

Youth prevention in Saint Lucia

A referral is a start. Did support arrive?

Saint Lucia Policy Analysis | Edited by Kevin L. Michel | 20 October 2026

Saint Lucia can make youth prevention more useful by checking the whole journey from a request for help to support actually received. The next practical step is a small, funded test of service handoffs, with clear responsibility for waiting cases, safe contact and follow-up.

This paper draws on an earlier Caribbean youth-groups study held in the SLPA research collection. It connects that historical evidence with current official records, then develops an original proposal using Institutional Intervention Readiness, RIPPLE-4 and Sovereign Option Theory.

The decision proposed

Prepare one bounded pathway through existing services. Confirm legal authority, staff time, usable appointments and safe information-sharing before enrolling a small cohort. Run a 90-day preparation, delivery and review cycle, protect support for those already enrolled, and continue outcome follow-up for at least six months.



The public test is whether a young person can reach appropriate help, receive it safely and continue when needed. A programme name, an intake form or an attendance total answers only part of that question.

How to read this paper

Pages 2-3 separate historical evidence from recent commitments. Pages 4-10 set out SLPA's proposed pathway, readiness conditions, costs, measures and decisions. Pages 11-12 list sources and the research still needed. The proposal has not been adopted or evaluated by government.

What the older study can still teach

Historical evidence should improve the next question we ask.

Katz and Nuño's 2016 brief examines youth groups across the Caribbean. It uses a research definition involving durable groups, public-space activity and illegal acts as part of group identity. Ordinary friendship groups and youth organisations should not acquire that label through association. [1]

The Saint Lucia school evidence dates from April 2013. The companion technical report records 2,126 completed surveys from Form 5 pupils across 23 public secondary schools, or 79.57% of reported enrolment. The completed responses exclude pupils absent that day, private-school pupils and young people outside school. Item response counts vary. [2]

Historical signal	What it helps us ask
About age 12	Surveyed members recalled joining at about age 12 on average. Could support begin before school disengagement becomes entrenched?
29.5%	Among 292 former-member respondents, 29.5% cited avoiding violence as a reason for leaving. Can help respond to safety concerns when someone seeks change?
9.2%	In the same former-member table, 9.2% cited a job. How can work pathways sit alongside protection, relationships and school connection?

Source: 2016 brief, pages 5 and 9, exhibit 7. The reasons can overlap and include missing answers; they are separate responses, not a composition adding to 100%. The figures describe a historical school cohort and do not establish causes or the effect of a programme. [1]

The policy implication

A useful prevention offer should respond to the reason a young person needs help. A training place may matter, yet a person facing threats may first need a safe way to attend it. An after-school activity can provide belonging only when the young person can reach it, feels welcome and has a trusted adult to approach.

The source does not supply a present-day gang count, a map of current risk or a basis for judging an individual child. SLPA therefore uses it to design questions about access and continuity. Current service decisions need current local evidence.

The current public record

Several initiatives make follow-through a practical policy question.

Record	Established by the source	Still to verify
February 2024 OASYS workshop	An official reported referral practice that could end with an intake form, without subsequent monitoring or evaluation. [3]	Frequency, agencies affected and improvements since the workshop.
April 2026 Catalyst	Government announced youth reintegration, school behavioural support, community psychosocial support, life skills and employability measures. [4]	Active sites, funded staff hours, usable places and participant outcomes.
May 2026 Crime prevention policy	Government described the national policy as under development, with early intervention and youth engagement among its priorities. [5]	Current adoption status, implementation responsibilities and budget.
July 2026 Survivor response	Multi-agency training advanced procedures for safe referrals and coordinated case management. [6]	Operational use, supervision and safe handoffs in participating services.

These records establish reported concerns, announcements and implementation work. They do not establish a national referral failure rate or the present performance of every service. The review did not locate a complete current roster of service capacity or a verified Catalyst results series.

