

Ending Gang and Youth Violence Programme 2012-15: Assessment

Contents:

1. Executive Summary
2. Background
3. Aims and approach
4. Findings and Discussion
5. Conclusion

1. Executive Summary

This report examines what has changed in local areas since they joined the EGYV programme and assesses what impact the EGYV programme has had locally from 2012 to 2015. Twenty local areas participating in the EGYV programme were chosen for this assessment. Half of these areas were chosen from the cohort that joined the programme in 2012 and the remaining ten areas from those that joined the programme in 2014. Areas were selected from these two cohorts to ensure that a range of geographical areas with different challenges were assessed. Assessments of change thought to be a result of participating in the programme were made against seven thematic principles for each area:

- Strong Local Leadership
- Mapping the Problem
- Multi-Agency Collaboration
- Assessment and Referral
- Targeted and Effective Interventions
- Criminal Justice and Breaking the Cycle
- Mobilising Communities

The assessment adopted a mixed methodology: an analysis of two sets of surveys completed by local areas (survey data completed upon entering the EGYV programme and survey data from September 2015). Responses were compared and quantified for each area to evidence improvements under the EGYV programme and issues for improvement.

In addition, six of the twenty local areas were examined in-depth (three from the 2012 cohort; three from the 2014 cohort). 39 qualitative interviews were conducted across the six areas with a broad range of partners and stakeholders including: Police Officers, Probation and YOS Practitioners, women safety project workers, Missing Person's workers, housing officers, mental health practitioners and community safety officers. Baseline information and benchmarking data on the areas position upon commencement of the programme was compared against data provided on their current position.

The assessment identified significant movement and action in each area on the recommendations made by earlier Peer Reviews. Local areas report the EGYV programme has had a 'galvanising effect' in improving multi-agency partnership working offering support to areas to implement strategies in response to acute local issues, including: local neighbourhood and street gangs; gang displacement; missing children; young people's involvement with sexual exploitation; the role of girls and young women; vulnerabilities and identification of risks and harm. Examples of good practice by local areas are outlined in the report. A summary of the main findings are outlined below, categorized into the seven principles of the EGYV agenda.

Peer Review Recommendations

Each EGYV area that participated in the assessment was asked to provide information on the implementation of the Peer Review recommendations that were made to them in either 2012 (for the 2012 cohort) or in 2014 (for the 2014 cohort).

For the 2012 cohort a total 94 formal recommendations were made across the nine areas that returned surveys on their progress in 2015. Of these 94 recommendations, 84 (89%) were reported as having been implemented - 51 (54%) as fully implemented and 33, (35%) as partially implemented. 10 recommendations, (11%) were reported as not having been implemented.

For the 2014 cohort a total of 63 formal recommendations were made across the seven areas that returned surveys on their progress in 2015. Of these 63 recommendations, 45 (71%) were reported as having been implemented, 19 (30%) as fully implemented and 26 (41%) as partially implemented. 18 recommendations, (29%) were reported as not having been implemented.

The majority of reasons for why recommendations had not been implemented were given as financial, resourcing or capacity issues.

Leadership

The EGYV programme has helped ensure that the gangs' agenda remains in focus and prioritised with improvements and successes identified for both cohorts. The importance of multi-agency strategies and taskforces is evident, and the role of a single point of contact (SPOC) is identified as crucial. The 2012 cohort have widened development of their strategies to include a broader array of partners including: Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), housing, Probation and early intervention. These partnerships appear, in most cases, to be maturing and enduring, though in some places key gaps remain.

The 2014 cohort all now have strategies in place and have benefited from the previous experience of the 2012 cohort by seeking engagement from a wider array of partners from the outset: though in places the picture is varied across the areas.

Mapping the problem

EGYV areas are now better equipped to analyse emerging changes; are able to respond more quickly to exploitation and thus to put strategies into place including effective preventative work. Agencies are working closely together and sharing good-quality information.

The 2012 cohort revealed marked improvements in data capture since joining the EGYV programme. Problem profiles are more widely used to map emerging issues and to analyse changes in the presentation of local gangs. Data sharing and data quality has improved including that from newer partners such as adults and children's services, YOS, education, health, DWP, Probation and voluntary community services. The 2012 cohort report successes in mapping exploitation, leading to improved strategies for prevalent issues such as; County Lines, missing children and CSE.

The 2014 cohort similarly report a marked rise in number of areas obtaining good quality partner data. More areas have adopted a problem profile to map specific cases and analyse trends. Areas have used these improvements to efficiently target more preventative work with young people.

Multi agency collaboration

Areas have experienced significant improvements in areas of partnership working. All local areas hold regular multi-agency meetings where cases are discussed. As a consequence of joining the EGYV programme the areas have expanded their partnerships and improved intelligence. The 2012 cohort reports that partnership working is a strength, with new partners adding fresh impetus, for example, health and troubled families. Active discussions take place re exploitation of children and girls at risk of gang association with noticeable improvements in intelligence sharing.

The 2014 cohort report more joint meetings and tasking processes taking place since joining the EGYV programme. These are reported to have better attendance, with more partner engagement and new partners such as children's services, housing, DWP and probation, more heavily involved. Areas report better recognition of emerging trends and good practice has been identified in pro-active working, e.g. Co-location of key staff significantly improved partnership working in one of the Task Forces in the areas.

Assessment and referral

Having a wide-range of appropriate partners communicating effectively and sharing data has had many positive effects within participating EGYV areas. Emerging good practice includes improvements in ability to identify gang nominals and those at risk of exploitation, and improvements in referral pathways for identified.

Both the 2012 and 2014 cohort report improvements in ability to identify gang nominals, girls associated to gangs and children at risk of violence and exploitation. Both cohorts demonstrated improved referral pathways for gang nominals, with a broader range of partners involved in this process.

Targeted and effective interventions

Since joining the EGYV programme areas demonstrated improvements in the identification of the needs of gang nominals, young people at risk of gang involvement and females associated with gangs. EGYV areas have an increased range of targeted interventions varying from enforcement to gang exit. EGYV areas demonstrated examples of good practice, which involved working with the right partners to facilitate the most appropriate response.

Positive outcomes were identified for the 2012 cohort for targeted and effective interventions. The key needs for individuals actively involved in gangs are identified by all participating EGYV areas and appropriate interventions are in place to address identified needs. Capacity building for these individuals and ensuring the right interventions are in place for other individuals still requires improvement.

The 2014 cohort also reported positive outcomes indicating they are largely meeting the needs of gang nominals with interventions targeted at the right people; however further work is required on use of interventions and capacity building.

Criminal justice pathways

Areas of positive work identified include: preventative work with schools, gang-exit programmes, female specific programmes and effective partnership work with relevant criminal justice agencies.

Key partners such as the police, Youth Offender Services (YOS) and probation are actively involved in the EGYV agenda for both the 2012 and 2014 cohort; however the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) and the secure estate play a less significant role. Early intervention involvement is improving and playing an increasingly influential role, while both cohorts report to have gang-exit interventions in place for gang nominals.

Mobilising communities

EGYV areas have mixed results in community relations; however areas are proactive in communicating information with community groups and recognise the importance of good relations for gathering intelligence, and utilising the local community in several initiatives.

The 2012 cohort needs to progress further with regards to integrating and mobilising communities into the EGYV agenda. Intelligence sharing is positive, and many areas have involved their communities in service delivery. Though gaps remain in involving local communities in strategic planning, victim work and advising on individual cases.

The 2014 cohort have made progress on mobilising communities since entering the EGYV programme with local communities involved in the agenda. The use of local communities in strategic planning, consultation and advice appear positive. More work could be undertaken on involving the community in delivering interventions.

2. Background

In November 2011, [a cross-government report](#) was published that looked into the scale of the problem of gang and youth violence, analysed its causes and identified what could be done by central government, local areas and other agencies to stop the violence and to turn around the lives of those involved. The Ending Gang and Youth Violence (EGYV) programme was established in 2012 and initially provided support to 33 local authorities, and has gradually expanded to over 52 local authorities over the past four years, through a network of over 100 experts with frontline experience of dealing with gangs. Local areas were selected following consideration of local violent crime levels, hospital data relating to violence, and police and local authority intelligence on gangs and youth violence.

As part of the support offered, programme areas were invited to collaborate in undertaking a peer review to highlight particular local issues around gang and youth violence. Each peer review lasted for four days and consisted of discussions with community members and local partners on issues such as health, safeguarding, and employment. They concluded with a report and presentation to the local partnership identifying strengths and areas for improvement across the seven principles outlined in the original 2011 report:

1. **Strong Local Leadership:** Strong political leadership from the leader of the council and relevant portfolio holders, as well as from the community safety partnership and senior executives of the relevant partnership agencies to ensure that the issue of gang and youth violence is resourced and prioritised effectively.
2. **Mapping the Problem:** Drawing on as wide a range of data as possible, including health, local authority, voluntary sector and community data, alongside police intelligence, local areas should map:

Who is involved in serious violence and gangs?

Where is the violence happening?

When is it happening?

Why is it happening?

This includes ensuring that the risk to girls and young women are also mapped.

3. **Multi-Agency Collaboration:** Local agencies should come together to agree shared priorities and commit resources based on local information about gangs and youth violence. Community safety partnerships are ideally placed to provide clear strategic direction, with operational delivery achieved through multi-agency approaches. Where existing arrangements do not adequately address gang and youth violence, more dedicated structures will be needed. In particular, agencies should make sure that support is seamless between services across age groups, so that those most at risk are not left without support when they turn 18.

4. **Assessment and Referral:** Harm is often hidden with many vulnerable people and therefore the full picture needs to be known for the potential harm to be identified. Information sharing is often key to this process and needs to happen effectively.
5. **Targeted and Effective Interventions:** Having identified high risk individuals and locations, local areas should target interventions in the right areas, at the right times and to the right people in order to stem the flow of new violent offenders or gang members, ensure tough enforcement to crack down on at risk individuals and provide routes out of criminality for those who want to change.
6. **Criminal Justice and Breaking the Cycle:** Local areas should develop pathways out of gang and youth violence to ensure that those involved do not become entrenched in criminality. Providing a range of exit programmes for offenders leaving the secure estate, working closely with prisons and other national offender management services to support gang and serious youth violence ex-offenders and reduce their risk of reoffending, is vital to the long term success.
7. **Mobilising Communities:** Sustainable violence reduction programmes must maintain and build community trust and support. Local communities have a key part to play in developing an understanding of the problem, making sure interventions are reaching the right people and holding agencies to account for what they are doing; this includes the involvement of young people.

Each area was also given recommendations on how to improve their approach to gang and youth violence.

Participation in all aspects of the Ending Gang and Youth Violence programme was entirely voluntary, and the Home Office's engagement was driven by the local areas' who were not compelled to act on the recommendations of their peer review.

This assessment provides an examination of what has changed in the local areas since joining the programme and assesses how the EGYV programme has driven these changes locally from 2012 to 2015. Six of the 20 local areas were examined in depth.

3. Aims and Approach

The central aim of this assessment has been to better understand the changes that the EGYV programme has had in local areas who participated in the programme over the three years from 2012 to 2015. Twenty local areas were chosen to balance a robust approach with minimising the burden on local areas in terms of new data collation. Half of these areas were chosen from the cohort of 33 local areas that joined the programme in 2012 on the basis of the level of baseline information and data available, and the remaining 10 areas are those that joined the programme in 2014.

<u>Areas of focus for the assessment</u>	
<u>2012</u>	<u>2014</u>
Croydon	Barnet
Derby	Bromley
Ealing	Havering
Greenwich	Hillingdon
Hackney	Ipswich
Islington	Kensington and Chelsea
Knowsley	Luton
Manchester	Stoke on Trent
Sandwell	Tendring
Wolverhampton	Thanet

Areas were chosen from these two cohorts to ensure that a range of geographical areas with different challenges were assessed. On the whole, the areas that joined the programme in 2012 experienced different challenges to those areas that joined in 2014 with the former dealing with more home grown gangs' issues and the latter more imported issues.

Given the way the programme was implemented across areas, with an emphasis on helping local areas to understand their gang problem and find their own solutions, no formal, national evaluation of the impact of the programme was

possible without placing significant burden on participating areas. Instead, local areas were encouraged to monitor and evaluate the progress they are making in reducing gang and youth violence and what impact the programme has had on this.

Therefore a largely qualitative approach to this assessment (see Method section) has been taken, with baseline information and data about each area and their position on joining the programme being compared against information they have provided on their current position.

In depth assessments involving interviews were conducted in six of these 20 areas (three of the 2012 cohort and three of the 2014 cohort) to provide a more in-depth examination of the findings.

Methodology for In-Depth Assessments

The in depth assessments were undertaken in six separate areas utilising a qualitative approach. Across the broad group of 20 potential case study areas it was important to ensure a representation of: both the 2012 and 2014 cohorts, a geographical spread that was not simply 'London focused' and areas with different ranges of development. To address this, a sift matrix was established for all 20 potential candidate areas. A review of available quantitative and qualitative literature and data was then undertaken across all 20 areas. Assessments of this data were made against all seven headline principles for each area and scored into the sift matrix. Evidence of strong performance was scored highly and evidence of gaps, or

weaker performance achieved a lower score. A final selection was then made for each cohort to reflect geographical spread. A total of six areas were then selected and approached to participate in the assessment.

Qualitative interviews were undertaken with a wide range of participants. These averaged around eight interviews per area. This schedule of interviews included participants from the following partners:

Police Officers, Probation Practitioners, Youth Offending Services (YOS), gang workers and area managers, women safety project workers, Missing person's workers, housing officers, mental health practitioners and community safety officers.

Interviews were conducted by two Middlesex University researchers and subsequently transcribed and analysed under each of the seven thematic principles. Alongside these interviews the researchers undertook an analysis of two sets of surveys that the six participating areas had completed (when entering the EGYV programme and then in September 2015). The answers areas gave to these questions were compared and quantified to show where areas had made improvements under the EGYV agenda and where there are areas for improvement.

New Data sets

In the 2015 survey a number of new data sets were recorded with new questions relating to the identification and action taken by areas into the risks of young people's involvement with sexual exploitation. This brought a new focus on the role of girls and young women, vulnerabilities and identification of risks and harm.

