



## **SURREY CHILDREN'S SERVICE PERFORMANCE REPORT**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S  
LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE AREA)  
23 MARCH 2005**

### **SUMMARY:**

This report sets out current performance and key issues for Surrey Children's Services (Social Care Teams), Early Years and Child Care, and Youth Justice. An overview of countywide service issues is provided (Appendix 2) as well as borough/district specific information. A separate report focussing on the Multi Professional Team's services for children with special education needs is also on this agenda (Item 8).

### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee is asked to:

- (i) Note the performance of the service both countywide, by area and locally within Elmbridge.
- (ii) Provide comment and feedback on the operation of the service and the content of the report.
- (iii) Consider opportunities for further familiarisation and engagement with the service via visits to teams/establishments.
- (iv) Become aware of the role of elected members as corporate parents for looked after children.

---

**LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER:** Janet Forster  
Area Manager Surrey Children's Service –  
North East Surrey

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 01372 363 920

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** Officer Report to the Children and Young People Executive, 28 September, on progress with our "Medium Term Strategy – Children's Service"

---

## 1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Surrey Children's Service was formed in 2002, integrating services for children and young people across the former Social Services and education departments. The service is now structured into four area teams, comprising of an Assessment Team, a Children's Team and Family Centres. Elmbridge lies in the North East area.

## 2 ELMBRIDGE FOCUS

- 2.1 In addition to local service context and initiatives, key data and trends are highlighted, showing borough data for Elmbridge where available, in the context of the North East area and Surrey wide performance. Unfortunately some statistics are only collated on an area or county basis. This is particularly true for information that is collected for the Department of Education and Skills who require a county return for all information.

## 3 TEAMS / STAFFING

Social work services for children in need of protection, Looked After Children, and children in need in the Elmbridge area are provided from:

Team	Base
Assessment Team Team Manager Bridget Ainley	Esher Civic Centre
Children's Team Team Manager Neil Kornfein	Epsom Town Hall
Family Centres 1. St Faith's - Team Manager vacancy 2. Ashford – Angela Stanton	St Faith's, Leatherhead Ashford
Children with Disabilities Team Team Manager Mark Nesden	Reigate (AO2)

### 3.1 Work at the Assessment Team

The Assessment Team at Esher is the front door for all referrals, which are screened for eligibility. This team takes referrals for the whole of the North East area, which includes Epsom and Ewell and Spelthorne. They deal with all the initial child protection work.

This is a very busy, fast paced team where stress levels are inevitably high. Traditionally we have had difficulty in recruiting for child protection work and this is in line with the rest of the country. It is particularly difficult to recruit in Elmbridge because we are near to the London borders where social workers can get London Weighting. We have had a very successful recruitment campaign over the past year, but we remain heavily reliant on overseas workers and locum staff.

We have been very successful in recruiting unqualified family support workers and we are committed to training them to become social workers. These family support workers are often people already living locally who are of more mature years and likely to stay longer in the area. Surrey Children's Service has set aside thirteen places a year to put these staff through the four-year training programme at a cost of £200K per year. We gained two newly qualified workers in Elmbridge this year by this route and are currently seconding five workers who will complete their qualification over the next three years.

### **3.2 Work at the Children's Team**

The Children's Team based at Epsom primarily deals with Looked After Children. We also have staffing vacancies in this team (currently four) but have recently recruited some workers from Canada who want to relocate to England. There are currently 184 Looked After Children in the North East area, of which 55 come from Elmbridge. 70 North East Looked After Children are at secondary school, 57 are at primary age and 41 are pre-school age.

In Elmbridge we have identified key stages where Looked After Children have difficulties in education. These are in the transition between years 6 and 7 and years 10 and 11 when they are taking GCSEs. Because so many of these children have past histories of abuse and difficulties within their families it can be difficult for them to concentrate on doing well in school. Stability in school and obtaining qualifications is their main chance of achieving in life and getting out of poverty so Surrey Children's Service has focussed its support services on this area. This year we have obtained tutors who will coach Looked After Children in years 10 and 11 to help them cover any work they find difficult or have missed due to home difficulties. This is an ongoing project which we plan to increase and is supported through the Corporate Parenting Steering Group chaired by Andrew Crisp, Executive Member for Children and Young People.

### **3.3 Work of the Family Centres**

#### **3.3.1 Ashford Family Centre**

The Family Centre at Ashford works with children on the child protection register and children and families in high levels of need. They run a range of groups from parenting groups for mothers with young babies, as well as parents struggling to manage teenagers with problems, through to anger management groups. A new project which will be running in the Elmbridge area is for isolated single parents with young babies. This aims to improve the mothers' self esteem and at the same time help with nutritional advice for their babies. Many of these groups are run jointly with local health visitors.

There are also two family support workers from the Ashford Family Centre working with the Multi Professional Teams in local schools. They attend the school planning meetings at the beginning of term where Head

Teachers identify support required for young people who are experiencing difficulties at school. Where there are issues at home which teachers feel may be affecting the children these workers will also work with the family. This is a new initiative which started in September 2004 and been very successful.

There will be a new preventative service for children aged up to 11 years old whose parents find their behaviour so difficult to cope with that they are asking for them to be accommodated. This will be based at Ashford Family Centre. The funding has been agreed and we are hoping to start recruiting in June 2005. The 9 – 11 year age range has been identified as a particular issue in Elmbridge.

### 3.3.2 St Faith's Family Centre

The St Faith's Family Centre in Leatherhead is currently without a Team Manager due to the sudden and untimely death of Andrew Jury, aged 39. This has been a major set back for the whole area because Andrew was instrumental in organising and promoting preventative work in both Epsom and Ewell and Elmbridge. He was a highly valued colleague. The Team Manager post is being advertised and will hopefully be recruited to in Spring 2005.

St Faith's will have the new outdoor playground which Andrew campaigned for and his daughter will be opening this in the summer in memory of him.

There continue to be a number of groups run at St Faith's involving Elmbridge families. A recent initiative is the Family Therapy Service in conjunction with a specialist family therapist doing work with families in crisis who feel they are unable to manage their children's behaviour.

