



Nacro response to The Justice Committee inquiry into children and young people in custody

About Nacro

We are a national social justice charity with more than 50 years' experience of changing lives, building stronger communities and reducing crime. We house, we educate, we support, we advise, and we speak out for and with disadvantaged young people and adults. We are passionate about changing lives. We never give up.

Our response to this consultation is based on the experiences of our practitioners and staff, and we have also used research findings from Beyond Youth Custody, a 6 year learning and awareness programme led by Nacro exploring effective resettlement for young people leaving custody. We believe the findings of this research are applicable and transferable across the criminal justice system and have referenced this throughout. Our reflections on the children's secure estate are also based upon our experience of delivering education in Medway Secure Training Centre

Nacro is a member of the Standing Committee for Youth Justice (SCYJ), and we endorse the comments set out in their response to this consultation.

Please contact Andrea Coady, Policy and Research Officer, for more information on our response: andrea.coady@nacro.org.uk.

The Beyond Youth Custody programme¹

The Beyond Youth Custody programme (BYC) was a six-year England-wide learning and awareness programme funded by the Big Lottery Fund as part of the Youth in Focus (YIF) initiative. BYC brought together Nacro with three research and evaluation partners: ARCS (UK), and Salford and Bedfordshire universities. Since its inception in 2012, BYC built a robust evidence base about what works in terms of effective resettlement for young people. This evidence base – rooted in the views of children and young people – was used to challenge, advance and promote better thinking in policy and practice for the effective resettlement of young people leaving custody. The framework provides a new focus for resettlement services' aims and objectives, and is particularly useful as a common language for the inter-agency working that is essential when supporting children and young people in the youth justice system.

¹ <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/>

Our response

The Youth Justice Population and entering the system

How has the young offender population changed and what are the challenges in managing this group?

We have provided overarching comments in respect of following questions rather than addressing each question individually.

- a) What are the characteristics of those entering the youth justice system and how has the mix of offences committed by young people changed?**
- b) What is the experience of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic offenders of the youth justice system and secure estate and what progress has been made in implementing the recommendations of the Lammy Review?**
- c) How effective is the youth justice system in diverting children and young people away from custody and what more needs to be done?**

Children entering the youth justice system

Statistics

In the year ending March 2018:²

- There were an average of just under 900 children in custody during the year (a slight increase of 3% in the latest year).
- The number of children held on remand has increased by 19% in the last year, and now makes up nearly a quarter (24%) of all children in youth custody.
- The proportion of children in youth custody from a Black background has been increasing, and now accounts for a quarter of the youth custody population.
- The majority (58%) of custodial episodes ended within three months.
- Violence against the person offences now account for 41% of the youth custody population.

Data from the Ministry of Justice shows that children in prison are twice as likely to have special educational needs as those in the general population.³ 30% of children who entered custody over 2018-19 were assessed as having special educational needs or disabilities, compared to less than 15% of children nationally. From our experience in delivering education in Medway Secure Training Centre, we see that a significant proportion of the children entering the youth justice system have Statements of Special Educational Needs/Education Health and Care Plans (EHCP), but there is a higher proportion for whom learning needs have been masked by behaviour and remain unidentified. We have also seen an increasing proportion of young people with complex social emotional mental health needs (SEMH) and with language and communication difficulties either identified in their EHCPs or identified by us through assessment. Many also have other specific learning needs or global developmental delay identified in their EHCPs or identified by us. The vast majority of the children have had a disrupted education, with many experiencing changes of school, and permanent and fixed term exclusions which can negatively impact their confidence and skills.

²

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/774866/youth_justice_statistics_bulletin_2017_2018.pdf

³ <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/children-prison-special-educational-needs-jail-uk-a9034846.html>

It has been very positive to see the reduction of first time entrants (FTE) into the justice system by delivering a range of person-centred interventions to address vulnerabilities and need, and we welcome the positive impact this has had on the significantly reduced number of children and young people in the secure estate. However, we have real concern that alongside this reduction the disproportionality in respect of young people from BAME communities coming in to the youth justice system has increased, as these young people appear to miss out on early diversion. It is therefore essential that any initiatives for early intervention and prevention must address the diverse needs of children and young people. The Lammy Review⁴ recommended that criminal justice agencies adopt the ‘explain or reform’ principle, but with disproportionality continuing to worsen it is clear that far more needs to be done to embed this principle in the youth justice system.