This new data might be held by new partners or might require a new form of analysis or to capture data in a new way. In most places this data had not been held before and thus presented a challenge for several areas. Despite being a new cohort, the 2014 areas did not find this any easier than the 2012 cohort as often their partnerships and gang agenda was less well developed. As a result gaps remain and there is often more to do to capture this new data set. Nevertheless, the data identifies that encouraging progress is well underway in capturing this data.

4. Findings

Survey Analysis

The following section analyses all of the EGYV Assessment surveys returned by the areas. Of the ten 2012 cohort, nine areas returned a survey in September 2015; in the ten 2014 cohort eight areas returned surveys; giving a total 17 areas out of the 20 surveyed who returned survey reports.

In addition commentary is obtained from six of these areas that were subject of a 'deep dive', involving a series of qualitative interviews on the seven principles of the EGYV programme and recent progress.

Recommendations Overview

Each EGYV area that participated in the assessment, was asked to provide information on the implementation of the Peer review recommendations that were made in either 2012 (for the 2012 cohort) or in 2014 (for the 2014 cohort). Further details on these recommendations are held within the Peer Review reports for each area/district.

For the 2012 cohort a total of 94 formal recommendations were made across the nine areas that returned surveys on their progress in 2015. Of these 94 recommendations, 84 (89%) were reported as having been implemented - 51 (54%) as fully implemented and 33, (35%) as partially implemented. Only 10 recommendations, (11%) were reported as having not been implemented.

For the 2014 cohort a total of 63 formal recommendations were made across the seven participating areas that returned surveys on their progress in 2015. Of these 63 recommendations, 45 (71%) have been implemented, 19 (30%) fully implemented and 26 (41%) partially implemented. Only 18 recommendations, (29%) have not been implemented.

The majority of reasons for why recommendations have not been implemented were given as financial, resourcing or capacity issues. Each of the seven principles will now be considered in turn.

Leadership

Summary

Strong local leadership is crucial in ensuring that gang related violence and related issues are taken seriously on both a local and strategic level. The EGYV agenda has helped ensure that the gangs' agenda remains in focus and prioritised:

(EGYV) "Put it on the agenda, different projects were happening; money was interjected into the community. It's put us back around the table, higher management, different focus groups, and different ways of working. Without it where would we be with gangs? There would be a huge gap".

Areas of improvement and success have been identified for both cohorts. The importance of multi-agency strategies and taskforces is evident, and the role of a SPOC has been identified as crucial. The 2012 cohort have widened out their strategic development of their strategies to include a wider array of partners who are now involved, including: DWP, housing, Probation and early intervention. These partnerships appear, in most cases, to be maturing and enduring, though in some places key gaps remain.

The 2014 cohort now all have strategies in place and appear to have benefited from the learning of the 2012 cohort and sought engagement from a wider array of partners from the outset, though again the picture is varied across the areas, with some areas reporting wider engagement and involvement of partners than others.

2012 Cohort

- The majority of the 2012 cohort reported having strategies in place and resources allocated to tackling gang and youth violence both prior to joining the programme (nine out of ten) and in September 2015 (eight out of nine).
- A mixed picture of partnership involvement in developing the strategies of the 2012 cohort was reported by areas before joining the programme and after three years of involvement.
- For some areas where there was a strong police leadership present, there was a clear preference for a more operational approach and a less hierarchical approach to permit faster action. One 2012 cohort area felt too much time was spent keeping the strategic leaders informed rather than focussing on operational issues.

'A flatter structure would be more helpful I think as there is a lot of duplication, too much presenting to groups and not enough doing'.

- For many, prioritising was effectively coordinated through the use of operational tasking groups or joint tasking groups. Several areas had set up Joint Tasking arrangements with partners and or with neighbouring forces which were providing successful:

'Lots of action days to action our live Intelligence so we have a joint force tasking with our neighbouring county too'.

- Police and community safety teams were reported as having major involvement in strategy development by eight areas (all the areas who answered the question) in both the 2012 and 2015 surveys. As principle partners in many areas it is common for one or other partner to take a lead role in the agenda.
- Areas were easily able to identify the values of good partnership working and strong leadership:

'I think in terms of leadership we have a representative of all key agencies, probation, police, education, health, community safety, they are all committed,

and attend meetings. We often ask for reports on progress made gang strategy, domestic violence strategy, youth offending, they provide reports on that, again they demonstrate that we all have the same understanding of those key issues, they also commit resources towards that, in terms of areas of development we don't know the situation of what budgets are'.

- In at least one 2014 cohort area, outside of London, the EGYV agenda had been enveloped within an active police Operation headed up by the police superintendent. Whilst this role is about to change, it was appeared to offer an effective command and control mechanism for leadership. This has meant fast moving action on a range of fronts which in turn had generated confidence that the agenda was being addressed and the action was being taken forward. Conversely some partners believed the Operation leadership approach was too police-led and should perhaps be time-limited with a move to a wider and broader partnership structure either needed or overdue.

*'The EGVY work here is effective through Operation ***** however it is very policey'.*

- Youth Offending Services were also reported as playing a major role by the most areas in both 2012 (seven out of eight) and they remained engaged and involved in 2015 (seven out of nine).
- Education's involvement varied with most areas reporting both in 2012 and 2015 that they played a minor role in developing the areas' strategies.
- Health partners were on the whole reported as playing a minor role or no role at all by most areas in both 2012 and this picture remained the same for 2015. None of the 2012 areas reported that health partners played a major role in strategy development either prior to joining the programme or after three years of involvement.
- Children's Services were involved in eight out of nine partnerships in the 2012 survey and remained so for the 2015 survey.
- The inclusion of Adult Services was reported in five out nine partnerships in the 2012 survey but only four out of nine in the 2015 survey.
- Job Centre Plus/DWP was not involved at all in five out of the nine partnerships in the 2012 surveys but by the 2015 survey, they were actively involved in seven out of nine areas.
- Housing, Probation and CRCs and the Voluntary and Community Sector were now engaged across all partnerships representing a significant improvement since the 2012 survey.
- For others it was important to link the area into the wider national or regional agenda regarding gangs:

*'***** has been very good in pulling together Operation Holdcroft. So he and his team advertised Holdcroft and hold regular Holdcroft meetings with reps from 15 counties, looking at gang nominals. This opportunity for wider partnership working with counties is good'*

- Significantly, since the 2012 survey a range of additional partners had been involved and were recorded in the 2015 survey. These reflected the changing landscape of the agenda and also the maturing of the 2012 partnerships.

'The key issue was then children going missing, we drastically reduced the number of boys going missing from local authority care. I think the gang issue was more widespread in the area but it has been reduced to particular areas now, maybe a sign that things are getting more difficult for gangs.'

- Early Intervention/ Early Help Services – These were now actively playing a role in six of eight areas with a developed strategy. Three of these were a major role.
- Troubled Families representatives were now engaged across all eight areas that reported a developed strategy, with two of these reported as a major role.
- The Missing Persons Coordinator was however only playing a role in two out of the eight areas with a developed strategy, though this was in both cases a major role.
- Similarly Clinical Commissioning groups played a minor role in two out of the eight areas with a developed strategy.
- Engagement with Youth Offender Institutes, (YOIs)/ Secure Estates/ NOMS has yet to fully develop as only two out of eight areas with a developed strategy reported their engagement.
- Involvement of the Local community (i.e. children, young people and families themselves) was only reported in two out of the eight areas with a developed strategy.
- Eight out of nine areas responding to the 2012 survey reported that they had allocated resources specifically for tackling gangs and youth violence. This number remained unchanged in the 2015 survey.
- The movement of key staff who were at one point central to the agenda locally or central to relationship building and partnership working was also identified by several areas who were unable to commit to an in-depth assessment. Another area noted the limiting nature of staff movements and staff churn:

'In November 2014 we had the peer review. We are not off to a great start as we replaced the Superintendent'

2014 Cohort

- The picture of partnership involvement in developing strategies reported since joining the programme is similar to that of the 2012 cohort.
- Many of the 2014 cohort are newer to the gangs agenda and have only recently become fully aware of its extent:

'I feel the gang's agenda is a big one with commissioning, police and community safety all involved, but we do have good oversight by the police though.'

- Three out of the seven areas in the 2014 cohort reported they had strategies in place for tackling gang and youth violence prior to joining the programme, whereas all seven had strategies as of September 2015.
- As might be expected the police and local authority Community Safety teams played a major role in the development of the strategy for tackling gangs and youth violence.
- For many, the police were the most crucial partners often holding the agenda together and providing leadership and firm directive and timely action.
- For at least one 2014 cohort area the strategic leadership arrangements that were in place were not as valued as the operational partnerships:

*‘Senior leadership and strategic partnership doesn’t get the work done at the operational level. We have clear structures following NIM to prioritise deployment but GOLD structure for Operation *****’*

‘Well more goes on at the local level than the strategic level’.

- In six out of seven areas, Children’s Services were engaged in strategy development and of these four had moved from a minor role before joining the programme to a major role in the partnership. In one reporting area they remain uninvolved.
- The involvement of Adult Services in the strategy development had increased from three areas reporting involvement prior to joining the programme to five out of seven since joining the programme.
- The involvement of Local authority public health remained at four areas out of seven however the involvement of Health providers (e.g. hospitals, GP’s, health visitors) had increased from three out of seven areas to four out of seven areas. Clinical Commissioning Groups however remain to become fully engaged as only two areas out of seven reported their involvement in strategy development.
- Youth Offending Service involvement in strategy development was reported in six out of seven areas.
- Education and Job Centre/ DWP involvement in strategy development had increased from five areas out of seven to six areas out of seven. In many areas, this remained a minor role.
- The involvement of voluntary organisations in strategy development has doubled from only three areas out of seven to six areas out of seven.
- The involvement of Probation/ CRCs and also of Housing providers in strategy development has similarly increased from three areas out of seven to five areas out of seven.
- The number of areas engaging Early Intervention services in strategy development has fallen from five areas out of seven to only four.
- Missing Persons Coordinators are now involved in strategic development of the strategy in three out of seven areas.
- The YOI/ Secure Estate/ NOMS involvement in strategy development was absent in four areas out of seven prior to the programme, however since joining the programme, only they are absent in only three out of seven areas.

- Prior to joining the programme Troubled Families were included in strategy development in five out of seven areas: this has since risen to six out of seven areas with three of these now playing a major role.
- Prior to joining the programme the Involvement of local communities in strategy development was only reported in two out of seven areas; since joining the programme this has now doubled to four areas out of seven.
- Two areas reported the challenges of engaging the Crown Prosecution Service and courts services in this agenda.
- Strong and effective leadership was not the sole premise of those areas from the 2012 cohort who have now worked on the gangs agenda for some years. One of the Task Forces in a local area demonstrated they were operating at a highly efficient and effective level. Their approach and strong grip of the issues and ability to generate confidence and participation from those in its partnership was strongly praised by its partners.
- A similar requirement was for strong and effective leadership of the agenda within each of the key partners, e.g. health, DWP, safeguarding etc.
- Strong and effective leadership was identified in all the deep dive areas and the role of the SPOCs were singled out as highly effective and central to the functioning of the partnership and credited with holding the agenda together and in high profile.
- Whilst this was positively reported by all interviewees in these areas, it was also recognised that the strength of leadership revolved around personality and ability of these individuals to bring partners with them and to build effective relationships. The downside to this was articulated by one respondent:

‘The leadership is very strong but it’s built upon the personalities involved. What do we do if they move on?’

This identified a potential future weakness in the development or the enduring ability of some partnerships.

- The support and backing of Elected Members was mentioned by many interviewees as crucial to the development and progression of the local agenda. Where such support was lacking it was felt to seriously inhibit the agenda from moving forward or from being taken up actively in the first place.
- One area within the 2014 cohort felt it was struggling locally to get the gangs agenda taken seriously and commented that local politicians have not really grasped the issue:

‘Our Elected Members don’t believe that there is a Gangs problem’.

- It was felt that this lack of leadership hindered the uptake of the agenda and inhibited local authority staff from full engagement. Similarly it was thought to suggest to partners that the issue of gangs was non-existent, not serious enough to warrant partnership focus or overstated. A lack of strategic governance in this area had left the local police frustrated and trying to both

raise the profile of the issue and address the issue at the same time in the absence of others:

'We set up the Strategic group and Action Plan and Case management meeting. There has been some investment. However I am not really impressed with the area approach to this issue. Safeguarding is not picked up. YOS is not involved. Work in School is underway on Prevent. MPS and pathways mapping has not been done. Essentially we are trying to deal with this internally in the police as the council is not fully playing its part'.

- In other locations the value of Elected Member support was clear:

*'Elected Members supportive? Well, yes they have to be. If they were not behind us the programmes would stall. This agenda is relatively new for **** and the changing dynamics of the political scheme in this district meant the new leader has had to catch up quickly'.*

'Elected members – in this area there is political support. Yes. The councillors I work with are brilliant and will come to meetings and support etc, one co-chairs the safer partnership etc. Deputy Leader comes to Safeguarding Children's Board. Leader called meeting on gang and knife crime two weeks ago'.

- The most effective mechanisms for political engagement often came via the role of Cabinet Members who retained a portfolio brief for the EGYV agenda:

'The Cabinet member for Community Safety has a much stronger understanding of the issues we face and this supports us. Some issues have influenced EM and how they work in corporate management through executive Boards. Greater fluidity between Exec Boards, to ensure Info filters up and down'.

- Effective leadership was bolstered by high quality and regular briefings to key staff and by key staff at the strategic leadership level having the opportunity to meet regularly to discuss the issues:

'Key development this year was the creation of [X] Leadership. It became clear that operationally we were fine but strategically weak – Peer Review picked this up. It's similar to a Local Strategic Partnership and includes the council, District and County, police and Clinical commissioning group for Health with senior managers such as the CEO of the council, the police super, Director of Public health they all come together.

'And monthly meetings re what are emerging trends and what is happening across the piece.

- In many places the Peer Review was credited with recommending such approaches and where these recommendations had been followed thorough the outcome was deemed effective and beneficial.

Mapping the problem

Summary

Effective EGYV areas should be able to draw on data from a variety of sources, in order to map the issues as they emerge. EGYV areas are showing they are better equipped in analysing the changes as they emerge, are able to respond quicker to issues such as exploitation and put strategies into place, such as effective preventative work. More agencies are working closely together and sharing good-quality information.