## 4 WORKLOAD / WORKFLOW

### 4.1 Referral Rates

The North East Assessment Team has the highest number of referrals across the County.

#### Initial Assessments completed Oct – Dec 2004

NE	508
NW	180
SE	321
SW	280

North East represents 39% of the total. Despite this the North East Assessment Team in December 2004 managed a completion rate within timescales (7 days) of 66% for Initial Assessments completed on time. This was the highest in the county but still needs improvement because it is one of the indicators which contributes towards the Council's star rating. We are developing a new system to try to speed this up but there are

guidelines for completing these assessments which make them difficult to do within the timescales, particularly when there are staffing vacancies.

One of the problems for the teams in this area has been the high workload and the number of care proceedings in Court. Each care proceeding needs a qualified social worker and involves preparation of reports, attendance at Court and supervision of contact arrangements between family members. One social worker can only manage a maximum of 5 – 6 care proceedings at any time with their other work. The caseload of social workers locally has been too high and although there is a workload management system workers have routinely been exceeding the hours they are supposed to work. This does have an impact in terms of stress levels, which we are carefully monitoring.

#### 4.2 Open Cases (Elmbridge)

The table below shows the number of open cases by borough. Elmbridge is consistently one of the highest boroughs for open cases. The number of cases in Elmbridge is reducing which is a countywide trend. This is a reflection of the higher threshold criteria due to the increased amount of regulation and recording responsibilities on social workers.

	30 <sup>th</sup> April 2003		31 <sup>st</sup> July 2003		30 <sup>th</sup> April 2004		31 <sup>st</sup> July 2004	
	Number	per 1000 population	Number	per 1000 population	Number	per 1000 population	Number	per 1000 population
<b>The number and rate per 1000 population of children with open cases as at the heading date</b>								
Elmbridge	639	22.9	611	21.9	614	20.88	543	18.46
Epsom and Ewell	315	21.69	265	18.25	207	13.34	207	13.34
Guildford	643	24.22	662	24.94	588	21.00	561	20.04
Mole Valley	363	21.25	365	21.37	313	18.65	270	16.09
Reigate and Banstead	696	24.89	659	23.57	578	21.13	623	22.78
Runnymede	508	33.43	547	35.99	412	25.97	459	28.93
Spelthorne	464	24.45	564	29.72	430	23.11	459	24.67
Surrey Heath	325	17.58	336	18.18	261	12.90	274	13.55
Tandridge	268	14.82	294	16.26	274	14.53	276	14.63
Waverley	443	17.38	449	17.62	395	14.53	399	14.68
Woking	557	27.03	591	28.68	395	18.92	413	19.79
Not Recorded	482		521		307		299	
Outside Surrey	N/k		80		61		59	
<b>Surrey Total</b>	<b>5703</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>5944</b>	<b>25.75</b>	<b>4835</b>	<b>20.26</b>	<b>4842</b>	<b>20.29</b>
<b>Sources:</b>								
Data held on the SWIFT social care system and reported using Business Objects report CH_CAS_01 amended to group by borough/district								
<b>Notes:</b>								
(a) Rate per 1000 population calculated using the 2001 Census figures.								
(b) 'Not Recorded' includes cases with insufficient data to map to a borough/district and children with no main display address.								

4.3 Child Protection

	30/06/04		30/09/04		31/12/04		2000
	Number	Rate/1000	Number	Rate/1000	Number	Rate/1000	Census Figure
<i>ELMBRIDGE</i>	50	1.70	32	1.09	29	0.99	29411
<i>EPSOM &amp; EWELL</i>	15	0.97	15	0.97	11	0.71	15521
<i>SPELTHORNE</i>	53	2.85	50	2.69	51	2.74	18604
<b>North East Boroughs</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>1.86</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>63536</b>
<i>RUNNYMEDE</i>	28	1.77	29	1.83	18	1.13	15864
<i>SURREY HEATH</i>	19	0.94	13	0.64	12	0.59	20228
<i>WOKING</i>	51	2.44	46	2.20	41	1.96	20873
<b>North West Boroughs</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>56965</b>
<i>MOLE VALLEY</i>	10	0.60	17	1.01	13	0.77	16784
<i>REIGATE &amp; BANSTEAD</i>	33	1.21	31	1.13	30	1.10	27349
<i>TANDRIDGE</i>	22	1.17	10	0.53	1	0.05	18861
<b>South East Boroughs</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>62994</b>
<i>GUILDFORD</i>	53	1.89	62	2.21	32	1.14	27997
<i>WAVERLEY</i>	23	0.85	17	0.63	16	0.59	27179
<b>South West Boroughs</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>55176</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>238671</b>
census figures are figures for children up to 18 years old From Sept 2001 census figures based on 2000 census.							
<b>National Rate per 1000 as at 31.03.03 - 2.40</b>							

Elmbridge has consistently had a high number of children on the child protection register. Despite this all Elmbridge child protection cases are allocated to a qualified social worker and reviewed within required timescales. These are also key indicators which contribute to the Council's star ratings.

The numbers are currently reducing in line with a general trend across Surrey. There may be a correlation between the increase in numbers and the publicity following the Climbié Inquiry.

There is a high correlation between children on the register in Elmbridge, domestic violence and parental drug use.

These are areas which we are addressing through the North East Children's Partnership Group which is developing preventative services. Both North Surrey PCT and East Elmbridge and Mid Surrey PCT are represented. The Local Director, Janet Cooke, Connexions, the Youth Offending Team (YOT), the Children's Fund, Early Years, Youth Service and the Police also attend.

