¹⁸

The Foundation has continued to support the work of the Centre for Justice Innovation (CJI) in seeking to pilot problem-solving courts for children as a step towards improving outcomes for children which align with recommendations of the Carlile Inquiry Report¹. This was an important part of discussions with the Ministry of Justice in April 2018. The approval of the Ministry of Justice and the Judiciary was later given to enable the CJI work to proceed. In December 2018 the CJI started work (funded by the Nuffield Foundation) to scope potential pilot projects. We continue to support this work, and contribute directly to the CJI’s work through representation on their Expert Advisory Group.

Youth Court or Crown Court?

On 7 February 2018 the Foundation organised a seminar entitled: Youth Court or Crown Court? The report for the event, published on The Michael Sieff Foundation website¹⁹ explored where and how best to hear cases related to youth in light of the recommendation of the Carlile Inquiry Report¹ for the majority of youth cases to be held in the Youth Court.

Care and crime together

The Carlile Inquiry Report¹ recommended that Magistrates should be able to specialise in the Youth Court, with the option of also sitting in the Family Court (rather than, or in addition to, the Adult Magistrates' Court). Joint Youth Court and Family Court training should also be introduced. This view is shared and promulgated by the Foundation.

On 14 June 2018 the Foundation organised a seminar held at Nuffield, entitled Care and Crime Together²⁰ to explore better coordination between the Youth Court and the Family Court. Currently there is no data on young people subject to orders in both jurisdictions; cross-over cases need to be identified. There was broad agreement that improved awareness, knowledge and understanding across the two jurisdictions would be welcomed. Improved communication and information sharing between agencies (CAFCASS, children's services, YJB and YOTs) would be beneficial for young people, agencies and the judiciary. Digitisation of court systems offers a gateway towards this.

A pilot programme of better information-sharing, problem-solving and awareness could be a good starting point, as with the Family Drug and Alcohol Court (FDAC)²¹. There could be a role for the Nuffield Family Justice Observatory here²².

Family Drug and Alcohol Court

During the summer of 2018 it was announced that funding from the Department for Education for the National Unit of the Family Drug and Alcohol Court was to be terminated as from 30 September 2018. The Unit has played an important role in promoting research and coordinating expansion of the FDAC concept, which provided the basis for the problem solving approach recommended for the Youth Court. From its own funds the Foundation helped to organise a meeting in the House of Lords on 11 July 2018 in order to discuss the future of the National Unit. A note of that meeting is available on The Michael Sieff Foundation website.²³

Subsequently a rescue plan has been put in place, whereby the Centre for Justice Innovation continues to operate most of the functions previously performed by the National Unit.

The Future of the Youth Court

On 5 February 2019 the Foundation organised a Roundtable Discussion in conjunction with the Nuffield Foundation and with the support of Sir Ernest Ryder, a Nuffield Foundation Trustee, to discuss the future of the Youth Court.²⁴

The discussion was framed in the context of a trend towards diverting more cases away from the Youth Court. As a consequence, Youth Courts are increasingly left with a group of children that display a wide range of complex needs and more limited communication skills. Many needs may be hidden and left unidentified, reducing the likelihood of achieving a just and successful outcome. It is therefore critical that children's vulnerabilities are fully identified, and that clear, effective communication is used with them, pitched at a level appropriate for their understanding.

The priority themes which emerged, for action over the short and medium terms, were:

- identification of children's needs and tailored planning for them by professionals who know them and their needs;
- improvement in court procedures;
- accurate, user defined quantitative and qualitative data collection which is gathered, suitably analysed and circulated to key stakeholders;
- education for decision makers and children;
- defining key solutions and the support and leadership necessary to implement them.

As part of this programme HMCTS is looking at the Youth Court and is looking at the needs of children and young defendants and examining each stage of the process to shape a version of it that is appropriate for them, with the right safeguards and enhancements. HMCTS's next steps in relation to Youth Court reform are to be considered by the Crime Programme Board in March 2020.

The Alliance for Youth Court Reform

We have used our influence to bring together a group of like-minded organisations to form an Alliance for Youth Court Reform²⁵. This was originally focussed on addressing legislative changes proposed in the Prisons and Courts Bill in 2016²⁶. The Alliance has not continued since its original objectives were met when parts of that Bill were re-introduced.

The Age of Criminal Responsibility

The age of criminal responsibility is a continuing issue for the Foundation. While it was recognised that there have been political reasons not to revisit this, this needs to be kept under constant review. At a minimum it is considered desirable to have a clearer policy statement for

a presumption of diversion for 10-14 year olds. This could mitigate against the risks for large numbers of younger child defendants of having such a low age threshold (in comparison with other countries, in particular Scotland). It was also felt clearer messaging about these risks might be helpful in public debate.