The 2012 cohort has shown a marked improvement in data capture since joining the EGYV programme. More areas have a problem profile in place and report they are using this to map issues as they emerge, and to analyse local gangs within the constantly changing gangs agenda. More data is being shared by agencies, including: adults and children's services, YOS, education, health, DWP, Probation and voluntary community services. 2012 areas have also had successes in mapping issues of exploitation, which have been hugely significant in putting strategies in place for prevalent issues such as; County Lines, missing children and CSE.

The 2014 cohort report a marked rise in number of areas obtaining good quality partner data. More areas also now have a problem profile in place that significantly is now able to map specific cases and analyse trends and common issues. Areas have used these improvements to efficiently target more preventative work with young people.

2012 cohort

In general there is a clear and marked improvement in terms of data captured as reported by areas in the 2012 and then the 2015 surveys.

- In answer to the question, 'Is there a current problem profile (or similar document) in place which sets out an analysis of the local youth violence?' Eight out of ten areas in 2012 reported that this was in place and eight of the nine respondent areas in 2015.

One area reported its positive approach to partnership working and how it was now identifying overlaps in the data which led to an improved understanding of the issues:

'I want a proper data set with no silos showing overlaps to best approach the issues. But we are getting there – need better assessment framework and understanding of overlaps. Work in progress, getting there, the Safeguarding Board now understands the crossovers; the language is shifting towards exploitation, missing, etc. Understanding has come on and evolved, it's a really good partnership.'

- This problem profile included an analysis of local gangs (e.g. numbers of gangs operating, gang names, locations, etc.) in eight of the ten areas reporting from 2012 and also eight out of nine reporting areas for 2015.

One area reported their data mapping as a clear success for their partnership:

'I think it is the way in which we have a shared understanding of the issues and priorities, how we share information and develop those networks, with partnership agencies on board that we have, the meetings, the information sharing, that we understand each other's common priorities and they are clear, and we share intelligence data stats, we also work with our community safety team, youth offending team and police, for example the way we look at children missing from local authority and the way we share that information with police and we see the links we see the trends, and the relationship between young people that go missing, so we manage to reduce... two three years ago this used to be an issue, where young people going missing were linked with gangs, being used to sell drugs, transport drugs, so by sharing information we are able to address that and I think pretty much the local gangs These are really difficult targets and the local agencies are aware of this and are making it difficult, it's very good news for our local area, but not such good news for other areas, because they started to target young people in other areas, obviously that means that, while we look at borders and areas, the gangs don't really work in the same. I think that's a strength for the local area, agencies do work together, they share information they understand key issues, we look at the same priorities, we have those links between key partnerships, we have the safeguarding children board, safer... partnership, a strategic group leading on sexual exploitation as there are links between gangs and sexual exploitation and radicalisation, forms of exploitation, that works really well'.

- The problem profile included information about specific cases, groups or gangs, or those identified as vulnerable to gang involvement or gang related exploitation from the local authority in eight out of eight reporting areas in 2012 and eight out of nine in 2015.

For some areas the value of early identification of the issues and their subsequent mapping was thought to be key to building a better understanding locally of the importance of the issues faced by the area:

'I think if there's a perception that it's a resource issue, I think people are ill-informed. What happens is the amount of resources that go into responding to groups when they emerge, its far more resource intensive, were we to identify them early. Very often this isn't my budget or x's budget. It's easy to think 'this is a resource implication' but it isn't. If you look at the amount of time spent in the police station processing young people, the amount of time spent with the YOS, appropriate adult services, Court time, you add it all up its very, very resource intensive.

Get them earlier on, identify them earlier. Not every young person will be willing or able to engage, but get them earlier we'll reduce that, and also what we'll do is reduce the amount of victims, which is key'.

- The police contributed data in eight out of eight reporting areas in 2012 and nine out of nine in 2015.
- There were positive increases in the use of data from Adult Services. In 2012 this was reported by only two out of eight areas, but four out of nine areas in 2015.
- There were also positive increases in the use of specific case data from Children's Services. In 2012 this data was contributed from five out of eight areas, rising significantly to eight out of nine areas by 2015.
- Specific case data from the YOS was supplied in eight out of eight areas in 2012 (with seven of these reporting a substantial amount of data); this rose to nine out of nine in 2015 (again mostly substantial data).
- Specific case data from Education was obtained by six out of eight areas in 2012 and seven out of nine reporting areas in 2015.
- Health data showed a significant improvement with only one out of eight areas recording this contribution in 2012 compared to five out of nine areas in 2015; however four out of nine areas obtained none at all.
- Specific case data from the Job Centre or DWP also showed a positive improvement from only one out of eight areas in 2012 to five out of nine in 2015.
- Specific case data from Voluntary originations or the community sector was reported by six out of eight areas in 2012 but this had risen to eight out of nine reporting areas by 2015.
- Probation data on specific cases was reported by seven out of eight reporting areas in 2012, rising to nine out of nine in 2015.
- In 2012 only four out of eight areas reported specific case data rising to seven out of nine in 2015.

The Challenges of partnership working and data mapping were mentioned by a few areas who whilst happy with improvements, also noted there were challenges in obtaining the data and still room for improvement:

'Does work but there is room here for improvement. Partnerships excellent here in general but need access to more data e.g. – demographics. We want to achieve local data profiles – working toward this now though but overall our gang's data is good. Beyond this however - perhaps less so. We are doing more mapping now – trying to see why changes are happening here. The data is not always available - Need better technology to analyse this'.

- In 2015 the problem profile included the addition of several new datasets; including an analysis of gang related exploitation (e.g. numbers of those at risk of exploitation). By 2015 five out of the nine reporting areas had this in place, though three said it was not in place at all.

- Several areas provided an overview of how the issues (including risks and threats) identified in their current problem profile have changed from those identified in the problem profile submitted to the programme in 2012. Those who had included analysis of gang-related exploitation noted a shift towards County Lines activity and a higher rate of CSE/exploitation disclosures. One acknowledged an improved recognition of criminal exploitation of young people, use of drug lines and less emphasis on Urban Street Gang dynamics. For them the links to Organised Criminal Groups were now better understood and links to other areas more clearly established.

One police officer commented on the changing nature of the situation:

'I've been in the gang arena for the past 10 years and it's completely changed. I used to be able to write you a list- but I don't think it's like that anymore. There are a lot of overlaps now, of people from different areas. Or people wherever they're living will be part of that gang, and there doesn't seem to be much loyalty. We don't tend to have gang-on-gang activity; it's more around involvement in drugs. It's not about I'm this gang and your that, it's more about 'you owe money to such and such' and it's about territory. I do think there are a lot of younger people coming up who we aren't aware of yet. It takes time and intelligence to find out who young kids are involved with. There isn't as much preventative work as they're used to be'.

- One area cited reduced access to firearms as evidenced by reduction in firearms discharges year on year but noted that cannabis cultivation was now being established as a key feature of the new business model being operated. Others reported a change in the nature of gang activity and how gangs operate with fewer territorial boundaries, more affiliation by association. In places this was coupled by an increase in younger gang members becoming more active as more established members were sent to prison following a police crackdown.
- A number of areas had identified such issues from undertaking deeper and more detailed mapping of their local issues and their local data:

'There are young girls going missing, and some girls loosely hanging around a gang we have. We mapped it and there's 17-18 people linked to the gang, aged from 15 plus, involved in dealing. The younger ones are involved in possession of cannabis, ASB and criminal damage, and the elder one's actively involved in dealing and not really trying to hide it, being picked up with wads of money in their pocket. In the community they are very closed and try and engage and get some conversation about what's going on, but they're very closed off'.

- For those areas reporting that they had not analysed gang exploitation most noted that *'the gang picture has shifted quite significantly since 2012'*. For one area mobile phone crime (particularly theft snatch) has increased exponentially leading to a significant reduction of youth violence; though this

was now said to be rising again due to conflicts over drug markets and respect.

- Several areas were actively mapping data on missing children however the challenge of working with new data sets on missing children was reported by more than one area but it is summed up here by one area:

“I’m the Missing Children’s Officer for this area so we obviously have a lot of children that go missing, that are from this area and are also placed here. So we get a lot of gang placements, where other areas think it’s safer to move children here who think we don’t have gang issues, so they get bought into this area. Then what we also have is young people who are getting recruited locally, and being influenced by the gangs coming into this area. So we link in with the taskforce daily with them on missing children, because of the risks around them and what they’re getting up to locally in the area. The adolescent risk management panel is the core members who go through the key cases once a month where we are highly concerned and tried a lot and things aren’t working. So that’s the management panel for that type of thing”.

- For some areas the links between gangs and CSE and County Lines have become a lot more evident but not yet fully understood. Some areas found the Home Office briefings and circulated information useful in helping them understand the issues involved:

‘The main things from my point of view, is using the research reports on the website. So the county lines report, the final review that has just come out, has been really helpful. We’ve been producing a toolkit for the local safeguarding board’s website, so quite a lot of information we’ve taken from that. So reading and disseminating that out to other agencies on things that we’re finding’.

- Some areas cited diminishing resources focused at youth and gangs work was proving a challenge for the area in understanding and responding quick time to issues as they arose. Some areas were seeking to re-group their activity into integrated partnership working around gangs, CSE and organised criminality. Two areas reported that the urban street gangs that they originally identified had diminished and doubted if they existed today thus mitigating the risks and the threats; though they were quick to qualify this by suggesting the threat might have shifted to OCGs.
- Other additional data sets (making their first appearance in the 2015 survey) have added greatly to a richer data mapping of the problem for many areas and has clearly helped them identify exploitation as a significant and growing issue in their areas. For example data from Early Intervention/ Early Help Services, whilst not included in the 2012 survey, was reported by six out of nine reporting areas in 2015. Specific case data from the Missing Persons Coordinator was reported by five out of nine reporting areas in 2015 (though interestingly four areas reported not using this data at all). Specific case data

from Clinical Commissioning groups has further to go as only one area reported using this in 2015. Specific case data from the YOI/ Secure Estate or NOMS was reported by six out of nine areas in 2015; Troubled Families data reported as used by four out of nine and local communities specific case data was reported by six out of nine areas in 2015.

Again for one area the value of mapping young people and early interventions work was strongly recognised:

‘Our mapping that created the profile was done in 2013. The list 12 is new, but it needs to be combined, so what it’s telling us we need to put in some coherent form, because it’s telling us lots of things about lots of people we haven’t really analysed properly, we are getting help to do that, but I think that is a priority. We’re using some of our interventions, to go into those schools where young people keep coming from, most of the times the schools say ‘we’re desperate for help with this’. But what we need to do is to do it more consistently, target those schools, but also we absolutely need to do early interventions in primary schools, because we know the journey of the children starts much earlier than we’re intervening, It’s not that the behaviour is entrenched when they get to 11 or 12, but they’ve already experienced so much trauma from being part of a gang, and I think if we could avoid that, the work of the intervention we need to deliver would be a lot easier to deliver’.

2014 cohort

- Before engagement with the EGYV programme, five out of seven areas reported they had assembled a problem profile (or similar document) which set out an analysis of the local youth violence problem which included an analysis of local gangs (e.g. numbers of gangs operating etc.). Only one of these however included any analysis of gang related exploitation (e.g. numbers of those at risk of exploitation).
- Since joining the EGYV programme this has now risen to six areas that have a current problem profile in place which sets out an analysis of local youth violence. Though for one area, the Community Safety Strategic Assessment is used for this purpose. All six of these areas report that their problem profile includes an analysis of local gangs, however only four include analysis of gang related exploitation.
- One example of how this new data set was already impacting upon an area was given:

‘Yes, next Monday we have this Call-in event. We have a core group of gang members locally but a considerable periphery of young people who associate with them but haven’t been caught up in it yet. We’ve identified those and invited them and their parents to a Call-in event where our officers will talk about gangs and the consequences of gangs in front of the parents as well to try and provide, at an early stage, alternative positive activities for most of those young people. So that’ll involve early interaction with the County council and youth services planning positive activities support from that event. Because there are a

lot of free positive diversionary activities out there. This is the first time we've run it. To me, it's a sense of hope. If you have a young person coming out of care, affected by gangs, we can provide mental health support; drug and alcohol treatment support or dual diagnosis – we're not maximising dual diagnosis protocols. We are in theory – both drugs and mental health should agree a joint action plan. But backing that up should be support from DWP, which they do offer, planning that career pathway or that education training pathway to give that young person a sense of hope'.

- For five out of seven areas, this profile includes information about specific cases, groups or gangs, or those identified as vulnerable to gang involvement or gang related exploitation.
- The new 2014 cohort areas were able to illustrate how the EGYV programme has led to changes in their collection of data since they joined the programme. Before joining the EGYV programme five out of seven areas reported their problem profile included information about specific cases, groups or gangs, or those identified as vulnerable to gang involvement or gang related exploitation. Following take up of the programme this increased to seven areas out of seven with the level of data supplied also increasing in three out of seven areas from a little data to a substantial amount.
- Before joining the programme, only one area out of seven included data from Adult Services in their problem profile. Since joining the programme this has risen to three out of seven. Similarly prior to joining the programme data from children's Services were included in only three out of seven area problem profiles however since joining the programme this has risen to six areas out of seven.
- Partner data for inclusion in the problem profile noticeably increased amongst the areas once they joined the EGYV programme. For example, prior to joining the programme police data was included by only six out of seven areas; since joining this rose to seven areas out of seven.
- Education data was only available for three out of seven areas prior to joining; post joining this rose to five areas out of seven.
- Job Centre data has significantly increased since areas joined the programme and this has moved from only two areas out of seven using this data prior to joining to six areas out of seven now using this data. Similarly data from the voluntary and community sector is now being used by five areas out of seven as opposed to only two who used their data before joining the programme. Data use from probation/CRC partners has doubled since areas joined the programme and data from housing partners has increased from only three areas using their data prior to joining to five areas that now use this data.
- As regards the new data set requirements significant improvements can be reported in terms of availability of specific case data from partners. In each case the number of areas now accessing this data had increased. For example prior to joining the EGYV programme only two areas out of seven accessed case specific data from the Early Intervention Services however after joining the programme this rose to five out of seven areas. Case specific data from the Local Missing Persons Coordinator is now accessed and used by four areas out of seven as opposed to only one prior to joining the

programme. Troubled Families data is now used by six areas out of seven since joining the programme as opposed to being used by only two areas prior to joining the programme. Case specific data from clinical commissioning groups in this cohort remains low at only two out of seven whereas case specific data from YOS/ Secure Estate/ NOMS and from Local Communities has doubled.