#### 4.4 Looked After Children (LAC)

	30th June 2002		30th June 2003		30th June 2004	
	Number	per 1000 population	Number	per 1000 population	Number	per 1000 population
<b>The number and rate per 1000 population of children looked after during the year to the heading date</b>						
Elmbridge	60	2.15	79	2.83	115	3.79
Epsom and Ewell	41	2.82	44	3.03	52	3.26
Guildford	105	3.96	108	4.07	122	4.07
Mole Valley	51	2.99	57	3.34	56	3.02
Reigate and Banstead	133	4.76	141	5.04	144	4.84
Runnymede	90	5.92	64	4.21	61	3.51
Spelthorne	50	2.64	55	2.90	68	3.29
Surrey Heath	32	1.73	30	1.62	43	2.15
Tandridge	52	2.88	58	3.21	58	2.97
Waverley	51	2.00	53	2.08	62	2.20
Woking	89	4.32	92	4.46	87	3.90
Not Recorded	64		66		20	
Outside Surrey	24		28		27	
<b>Total Workload</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>3.62</b>
<b>Sources:</b> Data held on the SWIFT social care system and reported using Business Objects report CH_LAC1 amended to group by borough/district						
<b>Notes:</b> (a) Rate per 1000 population calculated using the 2001 Census information. (b) 'Not Recorded' includes cases with insufficient data to map to a borough/district and children with no main display address identified.						

The number of Looked After Children rose steeply in Elmbridge between June 2002 and June 2004. This represented a high point which has since reduced to 55.

In 2004 there was an increase in the number of families with young children where the children have been removed for child protection reasons. These are usually pre-school children. There was also an increase in the number of adolescents where parents felt unable to cope with their behaviour. There is some correlation between numbers of adolescents accommodated and family divorce and lack of extended family support. The figures are small and last year there were two families of five children which added to these figures. It is also possible that the Courts have taken a more cautious line in care proceedings since the Victoria Climbié case, which may have added to the increase. Surrey Children's Service's aim is to reduce the number of Looked After Children by



identifying young children at risk earlier and provide alternative permanent placements away from the home if the family cannot keep the children safe. We are also investing in preventive work for older children to try to maintain them within their family homes because the prognosis for children who become accommodated when they are older is extremely poor. They appear to do less well Looked After than if they remain with their parents with support.

There are currently 13 children from Elmbridge who are placed with adopters pending the making of an adoption order or with long-term permanent foster carers.

#### 4.4.1 Educational Attainment for Looked After Children (LAC)

There are currently many initiatives, including:

- Secondary school based intervention to target improved attainment using the South London Education Psychology Service to provide 20 hours support for LAC.
- Dowry Audit of money given to schools. Completed analysis to take place in March 2005 to ensure targeted activity in schools.
- SENCOs (Special Educational Needs Coordinator in Schools) contribution to LAC is being further developed and training and support provided.
- Carezone funding secured to provide homework support for LAC and advice for carers. This is an IT package.
- Exclusions – 4 Multi Professional Teams prioritising Looked After Children in an audit of all exclusions.
- Education Welfare service to target LAC attendance.

#### PAF A2 – Percentage of Young People leaving care having achieved at least GCSE.

Measure				2001/02 Actual	2002/03 Actual	2003/04 Actual		2004 Target	2005 Target
<b>The percentage of young people leaving care aged 16 or over with at least 1 GCSE at grade A*-G or a GNVQ.</b>									
					30 out of 72	28 out of 59			
PAF A2	BV 50	QP 4.1.2		55.4%	41.7%	47.5%	Below Target	50.0%	50.0%
<p><b>Sources:</b> Collected as part of the OC1 Statutory Return for DfES.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> (a) Terminology for 'measure' references: 'PAF' = Performance Assessment Framework, 'BV' = Best Value, and 'QP' = 'Quality Protects' (b) The definition of this Performance Indicator was amended in 2003/04</p>									

Although we have made great improvements in the educational attainment of young people leaving care this is an area that we are intending to concentrate on for the next year to try to improve educational attainment.

#### 4.5 Foster Carer Numbers

	No of Foster Carers
Elmbridge	15
Epsom & Ewell	7
Guildford	28
Mole Valley	19
Reigate & Banstead	34
Runnymede	10
Spelthorne	26
Surrey Heath	10
Tandridge	23
Waverley	16
Woking	10
Grand Total	198

Foster carers are supported by specialist family placement workers. These workers provide training, group work and additional specialist support.

Recent foster carer recruitment campaigns have been very successful and the number of children placed with Surrey foster carers has increased. Usually it is desirable to place children locally when they become Looked After so that they can maintain contact with their family. We would like to be able to increase the number of foster carers within Elmbridge in order to maintain Elmbridge children within Elmbridge. The only exceptions would be where there are child protection reasons for them being placed away from their families.

Any support elected members can give to help publicise campaigns would be much appreciated. There is also the annual summer barbecue for Looked After Children and their carers, which this year will be held from 5 – 8.30pm on Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> July. Local members should let Janet Forster know if they wish to be invited to this event.

## 5 LOCAL INITIATIVES

### 5.1 Inter-Agency Referral Project

For all referrals to the North East Assessment Team we now have an improved inter-agency referral protocol. This has been particularly useful for health visitors and teachers and means that they can add their own assessments electronically to the Children's Service forms. Information already held on a family by one professional does not need to be asked for again. This has also helped clarify thresholds for referrals and different agency roles. A North East Area conference was held on 9 February 2005

to review the process, which was felt by all the agencies present to be working well. This does not affect urgent child protection referrals, which are still made by telephone in a crisis situation.

## **5.2 Community Development**

Surrey Children's Service remains primarily a targeted specialist service. However, there is some capacity for community development work, particularly in the area of community safety. Surrey Children's Services attends the Community Incident Action Group (CIAG) and are involved in taking forward multi-agency work on Prevent and Deter in Elmbridge with the Community Safety Team and other partners. Prevent and Deter is a key strand of the Prolific and Priority Offender Home Office initiative.

## **5.3 Preventative Work**

All Local Authorities have been tasked with developing a preventative strategy as part of the new Children's Bill. There is a strategic North East Partnership Group, already referred to, and it is planned that there will be a sub-group for each of the three boroughs in the North East area, one specifically for Elmbridge. This will include representatives across agencies and including voluntary services. Each area has been given a small amount of money as a development fund and local multi-agency bids can be made for specific preventative projects. We have agreed that in Elmbridge the multi-agency criteria for this is to support young people who are in danger of school exclusion and very young children who will have difficulty in accessing school.

Early discussions are underway to ensure that this work is linked in to new self-reliance work in the borough.

## **6 CONCLUSION**

Surrey Children's Service in Elmbridge is working to shift its resources into preventative work and this is working well locally. This is due to the commitment and hard work of our staff, which I would like to acknowledge in this report.