Nacro is concerned that the number of children held on remand has increased by 19% in the last year. We believe this requires urgent action to understand why this has taken place and ensure alternative options are in place to divert children and young people away from custody. The use of pre-trial detention draws children into an inappropriate environment before they have even been convicted of an offence. The fact that of those remanded, two-thirds do not go on to receive a custodial sentence is a strong indicator that remand is being used inappropriately for a large proportion of children. Children should only be remanded into custody where they pose a serious risk to themselves or others, and there are genuinely no other options for mitigating the risk in the community.

Reoffending rates of children released from custody remain high, with 71.6% of children and young people going on to reoffend within 12 months.⁵ It is important to recognise that the number of reoffences committed is rising, with 3.92 reoffences per person (the frequency rate).⁶ This is the highest frequency rate of the last ten years, and when considered in conjunction with stubbornly high reoffending rates it is a strong indicator that additional focus is required on reducing reoffending, and the frequency of that reoffending. Short custodial sentences will not be effective in reducing reoffending, instead we need investment in interventions which provide the opportunity, at the earliest possible moment, to address the issues that have led to offending.

Identity Development toolkit and the Beyond Youth Custody programme

The BYC programme explored the relationship between young people and the resettlement practitioners working with them. The research found five key characteristics of working with young people that were central to effective resettlement outcomes, namely, practitioners being constructive, consistent and coordinated across services. The BYC programme shows that co-creating - with the young person and their family - individualised and person-centred resettlement plans, customised for the individual, was critical. This underpins the personal support that goes along side structural resettlement support, such as access to education, training or accommodation.

Nacro and the University of Salford are currently developing a toolkit to support practitioners in applying the principles of the BYC programme in upstream settings, including Youth Conditional Cautions and Youth Referral Orders, as well as wider work with children in contact with the YOT. The toolkit is centred around using an identity lens to understand offending behaviour and how this can be explored by the YOT. The toolkit and will include practical tools and exercises, with the ultimate

⁴ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/643001/lammy-review-final-report.pdf

⁵

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/832662/proven_reoffending_bulletin_July_to_Sept_17.pdf

⁶ <https://yjlc.uk/youth-justice-statistics-2017-2018/>

aim of supporting YOTs to divert young people from progressing further into the criminal justice system.⁷

d) Is the current minimum age of criminal responsibility too low and should it be raised?

We believe that the current age of criminal responsibility is too low and should be raised, at least to 14 years. Using non-criminal, welfare procedures to ensure children get the support they need at a critical stage in their development is far more appropriate and effective than that of traumatic criminal procedures where, for example, children can be held in police custody or tried in court.

Background

In England and Wales the age of criminal responsibility is 10; one of the lowest in Europe. At this age, a young person is considered old enough to be culpable of a criminal offence, arrested and tried in a court. As at May 2019, there were 36 children aged between 10 and 14 held in Youth Custody.⁸

Comparatively, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child sets the minimum age of criminal responsibility at the age of 12, as an absolute minimum. England and Wales have come under repeated criticism for setting the age at 10. Other European countries have minimum ages set at 14 and above, reflecting international standards of juvenile justice and adhering to these minimum standards. Germany, Italy and Spain, for example, all have minimum ages of criminal responsibility set at 14.⁹

Evidence

Our experience of working with vulnerable children and young people, often with complex needs, has highlighted the need for support to be delivered in sensitive, trauma informed ways to maximise impact and sustainability. We believe this should be delivered in a community welfare setting not through the criminal justice system, where services can be inadequate, inconsistent and inappropriate for children. The numbers of children in the criminal justice system have substantially decreased over the last ten years, and as such the number of interventions delivered would not be resource burdensome for the current social welfare system to deliver.

Research has shown that labelling and identity are huge factors impacting on whether a young person can move on from a cycle of criminal behaviour or continue offending. Attaching an offender label to a child or young person acts as a significant barrier to a positive identity, affecting confidence and self esteem and, ultimately, how they view their future. This labelling can have a direct impact on whether that young person will reoffend or not.