Communications Plan

Our communications plan for this project has been incorporated into the wider communications and dissemination activities of the Foundation. These have centred on holding themed seminars and where appropriate arranging ad hoc meetings with the active involvement of key stakeholders who influence, or are directly responsible, for policy and practice. In addition, our meetings have encouraged the participation of journalists active in the respective areas of influence in a concerted effort to inform public debate on the issues raised.

On 27 March 2018 a seminar was held in the House of Lords, hosted by Lord Carlile and supported by Charlie Taylor, to inform the Parliamentarians who had sat on the Inquiry and others of developments since the Carlile Inquiry Report¹, the subsequent reports and the synergy between them for change to improve the experience of and outcomes from the court system for children.²⁶

Details concerning the audiences we have reached in our meetings accompany the individual reports, recommendations and supplementary materials published on The Michael Sieff Foundation website.

The website is the central repository of all the outcomes of the work carried out on the project which is augmented by the additional wider initiatives carried out by the Foundation. We have an active link development programme to the sites and resources of organisations (NGOs, Government, Charities, academic and research) active in our areas of influence.

In order to engage with the widest number of stakeholders the Foundation runs a dynamic and growing mailing list and sends regular e-mailings which update members on the outcomes of our activities. In addition, and where appropriate, the mailing list is used in the promotion of participation at our events. Our audience is centred on senior stakeholders including the Judiciary, solicitors and barristers, civil servants, parliamentarians, NGOs, think tanks, practitioners, researchers, and journalists.

Conclusions

Broadly, there are two categories of recommendation arising from the Carlile Inquiry Report¹:

- A. Changes which can be brought about in practice and different approaches under current legislation.
- B. Legislative change requiring the support from the Ministry of Justice and politicians.

A synopsis of these has been updated regularly by the Michael Sieff Foundation. The latest version can be found on the website.⁸ We have re-examined the recommendations in the light of current discussions and consider them all to be still worthy of implementation.

The work currently being undertaken by HMCTS suggests that new thinking is being considered. The Foundation will continue to press for the need to make legislative change, when parliamentary time becomes available, and continue to seek to demonstrate to the Ministry of Justice and its Ministers the virtues of particular implementations and the anticipated cost benefits arising from these changes.

We are encouraged by changes introduced by the Bar Standards Board introducing standards for barristers dealing with youth cases. We note that the Solicitors' Regulation Authority is discussing the adoption of comparable standards and training for solicitors.

We are maintaining our focus on improving the court experience and continue to press for change with central Government through our contacts with the Ministry of Justice, the Youth Justice Board, Parliamentarians and the Standing Committee for Youth Justice.

Since successful implementation is not in the gift of the Foundation it is working to bring about such implementation by a combination of methods relevant to the circumstances of each outstanding recommendation building on successes to date. It will therefore variously attempt to:

- Maintain awareness of the issues amongst the many current stakeholder groups such as the Ministry of Justice, Charlie Taylor, current Chair of the YJB and author of the Taylor Review of Youth Justice³, and other children's organisations;
- Continue our work with others, such as the Magistrates' Association and the Centre for Justice Innovation;

- Consider (in conjunction with the Centre for Justice Innovation) how specific recommendations (such as the use of Problem Solving Courts) might be implemented in policy or practice;
- Seek to ensure that the various efforts of other stakeholders, such as the legal professions, the Crown Prosecution Service, the Standing Committee for Youth Justice and the Youth Justice Board are joined up and that the various elements of the Carlile Inquiry Report¹ are being tackled in a way which leverages the status of the report and the research, which was conducted during the Inquiry.

It has been apparent since publication of the Carlile Inquiry Report¹ that the Foundation is peculiarly and perhaps uniquely well placed to promote good practice and procedures in relation to work within the youth justice field. This is likely due to its long standing reputation for independence and for working with other agencies and central government. The success of our work to date has been markedly assisted by the continuing and unswerving support of Lord Carlile in the process.

The Michael Sieff Foundation believes that a Working Group should be set up to examine the possibilities of rapprochement between the family and criminal jurisdictions for youth with the aim that they should operate holistically. This could connect with the Group set up by the retiring President of the Family Division to consider links between care and immigration proceedings. This is an important opportunity which could be transformative.