- Whilst availability of data from partners has clearly improved some gaps remain. One area noted a data gap as being lack of information from Children's Homes and Fostering providers.
- Data was used immediately by some areas in local multi-agency Tasking meetings which they reported as beneficial in focussing partners on key individuals:

'We have our weekly tasking meetings, where we go through our top 15 on the matrix, and that can be a mixture of both statutory or non-statutory clients. The police could bring someone to my attention whose maybe moved into the area, who might want help getting into work or help with housing then I'll work with them. Our weekly tasking meeting is very much intelligence based and focused on intelligence and what's happening'.

2012 cohort – Data Analysis (Ability to analyse data trends and common issues)

- The inclusion of analysis in the problem profile, i.e. an indication of trends or an identification of common issues, illustrates that there are still some gaps from key partners. Moreover in the three years since the first survey in 2012 several areas report a reduction in their analytical capability. In some areas this is because the local analyst has been lost, for others internal reorganisation or simply cutbacks. For example whilst eight out of eight reporting areas noted that their partners from community safety, police and youth offending were all able to analyse trends in 2012; by 2015 the some areas noted that only six out of eight community safety partners could do this, alongside only seven out of eight police partners and six out of eight YOS partners. Similarly areas reported a decline in the ability of partners from Adult Services, Health and Job Centres/ DWP to offer trend analysis. Only voluntary organisations/ Community services recorded an increase in analytical capability from three out of eight reporting areas in 2012 to five out of eight reporting areas in 2015.
- For those partners offering new data sets for the 2015 survey there is also some road to travel, for example: only two out of eight reporting areas obtained trend analysis from Early Intervention services whilst only area reported trend analysis data from YOI partners or from Clinical Commissioning groups. Three areas out of eight reported trend analysis data from Missing Person and four out of eight reported Troubled Families trend analysis data. Only three out of eight reported trend analysis data from local communities.
- There is, it seems, still more to achieve in this area for partners beyond simply producing raw data.

2014 cohort – Data analysis (Ability to analyse data trends and common issues)

- The contribution from partners to ensure the area's problem profile includes analysis (i.e. an indication of trends or an identification of common issues) has also significantly improved in areas since joining the programme.
- At least one area had been creative in making the case for their analyst by using cost-benefit analysis to inform the debate and persuade the funders to fund the post:

'Also thinking about cost-benefit analysis – what is the cost to us of the high demand around this – in terms of police, ambulance, health and using the Treasury new Economy tool to get better at saying – well these costs are invested and have the cost benefit of this'. Then improving the joint agency working actually to give us more effective and timely outcomes – but it collapses the cost in the longer term. We got the funding for the analyst'.

- Against a basket of 18 data sets in the survey which enquired about ability to analyse trends in data, 16 partner data sets showed significant improvement with an increased number of areas reporting that their partners are now able to provide or contribute to data analysis. Prior to joining the programme data from the police was analysed in six out of seven areas and since joining the programme this figure has stayed the same. Similarly with Adult Services, data analysis was only reported in two areas out of seven; a situation unchanged since joining the programme.
- Since joining the programme areas reported significant improvements in all other areas of data analysis capability from their partners. For example, prior to joining the programme four areas reported such capability from their community safety partners, rising to six out of seven areas after joining the programme.
- Areas reporting improved capability of data analysis from their Health partners rose from only one area prior to joining to three areas out of seven after joining the programme. The largest improvements in data analysis capability from partners were from Voluntary organisation and the community sector which rose from one area out of seven to four areas; probation/CRC partners which rose from one area out of seven to three areas out of seven and Housing partners which rose from one area prior to joining the programme to four areas after joining the programme.
- Similarly the ability to analyse data frequently rose from a little or limited ability before joining the programme to a substantial ability to analyse data after joining the programme.
- Areas also reported an improvement in partners providing the new data sets and again in each case the capability of partners to analyse their data sets had improved, for example, prior to joining the programme only three areas reported this capability amongst partners from Troubled Families or from local communities. After joining the programme four areas reported this capability from each of these partners. Despite that partners data from clinical

commissioning groups, Missing person Coordinators and YOI/Secure Estates/ NOMS is only fully analysed in two areas out of seven indicating there is more to do here.

2012 cohort - Data Sharing

- In the 2012 survey areas were asked to report upon the sharing of actual raw data amongst CSP partners before their engagement with the EGYV programme, (E.g. case-level data on specific individuals, crime figures, hospital admissions, etc., which has not yet been analysed). Whilst variable this nonetheless showed a fairly strong direction towards data sharing. For example ten out of ten areas reported active sharing of data from police partners and also from probation.
- Eight out of ten areas reported data sharing from community safety and also from the Youth Offending Service. Housing partners were reported by seven out of ten areas as sharing raw data, whilst Children's services and Education shared data in six out of ten reporting areas.
- Several areas noted the challenge of maintaining data sharing arrangements over a few years. They observed that often arrangements were facilitated by personal relationships which worked until the person moved role. For other areas the importance of co-locating partners made data sharing easier:

'Information sharing can be very good, it is dependent sometimes on the individuals because you'll develop relationships and get everything you need. I would say that sometimes we found out what was happening in the local newspaper and we're probably not alone on that. But what we do have in our team, sitting next to us are the ASB police liaison officers, and every morning if anything's happened, if anyone they know we're working with they'll flag it, they'll also ask our advice. They'll help with missing children and ask for advice'.

- One positive example of the use of data sharing from Housing and community partners was given:

'I am the community safety coordinator and investigator, I facilitate info and investigate, e.g. Operation xxx was regarding the emergence of lower end criminality and higher end ASB from a much larger group of 50-60 people so we looked at key Nominals and their criminality, and of course the hangers on. Basically the young people of xxxxxx are trying to recreate London based gang models but by bringing in London based gang members. So we have an intimate knowledge of the dynamics of certain areas, ties and family links, school links etc. So we facilitate that information, e.g. when the Nominals came to the force we as community safety investigators went through all the social media elements, Attach Face, Bank Accounts, ASK fm accounts to individuals and advise on conversation who is going out with whom, who has fallen out etc. Also to provide a better level of intelligence which the police normally did, but due to budget challenges they are under strain to do. So we as CS

officers help to build the case files, re CBOs, etc. So we will look at the background info to do up to 20 or more CBOs. This leads to more Community Engagement and doing community public meetings. We are preparing one Closure Order at the moment’.

- A secondary group of partners in 2012 fared less well in data sharing, for example, Health data was shared amongst other partners in only five out of ten areas; Adult Services data was shared in only four out of ten areas, as was data from Voluntary Organisations and the community sector. Finally in 2012 data sharing from the Job Centre/ DWP was only present in three out of ten reporting areas. Doubtless the data in this secondary group was sourced and acquired by many in the following three years until the next survey in 2015.
- Many areas reported data sharing protocols actively in place and more than one area reported challenges in obtaining accident and emergency data from hospitals.
- However the 2015 survey paints a different picture for this 2012 cohort which possibly reflects a slight contraction of partnership working and a reduction of analytical capability in some areas. In 2015 there was a noticeable decline in the number of areas reporting data shared amongst its partners. In fact there was a decline in data sharing amongst all partners with the exception of raw data shared by voluntary organisations and the community sector which reported a slight rise (from four areas in 2012) to five out of nine areas. The sharing of raw data amongst police had declined from ten out of ten areas in 2012 to only six out of nine in 2015. Similarly probation data sharing had declined from ten out of ten areas in 2012 to only five out of nine in 2015. Data sharing from other partners was also reported by areas in 2015 with some also reporting a decline the amount of data shared.
- The one area which indicated their partnership was not working well noted that this impacted upon their ability to map the issue and share data:

‘Data mapping is not working - Data sharing? Well only MPS data is available, so no sharing really underway; No analyst from the council; No health data; No partner data; only the gang’s team in MPS which does good stuff. Strategically on this topic we are very poor’.

- One particular area reported considerable success with tackling its gang agenda and as a result felt that partnership working, including data sharing, had now dropped off the table somewhat:

‘All protocols are in place and work well regarding sharing. We also have a MARAC. However data meetings are not really happening. Only now on an ad hoc basis but we have no dedicated analyst; so now there is actually not a lot of data to share. We do have some data tracking info showing the profiles of young people and criminality and YOS have some useful data, but it is not what it was’.

- Conversely however the new data from the additionally required data sets continued to be shared by the new partners in many areas. There is however still some gaps here to be filled. Early Intervention Services shared raw data in five out of nine reporting areas. Local Missing Persons coordinator shared data in four of nine reporting areas. The clinical Commissioning groups and the YOI/ Secure Estates/ NOMS partners shared data in two out of nine reporting areas and local communities shared raw data in only one out of nine reporting areas in 2015. Troubled Families however was reported as sharing data by five out of nine reporting areas.

2014 cohort - Data sharing

- The sharing of actual raw data shared amongst relevant partners (E.g. case-level data on specific individuals, aggregate crime figures, hospital admissions, etc., which has not yet been analysed) has also improved significantly in 16 data sets out of 18. For example data sharing from community safety partners prior to joining the programme was reported by three areas out of seven whilst this doubled to six areas out of seven after joining the programme. Data sharing amongst police partners was reported by six areas prior to joining increasing to seven areas after joining. Data sharing amongst the Youth Offending Service appears to have stalled slightly as five areas reported this took place before joining the area – the same number as after joining the programme.
- For this new cohort of areas sourcing and sharing these new data sets has helped them identify new issues and brought them to light:

'In terms of info-sharing that is becoming more apparent now we have much simpler mechanisms re cases or investigations where I can ask questions of the police Community Safety Officer or the Task force if the people we are investigating have any links into gangs or their periphery. For example we had a complaint from a member of the public from a social rented address re a complaint of sex noise. I dealt with the social housing provider, who was London based and not really able to investigate it, so I picked it up and looked at the perpetrator. Gathered the info and found they had links to London gangs. I worked closely with my complainant whose daughter had special needs and I got her moved. Based upon her information and leaflet drops to other tenants and subsequent other info led to the perpetrators (last month) being charged with the supply of crack cocaine and a series of other people. i.e. gang members from New Cross, Woolwich Boys and Eltham. So this also expands our information source. So if we can see that from people from London are working together in terms of drug supply then it helps me solve the issue but to have a better understanding of the synergies of how gangs work'.

- Data sharing amongst health providers and public health partners remains weak however with no more than two areas reporting data sharing amongst these groups since joining the programme. As one area noted:

'We need to improve the way that information, or how information is shared to have a more integrated data set, because the safeguarding board has a data set, the police have a data set, a significant part of that is shared, but I think it could be more integrated. We have key partnership meetings, significant links between us'.

- The challenge of obtaining health data was commented upon:

'Data is shared across partners but how do you collate it together? I wanted mental health data and – both personalised and de-personalised. So we can manage risk better with individual gang members. This is hard to get'.

- Data sharing from partners in probation, Education and Children's Services has reported increased from three areas prior to joining to five areas since joining the programme. Data sharing from voluntary organisations and the community sector has increased significantly from zero areas to five areas since joining the programme. In addition several areas reported that the level of data sharing amongst partners had improved a substantial amount.
- Two issues of data considered to be important but often missing was cross-border analysis to measure displacement and also linking in with areas regarding the placement of Looked After children:

'This would be an area for development, I'm not aware of any initiatives of working with neighbouring areas, we have done a sort of awareness event with neighbouring areas, not in terms of gang, but with children and exploitation'.

- The impact of the Peer Review as the instigator for data sharing and analysis was mentioned by more than one area:

'Yes the YOS have a seconded police officer and all young people are monitored. He goes to key meetings and shares Intel. He is linked into CSE and Mispers etc. Safeguarding has now come to the fore and they did an audit here recently. We set up the Vulnerable Young Persons Gang unit to identify the key risks and this arose directly from the Peer Review. WE had the gang stream in there but now it is in Safeguarding. We did a case review of 1067 young people and cross –referenced them across a range of risks in a Review matrix to identify cross-overs. We ensure safeguarding is addressed in all corporate reports. We realised gangs have a high co-relation to other risks for young people. The Peer Review influenced this work and we realised more risk and safeguarding issues. This was significant for us'.

- The number of areas reporting data sharing with partners in Early Intervention and with their local Missing Persons Coordinator has doubled from only two areas prior to joining the programme to four areas since joining the programme. Data sharing amongst Troubled Families partners is now reported by six out of seven areas (up from 4 prior to the programme) and

amongst local communities is now reported by three out of seven (up from only one prior to joining the programme). Data sharing amongst clinical commissioning groups and amongst YOI/Secure Estates/ NOMS remains the weakest with only one area and two areas respectively reporting that this occurs since joining the programme.

- The inconsistency of data sharing and internal changes within the police proved frustrating for one area:

'All partners agree to share data but it is really inconsistent. Mispers, CSE; Crime and Intelligence it all goes into one Pot. There is no formal mapping but the local police operation does have an Analyst. The police however struggle to get good data products as they are rolling out a new Intel system. Our cross county links are better'.

- Despite some shortcomings areas did recognise what needed to be done in order to improve their local situation and to generate more robust datasets:

'Areas to improve? Well I think better integration of databases and sharing of data sets, we don't necessarily always speak the same language especially on how we record information, so for example sometimes we look at information from the police on sexual exploitation, and the ways they have been recorded, it's not something we are used to, so we have to manipulate the data re arrange the data to make sense of it. So maybe access to stats and data sets, I think that's something we could definitely do more in terms of working with faith groups, the community, so maybe creating more opportunities are for them to provide feedback and participate in decisions, letting us know what are the key issues for them, so I think that there has been significant progress but more we can do'.