Viewing a child as an offender immediately detracts from the need to treat them as first and foremost children, often with support needs. This must be acknowledged so that the child can receive the welfare support they need and therefore reduce their likeliness to reoffend. Raising the age of criminal responsibility would divert young people away from experiencing this damaging process of negative labelling at a critical time in their adolescent development. The focus should be on ensuring that this small group of vulnerable children and early adolescents receive the welfare interventions they require and are diverted away from the criminal justice system.

Suitability of the Secure Estate

⁷ The toolkit will be published in December 2019. Please contact Caroline Drummond, Policy and Public Affairs Manager Nacro for a copy of the toolkit: Caroline.Drummond@nacro.org.uk

⁸ <https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Lords/2019-07-23/HL17392/>

⁹ <https://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/docs/CRC.C.GC.10.pdf>

Is the secure estate a fit and proper place to hold children and young people?

We have provided overarching comments in respect of following questions rather than addressing each question individually.

a) What impact has the changing nature of the population had on the management of the secure estate?

b) What does a good quality custodial place for a child or young person look like and is there sufficient provision across England and Wales?

c) What is the physical condition of the secure estate and is it an appropriate environment to hold children and young people?

d) Do staff receive appropriate training and support and what more can be done to improve this?

e) What other barriers are there to providing safe and decent accommodation in the secure estate and what more can be done to improve this?

f) Is the use of force in the secure estate proportionate and properly monitored?

g) How does the experience of children and young adults differ across the different types of secure custody and what lessons can be learnt ahead of the opening of the new secure schools?

The use of imprisonment for children

We do not believe that the secure estate is a fit and proper place to hold children and young people. Such restriction of liberty is harmful to children: it takes them away from their families, carers, supporters and communities; disrupts education; stigmatises and labels. We believe that children should only be deprived of their liberty as a last resort, and only in circumstances where they pose a serious risk to themselves or others, and there are genuinely no other options for mitigating that risk in the community.¹⁰ Punishment and deterrence should not be factors that are taken into account when any decision is made to place a child in a secure setting.

In those rare cases where there is no option but to deprive a child of their liberty, it is vital that the establishments holding those children are small, located close to the child's community, create an environment where welfare is prioritised over security and where education is the driving force, and have sufficient staffing and resources available to ensure that the child's physical, emotional, developmental needs are met, and particularly their entitlement to a good education. The BYC framework proposes a 'theory of change'¹¹ for the sustainable re-entry of children into the community, and this should be embedded into practice in the care of children deprived of their liberty. Service providers should support children to develop a shift in identity – a new narrative for how they relate to others. It involves guiding and enabling the child to create new roles in their life story that foster and reinforce this positive identity which promotes wellbeing and desistance. Progressing their education and learning new skills is part of this picture.

¹⁰ <https://justforkidslaw.org/sites/default/files/fields/download/ECI-Principles-and-Minimum-Expectations-FINAL-pub-18-April-2019.pdf>

¹¹ <http://www.beyondyouthcustody.net/wp-content/uploads/Now-all-I-care-about-is-my-future-Supporting-the-shift-a-summary.pdf>

Many of the children who come into contact with the youth justice system have had little or no engagement in education. Many have some form of learning difficulties and lack the basic skills in literacy and numeracy and IT to succeed at school, and many have been permanently or temporarily excluded. Education and skills should be central to the response to children who come into contact with the justice system, as education and training are fundamental elements on which a life free from crime can be constructed. Good technical learning, and real work experiences, both inside and outside of the secure estate, can enable young people to see themselves as skilled and successful individuals for the future. It is important that all young people in the secure estate have access to education services, where they are properly assessed, and an individual programme designed to meet their needs and which is aspirational to enable them to rapidly progress. Pedagogy should build on strengths and develop potential, and be supported with evidence-based interventions. Building resilience and behaviours for learning is vital.

