NAYJ

Justice for Children in Trouble

www.thenayj.org.uk

Newsletter – Spring 2012

The NAYJ is a registered charity and membership organisation campaigning for the rights of – and justice for – children in trouble with the law. Full membership of NAYJ costs just £18pa for a range of benefits including a free subscription to the international journal 'Youth Justice'. If you would like to know more about the organisation and how to become a member, please visit our website at:

www.thenayj.org.uk

Charity No. 1138177

Appropriate adult provision focuses on '*complying with PACE 1984 rather than safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children and young people*'

In the last Newsletter, we looked forward to – well anticipated is probably a more accurate expression – the forthcoming joint inspection of appropriate adult work and provision for children in police detention. The report, tellingly titled *Who's looking out for the children?* (a rhetorical question to which the rhetorical answer is '*Well no-one really*'), was finally published in December 2011 and it makes sobering reading.

In most areas, appropriate adult (AA) services are delivered by volunteers. The report found that, in the six areas inspected, recruitment procedures and the arrangements for provision of training to volunteers were '*generally sound*'. The problem is rather what they were trained to do. The question of what AAs are actually for is one that is not asked that often and as a consequence, the delivery of AA services has become process-driven rather than focused on the welfare of the child in police detention. In the inspectors' apt phrase, AA provision '*has evolved into being another part of the custody process*'.

For instance, decisions about whether or not to interview a young person in the evening were determined by pre-arranged cut offs (say 9.00pm) rather than individual assessment. The consequence was that many children spend longer in police custody than necessary. Funnily enough, the kids didn't like it in the pokey and the physical

environment in the cells did '*not encourage them to disclose vulnerabilities or special needs'*. (Sherlock might have spotted that one.)

The emphasis on process was reflected in poor information flows between YOTs and those attending police stations on their behalf, with the consequence that AAs were '*often ill prepared and did not take a proactive role in promoting the needs of children and young people'*. This lack of preparedness could have been mitigated to some extent by a careful perusal of custody records, except these were pretty naff too, with important details frequently left out (such as why parents were not in attendance or regarded as unsuitable to carry out the AA role) or simply wrong.

Despite the fact that AA volunteers told inspectors that they were confident to challenge the police when it was necessary to do so, the inspectors found that the threshold for necessary intervention was pretty high, since for the most part, AAs just sat there. Similarly, AAs reported that they were supportive to children in custody (another case of 'they would say that wouldn't they') but young people had a different story to tell. Many reported that they didn't really understand the AA's function and few indicated that their AA had been helpful.

Parliament makes the laws and the rest of us follow them – except when the rest of us are the police or the local authority (oh let's not forget the wealthy filling in their tax returns, large multinationals when it comes to health and safety regulations, and 90% of motorists confronted with a 30 mph limit). While the inspectors complained that the focus of AA work was too often on compliance with the *Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1994*, in one respect, such compliance might have been regarded as something of a result.

There is a clear statutory duty on the police – when they refuse bail after charging a child under 17 years of age – to transfer him / her to local authority accommodation. There is an equally clear duty on the local authority to accommodate the child. Moreover, this accommodation should not be secure other than in the case of a 12-16 year old who poses a risk to the public of 'significant harm'. Clarity is of course subjective and what is clear to one person is mudlike to others: the inspection found a lack of understanding of the legislation on the part of police, AAs, YOTs and local authorities. All but one of the areas inspected (Lincolnshire to its credit was the exception) didn't have a clue how many kids were detained by the police – and they didn't seem to mind this particular gap in their data monitoring. (It might be argued that this is a good example of what you don't know can't hurt you, but you can't extend that generalisation too far. Presumably a lack of knowledge about nuclear power wouldn't protect you in the event of a reactor meltdown; similarly, you might not know that big bloke who nicked your iPod, but that punch on the nose still leaves its mark.)

Nationally, the inspection team found that information on the number of juveniles detained after charge was not available. (Home Office data on refusal of bail by the police relates to children aged 10 – 17 years and is not broken down further by age. Those aged 17 however are treated as adults for the purposes of PACE). But in two

thirds of cases reviewed in the inspection areas, the police did not even ask for local authority accommodation – well, as that sign behind the pub bar says '*don't ask for credit since a refusal often offends'* – and only 3 out of 49 children were actually transferred. A report published by the Howard League confirms that the areas inspected were not exceptional: between 2008/2009, 53,000 children below the age of 16 years were detained in police custody overnight, most illegally: 4 were below the age of criminal responsibility – yes, that's right, not yet in double figures; 1,674 were aged 10-11, an age group that cannot be legally detained in any circumstances; 11,540 were below the age of 14 years. Minority ethnic children were overrepresented, accounting for 20% of the total. The figures moreover represent just the tip of the iceberg since only half of the police forces contacted supplied figures, with the Metropolitan police (the largest force in the country) being one of those that failed to respond.