Build on the institutions already present

School counselling, social services, health, probation and community organisations have different roles. The first task is to confirm which providers can accept which needs now. A 2025 report on Youth Empowered and Alive described counselling, mentorship and weekly sessions, but its publication does not establish availability in October 2026. [7]

The proposed test would begin by checking that service roster directly with providers. It would distinguish an announced programme, a staffed offer, a place accepted, a first contact attended and support sustained. Each stage needs its own evidence.

Follow a handoff through six steps

Every transfer needs a receiving person and a clear next action.

The pathway below is SLPA's proposed design for ordinary preventive support. Urgent protection and statutory justice matters must follow their authorised routes. They cannot wait for a routine sequence or be treated as voluntary participation when the law provides otherwise.

Step	What should happen	Evidence for the responsible team
1 Need heard	A qualified worker listens, checks urgency and explains suitable choices.	Agreed purpose and a responsible worker.
2 Handoff agreed	Explain who receives information, why it is needed and the applicable consent or legal basis.	A dated, authorised referral and safe contact method.
3 Capacity confirmed	The receiving service accepts responsibility, redirects or explains that no place is available.	Named receiving worker, usable slot or waiting status with a next action.
4 Access arranged	Address transport, timing, cost, disability access and safe attendance.	A realistic appointment and the arrangements needed to reach it.
5 Support received	Confirm that the intended first support was actually received.	Service confirmation and, where safe, the young person's account; reasons for a missed start.
6 Follow-up checked	Review usefulness, unresolved needs and continuing support, or explain a safe transfer or closure.	A dated follow-up, responsible worker and reasoned next decision.

First support received is a milestone, not proof that a need is resolved or harm prevented. An administrative call cannot count as counselling or a placement. A referral may change direction when the offer is unsuitable. Record the reason and agree what happens next.

Preserve an accessible route to help

Ordinary support should remain available without a gang label. A young person should understand what information will be shared and why, who can see it, and how to correct a mistake or raise a concern. Public reporting should use protected aggregates. The SLPA website is an explanation of the proposal, not a case-intake service.

Test readiness before opening places

IIR asks whether each essential function can be carried through.

Institutional Intervention Readiness starts with the existing arrangement: which functions protect young people, which needs remain unmet and what would change under the proposal. Its five gates should be assessed separately. An attractive average cannot compensate for an unresolved protection or continuity risk. [8]

Readiness gate	Evidence required for this proposed pathway
Bounded causal account	Conditional. Define the population, service boundary, local need, current routes and queues. Young people and frontline staff must be able to challenge the account.
Legitimacy and rights separation	Open. Confirm lawful authority, age-appropriate information, consent or other legal basis, safeguarding duties, secure access and a correction or complaint route.
Dependency and alternative symmetry	Conditional. Compare a named worker providing manual follow-up and added slots with the interagency pathway, using the same costs, rights and outcomes.
Function coverage and transition integrity	Open. Verify funded receiving staff, usable places, safe access and continuity. Protect existing users and prepare for staff or funding interruption.
Learning and recovery	Conditional. Approve measures, baseline, review dates, harm triggers, a reviewer and funded recovery before enrolment.

Document the evidence behind each decision

Each gate needs an owner, dated evidence, unresolved questions and a clear decision. A missing consent procedure cannot be treated as a minor data-quality issue. A provider with no protected staff time cannot be listed as ready because it attended a coordination meeting.

The relevant authorities would confirm current law, professional responsibilities and operational procedures. This paper does not assign new legal powers. Child protection, voluntary support and justice supervision require different routes and may require different records.

The initial decision

At present, this paper establishes a case for preparation. It does not certify that any service or proposed site is ready. The next commitment should fund the evidence and capacity needed to make that judgement.

Trace the effects beyond intake

RIPPLE-4 follows mechanisms, responses and accumulated conditions.