We believe a distinctive approach is required to achieve change through:

- A deep and expert understanding of the complex needs of the children and young people in custody
- Applied understanding of the factors that influence change, development and growth
- Exemplary system leadership, working with organisations and agencies 'beyond custody'
- A systemic approach to bringing temporary or fragmented professional networks together
- Creating, training and supporting a new, expert multi-disciplinary youth justice workforce

We believe that a good quality custodial place for a young person puts their relationships and social context at the centre of practice, and believe that change can only be achieved and maintained by working systematically at the individual, group or family, and societal level.

Use of force

Nacro believes that there should be an absolute prohibition on the use of pain-inducing restraint techniques on children in custody. The deliberate infliction of pain on children breaches Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which prohibits torture, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment, and Article 37 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which grants every child the right to protection from cruel treatment. The deliberate use of pain is damaging to children and causes unnecessary harm, particularly as we know that children in custody are extremely vulnerable and often traumatised by their life experiences. Even where pain-inducing techniques do not result in physical injury it can be profoundly damaging psychologically.¹²

According to HMIP surveys, 49% of children say that they have been physically restrained through minimising and managing physical restraint (MMPR) while in custody.¹³ The use of these techniques is a fundamentally flawed model for resolving conflict and developing trusted relationships between staff and children.

Resettlement and rehabilitation for children and young people

Is sufficient support available in the secure estate and community to ensure that children and young people do not reoffend and if not, what more should be done?

- a) Are children and young people able to access purposeful activity, education, healthcare and other support as needed whilst in custody?**

¹² P. Smallridge and A. Williamson, Independent review of restraint in juvenile secure settings, 2008

¹³ https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/07/6.5563_HMI-Prisons-AR_2018-19_WEB_FINAL_040719.pdf

Every child has a right to education. It is critical that those in youth custody, who in many cases have had previous poor educational experiences, receive high quality learning which puts them on a pathway to future learning and work. However, many children continue to receive far less than the 15 hours' education they are entitled to (25 hours in secure training centres).¹⁴ 'Keep-apart' lists to separate children in conflict with each other and other measures to prevent violence affect attendance and punctuality, and there is not enough outreach provision for children who cannot attend education. In the Feltham A HMIP inspection report of January 2019 the inspectorate reported that one in four children surveyed said they did not attend any purposeful activity and records demonstrated that attendance at education was poor.

Young people need to be able to access a variety of high quality pathways and progression routes and there needs to be an appropriate variety of curriculum at all levels, to ensure that every young person has the opportunity to access the right pathway for them. Availability of quality careers education, information, advice and guidance (CEIAG) alongside this is critical. High quality routes and progression pathways, including work-related learning such as traineeships, apprenticeships (and, in future, T-levels) should all be part of this, ensuring that the breadth of routes to further learning and employment opportunities are included.

The vocational and enrichment aspects of the curriculum should be adapted according to children's needs. Young people we have spoken to have said: ¹⁵

"I've been living by myself for 6 years and I only just understand it. They need to teach you about life. About how to run your house. Look after yourself. Look after your children"

"Should be life skills workshops, empowerment workshops"

"The syllabus should be about helping them find out what their talent is, what their skills are about, what makes them"

In order for young people to be able to concentrate on education, the environment must be safe, and urgent action needs to be taken to tackle increasing violence and self-harm. There should always be sufficient resources and staff to ensure that the entitlement to education is not compromised due to issues relating to security or the regime.

b) Is there good collaboration between the secure state, Youth Offending Teams, Local Authorities, Social Services and other relevant organisations?

The BYC research shows that the complex and multiple nature of young people's needs means that they are likely to require support from multiple agencies. The wraparound package of support needed to both guide and enable a shift in identity requires partnership and coordination of support from across sectors including statutory and voluntary agencies and employers in the private sector. Some elements of support are dependent on others, such as an education placement being dependent on where the young person will be living. The importance of coordination and information sharing is key.