The Michael Sieff Foundation – January 2020

Footnotes

1. Carlile Inquiry Report 2014. Independent Parliamentarian's Inquiry into the Operation and Effectiveness of the Youth Court, Chaired by Lord Carlile of Berriew CBE QC, June 2014
See: <https://yjlc.uk/lord-carliles-independent-parliamentarians-inquiry-into-the-youth-court/>
 2. Michael Sieff Foundation Seminars on Youth Justice
See: <http://michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk>
 3. Charlie Taylor Report 2016. Review of the Youth Justice System in England and Wales, Charlie Taylor, Ministry of Justice
See: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/577105/youth-justice-review-final-report-print.pdf
 4. Laming Report 2016. In care, Out of trouble - An independent Review Chaired by Lord Laming
See: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-protocol-on-reducing-criminalisation-of-looked-after-children>
 5. The Lammy Review (2017). An independent review into the treatment of, and outcomes for, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic individuals in the Criminal Justice System, David Lammy
See: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/643001/lammy-review-final-report.pdf
 6. Children in Conflict with the Law. An overview of trends and developments 2012, National Association for Youth Justice - NAYJ Briefing, Tim Bateman
See: https://thenayj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/2013-Children_in_conflict_with_the_law_briefing_Sep14.pdf
 7. Developments and Research Needs in Youth Justice Seminar, funded and hosted by the Nuffield Foundation, Michael Sieff Foundation, May 2016
See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/improving-child-protection-policy-practice-conferences-uk/>
 8. Matrix of the Progress in the Carlile Inquiry Report Recommendations, July 2019
See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/update-on-outcomes-from-the-carlile-inquiry-july-2019/>
- A post Carlile Inquiry Report meeting was organised by The Michael Sieff Foundation in Committee Room G House of Lords on 27 March 2018. The note from this meeting was published.
See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/content/Note-post-Carlile-Inquiry-Report-Meeting-27-01-2018.pdf>
- The Update on Outcomes from the Carlile Inquiry published September 2015
See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/lord-carlile-parliamentary-inquiry-into-the-youth-justice-system-update-september-2015/>
- The Update on Outcomes from the Carlile Inquiry published March 2015
See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/lord-carlile-parliamentary-inquiry-into-the-youth-justice-system-update-march-2015/>- 9. Youth Proceedings Advocacy Review, Bar Standards Board, November 2015
See: <https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/uploads/assets/8ce6f0eb-5583-4e4a-8f24f1d530eef1d7/yparfinalreportfinal.pdf>
- 10. Just for Kids Law work with and for young people to ensure their legal rights are respected and promoted, and their voices heard and valued
See: <https://justforkidslaw.org>

11. Ministry of Justice Consultation Paper

See:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/754383/Standards_for_children_in_the_justice_system_2019_consultation_document.pdf

12. Section 9 of the Children and Young Persons Act 1969

See: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1969/54/contents>

13. The Michael Sieff Foundation remains of the view, and has consistently argued, that Youth Courts should be afforded the power (as under s.37 Children Act 1989)

14. s.37 Children Act 1989

See: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1989/41/section/37>

15. s.47 investigation under the Children Act 1989

See: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1989/41/section/47>

16. Schedule 1 paragraph 35 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008

See: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/4/pdfs/ukpga_20080004_en.pdf

17. Michael Sieff Foundation Conference, Northampton, November 2016

18. A “starter pack” including templates and training materials, is available to assist discussions in local areas between Youth Offending Teams, Youth Panels and HMCTS to develop localised processes that will work for their area.

19. Youth Court or Crown Court? Report from the Seminar held on 7 February 2018 organised by The Michael Sieff Foundation website.

See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/youth-court-or-crown-court/>

20. Care and Crime Together Report from the Seminar held on 14 June 2019 at the Nuffield Foundation and organised by The Michael Sieff Foundation

See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/care-and-crime-together/closer-integration-between-the-family-and-youth-courts-in-the-uk/>

21. Family Drug and Alcohol Court (FDAC) a problem-solving court approach to improving outcomes for children involved in care proceedings

See: <https://fdac.org.uk/>

Michael Sieff Foundation Meeting to discuss the closure of the Family Drug and Alcohol Court National Unit, 11 July 2018

See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/family-drug-and-alcohol-court-fdac-national-unit-closure/>

22. The Nuffield Family Justice Observatory supports better outcomes for children in the family justice system in England and Wales by improving the use of data and research evidence in decision-making

See: <https://www.nuffieldfjo.org.uk/>

23. Details of the meeting organised by The Michael Sieff Foundation in the House of Lords on 11 July 2018 in order to discuss the future of the National Unit of the Family Drug and Alcohol Court.