2012 cohort - Data Quality

- Data Quality continues to be a challenge for those who do share raw data amongst partners. Again there was a reported decline in the quality of data from the 2012 survey to the 2015 survey. In 2012 ten out of ten areas reported that the quality of raw data from the police was of sufficient quality or mostly of sufficient quality. By 2015 this has dropped to seven areas out of nine. Similarly the quality of raw data from the YOS was reported as being of sufficient quality or mostly of sufficient quality by only six out of nine areas. The data quality from partners in probation reported as being of sufficient quality or mostly of sufficient quality dropped from eight out of ten areas in 2012 to only four out of nine in 2015. However data quality from the Job Centre/ DWP that was reported as being of sufficient quality or mostly of sufficient quality was reported by only one area out of ten in 2012 rising to three areas out of nine in 2015.
- As regards the new additional data sets the picture of data quality is variable. Naturally many of these data sets are feeding into the strategic gangs agenda for the first instance and quality might therefore improve over time as partners become clearer as to their requirements. Data from Troubled Families was

reported as being of sufficient, or mostly sufficient quality by five out of nine areas and that from the local Missing Persons Coordinator was reported as being of sufficient or mostly sufficient quality by four out of nine areas. Early intervention services was reported as generating data of sufficient or mostly sufficient quality by only three areas out of nine. Significantly data quality from YOI/Secure Estates/ NOMS appears to be a significant gap as does that from clinical commissioning groups. No areas reported quality data from local communities.

- Some areas acknowledged that their data requirements had changed following the collection of new data sets and an improved analysis of their current gang picture:

'The biggest challenge for us is agreeing to info-sharing at full post-code level and the protection and security of data being passed in from different agencies. So we want to know where the clients from drug treatment are, where the clients are so we can actually do visits on them to check they are not being cuckooed. If you can acquire this data you get better at protecting individual from the gang'.

2014 cohort - Data Quality

- Against a basket of 18 partner data sets the areas reported that data quality had improved either in the number of areas currently reporting improved data quality or in the quality of data already received. The only exception to this was data from Adult Services – no areas reported a quality data set from this partner.
- The change from before to after joining the programme was most noticeable in data quality from the Job Centres/ DWP and also voluntary organisations and the community sector: in both cases the number of areas reporting that data was now of sufficient quality or mostly of sufficient quality rose from zero areas out of seven to four areas.
- Similarly there has been a big improvement in data quality received from partners in probation/CRCs and Housing, again rising from only one area out of seven prior to joining the programme to a current position of five areas out of seven. As one area noted:

'Now Probation have a well-established info-sharing group. It's really there to share information on our Individuals of Concern. Also access to high level data beyond the ordinary checks. This has been very useful indeed. On the group are the council, the DIP team police etc. Also the Police updates are now thorough – on those 3 months prior and license conditions so we are better able to manage the risks'.

- The provision of quality data from health partners remains low at only two areas out of seven and data from clinical commissioning groups is only reported as of mostly sufficient quality by one area since joining the programme.

- Troubled families data is now reported as being of sufficient, or mostly sufficient, quality by six areas since joining the programme (up from four prior).
- Again several areas noted an increase in data quality rising from mostly sufficient quality to all of sufficient quality. Quality data from the local Missing Persons Coordinator was only reported by two areas since joining the programme which suggests that this area has some way to go before a real improvement is noticed.
- One area noted the missing data from regarding Housing Transfers and felt this would contribute to a fuller data picture.

General capacity regarding data

2012 cohort

- A general capacity amongst local partners to analyse and share data in relation to gangs and youth violence still exists in some or in all cases despite some setbacks in data sharing and quality. In 2012 eight out of ten areas reported this was the case. In 2015 this was similarly reported by eight out of nine areas. Those who reported that mostly they did not have the capacity cited a lack of resources as the main reason. One area cited the loss of their dedicated gangs resource or SPOC as a key reason for the current lack of capacity. Resources, or lack of resources, were mentioned by several areas as an issue:

'I think we've come a long way. The hard part is keeping on top of the gangs profile and having the resources to do that. At the moment we haven't got the analytical support for this area of work. For example we have one community safety analyst in the area for us, who has to do the strategic tenders, assessments, problem solving. There has recently been in the last week a mapping exercise and they are trying to develop work, but actually what does need to happen and we haven't got the resources for it ongoing, is an update of local intelligence about the gangs picture, which is very difficult, and that is because of resources'.

2014 cohort

- Before joining the programme only three out of seven areas reported that there was generally a capacity amongst local partners to analyse and share data in relation to gangs and youth violence. Since joining the programme this has risen to five areas out of seven. Those areas indicating that mostly they do not have such a capacity cited lack of resources, lack of expertise or lack of equipment as the key reasons.
- One area outside of London suggested that London boroughs were perhaps being favoured in terms of resources:

'Data sharing and analysis? That's what we try to do – but in reality if you look at metropolitan areas the amount of investment to try to deal with this and we are trying to do this with existing funding and very little

investment but we feel you can often do the same by smarter joint-working’.

- One area was seeking to plug their data gap by bidding for a new analytical capability:

‘At the moment we put in a bid to DCLG for a partnership analyst so two of our programmes within that will be development for the joint agency data product and mapping to see where the multiple areas of risk exist and then have everyone sit round the table and decide jointly to take action – using data to drive that business’.

Multi-agency collaboration

Summary

Effective partnership working has been identified as fundamentally key within the EGYV agenda. Sharing resources, data and intelligence is crucial in gaining any successes in ending gang violence. Areas have experienced significant improvements in these areas of partnership working. All areas hold regular multi-agency meetings where cases are discussed. Since entering the programme EGYV areas have more partners involved and more intelligence sharing takes place.

The 2012 cohort report that partnership working is a strength, since entering EGYV there are now more partners involved, including: health and troubled families. This cohort is now also able to discuss cases of children and girls being exploited and at risk of gang association. Areas also report improvements in being able to share intelligence and so can map and then tackle issues as they emerge.

For the 2014 cohort, more joint meetings and tasking processes are taking place for areas since joining the EGYV programme. Areas are recording better attendance, with more partners, such as: children’s services, housing, DWP and probation, more heavily involved. Areas are reporting they are better able to recognise issues as they emerge, and several areas of good practice have been identified in pro-active working to tackle current issues. Partnership working was apparently significantly eased or improved following co-location of key staff

2012 cohort

- In 2012 ten areas out of ten reported that there was a regular meeting of operational partners to address gangs and youth violence before their engagement with the EGYV programme. In eight out of ten of these areas individual cases were discussed and actions agreed. The value of this was clear to all areas, as one area stated when asked about collaboration:

‘Really helped in terms of creating those links between key agencies, information sharing, we’re definitely working together in a much better way, definitely addressing those key issues, we consider that more

young people are safeguarded, fewer are in gangs, especially those in local authority care or subject to child protection’.

- In 2012, nine areas out of ten reported that they had a multi-agency tasking process relating to gangs before their engagement with the EGYV programme. The value of this to partners and to the process was evidenced by one area in their comments:

‘We have our weekly tasking meetings, where we go through our top 15 on the matrix, and that can be a mixture of both statutory or non-statutory clients. The police could bring someone to my attention who maybe moved into the area, who might want help getting into work or help with housing then I’ll work with them. Our weekly tasking meeting is very much intelligence based and focused on intelligence and what’s happening. Then we have our pathways meeting every month, where that’s a bigger arena with education, housing, SMTs, Job Centre Plus/DWP, we have Safer London and the youth service. That meeting is the bigger meeting, and it’s purely focused around partnerships, so it’s a bigger forum to discuss issues. I think we have the main people. We have a gang’s SPOC in DWP, who is a link in if we’ve got clients with any issues around benefit issues; I have someone to liaise with. We’ve also worked to set up our own job club, to have another resource, so people can access support there. If I know a young person is coming over to probation, I will link-in, work with the probation officer, attend hand-over meetings if needed, and co-working those cases with the probation officer, so if they need additional support I can help with that, as well as provide updated intelligence’.

- In 2012, attendance of partners at multi-agency meetings was strong in most places but with some key partners missing notably health and Job centres/DWP and in several places Adult services. Across all areas the strongest attendance was from community safety partners, YOS, Police and Probation; each attending multi-agency partnerships regularly or sometimes in nine out of ten areas. This is perhaps unsurprising as these are statutory partners in the community safety agenda. Housing and voluntary organisations attended in eight of out ten areas regularly or sometimes, whilst education and children’s services attended partnerships in seven out of ten areas and six out of ten areas respectively. Health and Job Centres/ DWP only attended two out of ten partnerships.
- Two out of ten areas reported attendance from CAMHS, Prison services, CPS or Registered Social Landlords.
- Nine out of ten areas also reported in 2012 that their partners attended a multi-agency tasking group. As one area noted:

‘We have developed a mapping Exercise regarding county Lines some 3 years ago. Close working with YOT, BOCU , St, Giles and Troubled Families. Partnership working is sold here. Actually it’s brilliant. Also cross-area working with others affected by county Lines’.

- In terms of effective engagement of partners in multi-agency collaboration the picture was fairly similar across all with fairly good or very good engagement from key partners such as police, Probation and Youth Offending Services'; each of which were reported in ten out of ten areas. This engagement was reported by one area in this way:

'So it might come via a YouTube video, or it could be a gang's worker has screened someone, who has passed the intelligence from us. Or it could come from any of our partners, and then put it on our system. The intelligence sharing is really good. Everything is shared as much as possible. We have weekly meetings and a monthly meeting where different partners come and we share intelligence and go through the cohort of gangs. My job is made so much easier because we all share everything together. We also go to child in need and child protection meetings so that we have our gang input and gang concerns and also into the other aspects into their lives as well, to get a better understanding of the dynamics of the whole family and not just that individual. One thing we do is try to build up a rapport with the parents with lots of visits. And that's really beneficial, to get the parents onside. We've had a recent case where we've worked with social services and YOS. What we are improving on is sharing information more, so for CSE and gangs there is an overlap, but we've started sharing our information better'.

- Children's Services and Housing were effectively engaged in nine out of ten areas and community safety effectively engaged in eight out of ten areas. Voluntary organisations are effectively engaged in eight out of ten areas whilst education was only effectively engaged in six out of ten areas. Adult Services were poorly engaged with only three out of ten reports reporting their engagement as fairly or very good.
- Engagement from health and from job centres/ DWP on the other hand were each reported as poor or very poor in seven out of ten areas.
- Only one area reported effective engagement from the local secure estate or CAMHS. Their view of the effective role which can be played by their involvement is however useful:

'We do good engagement with parents in terms of the NVR programme- the non-violent resistant programme. It was a programme run by CAHMS. The CAHMS approached the community safety co-ordinator saying 'look I've got this programme and I'm willing to adapt this to people in gangs' and she did a CSE version. I must admit I was a little bit sceptical, and I've read the material and used it myself in terms of de-escalating. But the testimonial of the parents was so strong, we've got parents of children that have been in gangs for years that have been looked after and been returned home and whilst with some of the children the patterns haven't changed, why the patterns of behaviour hasn't changed, the parents are able to deal with it far more effectively. And not only that, we train the parents to deal with their own child, but train them as facilitators. So in terms of their confidence what

they take out of that is amazing, you here some of the testaments and it's actually amazing'.

- By 2015 ten out of ten areas still had regular meetings of operational partners and ten out of ten areas now discussed and actioned individual cases suggesting that multi-agency collaboration was robust and enduring.
- The success of this arrangement was evidenced by one area:

'I've just had a full-joint inspection, we are the first area to ever get four starts out of four for partnerships, what HMIP said, and his view was that it was the best example he'd seen of a partnership where the YOS is fully imbedded in a partnership, while the YOS maintaining a clear identity as a youth offending service. I'm proud of our partnership, there's where our strength lies'.

- In another area the enduring but effective partnership working with the police was highlighted:

'We have such a good relationship with police, we find information straight away, and we're responsive and reactive, we're quite lucky because of those relationships- without that it could be completely different situation. It's our strongest partnership with the police. We've also done some reflection with emergency placements with social care, and when the child needs to be moved out of the area immediately, so our relationship with social care has improved by recognising when there's a risk the need to move quickly in our timeliness in our responses. to improve that we now have a process in place with social care, so they know have to have social care in place within 24 hours, so in terms of risk management we now have a quick response where a serious incidents occur, especially when you don't have the powers or control of the court. When you haven't got that, it can still work through effective multi-agency working and getting the right outcome'.

- The shift in the gangs agenda by 2015 was reflected in the fact eight out of nine areas now included individual cases of children and young people identified as at risk of gang involvement or gang related exploitation (in addition to cases of those involved with gang activity). The one area which did not include this analysis pointed out that:

'There are no adequate systems in place that enable us to work with young people at an intervention level. We are instead still waiting for subjects to commit a serious offence before they are properly worked with'.

This new agenda had been actively embraced by many of the areas with one area establishing a Monthly Young People Sexually Exploited YPSE group, a Strategic Child sexual exploitation and missing group (CMOG) and thus resisted plans to introduce a new Missing Operational Group (MOG) in 2015.

At least one area addressed such issues through emergency meetings rather than at regular groups.

- Some areas stated that despite effective working multi-agency arrangements partners can still operate within their own silos and need to be almost coaxed out of them:

'Partners are still siloe'd but Children's Services now actually understand the cross over now – when looking at CSE can we think if it's also missing, DV or gangs – etc. so we can plot and overlap all this . They find patterns now. They have thematic approach to look at missing, gangs etc, all together so they understand the joins. That is their dataset. Also with Ms Understood they look at peer on peer links. They also look at datasets. We will feed this in, via the AD for Children's Services'.

'When I first started, I was accused of criminalising all young people by the head of youth services at the time, so you can imagine what it used to be, but that was back in 2006. It's come a long, long way; it's much more integrated than it ever was before. There are still professional differences but that will always be the case, there will always be arguments with individual social workers, because some of them still think 'the mum's protecting him' and if the mum says the right things. There's always going to be professional differences. Community Safety are not always the most popular people in the council, because we challenge, our main role in this whole world has been to challenge other agencies around gangs. One thing the peer review did do on a positive note, it made everyone come around and be interviewed'.

- The 2015 survey demonstrated that partnership working or multi-agency collaboration was still strong amongst those areas who joined the EGYV programme in 2012 though with something of a shift in the partners attending.
- Several areas were easily able to identify success of partnership working:

'I think one of our biggest success is the way the partnership works, how we've all got our clear identities as agencies and organisations, we've all got a clear role to play. But it's very fluid the way the information moves between the partners, and I think that's the strength of the work we do around the partnerships, and the information flow and the risk management as well'.