**List of Appendices:**

**Appendix 1 - Youth Justice Statistical Report for Local Committees**

**Appendix 2 - Service Context**

**Appendix 3 - Early Years and Childcare Statistics (Borough/District)**

**Appendix 4 - Population Figures**

**Appendix 5 - Looked After Children and Offending**

## APPENDIX 1

## YOUTH JUSTICE STATISTICAL REPORT FOR LOCAL COMMITTEES

The following data is for offences committed by 10-17 year olds from Elmbridge. Data for the past two years is provided for comparison purposes.

## Offence by Borough Data 1.7.02 to 30.6.03

Category Desc	Elmbridge	Epsom & Ewell	Guildford	Mole Valley	Reigate & Banstead	Runnymede	Spelthorne	Surrey Heath	Tandridge	Waverley	Woking	Grand Total
Arson	2		2	1	1			1	2		1	10
Breach of Bail							1	1		1		3
Breach of Conditional Discharge	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2		1		14
Breach of Statutory Order	4	1	19	7	23	1	6	1	2	8	13	85
Criminal Damage (excluding Arson)	14	13	27	8	23	16	24	31	6	22	22	206
Domestic Burglary	4	6	16	1	6	1	5			1	4	44
Drugs	12	9	25	14	27	10	16	8	10	11	27	169
Fraud and Forgery	6			5	5	1	8		1	1	3	30
Motoring Offences	46	51	123	41	69	25	157	32	11	38	113	706
Non Domestic Burglary	1	1	6	2	5	5	1			4	4	29
Other	5	1	17	15	21	5	13	11	1	9	6	104
Public Order	8	5	23	11	13	8	12	20		21	18	139
Racially Aggravated		1			1	2	3	1				8
Robbery	22	7	3	2	12	1	6			2	2	57
Sexual Offences	1		5	1	1			1			1	10
Theft and Handling Stolen Goods	23	18	51	15	59	38	39	15	14	42	40	354
Vehicle Theft and Unauthorised Taking	7	4	19		16	4	15	3		10	9	87
Violence Against the Person	24	15	57	21	28	29	30	27	14	21	34	300
Grand Total	180	134	394	146	312	147	338	154	61	192	297	2355

## Offence by Borough Data 1.7.03 to 30.6.04

Category Desc	Not Known	Out County	Elmbridge	Epsom & Ewell	Guildford	Mole Valley	Reigate & Banstead	Runnymede	Spelthorne	Surrey Heath	Tandridge	Waverley	Woking	Grand Total
Arson		1		6	3		2	4					2	18
Breach of Bail	1	3			2			2		4		2	1	15
Breach Of Conditional Discharge		1			3	2	5	2	2				1	16
Breach of Statutory Order	4	13	6	11	21	7	16	7	17	7	3	6	10	128
Criminal Damage		2	12		18	3	12	11	3	10	2	5	2	80
Criminal Damage (excluding Arson)		10	21	19	27	37	34	8	12	25	4	8	22	227
Domestic Burglary		4	2	1	5	3	14	2	2	3		4	5	45
Drugs	1		13	5	16	6	23	3	10	8	4	9	4	102
Fraud and Forgery	1				2		1	1	3		1	1		10
Motoring Offences	2	17	74	28	142	28	85	29	122	62	8	38	41	676
Non Domestic Burglary	1		3	3	5		5	1	2	2	1	1	4	28
Other		6		9	15	4	26	3	3	15		3	3	87
Public Order		7	19	14	26	6	36	19	13	25	2	10	20	197
Racially Aggravated	1	1	1	1		8	5	2	7				5	31
Robbery	1	2	5		4	3	2	1	4			2		24
Sexual Offences		2		3	4	4				3			3	19
Theft and Handling Stolen Goods	3	13	28	38	61	18	75	45	29	22	14	21	48	415
Vehicle Theft / Unauthorised Taking				2	7	2	6	2	1	2		1	1	24
Vehicle Theft and Unauthorised Taking	1	4	3	6	4	4	19	5	8	4	1	3	6	68
Violence Against the Person	6	18	30	23	59	16	56	27	39	43	8	20	33	378
Grand Total	22	104	217	169	424	151	422	174	277	235	48	134	211	2588

## Youth Justice Service

The Surrey Youth Offending Team continues as a high performing YOT, occupying a top twenty position in the national performance table (out of 154 YOTs nationally). This evidences consistent target beating performance against 11 of the 13 performance measures defined by the Youth Justice Board. Performance for the second quarter of 2004, the most recent available, is summarised below:

1	Ensure all areas have in place effective arrangements that ensure children and young people most at risk of offending are targeted by mainstream services	Two Junior Youth Inclusion and Support Programmes are now in place in Camberley and Tadworth aimed at supporting children at primary/secondary transition phase
2	Reduce re-offending rates by 5% based on 2000 sample compared to 2001 sample after 24 months (annual data)	Pre-court 8% increase First tier penalties 2% increase Community penalties 14.5% decrease Custody 4% increase
3	Ensure that the proportion of Final Warnings supported by interventions remains constant at 80%	83%
4	Reduce the use of the secure estate to 30% for remands and 6% following sentence	Remands 23% Sentence 3.1%
5	Ensure that 75% of victims are offered the opportunity to participate in restorative processes	85%
6	Ensure that 10% of young people with final warnings supported by intervention and community based penalties receive a parenting intervention	10%
7	Ensure that ASSET (the core offender assessment tool) is completed for 95% of young people subject to community and custodial sentences	97.8%
8	Pre-sentence reports completed 10 days for persistent young offenders (90%) 15 days for all other reports (90%)	98% (10 & 15 day reports combined)
9	Detention and Training Order (DTO) training plans: 100% of plans drawn up within 10 days of sentence	100%
10	Ensure 90% of young offenders are in full time education, training or employment	67%
11	Ensure 100% of young offenders have satisfactory accommodation	95%
12	Young offenders with mental health difficulties: 100% acute cases seen within 5 days 100% non acute seen within 15 days	No acute cases 96%
13	Ensure that all young people are screened for substance misuse and those with needs are assessed within 5 days and access treatment within 10 days	100% need assessment are seen within 5 days