See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/family-drug-and-alcohol-court-fdac-national-unit-closure/>

24. Report from The Future of the Youth Court Round Table, held in conjunction with the Nuffield Foundation with the support of Sir Ernest Ryder, a Nuffield Trustee, 5th February 2019

See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/the-future-of-the-youth-court/>

25. The Alliance for Youth Court Reform - The Michael Sieff Foundation has established an Alliance for Youth Court Reform under the chairmanship of Lord Carlile, which is a group of like-minded organisations, who seek to put pressure on the Government to implement recommendations in the full Carlile Inquiry Report

See: <http://www.michaelsieff-foundation.org.uk/alliance-for-youth-court-reform-in-the-uk/>

26. Prisons and Courts Bill in 2016

See: <https://services.parliament.uk/bills/2016-17/prisonsandcourts.html>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS



The Nuffield Foundation is an independent charitable trust with a mission to advance social well-being. It funds research that informs social policy, primarily in Education, Welfare, and Justice. It also funds student programmes that provide opportunities for young people to develop skills in quantitative and scientific methods. The Nuffield Foundation is the founder and co-funder of the Nuffield Council on Bioethics and the Ada Lovelace Institute. The Foundation has funded this project, but the views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily the Foundation. Visit www.nuffieldfoundation.org

Annex A

Carlile Report Recommendations: Progress to July 2019

PRE-COURT

Task	Progress
Family Group conferences: pre-sentence (p60)	No progress
Comprehensive needs assessment: pre-hearing (p60)	Taylor recommendation; Design Project
All YPs must be represented by a youth specialist solicitor at the police station (p58)	Taylor recommendation; Design Project
Out of court measures only to be imposed in the presence of an appropriate adult (p59)	Taylor recommendation; Design Project
Police to ensure that YPs are warned of a disposal recorded for B+D purposes (p59)	Taylor calls for further training for custody sergeants.
Decisions to prosecute must be in the public interest and reviewable by the Chief Regional Prosecutor and the Court (p58)	Not achieved
'Youth Scrutiny Panels' to be established by the YJB and local authorities to focus on diversionary measures (p58)	Operating in various parts of the country; Mapping to be done by MA and PCCs

COMPETENCES

Task	Progress
Trained representation and Advocacy for young people in police station and court (p60)	Bar Standards Board guidance and training set up. Law Society and SRA considering. Law Society recommending increased fees for Youth Court advocacy.
LASW to be seconded to YOTs (p59)	Covered by Taylor
Appointment of a designated senior judge to	

be Youth Court representative at national level (p62)	Mr Justice William Davis appointed
Magistrates, District Judge and Crown Court ticketing (p62)	Sieff organised a conference on 14 June 2018 to discuss proposals to merge youth and family courts, supported by Sir James Munby, president of Family Division. See report on the website.
Magistrates specialisation (p62) and co-ticketing	Ditto
Joint Family and Youth Court training (p62)	Ditto
Linked sitting (p62)	Ditto

COURT PROCEDURES

Task	Progress
YPs not to appear in court without an appropriate adult (p60)	Taylor Proposals for children's Panels: Design Project
Social worker required to give verbal report on child's circumstances (p59)	Ditto
All magistrates' courts to introduce a rota system to ensure that a senior youth magistrate or youth ticketed judge is always sitting in the adult court when the youth court is not sitting (p58)	Not achieved
Timetabling system for youth hearings (p59)	Recommended by Taylor
Crown Court trials only in exceptional cases (p62)	Sieff organised a conference on 7th February 2018 to discuss this issue. See the Foundation website.
Crime and Courts Act 2013, Sch 16: defer sentence to allow for restorative justice (p60)	This can take place

Coroners and Justice Act 2009, s104: Provide for defendants' communication needs (p60)	Training is available for Magistrates from the Judicial College
Apply Children Act 1989, s37 to Youth Court Direction to other services (p59)	This is regularly raised with MoJ
Children Act 2004, s10, provide services (p60)	Covered by Taylor Children's Panels
Referral orders / problem solving conferences (p63/64)	Problem solving courts moving forward with CJI
Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999 S 44: implement for anonymity and (p62) reporting restrictions	SCYJ and Justice Select committee have put proposals to Government
Problem Solving approach in Youth Court (p63)	CJI had permission to commence work at the end of 2018.
Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 Sch 1, para 35 ; review of rehabilitation orders (p63)	MoJ considering
Approval of guidance on police recording of crimes by young people in residential care (p58)	Covered by various reports, namely, Laming, Howard League and Taylor
Disclosure and Barring Service Filtering Rules Extend to exclude continuance after 18 (p63)	Ditto
Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974, amend to filter cautions and convictions (p62)	SCYJ is leading on this issue.
International comparisons (p64)	Not covered