Returning to the inspection, the report contains a case study that is reminiscent of a West End farce. It is worth looking at the details. The case involves Jay, a 16 year old boy who breaks a window at home following an argument with his dad. He is arrested at 9.00am on Friday for criminal damage, but not interviewed until 2.30pm, at which point he admits the offence. Jay is charged at 5.20pm and refused bail as the Family Intervention Project advises his father not to allow him to return home. The project further proposes that Jay should present to 'Homeless persons' once he has attended court. The police do not request LA accommodation and the LA does not offer any. Jay remains in police custody overnight.

Jay attends court on Friday morning and is advised to report to 'homeless persons' as previously arranged. On arrival at the office, he is told that he cannot return home and he responds by saying that he will burn his dad's house down. He is arrested at 12.30pm for threats to commit criminal damage. Jay's father refuses to attend the police station so a referral is made to the YOT. After six hours at the police station, Jay covers his cell with his own blood by banging his nose on the wall because he thought it would get him out sooner. Wrong call – the police arrest him for criminal damage by '*impairing his cell with bodily fluids*'. (Sid James eat your heart out…) The emergency duty team are too busy to attend: no AA, no interview, no request for LA accommodation, no question of Jay being released.

Jay is interviewed on Saturday morning in the presence of an AA shortly after 9.30am. Later in the day, he is charged with criminal damage to the police cell, bail is refused, the police do not request accommodation from the local authority and the AA form sent to the YOT provides no detail of events. Jay spends Saturday (and presumably Sunday – though the report is not explicit about this) night in police custody.

So a family argument and a broken window. The outcome is a 16-year-old spending three or four nights in police custody illegally, facing three criminal charges and (a minimum of) two court appearances, and becoming homeless. The AA system and the legislation in relation to PACE transfer is presumably designed to prevent just such outcomes. '*Who's looking out for the children?*' Precisely.

The joint inspection report makes ten recommendations intended to reduce the time children spend in police custody, improve information flow to and from AAs, enhance police recording and to ensure that the legislation in relation of transfer to LA accommodation following refusal of bail is understood and complied with.

Revised national standards allow increased practitioner flexibility – but only if you fancy it

One of the ways in which the coalition government distinguishes itself from its New Labour predecessor (other than favouring reduced taxes for the rich and increased taxes – in the form of VAT – that impact disproportionately on the poor) is a new-found enthusiasm for practitioner discretion and local decision making. For instance, the criminal justice green paper, *Breaking the Cycle: effective punishment, rehabilitation and sentencing of offenders*, published in December 2010, committed the government to explore how to '*increase discretion and reduce the amount of time frontline workers spend in front of their computers, so as to free up their time to work with young offenders*'. In this context, it was inevitable that national standards – which have been a tad prescriptive (in fact it is a bit tricky to find anything in the 2009 edition other than the contents pages which is less than pure prescription) would need revising. When Crispin Blunt, minister with responsibility for youth justice, announced in mid January that new guidance would come into force as early April this year, however, the short timescale was a bit of surprise to some (including, if rumours are to be believed, those at the Youth Justice Board (YJB) with responsibility for producing them). To their credit, the (few remaining) stalwarts at the Board produced the goods on time nonetheless and the new standards were revealed to the youth justice public shortly before going live – very shortly in fact.

Perhaps given that even the most dedicated YOT practitioners would have struggled to find the new standards on the Ministry of Justice website – let alone digest them – prior to the beginning of April, and taking account of the fact that the document –once located – reads a little like work in progress (it has the feel of an essay written the night before the deadline), implementation is on a trial basis. The idea is that standards will go to ministers for final approval for implementation in April 2013. The current year will constitute a trial period: the revised guidance is available for YOTs to use from that April 2012 onwards, but they will have a six month period of grace, if they wish to take advantage of it, before being required to adopt the changes. The secure estate meanwhile can carry on locking up kids in the manner to which they are accustomed since existing procedures for custodial establishments will continue to apply until next year when revisions will be incorporated into the proposals put to ministers.