- The development of partnership as a shared understanding was commonly stated:

'It's effective, I think there are two things, on one level it's very, very effective. We know our cohort, our partnership have a shared understanding of what we need to do, we may play slightly different roles, so there's an understanding when its intervention as opposed to enforcement, but there aren't any tensions between any services. I think

over time we've learnt to understand different roles. But what we also know, there's absolutely a shared understanding of what the end goal is. We're effective, but then we still get these groups of young people appearing, and they come committing these very serious offences. And there are lots of them; they've got an identity as a group when they come to our attention. Until we reduce that number and the incidents of that happening I don't think we're as effective as we could be. But I know how other areas work and I know we do really well'.

- Attendance by community safety partners, the police remains broadly the same with eight out of nine areas reporting their attendance. Education attendance was reported by seven out of nine areas. Some areas had engaged Education through use of data and training:

'Our mapping I think is best practice. We have a foot in the door with Education and the impact of young people with gangs is being considered, e.g. for bright kids if no response early then they might go higher up in the gang. This is all incorporated in training. We have highlighted the health outcomes. We physically map issues and we can track when they are first known to services. Now – we have training packages on Safeguarding; for Parents and Staff which are all locally contextualised. We incorporate county lines in the training we offer'.

- Children's Services were now making an increased appearance at eight out of nine areas.
- YOS attendance was up and favourably reported by nine out of nine areas. Several examples of strong partnership working with Youth Offending Services was evident, however as one area put it:

'We would utilise our YOS gang officers they would do screening on those individuals, which would build up a good picture on them. What does really well is a fantastic relationship with the YOS and the gang workers, we're so so lucky, so we can get a better picture by utilising them, as if some people see a police officer, they might just shut down automatically. We do joint call-ins with gang leaders, but we try to get to know them first and build up a rapport'.

- For another: *'It is pivotal to us [to be] working together as partners to manage 18-25 year olds. Knowledge and information has also improved. Various strides to improve this - not least the BOCU now reporting to the Community Safety Partnership. We also have the Reducing Offending Board so a good sense of activities overall going on. New concerns will be aired here and resolved. **** did a conference on Mispers and county Lines and this raised awareness as many of the partners were not really sighted on the issues. Pretty good engagement overall really. Wider engagement some good faith group work being undertaken through the MOSAIC group project. Lots done here. Looks also at Gangs in Muslim community. There is still a bit of a lack of knowledge in schools'.*

- An increase of attendance was also noted for health and public health who now attended regularly or sometimes in three out of nine areas and six out of nine areas respectively. Given the poor or very poor attendance recorded in the 2012 survey this is significant improvement. Attendance from the job centre/DWP has also improved since 2012 and four areas now report their attendee regularly or sometimes as opposed to only two out of ten in 2012.
- Some partners who were regular attendees in 2012 were now reported as attending less frequently in 2015, for example, attendance by voluntary organisations or the community sector had slipped back from eight out of ten areas in 2012 to six out of nine areas in 2015. Probation/CRC, a strong and regular attendees in nine out of ten areas in 2012 had also slipped back to seven areas out of nine in 2015.
- One area noted a decline in its partnership working, citing that it had effectively addressed many of the urban street gangs issues with which it was once confronted:

'We had a strong partnership via the CSP – really strong relationships but that has now gone too. Some partners have moved on so historical relationships have now folded. Not a lot of priority on the gang's side of things, so many partners not bothered. It's not on their agenda. Our charity for example has no contact with the YOS. YOS had engagement at the beginning on gangs but not now. Partners did commission proactive and preventative work but now it's silo working again and actions are taken in house, so it's not working. We only have case work teams nothing community focussed'.

- Housing partners, again a strong attendee in 2012 partnerships as reported by eight out of ten areas, had slipped back to regular attendance in only seven out of nine areas. The effectiveness and value of engaging Housing partners was enthusiastically reported by one area Housing Officer:

'So it's now a single point of contact, I'm realistic on what I will and won't be told, but perhaps an expectation now that if there's a warrant or activity on one of our properties we will be updated. So we can join up on tenancy support or enforcement that we need to deal with, with the tenant of the property. Whereas before I might be told by a neighbour 'did you know the police were at such and such addresses so I was always trying to keep up. So the most important thing, the meetings are very impressive, and there's a very prompt response in addressing the issue, so when the police do a warrant and make seizures, we need timely information of the assessment is of their find- quantity and type, because if we're to do a possession order we need to know that information. Where the police have to take (the drugs) away for forensic confirmation. But we're saying if you give us the confirmation we can put that in to our orders. So that's come out of the last meeting, where we're waiting for the information, but now it's being immediately unlocked and that update provided'.

- 2015 however witnessed the attendance of a range of new partners in the multi-agency collaborations. Early Intervention Services were now attending or regularly or sometimes in seven areas out of nine. Troubled Families were similarly represented in seven out of nine areas. Local Missing Persons Coordinators were however only attending in four out of nine areas. The new partners of clinical commissioning groups and YOI/Secure Estates/ NOMS still had to make an impact and only attended regularly or sometimes in one area. Local Communities were missing across all nine areas representing something of a gap in the multi-agency collaboration from the community perspective. One area defended their lack of involvement by suggesting the sensitive nature of the data and discussion precluded their attendance as inappropriate. The value of new partner engagement was articulated by one area in this way:

'There are partners across the board involved now. Enforcement is mainly police-led, but also we're doing criminal behaviour orders now, safeguarding is at the heart of it with children services. Community services are 'the glue' of partnership working, because we're the ones that make sure it happens, and if people aren't talking who they need to talk to, we make sure they are. We're also linked in with anyone else that can help, the youth offending service obviously; when I say children's services that includes youth offending services because they're together in the area, when I talk about children services I'm also talking about the YOS, as other areas are separate, so obviously the YOS are key. It's about ensuring that everybody is interlinked, and because everyone shares information, when orders are put in place, they're put in place with the needs of the child, and including things like restrictions, non-associations is good as well'.

- Effective engagement of some partners appears to have slipped slightly in 2015 whilst at the same time their presence has been replaced by other new partners. Again this perhaps reflects the new turn in the gang's agenda. Seven out of nine areas reported effective engagement (fairly good or very good) in multi-agency partnerships (as opposed to eight out of ten in 2012). Adult services partners were now less engaged in 2015 as only one area out of nine reported fairly good or good engagement. Effective engagement of Children's services was only reported by seven out of nine areas in 2015 as opposed to nine out of ten in 2012.
- Effective engagement of the police and the YOS in 2012 was reported by ten out of ten areas but in 2015 this had dropped to eight out of nine for each partner. A good example of this is reported by one area:

'What I would say some of the strengths around us are, having those strong communication skills, and information sharing between the police and partner agencies. So there's a perfect example of a youth that was recently stabbed, he had no previous offending history, so no bail act or community order to share with the YOS. But we needed to risk manage what our concerns were. we held a strategy meeting with trident, the gangs team here, social care, education and we ended up with a

package that we presented to the court for an emergency protection order so he could be placed outside the area, through housing we got an injunction from the area, so that managed his risks, whilst also doing the internal control stuff through the gangs team- so it was a risk-led package that had all the right partners around, so I think partnership working in xxx is very strong. We also work closely with red-thread, who attend monthly tasking meeting to share any information on on-going pieces of work, and share assessments with us, so we can review our assessments with in YOS or probation’.

- The YOS Officer from the same area noted: *‘you have young girls attending parties. When you think of the word exploited, you think of someone being held against their will, but often it’s not, they want to go these parties, they run away from home, or be away for days around other people’s house. So that’s the work Safer London do on empowerment, self-esteem and confidence. We’ve started to do that work with young guys on their mentality towards girls. A lot of females have orders with the YOS, Safer London also does voluntary, so I might bring a referral to them, or maybe through their school. They have to manage it carefully about how they engage people as it’s voluntary. They do a lot of workshops at school to get that message out there’.*
- Voluntary sector engagement was reported as effective in eight out of ten areas in 2012 as opposed to seven out of nine in 2015.
- The 2015 survey also reported less effective engagement from Probation and Housing dropping from ten out of ten areas in 2012 to eight out of nine; and dropping from nine out of ten to only six out of nine.
- One issue regularly reported by areas is the challenge of consistency of staff and staff churn:

‘Only issue is that organisations change (including us) and to keep consistency of attendance and staff, so it can be difficult for people to commit to or get to. How to keep consistency? Well they all understand the issues and so they all come. There might be a slight drop off – e.g. A&E. Ambulance Service been to the first few but might not be able to come again. We still need data from them. Attendance is good and well bought into’.

- Health engagement in 2015 had however risen from the very poor rating in the 2012 survey. In 2015 three areas out of nine reported effective engagement of health providers whilst public health was effectively engaged in four out of nine areas.
- It is likely that some of the declined attendance or effective engagement of partners in multi-agency working is because new partners have come on board. For example five out of nine areas now report effective engagement from early intervention services. Four out of nine areas now also report effective engagement from the local missing person coordinator, Troubled Families representatives, and the YOI/ Secure Estate/ NOMS reps.

- Local communities are only effectively engaged in two out of nine areas and the clinical commissioning group is only effectively engaged in one out of nine areas.
- One area reported that the agenda had effectively now altered significantly following their earlier success in tackling the youth gangs issue in the city.

‘Our big strength was partnership working. Now police do their own OCG thing and all the voluntary orgs are fighting for the scraps. It’s pretty crap. The financial situation made people retract into their silos and their boundaries are tighter. Even the YOS says, ‘No issues on gangs right now’.

- The same area identified the challenges of working with their own local communities:

‘Our strength before was really Prevention but this is not there now. No resources for this. Risk and threat is regarding Asian gangs but there is no footprint on this community. We must work within these communities. We now have no money to do prevention projects and we don’t have that Intel, so really our foot is off the pedal. We don’t have the right Intel regarding our new OCG/ Asian family issues. We are not sighted on the trends coming down the track. When you look at CSE, gangs, Prevent etc. it is all the same people. Out partnership work is too siloed. Police sessions take place on the OCG profile – but we don’t have partnership Intel only police data. We need to identify the Vulnerable Asian boys and the Asian community is not interested in working with us’.

2014 cohort

- Before their engagement with the EGYV programme, three out of seven areas reported there was a regular meeting of operational partners to address gangs and youth violence. After joining the programme this rose to six out of seven areas.
- Similarly the three areas which regularly met before joining the programme also discussed individual cases. After joining the programme this also rose to all seven out of seven areas. The value and benefits of this were widely commented upon, for example:

‘We are quicker now at recognising the issues and looking at responsibilities – where it lays – Intel – flow of information is Better. It became clear local police were not aware, now they are aware, this is better. Police meetings are now much more multi-agency and I attend the Op Volcanic meetings so Info-sharing is much better’.

- A further improvement was reported when considering whether this included individual cases of children and young people identified as at risk of gang involvement or gang related exploitation (in addition to cases of those involved with gang activity). Prior to joining the programme only three out of

seven areas reported this activity whereas after joining this had again risen to seven areas out of seven, illustrating the importance of this agenda.

- A couple of areas have developed this part of the agenda effectively through their local Safeguarding Hub.

'We have the Case Conferencing then the Multi-agency Safeguarding Hub. It is co-located with health and social care and police. CSE is also there, but we don't really need a Gangs process but a CSE one at the moment. All strategized upstairs in the co-located team. Also Mispers coordinators from the police side are in place. We do debrief interviews with Mispers and we will improve over briefing to police officers. We aim to fix the problem but it takes time. We lack resources and it is difficult to keep momentum. Each child has a care plan. Operation xxx is police only and we feed into the Child Plans. So police are aware of concerns regarding the child. Also the drugs team must be alerted to look at the child as a victim and as a perpetrator. Schools are also linked in and we had a CSE working Conference two weeks ago. A new launch in schools on CSE and trafficking was done. We included hotels and taxis and into this'.

- One example of good practice in a local area was the use of a multi-agency case conferencing scheme called Neighbourhood Responsibility Panels:

'And then there are the neighbourhood responsibility panels. So say for example the police arrest someone, but are aware these people have certain needs: debts, benefits. So these people will be invited to a neighbourhood panel which is held in a neutral area and generally, there are the police; they'll be me, someone from the drug agency, and someone from DWP. So all their problems will get dealt with at the same time. If they just come to me, I'll just deal with their mental health problem, someone will go to the benefits office just to deal with their benefits problems. But when someone comes to the neighbourhood responsibility panel, someone will chair it and put all their needs up on the board and it's all discussed. So if someone has multiple problems, all the agencies that need to be are there and it's all picked up at once, and it's always quite reassuring, and it stops duplication of work. I personally am totally impressed with it'.

- The attendance of partners at multi-agency meetings has shown a significant improvement for almost all areas since joining the EGYV programme. Against the basket of 18 partners identified in the questionnaire, there were reported increases against all 18 in terms of their improved attendance at multi-agency partnerships, (i.e. attended sometimes or regularly).
- Areas which had decided to drive forward their multi-agency partnership work through the co-location of staff appeared to be developing an effective advantage:

'Data is good and the substance Misuse team are good. They detail all the needle finds. Helped by co-location. She can ID the congregating drug users via the local needle finds. Housing data comes through to us via rented accommodation who are again co-located with us. This is a big help. Partnership working is quite strong due to co-location'.

- One area offered a particular strong example of this process and its benefits:

'I think for the taskforce and the work they're doing, it's amazing, because it really promotes that concerns we have here, and being able to bring out recommendations to push it forward, with what we need with the services and the services and the staffing in this area. So it's good we link in and get the information and the links the taskforce has made with London and with different services that can assist us and give us different information that they can feed to us. We've got a lot of support; we've got a team who's worked together for a number of years, which is really important. We know how we all work, we know the issues and that's really key I think. It's talking to people every day that sorts the problems out. The co-location really helps'.

Further expressed by another officer the value of co-location was put thus:

'We work with 13 different agencies in the taskforce. And simply working out of the same office and talking to each other, we've got that communication with people. We haven't got the same focus, but they're aware of it (the work we do). Some of the people who are being cuckooed, they flash up on other people's systems. Maybe for housing, or anti-social behaviour issues or something like that'.