Some collaboration across multiple agencies is of high quality, and works well for many young people. However, too many opportunities remain for vulnerable children and young people to fall through the gaps in the system because agencies are not supported to work together. Often, risky behaviour is met with a punitive response, and families are left ill-equipped and unsupported. We

¹⁴ https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprison/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/07/6.5563_HMI-Prisons-AR_2018-19_WEB_FINAL_040719.pdf

¹⁵ In order to capture the voices of young people and feed their views into Charlie Taylor's Review of Youth Justice we held consultation events in 2016. These are comments made during those consultations. <https://www.nacro.org.uk/news/nacro-news/joint-response-taylor-review-government-response/>

believe that to achieve transformation it is essential that leaders can act as system integrators; this ensures that the child's needs are kept central and they are not passed between agencies with inadequate oversight. Clarity of role and purpose within and between agencies is essential to this, as is the creation of a supportive professional environment that is able to take account of, and respond to, the different contexts in which we operate.

c) Is there effective release planning to ensure that children and young people have access to accommodation, training and education upon release and what more can be done to ensure they do not reoffend?

It is clear from the interim report of the Joint Thematic Inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Prisons on youth resettlement work¹⁶ that there is often inadequate release planning. HMIP found that, the services that children and young people needed on release were too often not in place to help them resettle, and the risks that they posed were not always sufficiently managed in their early days in the community. None of the children that the inspectors spoke to felt that the work that had been done in young offender institutions had helped them towards doing better on release. The report also states that the timely provision of safe and suitable accommodation remained problematic for a small number of children, some of whom did not know where they were going to live until the day of release or very shortly before. As a result, there were no other services in place for them when they left custody.

We spoke to young people about their experiences of resettlement at a number of focus groups in 2016 (in order to feed their views into Charlie Taylor's Review of Youth Justice) They told us:¹⁷

"They promised me a college course and a flat and I got thrown out to nothing"

"There's no point going to prison and being rehabilitated if you come out to nothing"

"If it was a rehabilitation centre people would get a lot more support when they are released"

Nacro provides education in Medway Secure Training Centre, and achieved an Ofsted 'good' rating following inspection in December 2018.¹⁸ In Medway, we focus on release planning in the support we provide and, following an initial thorough assessment each child receives a programme of learning that takes account of their specific needs. From the outset we identify potential routes into training and employment opportunities, and identify the most suitable vocational learning pathways. Independent living skills are developed by children learning about, for example, budgeting and banking, in lively, engaging sessions. A wide range of creative enrichment activities benefit the children that we work with and they are often educationally focused.

What does effective resettlement look like?

Young people released from custody enter a period of disorientation following release, where the transition can destabilise them. This requires the young person to undertake a process of reorientation in order to move towards successful resettlement and desistance.

This process is made more difficult because:

1. they may not have developed strategies to cope with transitions,
2. this particular group have higher levels of need and vulnerabilities,

¹⁶ <https://prisons.org.uk/YouthresettlementTR082019.pdf>

¹⁷ In order to capture the voices of young people and feed their views into Charlie Taylor's Review of Youth Justice we held consultation events in 2016. These are comments made during those consultations.

<https://www.nacro.org.uk/news/nacro-news/joint-response-taylor-review-government-response/>

¹⁸ <https://files.api.ofsted.gov.uk/v1/file/50052394>

3. they are more likely to have to orient themselves around a chaotic home environment,
4. they are simultaneously trying to renegotiate a post-custody identity for themselves, and
5. research suggests that structural support such as stable accommodation, education, training, employment and financial stability on which to build their reorientation may well not be available by the time of release.

5 Key characteristics for support

There are characteristics of all resettlement support (covering both personal and structural processes) which research has consistently shown are key to effectiveness and sustainability. The effectiveness of resettlement support is not just dependent on what steps providers take at different stages of the sentence, but how they take them. If interventions demonstrate the following key characteristics, they are more likely to be able to promote a young person's shift in identity and their wider narrative.

1. Constructive: Centred on identity shift, future-oriented, motivating, strengths-based, empowering

Centred on exploring, building and reinforcing a positive identity: The central task of resettlement services should be providing personal and structural support to guide and enable a young person's shift in identity. This journey for the young person should always be the focus for any planning and thinking around the support.

Future-focused and strengths-based: It is particularly important that interventions avoid any underlining of the previous pro-criminal identity that could lead to recidivism. Resettlement interventions need to reinforce the alternative positive identity and wider narrative for the future.

Empowering and motivating: Interventions should ensure that they help build self-esteem in the young person. This helps to combat the vulnerabilities and disempowerment that often characterise young people in custody, and helps to sustain their motivation to change.