The new standards '*aim to combine the maximum freedom and flexibility possible on the one hand, combined with rigour and service quality on the other*'. Certainly they are shorter than those they replace, weighing in at 55 pages compared to 136 pages. However, they are considerably longer than – and retain a good deal more prescription than – adult standards currently being rolled out to probation. (The latter run to – or more accurately stroll towards – just 4 pages – and repetition accounts for the bulk of the wordcount. They can be summarised – though it would only take two minutes to

read the full document – as saying '*there will be an assessment, there will a supervision plan, and the order will be enforced*'.)

It is also true that there is greater flexibility – particularly for managers as it turns out. Whereas each section in the previous edition commenced with an overview of '*YOT manager responsibilities*', these have all but disappeared in the revised version. They are replaced by 14 bullet points outlining '*Strategic standards and operational mangaers standards*' which are at a level of generalisation that would make it hard to determine whether or not they had been met. Example: '*Ensure that a workforce development strategy is in place to ensure the delivery of a high quality workforce*'; or again '*Implement systems for ensuring that policies are understood by staff and implemented in practice*'. Key elements of effective practice (KEEPs) were at one time as central to the YJB's strategy for youth justice as George Osborne is to the government's plans for the economy (ie fundamental but not very popular). But these have now been consigned to the dustbin of history – the KEEPs that is.

There are also clear moves towards a less formulaic approach for practitioners. Indeed, it might be argued that in some places this goes too far. Take appropriate adult work, for instance. Given the criticism by the joint inspection (see previous item), which one would have thought ought to be ringing in the YJB's ears still, beefed-up guidance in that area of practice might have been expected. But, as Inspector Clouseau once said in a similar context, 'expect the unexpected': references to police station work are reduced to a single paragraph, copied verbatim from the previous standards, requiring local authorities to put in place arrangements for dealing with PACE transfers.

This might of course simply be an oversight as a consequence of ministerially induced haste. There is certainly evidence of the impact of such haste elsewhere. For instance, there is a reference in the standard on court work to '*providing the court with a service as agreed with the youth justice service agreement*' but the corresponding requirement to ensure that such an agreement should be in place (previously a YOT manager responsibility) has disappeared in the interests of increased flexibility and discretion. Similarly, the standard on child safety orders reads a bit like a William Burroughs novel until you realise that the text is actually the guidance for parenting orders from the 2009 edition. (The standard on parenting orders has been successfully updated.)

There are other areas where there is a shift towards greater practitioner autonomy. A number of time limits are relaxed or simply abandoned. The required frequency of reviews is reduced, for instance, from once every three to once every six months; first contacts with children subject to court orders is required within three, rather than one day; the requirement to home visit children subject to bail supervision and support goes from monthly to whenever the supervising officer needs an excuse to leave the office. For children subject to YROs and DTOs, while home visits remain a requirement of supervision, they no longer have to be on a 'regular' basis. The timescales for production of pre-sentence reports have also changed. The previous standards allowed 15 days as a default, but (counter intuitively) just ten days for children who met the criteria for intensive supervision and surveillance. ('*Hey, let's allow less time for those more complex cases that require a more in depth assessment, greater*

planning, the deployment of a higher level of resources, and a more carefully argued report'.) This tension is resolved by requiring that all PSRs are completed within a timescale agreed with the court.

Assessment is another area of significant change. Prevention programmes previously required an assessment using *Onset* (*Asset's* little sister). Any old assessment will now do. Similarly, at least some of the references to *Asset* are replaced by '*the YJB's approved assessment tool'*, allowing for the prospect that an alternative form of assessment framework might be implemented at some point. The Board is still committed to replacing *Asset* (see NAYJ Newsletter, Winter 2011) and '*formal approval of the national roll-out of the framework and its funding is now being sought from the Government*'. Unfortunately, the copy and replace exercise is not conducted consistently; references to *Asset* still pepper some of the later pages of the revised standards. But if there is a potential for not having Asset there is also a potential for not having *Asset* scores– which would play havoc with the scaled approach. Or would it?

The previous standards linked risk of reoffending scores to minimum required levels of contact. The revised guidelines retain the previous threefold classification – intensive, enhanced and standard levels of intervention – but dispense with any connection to scoring. The problem is they don't – explicitly at least – replace it with any other mechanism for allocating children to the appropriate category – the process is to all intents and purposes mystical. Presumably this is one place that practitioners are supposed to exercise their professional discretion. How flexible can you get? Just a thought though – where discretion is exercised subsequent to an *Asset* assessment, which will inevitably continue to generate scores, won't there be a bit of temptation to use those scores to some end? Perhaps for determining minimum levels of intervention. On a different though related issue, it would appear that children at the heavy end are not as risky as they used to be, since the minimum number of contacts for those subject to intensive intervention has been reduced from 12 per month to 8.