RIPPLE-4 helps test what a change may set in motion. For this proposal, a successful referral can change demand, staff behaviour and trust as well as the immediate service received. The pathways below are hypotheses to monitor, not predicted effects. [9]

Order	Mechanism to examine	Signal and response
1 Direct incidence	A clearer referral route changes who receives an offer, who waits and who bears travel or time costs.	Track usable offers, non-starts and waiting time. Fund access where the offer is otherwise unusable.
2 Adaptation	Families may seek help earlier; staff may redirect hard cases or prioritise easy completions when judged by targets.	Review rejected and withdrawn cases, case mix and youth feedback. Avoid rewarding a raw completion rate.
3 Propagation	Higher demand reaches shared counsellors, transport or specialist services and can delay people outside the test.	Measure displaced appointments and total queues. Limit new intake to funded capacity and protect existing users.
4 Inherited conditions	Repeated experiences shape trust, provider skills, record quality and future willingness to seek help.	Follow safe access and continuity over time. Retain useful skills and agreed procedures when a component closes.

Watch the shared points of failure

One receiving worker may serve several schools. One transport arrangement may determine whether several services are usable. These shared dependencies can spread a small failure through the pathway. The capacity map should identify them before the pilot selects its intake size.

Protect against serious harm

A confidentiality breach could expose a young person to retaliation. A poorly timed transfer could interrupt protection. An outcome target could encourage coercion or exclusion. These risks need direct controls and escalation; they should not be diluted by a large number of routine successful referrals.

After tracing these effects, return to IIR. Check whether the revised design still covers essential functions, protects people during transition and can recover when a dependency fails. Only then choose how much to commit.

Fund the receiving capacity

A better front door can lengthen a queue unless help is available.

The most important capacity question is how many appropriate contacts a provider can actually deliver. A list of participating organisations does not answer it. Count protected hours, supervision, safe rooms, transport arrangements and specialist appointments before inviting a new cohort.

A proposed division of responsibility

Role to confirm	Responsibility in the test
Accountable public sponsor	Approve scope, funding, participating services, legal review and the day-90 decision. Publish aggregate progress and reasons for changes.
Pathway coordinator	Keep the service roster current, confirm receiving ownership and resolve stalled handoffs without taking over professional decisions or pooling police and school identity records.
Receiving provider	Confirm capacity, contact safely, deliver agreed support and record a reason when the offer cannot continue.
Safeguarding and review leads	Manage urgent escalation, privacy incidents and complaints; review harms independently of delivery targets.
Young people and caregivers	Help test access, clarity and usefulness. Participation in feedback is voluntary and must not affect eligibility.

Build the budget from quantities

Estimate protected staff hours at their full cost, supervision and specialist time, appointment or activity places, transport and accessibility support, secure administration, independent review, and a reserve for continuity or safe exit. Record quantities, rates, duration and the payer for each line.

Separate setup costs from the cost of delivering and sustaining support. Show what existing staff must stop doing if their time is reassigned. A donated service still has capacity limits and a risk of withdrawal. Confirm the successor arrangement before relying on it.

No total budget, caseload or expected savings is estimated here. Those figures require provider-level evidence. The intake ceiling should follow the scarcest necessary resource, with room for urgent existing work. If that resource cannot be funded, narrow the test or repair capacity first.

A bounded 90 day test

Preparation, controlled delivery and a recorded decision.

Period	Proposed work	Decision record
Days 1-30	Confirm needs, current capacity, safe procedures and baseline queues. Review the offer with young people. Rehearse synthetic cases and failure scenarios.	Readiness evidence for every gate; costed scope; authorised owners; intake and exposure limits.
Days 31-60	Enrol a small cohort only within verified capacity. Track acceptance, usable first contact and continuity. Review stalled cases and effects on existing users each week.	Dated reasons for delays, withdrawals and redirects; corrective action; harm and capacity reviews.
Days 61-90	Check cohort data, youth feedback, service continuity and unresolved risks. Publish protected aggregates and a reasoned decision on each component.	Continue within bounds, repair before adding places, or pause a component while protecting existing participants.
After day 90	Maintain agreed support. Follow outcomes for at least six months, with a longer period where a service plan requires it.	Evidence on safety, participation and durable support; a separate judgement about further evaluation and scale.