**Rate of Offenders per 1000 population**

	<b>No of Offenders by Borough Year to 30-06-2004</b>	<b>10 - 17 population by Borough</b>	<b>Rate of Offenders per 1000 population</b>
<b>Elmbridge</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>11838</b>	<b>7.9</b>
<b>Epsom &amp; Ewell</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>6629</b>	<b>8.1</b>
<b>Guildford</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>12127</b>	<b>13.3</b>
<b>Mole Valley</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>7907</b>	<b>7.7</b>
<b>Reigate &amp; Banstead</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>12243</b>	<b>11.7</b>
<b>Runnymede</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>6589</b>	<b>11.4</b>
<b>Spelthorne</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>8462</b>	<b>12.5</b>
<b>Surrey Heath</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>8232</b>	<b>10.8</b>
<b>Tandridge</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>8464</b>	<b>3.7</b>
<b>Waverley</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>12484</b>	<b>5.4</b>
<b>Woking</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>9013</b>	<b>9.9</b>
<b>Total for Surrey</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>103988</b>	<b>9.3</b>
<b>Not Known</b>	<b>2</b>	n/a	n/a
<b>Out County</b>	<b>26</b>	n/a	n/a

**Youth Justice in Elmbridge**

In April 2004 the Surrey Youth Offending Team re-organised its team structure along court divisional boundaries in line with recommendations from the 2003-04 Best Value Review. North Surrey (Elmbridge and Spelthorne) now has a dedicated YOT team delivering services within this division. Re-organisation took place to enable better delivery of services in line with local needs.

The new structure is already bearing fruit with the YOT taking an increasingly active role in Elmbridge's crime and disorder and community safety agenda. YOT staff participate in the Community Incident Action Group and the Joint Action Group in order to address issues of youth crime and disorder in the borough. From this interface with borough partners and in line with the government's Prolific and Other Priority Offender (PPO) Scheme the need for a greater emphasis upon prevention of offending from its onset has become clear. To meet this need the YOT and Elmbridge Crime and Disorder Partnership have agreed a joint intervention project to work with those young people exhibiting behaviour and subject to the risk factors indicative of future persistent criminality.

Youth offending for the borough remains below the Surrey average. Reconviction rates for 2004 for those receiving community interventions from the YOT have shown a 14.5% reduction in offending across Surrey and work in Elmbridge is building upon strong partnerships, particularly with the Police and Youth Development Service, to ensure levels of reconviction continue to fall. Motor offences, by which is meant driving matters rather than theft of or theft from motor vehicles, account for one third of all offences committed by youths who come to the attention of the YOT. Addressing this type of offending is a priority for the YOT with existing 'Roadkill' and 'Road Safety and the Law' groups being supplemented by the Shepperton Karting Project and referrals to the 'Safe Drive, Stay Alive' programme.

## APPENDIX 2

### SERVICE CONTEXT

#### A.1 National Developments

- Surrey decided, three years ago, to integrate Children's Services. With the Children Bill, this will become a statutory requirement, and local authorities will be required to have a lead member and a single Director of Children's Services.
- There is significant activity in hand to progress government requirements to have local inter-agency information-sharing protocols, and to progress towards electronic files by December 2005. A model system, the Integrated Children's System, will form the framework for this.
- Surrey was awarded two stars in the Annual Review process in November 2003; the Children's Service Plan addresses areas for development, which are progressing as at A.2 below:

#### A.2 Surrey "headlines"

These are set out under the six key themes of the Medium Term Strategy as follows:

##### A.2.1 Prevention

- Developing preventive working in partnership – the Surrey Children and Young People Partnership is now mirrored at area level by multi agency partnership groups. During June/July, 19 workshops have been held, attended by 650 people, to engage with a wide range of stakeholders including governors, teachers, children's service staff, the voluntary sector, health, police and parents/carers. There was strong support for cross service preventive working, improved access, integration of multi professional teams, schools being central to service delivery for children, and more focussed support for parents.
- Funding for prevention – Area Managers now have funding and authority to spend on preventive services, subject to agreed criteria. The challenge is to shift funding from high cost placements to ensure the sustainability of a funding base for preventive services.
- Kinship Care and Family Group Conferences – new procedures and funding arrangements are in place to support in-family care of children who might otherwise become formally "looked after" children.
- Expansion of the Community and Placement Support Team – an additional 7 staff have been appointed, the service now covers the whole county and their age range has extended to 12-17 year olds, focussing on two objectives:
  - The prevention of 12-17 years olds entering the Looked After System.



- The return home within 12 weeks of any 12 – 17 year olds who become Looked After.
- More children with disability have been supported in their homes or local community.
- Increased access to Early Years Provision

#### A.2.2 Integration and Inclusion

- Boundary changes to align our social care teams with the four areas of the Children and Young People Directorate was completed in April 2004. As part of this move, the two (East and West) Children with Disabilities Teams were split into four teams and are now integrated within the Multi Professional Team.
- Multi Professional Teams now hold regular Care Planning meetings with schools.
- The pilot of the Integrated Assessment and Referral System has been completed successfully in North West Surrey and this is being rolled out in the other three areas over the next year.
- A “Corporate Parent Steering Group” has been set up, chaired by Andrew Crisp, and will co-ordinate and raise the profile of looked after children to ensure that agencies work together to maintain these children in mainstream provision, and improve outcomes.

#### A.2.3 Engagement

A variety of activities have included:

- Annual barbeque for children, young people and foster carers (including a questionnaire regarding the notion of an Awards Ceremony)
- Survey of Adopters
- Survey of foster-carers regarding out of hours support needs
- Involvement of children and young people in appointments
- User Survey on Assessment Services
- 20 young people (11-19 years) consulted on development of local preventive strategies

#### A.2.4 Recruitment, Retention and Skill Mix

- Since the beginning of 2004 a targeted campaign for social worker recruitment has been running permanently in the national and professional press and via the website. This has had a significant impact and we have reduced our vacancies dramatically. A significant proportion of new recruits are from overseas and they have a bespoke induction, training and support group. The results for Assessment and Children's Teams are as follows:

Team	Vacancy Levels	
	January 2004	July 2004
Assessment	37.7% (20.7 wte)	12.4% (6.8 wte)
Children's	32.4% (21.4 wte)	9.1% (6.0 wte)
<i>Overall</i>	34.8% (42.1 wte)	10.5% (12.8 wte)

Note: wte = whole time equivalent

- Between October and December 2004 we ran a development programme for experienced Senior Social Workers aspiring to become managers.
- Trainees and Social Work Degree Course. Following fresh emphasis on in-service training, and the development of a new social work degree course with Reading University, we now have 36 staff undertaking in-service professional social work training.