On the face of it, the most positive relaxation of the standards is in relation to breach. Increasingly prescriptive standards, in concert with more punitive attitudes and a managerialist approach, have combined to ensure that '*we now breach more kids in a week than we used to in a whole year*' as one practitioner perceptively put it. The revised standards depart from the '*I'll count to three*' approach to one that simply talks in terms of a pattern of non compliance. But every silver lining has a dark cloud and, so far as the youth rehabilitation order is concerned, the provisions of the *Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008* will continue to require breach on the third missed appointment unless there are exceptional circumstances.

At the level of theory, as Boris Johnson is fond of saying, there is the more abstract question of what increased practitioner discretion might mean in a risk averse climate. Where national standards are prescriptive, practitioners enjoy (obviously a euphemism in this context) a certain amount of protection, providing they have followed the guidance to the letter when things go pear shaped. Where that guidance gives latitude, on the other hand, then the buck stops with the worker who makes the decision or the

manager who authorises it. The 'safest' thing to do in these circumstances is to err on the side of caution. Who could be criticised for continuing to adhere to the old, stricter, standards? (Such a practice would incidentally ensure compliance with the revised standards too.) A commitment to the child's best interests might provide a useful counterweight to that tendency towards doing as we have done up to now.

Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act receives Royal Assent

It's a testament to her energy and her sharp legal faculties that, even in her diamond jubilee year, Her Majesty continues to keep a close eye on all the legislation going through parliament. Having carefully scrutinised the minutiae of the provisions of what was the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Bill, the Queen decided that she agreed with the lot on 1 May 2012. She has yet to determine when the measures will be implemented, but best guesses are that those that impact most significantly on the youth justice system will come into effect during 2013. (As an aside, there is a rumour that when it first came out as a draft from the Ministry of Justice, the Bill was called the *Legal Aid, Sentencing and Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill* – but a certain DC, who lives at Number 10, personally insisted on changing 'rehabilitation' to 'punishment' as he didn't want to appear softer than TB who used to reside at the same address.)

For the most part the changes are welcome. (Thanks Liz.) Youth cautions will replace the final warning scheme, allowing children to have as many pre-court disposals as considered appropriate, even if they have previous convictions. Seventeen year olds, who are currently treated as adults for remand purposes, will be brought within the arrangements for younger children, allowing them to be made subject of (non-secure) remands to local authority accommodation. Remands to the secure estate will no longer be available unless the court considers that a custodial sentence is likely. Courts will be allowed to make a conditional discharge for a first offence in place of a referral order. In addition, those pesky penalty notices for disorder are to be abolished for children below the age of 18. As a consequence of a late amendment, the Act also reforms the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act – in a good way (see following item).

Some potentially useful amendments to the Bill were rejected in the final parliamentary debates. Lord Beecham attempted to tie the government to reviewing the operation of the new youth caution within three years at the end of which they should report on its operation, with a particular focus on appropriate adults and the potential for extending the requirement for an AA to include 17 year olds. The government responded that work was already underway to look at the possible extension, but resource implications would need to be fully considered (for which read, *'not while we are in power, mate'*). In the spirit of compromise, Lord Beecham withdrew the amendment so as not '*to divide a thinly attended House'*, noting that the three year period suggested in the amendment '*should be long enough for even the Home Office to come to some conclusions*'.

Not everything about the Act raises a smile in the NAYJ camp however. For instance, the maximum duration of a YRO will be raised to a maximum of three years following a breach or amendment. The maximum period that a child can be subject to curfew

under sentence is to be increased from 12 to 16 hours a day, and the maximum length of a curfew requirement from 6 to 12 months. Mandatory custodial sentences (a minimum of 4 months) are to be introduced for 16 – 17 year olds convicted of an offence of 'threatening with offensive weapon in public'. (Your Majesty, what were you thinking of?)