Select sites transparently

Use current need, service readiness and the ability to learn across different access conditions. Publish the selection method without labelling a neighbourhood as a gang area. A convenient urban site alone may teach little about travel barriers in other communities.

Treat a missed appointment as a question

A missed start may reflect transport cost, fear, unsuitable hours, a changed need or a voluntary decision. The response should follow the safe contact plan. It should not assume defiance or escalate a routine support case into enforcement merely to improve a completion figure.

Ninety days can reveal whether responsibilities, capacity and handoffs work. It is too short, and this design too limited, to establish a causal reduction in violence. Longer observation still needs a suitable evaluation design and fair comparison before attributing outcomes to the pathway.

Measure what actually happened

Keep denominators, missing cases and time windows visible.

Measure	Definition for the proposed test
Receiving acceptance	Accepted eligible referrals divided by eligible referrals sent in a stated cohort. Report pending, redirected and capacity-declined referrals separately.
First support received	People with confirmed receipt of the intended first support divided by accepted referrals whose observation window has elapsed. State the service and window; retain waiting and uncontactable cases.
Time to first support	Median elapsed days among those receiving support, alongside the number still waiting and the oldest unresolved wait. A completed-case median alone hides non-starts.
Continuity	People completing an agreed follow-up divided by people due for that follow-up. Distinguish voluntary withdrawal, changed plans, loss of safe contact and service cancellation.
Usable capacity	Funded and staffed places available during the period, with used places, cancellations and displaced appointments for existing users.
Safety and experience	Protected counts of adverse events and voluntary feedback on respect, safety, usefulness and access barriers, with response numbers and missingness.

Interpret changes before rewarding them

A rise in referrals may reflect stronger trust, increased need or a newly visible backlog. A higher completion rate may reflect better service or the exclusion of people who need more support. Compare like cohorts, inspect changes in case mix and read the numbers with young people's accounts.

Review access by age, sex, disability and school participation when it can be done safely. Small groups must not be identifiable through combinations of fields. Agree disclosure rules before publishing and pool periods where necessary. The public should see service performance without being able to infer who sought help.

Keep outcomes separate from delivery

School or training participation, reported safety, stable relationships and repeat harm may matter over time. Their measurement requires suitable consent, definitions and follow-up. Service attendance alone cannot stand in for these outcomes. Arrest counts alone cannot show whether young people are safer.

Choose a commitment that can be revised

Sovereign Option Theory applies after readiness has been tested.

Sovereign Option Theory asks which feasible course best advances public purpose while retaining the ability to adapt. A useful option requires authority, people, money and support to exercise it. For this proposal, the first commitment should build reusable service capacity and evidence before locking in a broad expansion. [10]

Course	Public value and exposure	Decision condition
Protected manual follow-up	A named worker within one agency follows referrals with protected time and additional service slots. It may still leave cross-agency gaps.	Compare this simpler option over the same period, using the same rights, costs, capacity and outcome tests.
Bounded pathway test	Creates evidence about receiving capacity, usable access and shared responsibility. Exposes a limited cohort to a controlled change.	Proceed only after separate readiness gates pass and continuity funding is protected.
Broad expansion	Could reach more people, but can spread unmet promises, overload shared services and make retreat costly.	Consider after demonstrated delivery, outcome evidence, affordable capacity and a fresh readiness review.

Name the triggers before starting

An unresolved protection incident, unlawful disclosure or loss of essential receiving capacity should stop the affected activity and trigger an authorised review. People already receiving support need a safe continuing route. A queue that breaches the locally agreed service standard should halt additional intake into that bottleneck until capacity or scope is repaired.

A restart needs evidence that the failed function works again, a named decision-maker and a date for review. Preserve only the records required by lawful retention rules. Do not leave a suspended case without an owner or use the end of a pilot as a reason to withdraw necessary support abruptly.

What remains valuable if the design changes

A verified service roster, trained receiving staff, sound consent procedures, better access arrangements and a reliable evaluation method can support future choices. These are practical national capabilities. Their value depends on maintenance and use, not simply on having produced a document or database.