#### A.2.5 Getting more from our funding

- The key strategy is to reduce the number of independent sector care placements in order to shift resources into community based and preventive provision. The number of (non-disabled) children in such placements has reduced from 142 (October 03) to 116 (June 04).
- Apart from tight gate-keeping and care planning, a vital component of the strategy has been to strengthen our in-house fostering resource, and the figures demonstrate an outstandingly successful recruitment strategy that has exceeded the set target. By April 2004, 89 new households had been recruited (target 50). The target for new recruits (April 04 – March 05) is 100 foster carers, and in the first quarter 33 new foster homes have been recruited providing an additional 49 places.
- The third key strategy to reduce pressure on placement services/budgets has been to reduce the overall number of looked after children. Whilst numbers have actually increased overall by 40 from June 2003 to June 2004, the current trend is a downward trend. The position stabilised from January 2004 and in the quarter to June there were 12 more leavers than entrants. Our target is to reduce overall numbers by 50 by March 2005.

#### A.2.6 Communication and Leadership

- Termly staff conferences have been held in each area.
- Monthly (Area) and Quarterly (Service) Performance Meetings have become established. At the Annual Review Meeting in August 2004, The Commission for Social Care Inspection remarked upon positive progress and commended the “step change” which had been achieved in performance management by Surrey Children's Services.
- By the end of September 2004, 93 teams will have taken part in the corporate Impact 3 Programme.

- Leadership and Learning Programme for middle managers. 83 managers are involved and the second module of the programme on performance management will be completed in September. An evaluation of the learning and its transfer to the workplace is currently being conducted and the results will be available later in the year.

**APPENDIX 3**

**EARLY YEARS AND CHILDCARE STATISTICS (BOROUGH/DISTRICT)**

**Early Years and Childcare**

Issues in the development of childcare places continue to include lack of suitable premises, low salaries resulting in difficulties recruiting staff and ensuring that provision has sufficient income to cover costs (financially sustainable).

The Early Years and Childcare Service has restructured to ensure greater knowledge of local opportunities and issues. Support and advice will be focused for existing and potential providers to encourage development in areas of greatest need or demand.

A number of schools have expressed an interest in developing childcare as part of the extended schools programme, which may assist parents who continue to desire services very near their home or work.

The development of integrated childcare and early education (educare) places will support parents who work or train and enhance parental choice.

The strategic development of childcare continues to be reliant on potential providers being receptive to the advice offered.

All four year olds and most three year olds are now eligible to a funded early education place. Despite a known over capacity of places across the county, a research programme is planned to determine if parents are able to access their entitlement locally. Work continues to ensure a diversity of provision is available to enable parental choice.

**Workforce Development**

Issues of low pay continue to inhibit the development and expansion of the workforce. An extensive training programme is available locally to equip the workforce with the skills to deliver quality childcare and education. Professional development is encouraged via a range of training bursaries and supply cover funding to release staff for training. Support and advice is available on recruitment and retention issues and a business management training programme is being developed to promote the retention of staff and the financial viability of providers.

**Pre-School**

Pre-school childcare settings and places in private, voluntary, and independent sectors at 31 March 2004:

	No. of settings providing pre-school childcare	No. of pre-school childcare places in settings	No. registered child-minders	No. of child-minding places	Total no. pre-school childcare places	Total no. children aged 0 -4 years	Places per 100 children aged 0 - 4 years 31 March 2004
Elmbridge	62	2485	204	478	2963	8037	37
Epsom and Ewell	36	1218	161	376	1594	3965	40
Guildford	75	2728	177	448	3176	7069	45
Mole Valley	52	1486	135	321	1807	4580	39
Reigate and Banstead	66	2130	266	622	2752	7778	35
Runnymede	33	1297	130	320	1617	4277	38
Spelthorne	41	755	166	403	1158	5179	22
Surrey Heath	50	1713	174	419	2132	4929	43
Tandridge	52	1733	174	403	2136	4769	45
Waverley	79	2679	156	363	3042	6587	46
Woking	45	1540	167	399	1939	5679	34
<b>SURREY TOTAL</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>19764</b>	<b>1910</b>	<b>4552</b>	<b>24316</b>	<b>62849</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Bor./Dist Average</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1797</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>2211</b>	<b>5714</b>	<b>39</b>

**Sources:** Full day care and sessional settings figures are supplied by OfSTED, or if unavailable from OfSTED supplied by the provider to Surrey Early Years and Childcare and Surrey Children's Information Service.

Figures for childminding (CM) places are provided by OfSTED. Figures are for the number of children under the age of 5 that each childminder is registered for.

Figures for Independent Schools are based on the number of part-time equivalent places funded by the Nursery Education Grant in the spring term of 2003.

Demographic data is based on the 2001 Census, and taken from the Office for National Statistics website: [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk).

## Out of School

Out of school childcare settings and places in private, voluntary and independent sectors at 31 March 2004:

	No. settings providing out of school childcare	No. of out of school childcare places in settings	No. registered child-minders	No. out of school child-minding places	Total no. out of school childcare places	No. children aged 5 - 14 years	Places per 100 children aged 5 - 14 years
Elmbridge	34	1496	204	400	1896	14404	13
Epsom and Ewell	12	531	161	309	840	7271	12
Guildford	25	1077	177	352	1429	13530	11
Mole Valley	24	992	135	257	1249	8855	14
Reigate and Banstead	14	682	266	541	1223	14369	9
Runnymede	19	1102	130	248	1350	7908	17
Spelthorne	22	1039	166	343	1382	9881	14
Surrey Heath	24	1102	174	352	1454	9511	15
Tandridge	19	716	174	267	983	9295	11
Waverley	29	1523	156	260	1783	12729	14
Woking	31	1311	167	255	1566	10618	15
SURREY TOTAL	253	11571	1910	3584	15155	118371	13
Bor./Dist. AVERAGE	23	1052	174	326	1378	10761	13

**Sources:** Figures for Before and After School groups and Holiday Play Schemes are provided by OfSTED where settings are registered and by the provider if exempt from registration.