One practitioner involved in the partnership felt that co-location really helped the different agencies to understand how each other worker:

'I think the work the taskforce is doing is exemplary. They're so dedicated towards improving the local community. And I really think this type of joint working, it's evident it works. Historically, there's misunderstanding and miscommunication between the different agencies. Working altogether we're seeing what our lack of resources are. So I used to say 'those bloody police, haven't come out again' but now I'm working with them I know why, and vice versa, and we know where our limitations are, and I think it's all about sharing information and sharing knowledge. And certainly it's transformed my working with police and other agencies. And you get named people and it cuts out so much time. I know who to contact, I know who to speak to. Rather than ringing someone and leaving a message and you don't get a response for two weeks. And frequently requested information from me, and so I'm able to say if someone is under our services and so I can say 'what can I do to help?' And with the taskforce I can deal with emergencies and problems straight away. Within the taskforce it's a lot more joint working, and there's connections'.

- Some partners such as community safety or the police were reported by three out of seven areas and four out of seven areas respectively as attending sometimes or regularly prior to joining the programme however after joining the programme seven out of seven areas reported attendance from both these crucial partners.
- Partial or regular attendance from Children's Services also increased significantly from only four areas out of seven prior to joining the programme, increasing to attendance in all seven areas after joining.
- Several sets of partners including Housing partners, Voluntary organisations and probation/CRCs had increased their attendance from only three areas each prior to joining to six areas out of seven after joining.
- Job Centre Plus/ DWP partners were now in attendance in six out of seven areas as opposed to only attending two out of seven before the programme.
- Health providers attendance was noticeably very low (only one area) prior to joining the programme. This however doubled to two areas after the programme.
- Whilst the engagement of the health providers and of public health remains slender, the value of this engagement was effectively reported in this example:

'I work for public health and two years ago was the DAT coordinator for the area. So I started working with EGYV in the DAT and I kept the link going when I moved. The DAT is now moved into Public Health. We do more on prevention but various cuts and mergers etc. overtime have led to this move. It's fundamental for us to get involved in this gangs work. The individual impacts can be huge on both individuals and their families. So it fits well with our brief. Public health and protection is now in Suffolk and has merged with Community Safety and Trading Standards. So all work in licensing and community safety is now firmly established in the structure. Advantage of lots of money in public health which is ring-fenced – so we help channel it into community safety.

- Adult Services similarly only increased attendance from two areas out of seven to three.
- The value of engagement with the health providers however was clearly expressed by one of the areas that manages to retain their active engagement:

'Recent example of a man with dual diagnosis issues making multiple calls to the police etc. Joint Action plan agreed for him. Cost saving was then huge. Having a dual diagnosis person embedded we can nail the Joint Action Plan quickly. Looking at the investment and mapping of cost benefit'.

'Still gaps with health and schools- But health and school practitioners that have access to huge wealth of intelligence and data are not actually aware of the data they hold. So doing more work to develop models of info-sharing without more meetings'.

- Partners who advised and assisted in the new agenda and the new data sets had also increased or improved their attendance. For example early intervention partners were now attending five out of seven area multi-agency partnerships (four of whom were now regularly attending) as opposed to only three out of seven prior to joining the programme. The local Missing Persons Coordinator, clinical Commissioning Groups and partners from the local communities who were all absent from multi-agency partnerships prior to joining the programme were now in attendance in four, two and two areas respectively, demonstrating an increasing level of engagement. Clearly attendance from local communities remains low across this cohort of areas.
- Attendance from Troubled Families and from public health has also improved from each presenting at only three areas out of seven prior to joining the programme to five and four areas respectively, since joining. All the areas receiving attendance from Troubled Families reported them as regular attendees. One area had recently held a gangs conference to bring partners together round the table and to develop a shared understanding of the issues:

'The conference we held with health, GPS, practitioners, A7E etc. all brought together. Many didn't know about exploitation or drugs elements of gangs; cuckooing etc. They were not aware. But the awareness came quickly and since then liaison with SW much better and they are more forthcoming to us foot-soldiers. Info-sharing improved greatly especially regarding drug supply'.

- Before engagement with the EGYV programme there were multi-agency tasking processes relating to or including gangs in only four out of seven areas, though each of these reported that this included a process to include children and young people identified as at risk of gang involvement or gang-related exploitation. Since joining the programme this has improved to seven areas out of seven reporting a tasking group and six areas out of seven reporting that they include children and young people at risk of CSE within this process.
- The rating for the effectiveness of partners' engagement with tackling gangs and youth violence (including preventing children and young people from becoming involved) has also improved in this cohort. Out of a basket of 18 identified partners effective engagement has improved in 14 of these partners since joining the programme with four others remaining the same.
- One area identified both good practice and the challenges involved in partnership working:

'Yes it's been good but some partners are still missing from round the table. Early Help are not yet linked in. Social Services – think the At Risk Panel could be used more effectively to monitor young people. Also we have a Missing Children meeting every morning. Girls often go missing and then get involved in CSE. So there is more to do here on this agenda. Some businesses also seem to be involved such as taxis and takeaways. We are currently building stronger links with Probation

now as this is seen as greater need. Police – we have good links with them but our embedded police officer is about to be lost. Need the Care Providers to engage more – would need to be careful however re the police intelligence as some data could be compromised’.

- Prior to joining the programme the effectiveness of both the police and community safety partners engagement was rated as fairly good or very good in six out of seven areas. After joining the programme this remained at six out of seven partners. YOS partners similarly stayed the same before and after joining at five areas out of seven.
- The effectiveness of Children’s Services as fairly good or very good however rose from only one area providing this rating before joining the programme to four out of seven after joining the programme.
- Another significant improvement in effective engagement has been Job Centre Plus/ DWP which were reported by only one area as effectively engaged prior to joining the programme, later rising to five out of seven areas after joining.
- A doubling to effective engagement was reported by areas with regards to partners from Education (two area out of seven prior to joining rising to four areas after joining); Voluntary sector organisations (two areas rising four out of seven after joining) and Housing rising from only one area out of seven to four out of seven after joining.
- One area however had developed a strong and effective working relationship with the county Fire and Rescue Service and used them to work alongside housing to enter premises , gather intelligence and provide services to vulnerable people:

‘Fire and Rescue Services are used because we can get into places the police can’t. So if the police arrive, often people are not interested, but if its [XXX] then we can get in – free safety visits, smoke alarms etc. We can also get upstairs for safety reasons. We can be used then for intelligence gathering. It works well. The fire service is still seen as the good guys. We gather info when we go’.

- Most of the newly identified partners were also now effectively engaged in this cohort. For example early intervention partners and the local Missing Persons Coordinator has previously been reported as effectively engaged in only two areas out of seven prior to joining the programme. Post joining this had risen to four out of seven for both sets of partners.
- One area stated that they felt London boroughs were however not fully addressing the issues resulting from their placement of young people in coastal towns and out of London resettlement schemes:

‘Young people placed here to get away from gangs in London. But there is a big gap in the understanding of social services in London as to what exactly they are placing their young people into. They don’t understand’.

- Troubled Families again were now more effectively engaged in five out of seven areas as opposed to only two prior to joining. Again the value of this was clearly expressed by one area who managed effective practice on this topic:

‘One way we do try and support them is through the Family Support Panel, so we identify a young person at risk of gangs. We all sit in a semi-circle as a joint agency team at an independent location like the Fire station and we invite the Young people in, normally with their parent or someone from school to go through a cognitive-behavioural process with them. How do they feel? Happy, Sad? Frustrated, in fear? Why are you feeling that way? What can we do to support you? To better profile, there and then, what their needs are and to provide a better wrap around service. We do the same with the adult Cuckooing victims. The adult version is called the Neighbourhood Responsibility Panel. For every cuckooing victim we’ve had is, at the root of it, mental health issues combined with drug treatment issues, of drugs and alcohol and NEET’.

- Partners from the YOI/ Secure Estates and NOMS were still not effectively engaged as only area reported their effective engagement prior to joining and this remained the only area post joining.
- Only marginal improvements had been reported in the effective engagement of clinical commissioning groups and the partners from the local community. In both cases no areas reported their effective engagement prior to joining and in both cases only one area reported their effective engagement post joining.
- Gaps in partnership working were identified as being Mental health:

‘I guess mental health needs to be more coordinated into all of this’.

- Other gaps reported were with courts and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). One area noted its recent attempts at obtaining Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBOs) had been dashed because of poor communication and understanding with the local courts and CPS:

‘Tried to do this last year and we applied for seven CRASBOs but it all fell through and was not accepted in court. There was a problem between the CPS and court and this seems to be an issue’.

Assessment and Referral

Summary

The ability for partners to quickly identify issues as they emerge and put in place a robust and effective response has been identified as a key asset of the EGYV process. Having a wide-range of appropriate partners communicating effectively and sharing data has had many positive effects within participating EGYV areas, with many areas of good practice emerging including a markedly improved response to

identifying gang nominals as well as children and girls at risk of exploitation, as well as improvements in referral pathways for these cohorts.

Both the 2012 and 2014 cohort has been able to identify improvements in their ability to identify lists of gang nominals, girls associated to gangs and children at risk of violence and exploitation. Both cohorts have also shown improvements in referral pathways for gang nominals, with a broader range of partners involved in this process.

2012 Cohort

- The majority of the 2012 cohort report that prior to joining the EGYV programme they had a list of priority gang nominals that had been identified and that regular meetings took place in order to update and manage this list (eight out of ten areas) there is a similar picture in September 2015, where eight out of nine areas report they have an updated list of priority gang nominals.
- However there have been significant improvements with the 2012 cohort identifying girls associated with gangs, or girls at risk of gang violence, with an increase from three out of ten areas prior to joining the programme, to seven out of nine reporting in September 2015 that they now undertake this task.
- The September 2015 survey also recognized an important development in the assessment and referral process. Eight out of nine areas are now able to identify children and young people at risk of gang involvement and related exploitation.

All areas recognised the value of holding regular partner meetings to discuss cases and new referrals. A tiered response has been adopted, which allows individuals to be discussed on a case by case basis that is reflective of risk, and allows an appropriate, consistent response.

“I chair the weekly task meeting, once a month we talk about every single case that’s known to us and then every other week, we talk about the: high risk, any new referrals, and the top 15 on the gangs matrix. There’s two ways people are identified: one is that they are on the gangs matrix that is provided by the police intel, so if in the top 15 they’re automatically discussed, the other way is through a co-ordinated response of risk assessments. So once we’ve deemed them high risk they’ll be talked about weekly, if it’s medium then its once a month. The use of the gang matrix really helps us with who we are targeting and what resources we put around these individuals”.

- Improvements are also evident in referral pathways for gang nominals, with six out of ten of the 2012 cohort reporting pathways prior to joining the programme, this has increased to eight areas out of nine in September 2015 that now confirm they have this in place.

Effective Multi agency working has improved responsiveness to assessing individuals. Areas involved in the EGYV process report that all the partners are now around the table working collectively, committing resources and sharing information.

“I think we’ve had very good feedback since the introduction of MASH in terms of referral pathways, I think professionals and volunteers understand how to respond to incidents, who to contact to make a referral, what to expect, we had an evaluation of mash earlier this year, it looks like it is effective, the key agencies are involved in MASH and now commit resources, they provide information that they have on their database, there’s a good link with youth offending and probation, our key partners in addressing gang issues.”

- Partnership working for referral pathways is generally positive, with the majority of the cohort reporting they have a range of partners in place:
 - Prior to joining the programme one area felt that referrals to drug agencies was poor, this picture has remained the same in September 2015.
 - The referral pathway to education appears to have improved. Prior to joining the EGYV programme four areas felt education was ineffective, however only one area in September 2015 reported that this was the case, with seven of the nine areas rating the education referral pathway as either somewhat or very effective.
 - Improvements are also evident in the referral pathway for housing. Prior to joining the programme four areas categorized the housing pathway as an issue, in September 2015 no area flagged housing as problematic, with eight out of nine areas rating this pathway as either somewhat or very effective.
 - Alcohol pathways have seen a small improvement. Prior to entering the EGYV programme two areas indicated that their alcohol referral pathways were not adequate. In September 2015, one area felt alcohol was still problematic, but seven areas rated this process as very or somewhat effective.
 - A similar picture can be seen with mental health pathways. Four areas saw this as a poor area prior to joining the programme. In September 2015 only two felt this pathway was ineffective, with six areas indicating that this pathway was either somewhat or very effective.
 - Sexual and domestic violence pathways have also seen marked improvements. Prior to joining the programme five areas felt that this pathway was ineffective. However the 2015 survey results show that none of the nine areas that participated indicated this pathway was an issue, and seven rated it as very or somewhat effective.
 - The September 2015 survey has also shown that a further four pathways have subsequently been developed since entering the EGYV programme: seven areas have pathways with early help, eight areas reported pathways with Troubled Families, six areas now have pathways with wider support family services and eight areas have a safeguarding pathway in place.

EGYV areas outline that a partnership approach to assessments and referrals ensure that more individuals can be identified, and can be ‘picked up’ by services.

“We get referrals from everywhere, but through the different panels we get a lot of referrals. We sit on tasking, pathways, missing panel and we sit on MACE, we sometimes sit on MARAC. In those meetings cases are discussed and if we think they’re suitable we’ll get them referred to us. Or just sharing the information we have in those panels.”

2014 Cohort

The picture for assessment and referrals for the 2014 cohort is similar to the 2012 cohort:

- Six out of seven areas reported having a list of identified gang nominals prior to joining the EGYV programme; this has now improved to all seven areas in September 2015.
- The 2014 cohort also report improvements in identifying girls associated or at risk of exploitation by gangs, with four out of seven reporting they undertook this task prior to joining the programme, now increasing to all seven areas in September 2015.
- There are similar outcomes for areas identifying children and young people at risk from gangs, with four out of seven reporting they undertook this task prior to joining the programme, now increasing to all seven areas in September 2015.

Areas also felt there was particular value in ensuring all assessments and screenings are undertaken in one place, by utilising a single point of contact that could then co-ordinate the best course of actions and identify the most appropriate partner to work with.

“All the screenings come through us. We get screenings through MASH and through YOS. I undertake the checks and send all the information out for assessments.”

- Similarly there are also improvements in referral pathways for gang nominals. Five areas in September 2015 report effective pathways, up from three who reported to have this prior to joining the programme.

There are numerous benefits to this partnership-led approach, which has allowed for more information to be exchanged, resulting in robust risk management plan, with a comprehensive picture of each individual.