Evidence still needed and source notes

The next research pass should resolve decisions that affect delivery.

Before a public sponsor authorises delivery, obtain the current service roster, staffed hours, waiting lists, access costs, legally reviewed information-sharing rules and a funded continuity plan. Confirm Catalyst's active sites, budget details and results reporting. Check the current crime-prevention policy status and relevant child-justice amendments.

Before expansion, examine whether the pathway reaches young people who are outside school, girls, those with disabilities and those facing longer journeys. Record who declines or cannot use the offer. Commission an evaluation that can distinguish service improvement from broader changes in safety, schooling and opportunity.

Use the PITONS decision record to retain the source status, alternatives, unknowns, affected groups, separate gate findings, authority, cost, triggers and next decision. Record disagreements and evidence that would change the choice. This paper is a targeted synthesis of an archival study and official public records, reviewed on 20 October 2026. It contains no interviews, participant-level analysis or audit of an agency's complete current practice. Failure to locate a record in this review does not establish that the record or service does not exist.

References 1 to 6

1. Katz, C. M., and Nuño, L. E. (2016). Prevalence and Patterns of Troublesome Youth Groups in the Caribbean: Implications for Policy and Practice. RSS/ASU. Cover November; inner title October. Pages 3, 5 and 9, exhibit 7. Source held in the SLPA research collection. [Open source](#)
2. Katz, C. M., and Nuño, L. E. (January 2017). Prevalence and Patterns of Troublesome Youth Groups in the Caribbean: Final Report. Appendix A, printed pages 41-44, especially page 42 (PDF page 48); exit table, printed page 32. [Open source](#)
3. Ministry of Equity (16 February 2024). OASYS project continues drive for enhanced youth justice. Report of the 13 February workshop; follow-up concern attributed to a Transit Home official. [Open source](#)
4. Ministry of Equity (27 April 2026). Government expands social protection and targets youth crime through Catalyst programme. Programme announcement; delivery and impact not established. [Open source](#)
5. Office of the Prime Minister (26 May 2026). Government continues justice system improvements and reforms. Describes crime-prevention policy development. [Open source](#)
6. Ministry of Equity (8 July 2026). Saint Lucia strengthens national response to gender-based violence with new multi-sector protocols. Training and implementation work. [Open source](#)

Sources and further reading

Read the supporting record and the SLPA analytical methods.

7. Government Information Service (28 March 2025). New program aims to transform young lives in Saint Lucia. Youth Empowered and Alive launch and schedule at publication. [Open source](#)

8. Michel, K. L. (11 August 2026). Beyond Chesterton's Fence: Institutional Intervention Readiness in Complex Policy Systems. Version 1.0. [Open source](#)

9. Michel, K. L. (7 August 2026). Beyond the First Ripple: RIPPLE-4 as a Mechanism-Based Recursive Policy-Appraisal Framework for Small Open States. Version 1.0. [Open source](#)

10. Michel, K. L. (5 August 2026). The Sovereign Option: A Lewisian Theory of Decisive Action in Complex Policy Systems. Version 1.0. [Open source](#)

Connected SLPA research

The national safety analysis examines prevention, lawful enforcement, victim support and justice flow. The youth income analysis examines pathways from learning and work experience to durable earnings. This paper contributes the receiving-service and follow-through test that connects those wider aims to an individual offer of help.

[National safety operating system](#)

[Youth first income](#)

[The SLPA policy reasoning cycle](#)

[The PITONS Standard](#)

[Interactive feature and this report](#)

Source handling

The historical brief's cover date is 2016; the OAS hosting folder marked 2024 is not its publication date. The technical report is dated January 2017. Its school survey figures describe 2013, not current conditions. The full research pack preserves the source audit and the broader resource backlog for future SLPA work.

Suggested citation: Saint Lucia Policy Analysis (2026). A referral is a start. Did support arrive? Youth prevention and received support in Saint Lucia. Edited by Kevin L. Michel. 20 October. <https://saintluciapolicy.org/research/youth-prevention-pathway>