Figures for childminding places are provided by OfSTED. Figures are for the number of children aged 5 - 8 that each childminder is registered for.

Demographic data is based on the 2001 Census, and taken from the Office for National Statistics website: [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk) .

**Early Education**

Early Education Places: Summer term 2004:

	<b>Places Taken</b>				
	<b>NEG*</b>	<b>LEA**</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>No. of children aged 3 and 4 years</b>	<b>Total places taken as % of children aged 3 and 4 years</b>
<b>Elmbridge</b>	1717	980	2697	3031	89%
<b>Epsom and Ewell</b>	794	704	1498	1539	97%
<b>Guildford</b>	1503	975	2478	2795	89%
<b>Mole Valley</b>	1090	498	1588	1729	92%
<b>Reigate &amp; Banstead</b>	1419	911	2330	3059	76%
<b>Runnymede</b>	782	574	1356	1647	82%
<b>Spelthorne</b>	859	788	1647	1981	83%
<b>Surrey Heath</b>	1054	605	1659	1837	90%
<b>Tandridge</b>	1086	659	1745	1808	97%
<b>Waverley</b>	1657	733	2390	2540	94%
<b>Woking</b>	930	741	1671	2198	76%
<b>Surrey Total</b>	12891	8208	21099	24164	87%
<b>Bor./Dist. Average</b>	1172	743	1914	2197	88%

**Notes:**

Places Taken: For Nursery Education Grant (NEG), figures represent part-time equivalent places (5 2.5hr sessions per week for 33 weeks of the year) in the private, voluntary and independent sector. Local Education Authority places taken represent the number of places taken in maintained nursery classes, nursery school and reception classes by 3 and 4 years old children. These figures are based on 2004 Summer term data.

Population figures are based on 2001 Census data for children aged under 1 year and 1 year.

**APPENDIX 4****POPULATION FIGURES****Mid Year Estimates from ONS**

2002 Mid Year Estimates: Unrounded

	Age					
	0	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	0-19
<b>Elmbridge</b>	1479	6526	8250	7645	6479	30379
<b>Epsom &amp; Ewell</b>	766	3169	4015	4128	3874	15952
<b>Guildford</b>	1375	5615	7290	7486	8173	29939
<b>Mole Valley</b>	789	3570	4833	5109	4242	18543
<b>Reigate &amp; Banstead</b>	1378	6190	7736	7926	6539	29769
<b>Runnymede</b>	756	3324	4426	4190	4672	17368
<b>Spelthorne</b>	982	4075	5471	5407	4757	20692
<b>Surrey Heath</b>	909	3915	5254	5260	4640	19978
<b>Tandridge</b>	891	3783	4907	5492	4472	19545
<b>Waverley</b>	1249	5214	6836	7635	7298	28232
<b>Woking</b>	1023	4510	5923	5760	5088	22304
<b>Surrey</b>	11597	49891	64941	66038	60234	252701

1. It is ONS policy to publish population estimates rounded to at least the nearest hundred persons. Estimates are sometimes provided in units to facilitate further calculations but the cannot be guaranteed to be exact as the level of detail implied by unit figures.
2. Source: Population Estimates Unit, ONS, Crown Copyright 2003.



**APPENDIX 5****LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN AND OFFENDING****Introduction**

The Quality Protects (QP) indicator PAF C18 measures the incidence of offending by looked after children compared with the general 10-18 population. The position in Surrey is that looked after children are now 6 times more likely to commit offences according to figures used for the QP report. This figure appears to have deteriorated against the previous year and falls significantly short of the target. This paper considers the basis on which the figure has been calculated, a comparison with neighbouring areas and what measures might be put in place to improve performance.

**Definition**

To be counted under the PAF C18 indicator, *the child has to, as at the 30th September, have been looked after continuously for at least 12 months and cautioned or convicted whilst being looked after and the offence has to have been committed whilst the child/young person is looked after.*

**Calculation according to figures available to the YOT**

For the year ending 30<sup>th</sup> September 2002 there were 32 looked after children who met the offence criterion under PAF C18 out of a total of 339 looked after children aged 10-17 years (excluding children with disability), an offending rate of 9.4%.

For the general 10-18 population there were 1588 offenders out of a total 10-18 population of 105,292, an offending rate of 1.5 %. The PAF C18 indicator is the ratio of these two offending rates:  $9.4 \div 1.5 = 6.3:1$

**Comparisons with neighboring shire authorities**

<b><u>Authority</u></b>	% of 10-17 continuously looked after 12 months at 30 <sup>th</sup> September, convicted or warned for offences previous 12 months	% of general 10-17 year population convicted or warned for offences previous 12 months	PAF C18 Ratio	% 10-17 looked after
Surrey	9.4	1.53	6.3	0.33
West Sussex	7.53	2.78	2.7	} 0.4
East Sussex	10.94	2.78	3.9	
Buckinghamshire	7.89	2.47	3.2	No data
Hampshire	11.56	4.04	2.9	0.25
Hertfordshire	8.71	2.44	3.6	0.38
Kent	5.51	3.27	1.7	0.47
Average	8.5	2.54	3.3	0.36
	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>	<b>IV</b>

The table above shows that the offending rate by the general 10-17 population in Surrey is *exceptionally* low, no other area in England and Wales comes close to this figure. The offending rate by Surrey's looked after children is above the

average for this group of neighbouring authorities (column I). But, Surrey has the second to lowest proportion of children in the looked after system (column IV), suggesting that the threshold for entry is higher than average.

Analysis of the comparison data above leads to the following conclusions:

- The threshold for entry to the looked after system may be higher than average, or Surrey may be more successful in returning young people to their families inside of twelve months. Either way, looked after children in Surrey may therefore present with a higher incidence of behavioural difficulty than their peers in neighbouring areas.
- The difference in Surrey between the level of offending in the general 10-17 population and that in the looked after population is exaggerated by the exceptionally low levels of offending in the general population and the high threshold for entry into the looked after system.