Rehabilitating the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974

As noted above, one of the effects of the Legal Aid etc etc Act will be to amend the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974, substantially reducing the rehabilitation period before an offence becomes spent. However, there is something of a sting in the tail: currently the rehabilitation period kicks in at the point of disposal, but will in future start at the end of the sentence (including licence). As a consequence, while most children will benefit from the changes, those aged 12 – 14 subject to a DTO will actually be worse off as indicated in the table below:

Sentence	Current rehabilitation period	Amended rehabilitation period
Custody more than 4 years	Never spent	Never spent
Custody 30 – 48 months	Never spent	Sentence plus 3.5 years
Custody 6 – 30 months	5 years from conviction For children aged 12–14 subject to DTO of more than 6 months, sentence plus 1 year	Sentence plus 2 years
Custody less than 6 months	3.5 years from conviction Sentence plus 1 year if aged 12–14	Sentence plus 1.5 years
YRO	One year from conviction or end of the order – whichever is longer	Sentence plus 6 months
Fine	2.5 years from conviction	6 months from conviction
Compensation	2.5 years from conviction	Date compensation paid in full
Referral order	On completion of order	On completion of order
Conditional discharge / bind over	1 year or end of order – whichever is longer	End of order

Ken Clarke, the Justice Minister (and, by comparison with his Tory colleagues, something of a teddy bear) expected '*a bit of a row*' when the amendment was introduced. But the predicted backlash never came. Even the CBI approved.

Welcome though the changes are, there is still room for gripes and the NAYJ would be derelict in its duties if it failed to raise them. Both Labour and Conservative could be accused of dragging their feet since the proposals are not new. A government review called '*Breaking the Circle*' (not to be confused with the 2010 green paper '*Breaking the Cycle*' which inevitably sends chills down the spine of all avid cyclists) recommended the revisions more than ten years ago. Secondly, parliament was presented with a better alternative: Lord Dholakia proposed wiping the slate clean when children turned 18 providing that they had completed their sentence. The government response was in effect '*You are pushing your luck mate*'. Lord D and his supporters obviously thought so too and dropped the amendment.

The logic of payment by results?

Outside of the legislative arena, the coalition government's big idea for the criminal justice system, including that part of it that deals with children, is to move towards payment by results (PbR). The Green Paper, '*Breaking the Cycle'* was replete with references to financially incentivising providers who meet targets to reduce custody, reduce reoffending, and reduce first time entrants. At one level, this is a reflection of an ideological commitment to the efficacy of the market and competition– '*greed is good'* you know; it also ticks another Tory box, since if reoffending goes up, service providers won't get financially remunerated, thereby expanding the role of volunteers within the youth justice arena.

This apparently simple idea is providing a tad difficult to implement – leading to a range of pilots flying in different directions and at different altitudes. Not that negative results are likely to faze the government: Crispin Blunt recently made clear that the administration *knew* that PbR was the best policy, they just hadn't figured out yet how to make it work. (Though he didn't cite it as an inspiration, such an approach is reminiscent of the film, *The Girl who kicked the Hornet's Nest*. There is a pivotal scene during the trial of the heroine for attempted murder in which it becomes apparent that the psychiatrist's report that seems destined to condemn her to indefinite detention in a psychiatric institution was in fact written before the report's author had met her to conduct the assessment.)

In any event, the law of unintended consequences has shown some of the potential complexities of the government's 'rehabilitation revolution' and the opening up of service provision to contestability. According to an article in the Guardian in March 2012, the governor of three South Yorkshire prisons had probation officers '*marched off the premises'* in response to the South Yorkshire probation trust signing a partnership agreement with G4S. The rationale was that since the probation now worked for a competitor organisation belonging to a consortium that intended to bid to run public sector custodial establishments, the exclusion of probation staff was necessary '*to protect the commercial confidentiality of the rival public sector bid'*.

Reduction in the number of children supervised by YOTs accompanied by an increasing overrepresentation of black children

Between 2006/7 and 2010/11, there was a fall in detected youth offending of more than 40%, attributable in part to the introduction of a government target to reduce first time entrants (FTEs) to the youth justice system. The corresponding decline in the number of children supervised by YOTs has varied by ethnicity. For white young people, the fall over the same period was 46%; the equivalent reduction for black and Asian children was 30% and 28% respectively, exacerbating black and minority overrepresentation. The data might be thought to suggest that BME children have been less likely than their white counterparts to benefit from the FTE target.

The table from which the figures are derived (*Table 3.3: trends in number of young people in the youth justice system supervised by YOTs by ethnicity, 2006/07 to 2010/11* of the supplementary tables of Youth Justice 2010/2011 for anyone sad enough to want to check the original source for themselves) shows a contrary trend for

those classified as mixed race, in the form of an 86% decline in the number of such children supervised by YOTs.