We are pleased to see that the Youth Justice Board have recognised the importance of a constructive approach, in putting constructive resettlement at the heart of its strategy.

2. Co-created: Inclusive of the young person and their supporters

Young person as central: The shift in identity is a journey taken by the young person themselves and is dependent on their agency and motivation to change. Their engagement is crucial. Active participation can also be part of the process of empowerment – making positive choices, developing trusted relationships with service providers and helping to build self-esteem and a positive identity.

Involving informal supporters: When appropriate, families and friends are an important source of support for young people on their resettlement journey. As part of a coordinated package of personal support, the family can help to reinforce each stage of the resettlement process.

3. Customised: Individual and diverse wraparound support

Recognising barriers and responding to diversity

Resettlement planning needs to acknowledge the huge range of diversity in young people's support needs, including the impacts of previous trauma, and the part it plays in their narrative about their

place in the world. Tailored interventions should be responsive to each of these needs, which include ethnic, cultural and gender differences. Young people from particularly disadvantaged or discriminated against groups, including girls and those from BAME backgrounds, are likely to need a particular emphasis on empowerment. This means that service providers are required to create an individualised wraparound package of support that facilitates their particular process of narrative shift and addresses underlying issues such as the impact of childhood trauma.

4. Consistent: Resettlement focus from the start, seamless, enhanced at transitions, stable relationships

Support runs throughout the resettlement journey: It is important that resettlement is recognised as a long-term journey for the young person rather than just the act of release from custody. It is necessary to begin the resettlement process at the beginning of the sentence, if not before, in order to provide time to identify and facilitate pathways prior to release. The support must also continue after the end of sentence in order to sustain and reinforce progress.

All service providers focus on resettlement: It is crucial that all service providers prioritise the personal and structural support required to facilitate the shift in identity. Custody, and custodial services, need to focus on preparation for what will happen in the community. Community services need to be arranged well before release in order to prepare the young person and help them engage with a practical pathway for change.

Seamless programme: The resettlement process should be a seamless one that bridges the divide between custody and community, working cohesively towards the same shift in identity.

Consistent formal support relationships: Stable support relationships are important for trust and engagement, requiring early formation and consistency where possible. Where those support relationships are with institution staff, trust and engagement can be protected by not moving young people between custodial institutions.

5. Coordinated: Managed widespread partnership across sectors

The complex and multiple nature of young people's needs means that they are likely to require support from multiple agencies. The importance of coordination and information sharing is key. Such a widespread partnership requires coordination at a management as well as case level in order to map and maintain a menu of support available locally. Successful resettlement programmes require dedicated resettlement staff to broker the engagement of partners across sectors, involving high-level buy-in, joint planning and information sharing. Having a resettlement broker means that someone has a wider view of the young person's life and needs and reduces the number of times a young person has to tell the same story to different members of staff.

d) What mechanisms exist to transition young people from the youth to the young adult/adult estate? What challenges does this raise and is more support required?

The Joint Thematic Inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Prisons on youth resettlement work is clear that transition to adult offending services was problematic for some children, and was not always managed well.

Despite strong evidence that the transition to adulthood is a process, not a moment in time, criminal justice agencies can abruptly change their response to young offenders when they turn 18. The transition process is a critical time, where extra effort, early planning, accurate assessment and the

active involvement of key professionals from both youth and adult services is required to ensure young people's transition experience is both safe, positive, and which aids resettlement. This is a crucial time because of the combination of the ongoing vulnerabilities that a young person may have, and the fact that much of the support that is available to children is suddenly withdrawn. When a young person is transferred to the adult secure estate every aspect of their life is transformed. The ability of parents, carers and professionals to support and access the young person changes dramatically, as does the physical environment and the regime.

Transition planning should always take place with resettlement in mind, with all interested parties working to ensure that resettlement planning starts when the young person enters custody. Transfer protocols should take account of a young adult's needs and give specific consideration to the level of maturity. Best practice would enable a specialist transitions key worker to act as the continuity between services, managing the handover of information, ensuring the young person understands what is required during and following the transfer, and liaising with other support agencies.