If the PAF C18 ratio is calculated based on the average figure for offending in the general population across all neighbouring authorities, the ratio would be 3:1.

### **Current activity in support of PAF C18**

Our current activity falls into three areas:

- An enhanced response to looked after children in Surrey's residential units where there are concerns about risk of offending, either because the child has been Reprimanded by the police for an offence or where there are concerns about a child's behaviour. Police officers seconded to the YOT have tried to cultivate a positive relationship with young people in each of the residential units.
- Liaison between the YOT and Residential Services Manager to keep under review the threshold at which Police are called to incidents within the residential units, usually criminal damage to Surrey County Council (SCC) property and assaults on staff. The approach being employed by the YOT is to question whether behaviour being brought to the attention of the police by residential staff would be dealt with by informal family discipline in a family context.
- Dialogue between the Residential Team Managers (RTMs) and the Police, facilitated by the YOT, to agree response strategies in the event of the Police being asked to attend. This is to promote response from the Police which fall short of formal arrest and charge. (It is likely that with the rapid "churn" of Police personnel and the relative inexperience of the Force that this area requires renewed and continuing investment of time).

Children looked after in fostering placements have not been the subject of this focus.

### **Evidence from research**

Research evidence on the causes of youth offending point towards the following risk factors as predictors of criminal involvement:

- Troubled home life, including poor parenting, criminal family member, violence or abuse
- Peer group pressure
- Poor attainment at school, truancy and school exclusion
- Drug and alcohol abuse
- Mental illness
- Deprivation such as poor housing or homelessness

It is very likely that looked after children present risk factors in two or more of the areas above and experience shows that their reception into the looked after system does not necessarily mitigate these risks. Conversely, the risk factors that predispose young people to offending may actually increase as a consequence of becoming looked after.

Factors which protect young people from involvement in offending are:

- Strong bonds with family, friends and teachers
- Healthy standards set by parents, teachers and community leaders
- Opportunities for involvement in families, schools and the community
- Social and learning skills to enable participation
- Recognition and praise for positive behaviour

The looked after setting provides major challenges in both promoting protective factors and minimising risk factors – the usual approach of the YOT in working with young people to prevent offending and re-offending. Clearly, reducing the likelihood of offending by looked after children calls for skilled residential staff and foster carers who have a good understanding of these factors and are committed to this Quality Protects objective.

### **PAF C18 Analysis of offending of looked after children**

Details of the offences of the 32 young people are attached to this paper. The main findings are:

- 11 of the 32 young people committed some or all of their offences within the residential or foster care setting
- 3 young people committed offences only within the care setting (residential)
- 18 young people (56%) committed offences *after* becoming looked after
- Offences committed within the care setting are exclusively criminal damage and assault
- Frequency distribution of offences outside care setting:
 

▪ Theft from shops	11	22%
▪ Criminal Damage	10	20%
▪ Taking Without Owners Consent	7	14%
▪ Assault	6	12%
▪ Theft	6	12%
▪ Burglary	6	12%
▪ Robbery	1	2%
▪ Drugs	1	2%
▪ Driving offences	1	2%

### Proposed Improvement Plan

There appear to be a number of actions that are likely to have a positive effect on the PAF C18 indicator:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.Re-establish dialogue with the Police (perhaps supported at very senior level) on response strategies when officers are called to incidents at residential units	High	Nil	Convene meeting with Area Inspector for Woking & Horley TW LM
2. Discuss and agree with residential staff (and union representatives) and managers the threshold for involving the Police in relation to thefts and criminal damage and develop alternative strategies for both applying sanctions and rewarding positive behaviour	Medium	Low	½ day workshop to be convened July 8 <sup>th</sup> 2003 for RTMs and YOT LM & TW
3.As corporate parent, SCC to have a policy of not pressing charges against looked after children for offences of criminal damage and theft up to an agreed threshold and use Restorative Justice alternative	Medium	Nil	Should be outcome of workshop above
4. Consider whether residential social workers and foster carers might benefit from training, perhaps provided by the YOT, on risk and protective factors and aspects of the YOT's training programme for parents (coping with teenagers)	High	Organised in-house Possible cost of external trainer	Liaise with Annie Maclver and Christine Barnard re NVQs for foster carers and Daryl Freeman re Residential Social Workers TW
5. Train residential social work staff in Restorative Justice to broaden their repertoire of responses to offending behaviour	High	£500 per day 10 participants	Liaise with Police & Daryl Freeman re programme for this. TW
6. Incentives for Community Homes on PAF C18	Low	Level of incentive to be determined	Explore with RTMs; possible bid for new money LM
7. Appoint experienced RSW to YOT to coordinate management strategies for LAC assessed at risk	Medium	£30,000	Consider bid for new funding; consult with Liz Woolford TW

8. Provide substance mis-use assessment to all looked after children where identified at risk	Medium to High	Depends on scale of referral	YOT Acorn drugs workers TW
9 Provide intervention to looked after children following Reprimand	Medium	?	YOT – links to 7 above TW

## Conclusion

The PAF C18 indicator for Surrey is 6.3:1, by far the highest ratio amongst south east counties. However, the offending rate amongst the general population is the lowest in the south east (and probably the country) and our threshold for entry into the looked after system amongst the highest. If our PAF C18 indicator is calculated using the average rate of offending for the south east, the ratio is 3:1.

Evidence from research on the causes of youth offending highlight the very difficult task that confronts managers and practitioners in the looked after system if they are to minimise risk factors and maximise protective factors. Analysis of the 2002 looked after offending cohort shows that over half began to commit offences *after* they had become looked after by the county council.

The proposed improvement plan puts forward some ideas on how progress might be made and these actions will be progressed over the coming months and subject to review at the quarterly performance meetings. Significant gains may prove hard to achieve given that the bar is set so high by the fact that the incidence of offending in the general population is so low. There is an arguable case for Surrey's target to be recalibrated in the light of this, perhaps using a regional average figure for general offending.