How might such a puzzling result be explained? Quite straightforwardly as it turns out. The Ministry of Justice / YJB staff responsible for compilation of the statistics have simply transposed the figures for mixed heritage and 'other' children so that they appear in the wrong category (easily done of course – though they might have noticed the clue to the error in the 453% increase in the YOT caseload for young people from 'other' ethnic backgrounds). Once corrected, the data show that fall in the number of mixed race children subject to YOT supervision is lower than that for any other group – 17% over the relevant period.

Black and mixed race children are not just overrepresented among those subject to YOT supervision. They are also more likely to be breached than their white counterparts: the table below shows breach of a statutory order as a proportion of all proven offences. If only practitioners had more discretion in relation to the breach process…

Ethnicity	Breach of statutory order as % of all offences
Asian	4.2%
Black	6.2%
Mixed	7.6%
Other	3.5%
White	5.8%
Overall	5.7%

Further cuts to youth offending team budgets

According to an article in *Children and Young People Now*, youth offending teams can expect a further reduction of 7% in the budgets that they receive from the Youth Justice Board for 2012/13, on top of the 20% decline for the current financial year.

The financial climate, in concert with the new found freedom to determine local policy has seen a range of different responses. Local authorities in West London (Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, and Westminster) for instance have amalgamated to form a single YOT. By contrast, Wessex YOT (a long standing consortium of local authorities) has disbanded. The Isle of Wight split off some time ago, but it now transpires that the remaining constituent parts – Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton – have decided to go their own ways. The rumour that the divorce after all these years is a reflection of the rivalry between Southampton and Portsmouth football teams is far from convincing. On the other hand, the suggestion that Isle of Wight wanted to concentrate on hosting rock festivals is hard to resist.

If such activity makes it hard to be clear quite how many YOTs there currently are, the water is further muddied in many areas by restructuring, which in some cases has seen youth justice provision effectively dissolved into broader services for young people. Whether such arrangements comply with the provisions of the *Crime and Disorder Act*

1998 which require local authorities to establish one or more youth offending teams for their area is debateable. John Drew, chief executive of the YJB, has told *Children and Young People Now* that the Board will be '*keeping a close eye on those areas*' where structures make the delivery of desired outcomes '*more problematic'*. Shakespeare comes to mind. In Henry IV, Owen Glendower brags '*I can call the sprites from the vasty deep*'. To which Hotspur retorts, '*Why so can I or so can any man, but will they come when you call them?*'.

NAYJ seminar in Liverpool (very) well received

At the risk of blowing our own trumpets, we think it is fair to say that the NAYJ training seminar – '*The changing face of youth justice'* – in early April 2012 was one of the year's best youth justice events to date. Hosted by the Centre for the Study of Crime, Criminalisation and Social Exclusion at Liverpool John Moores University. An audience of youth justice practitioners and policy makers joined students from the University to hear presentations from four of the NAYJ's trustees. The organisation's chair Pam Hibbert, opened the day which was chaired by Professor Barry Goldson of Liverpool University. Plenary addresses were given by Dr Joe Yates of Liverpool John Moores University and Dr Tim Bateman of the University of Bedfordshire and the selection of workshops was good enough to make your mouth water.

A briefing paper, offering an analysis of trends and developments in relation to children in conflict with the law, was launched on the day. If you haven't had the pleasure, it can be downloaded from the NAYJ's website at:
http://thenayj.org.uk/campaigns-and-publications-2/

But you don't have to take our word about how good the event was. Here is what some of the punters had to say: *An excellent seminar day and good opportunity to meet other like -minded people in a variety of contexts'; 'Really interesting and informative'; 'Well thought-out and planned in respect of facilitators, delivery and content'; 'Perfectly priced, sometimes expensive conferences miss out on key participants because of the cost'* and '*Brilliant value for money'.* We could go on. Indeed we will. If you are gnashing your teeth at the thought of having missed such an '*excellent, interesting, informative, well thought out, perfectly priced'* gig, don't worry. The event is being repeated on 12 September. The seminar will be held in Stockton and hosted by the University of Durham. Further details can be obtained by emailing **info@thenayj.org.uk.**

Please pass the Newsletter on to any of your colleagues who may find it of interest

If you would like to receive an email alert when future editions of the NAYJ Newsletter and other papers are published, please subscribe to the mailing list by sending your e mail address to: info@thenayj.org.uk

The NAYJ can be contacted at: info@thenayj.org.uk