“The assessment and referral pathways are much better, the assessments are done, they cover whole aspects, they are done jointly with children’s service and social care and police intelligence which means the planning for that child is based on full information, not on one agency. For example it was solely social care doing an assessment of the child they would mainly assess it on what was happening in the home and what the parents were saying, when actually what we bring to the picture is the police intelligence- the other side, so we ensure the planning is done. We’re also involved in child protection plans, child in

need plans; the whole spectrum- team around the child. Probation they come in on the older age group. I did develop an 18 to 25 panel that picks up the young people that fall off when they turn 18. We work with probation on that cohort. So when you're talking about information that's the biggest thing they (EGYV) have done."

Partnership working in regards to referral pathways has improved, with a broader range of partners now engaged with the 2014 cohort:

- Four of seven areas now report that there are effective pathways for drug addiction, which has increased from two areas who reported having this in place prior to entering the programme.
- Education pathways have also increased from four areas to five since joining the EGYV programme.
- Housing pathways has seen a marked increase from two areas reporting this pathway was effective prior to joining, to five areas now reporting improvements in effectiveness in this area.
- Alcohol pathways have increased from one area being able to identify this as effective, to three out of the seven areas in September 2015.
- Mental health pathways share a similar outlook. Again three areas in September 2015 felt this was now effective, where only one area had this in place prior to joining the programme.
- Sexual and domestic violence has also seen a small increase. Three areas had identified this as effective prior to joining EGYV; four in September 2015 now see this as an effective pathway.
- A further four pathways have again been identified by the 2014 cohort as being effective. Early help is now an effective pathway for four areas in September 2015 as opposed to two areas before joining. Troubled families have also seen an increase from three areas to six areas identifying this as effective by September 2015. Wider family support pathways have increased from one area to two, and safeguarding pathways are now effective for five areas of the 2014 cohort, as opposed to three areas labelling this as effective prior to entering the programme.
- Areas also identified the value of having a range of partners involved in the EGYV process, which can enable a holistic approach to assessments that is more responsive to the individual and can help facilitate gang exit and desistance, or enforcement if needed.

"First we do a screening and assessment, we have to do a lot of figuring out of the truth through assessments, and through assessments we look at areas that are contributing towards gang activity. So if it's home life, education, the neighbourhood, substance misuse, or mental health, we would work closely with the YOS to resolve those issues and that particular area. We also work closely with the police- the enforcement side. So if the young people is continually offending, won't accept help, then they would get a lot of attention by the police. I tell the young people if they want support, then we've got substance misuse workers, housing workers, mental health workers, parenting workers, education

workers, YOS and probation. We'll do that work with the young person, with the primary aim of exiting from the gang."

Targeted and Effective Interventions

Summary

In the constantly evolving gang picture, EGYV areas must ensure that they are able to stay on top of the agenda, and be able to rapidly determine a response that is both timely and effective. Areas were able to demonstrate improvements since joining the EGYV programme in being able to identify the needs of gang nominals, young people at risk of gang involvement and females associated with gangs. EGYV areas have an increased range of targeted interventions varying from enforcement to gang exit. EGYV areas were able to demonstrate examples of good practice, which involved working with the right partners who help, facilitate the most appropriate response.

"We've taken that (EGYV) model and gone with it and used it. We've got intervention, we've got enforcement- but in terms of how it's given a base model to work from and grow, and opened up our partnerships with different departments".

Positive outcomes have been identified for the 2012 cohort for targeted and effective interventions. The key needs for individuals actively involved in gangs are identified by all participating EGYV areas for these cohorts, and appropriate interventions are in place to address identified needs. Improvements need to be made in capacity building for these individuals, and for ensuring the right interventions are in place for other individuals identified.

The 2014 cohort have also returned positive responses. These areas indicate they in-large are meeting the needs of gang nominals and have the interventions that are targeted at the right people, however further work needs to be done on use of interventions and capacity building.

2012 Cohort

- In regards to individuals actively involved in gangs, six out of ten areas indicated that they have identified the key needs for this cohort prior to entering the EGYV programme. This has markedly increased to all nine areas that responded to the September 2015 survey who now feel that key needs have been identified.
- Before joining the programme, only five of the ten areas felt that they had the interventions in place to deliver to this identified cohort. In September 2015 all nine areas surveyed felt this was now an area that was adequately covered.
- Four areas felt that these identified interventions were being regularly used prior to entering the EGYV process; however seven areas feel that as of September 2015 these interventions are now being used.
- Only one area felt that the interventions that were in place prior to joining met the capacity of the local population, four areas in September 2015 now feel the capacity is available.

- Eight areas as of September 2015 felt that these interventions were targeted at the right individuals; this has improved from six areas who initially reported this before joining the EGYV programme.
- The September 2015 survey has also indicated that six areas also now have evidence as to the effectiveness of the interventions for individuals actively involved in gangs.

Partnership working allows for quicker more effective responses. Below are three case examples for different EGYV areas that reflect the importance of effective partnership work in targeting the issues and effective interventions in response.

“So we had one property that was being frequented by young males, who were missing from looked-after facilities, and I was feeding that information to police before they were perhaps even aware of it, but we were feeding that to them, and through a positive relationship with other tenants who would call me and say ‘I’ve just seen three black males, in car index number xxx go into property x’ so I spoke to the police, who went to the property, and recovered the young males who were missing from a facility in London. And we’ve had this situation happening 3 or 4 times with this particular property and we’ve given the tenant an abduction warning notice, she was facilitating them to be there, these were friends or relatives. She was a chaotic user herself, so her property gets taken over, so we’re now looking to do a possession order, and the police did a recent operation where the police recovered a number of wraps from this property. So there’s an evidence trail linked to that.”

“The other thing we noticed is young people who were from London, not county lines, but young people placed in children's homes here who clearly had a gang association, so actually that was something we noticed as a YOS, of young people being transferred from London, and you’d gradually start learning more. So we’ve got much better at that. We’re much quicker at recognising there might be a gang issue, much better at sort of being clear at whose doing what and whose responsibility it is, much better at looking for intelligence, and gathering information. The flow of information is much better than it was, when we first started seeing young people arriving often the first thing we’d know about them we’d started doing digging with the police, and we became aware that the local police weren’t aware. That seems to me to have changed, so it seems to me the intelligence sharing has got much better.”

“My involvement has been approximately 2-3 years with the taskforce. There was another incidence where I went to a client’s house, 6 months or so ago. It was quite scary because there were people from London there who were being quite intimidating ‘who are you, what are you doing here?’ but fortunately the client came down and said who I was. But I was able to feed this information back to the taskforce, and they were able to go back and they arrested people with significant amounts of drugs and cash. Until the taskforce they wouldn’t get to hear about

this, and we wouldn't know there's a problem with gangs, because I can tell my team the problems with gangs from the Intel from the taskforce."

- The 2012 cohort also show improvements in targeted and effective interventions for individuals at risk of active involvement or at risk of gangs. Six areas previously had identified the needs for this cohort, with the picture remaining the same in September 2015 with six areas again having met this objective.
- However there are improvements in this cohort's ability to have the interventions in place, with all nine areas feeling this is an area covered, increasing from four having this outlook before joining the EGYV programme.
- Seven areas feel that these interventions are now regularly used, which is an increase from four from the outset of joining the programme.
- No areas feel that they have the capacity to meet the needs for this cohort, with no improvement signified from joining the programme.
- Prior to joining the EGYV programme five areas felt that the interventions were being targeted at the right people, however six areas now report a positive reflection on this.
- The September 2015 survey also reflected that three areas have also been able to evidence the effectiveness of the interventions for those at risk.

Areas have identified that EGYV has allowed participants to identify key bespoke needs to address and have then subsequently implement a range of strategies involving specialist roles for frontline work that directly address these issues.

"Once a case starts to go missing, we're quick with having a wrap-around meeting, and a plan, and if that plan doesn't work, we will put pressure on and say is this the right place for them."

- The 2012 cohort also have positive outcomes in regards to targeted interventions for girls or females identified of active involvement or risk of exploitation from gangs. Prior to joining the programme only three areas believed they were able to identify the key needs for this cohort, however the September 2015 survey indicates that six of the seven responding areas feel this was something they were now able to do.
- Similarly seven areas responded in September 2015 to having suitable interventions in place, an increase from four prior to 2014.
- Five areas in 2015 were able to say these interventions were being used regularly, whereas prior to joining EGYV two areas had indicated this was something within their capacity.
- Only one area felt that the interventions they had in place for females met the capacity, which shows no increase from the previous survey.
- However, four areas now feel that these interventions are targeted at the right individuals, which is an increase from one area that indicated this prior to joining the programme.
- Four areas are also now able to evidence the effectiveness of the interventions they have in place for females, and one area has plans to undertake this task.

Specialist work with young girls has also been identified as a need by areas, with areas utilising specialist support from services.

*Our organisation has two projects in this area: *** and the *** project. *** is based in the YOS, we work with girls at risk or experiencing CSE primarily through gangs. More recently we've got the *** project which is a collaboration between ourselves, *** council, the NSPCC and where we work with young people who are going missing a lot. That can be girls and boys, and the boys' maybe gang associated, linked to drug running and county lines. So it links in with the work we've been doing with ***. We provide the long term support, where the NSPCC do the return-home interview. It's the same for both projects: 121 intensive work with the young people, young person led. Lots of safety planning and advocacy, or support them through the CJ system, or preventative around healthy relationships, self-esteem and safety planning. It came about through the different panel we sat on and the young people going missing, so there was an identified need for that. We're funded to work with 40 people a year, and we're nearly at capacity, we get lots of referrals."*

2014 Cohort

- The 2014 cohort also reported positive improvements in targeted and effective interventions. In regards to individuals actively involved in gangs, five areas out of seven reported in September 2015 that the key needs for this cohort are now identified; only one area was able to signify they do this prior to joining the programme.
- Five areas also responded in September 2015 as having interventions in place for this cohort. Again an improvement from two areas who originally stated this prior to entering the EGYV process.
- Three areas now feel these interventions are regularly used, with only one reporting this before 2014.
- Prior to joining the programme no areas felt they had the capacity to meet the needs of this population; however in September 2014 two areas were positive in this regard.
- Five areas also reported in the recent 2015 survey that the interventions were targeted at the right individuals, where previously this number was only two before joining the programme.
- The September 2015 survey has also shown that three areas have improved their capacity to evidence the value of their interventions; with a further three indicating that they have plans to do so in the future.

Areas advocate the positives involved in having a range of partners involved, which in-turn can offer a more diverse range of responses.

"The young people and adults on the matrix are scored accordingly and we deal with those individuals on a case to case basis, and trying to manage the risk to them, or if that doesn't work then potentially enforcement as police officers. On top of the matrix we do lots of CPO's (criminal behavioural orders) it's about the positives and negatives, so

exclusions or courses for individuals to do, to guide people into the right way of dealing with things.”

- A similar improvement can also be seen in this cohort’s ability to identify the needs of those at risk of gang involvement, with five areas affirming this is now within their capability, only one area reported this outcome prior to joining the programme.
- Four areas now have interventions in place to those at risk, an increase from two in the previous survey.
- Before joining the EGYV programme, no areas felt that the interventions for those at risk were being used, although two areas now feel this has changed.
- Similarly no areas were confident about their capacities to meet the needs of the population, although one has now indicated that they do in September 2015.
- Three areas also believe that their interventions are targeted at the right individuals, a small improvement from one area that previously reported this.
- The September 2015 survey has also shown that two areas have the ability now to evidence the effectiveness of their work with this cohort, and a further three areas have plans to put this into place in the future.

2014 Areas have also recognised the need to identify key local issues and involve the right partners that can respond robustly and effectively to issues before they deteriorate.

“First and in any case the synergy between ourselves and the intelligence locally, so formal proactive in terms of quick time enforcement, what we’re doing at the moment around cuckooing the victims, we’ve got a better appreciation and understanding of those that are affected and impacted by gangs, we do neighbourhood responsibility panels multi agency wrap-around of individuals at risk from gang influence, initially it was drug treatment but its increased to the subject of cuckooing, and the influence around gangs, so we’ve increased that to safeguarding around housing and health other agency support to try and separate them from the influence of being aggressively taking over. It’s given us an opportunity to legitimise regular safe and well checks with those individuals, so we’ve got a regular round robin well our officers will go around and engage with the most vulnerable people, got that consent to wonder into those houses and that’s important in terms of making key arrests of individuals network down here, disruption, turfing them out, putting them out on the street, making them sort of vulnerable, so we’ve had success in relation to that.”

- The 2014 cohort have also made progress with identifying the key needs for females and girls at risk or associated with gangs. Five of the seven areas from the September 2015 survey now feel this is within their capability, where only one area was positive about this before joining the EGYV programme.
- Four areas also feel the interventions are now in place (two areas responded positively to this question prior to joining the programme).

- Upon joining the EGYV programme only one area felt that these interventions were being used, three areas in the most recent September 2015 survey are now using the interventions.
- An area of improvement is the ability to meet capacity, with only one area indicating they are now able to do this, with no areas having this ability prior to joining the EGYV programme.
- Four areas indicated in September 2015 that the interventions were targeted at the right individuals, a clear improvement from two areas that previously made this statement.
- Lastly, three areas are now able to evidence the effectiveness of their interventions, and a further three have plans in place to undertake this in the future.

2014 areas recognised that although there were interventions in place for females, there is more to do, and is an area of priority.

“There are some specific programmes I think for this linked to the LSCB. Adult safeguarding is however not so involved. We have MASH, MARAC, etc but not so sure about sexual health.”

Criminal Justice Pathways

Summary

Areas have been encouraged by the EGYV programme to develop work that encompasses pathways out of gang and youth violence, and facilitates gang exit. Areas of positive work identified include: preventative work with schools, gang-exit programmes, female specific programmes and effective partnership work with relevant criminal justice agencies.

Key partners such as the police, YOS and probation are actively involved in the EGYV agenda for both the 2012 and 2014 cohort; however NOMS and the secure estate play a less significant role. Early intervention involvement is improving with areas, playing an increasingly influential role, while areas from both cohorts report to have gang-exit interventions in place for gang nominals.

2012 Cohort

The 2012 cohort report that the key statutory partners are actively involved within the EGYV agenda:

- The Youth Offending Service (YOS) have been involved in each areas EGYV strategy from the outset, as well as participating in: the problem profile, the analysis of key trends, sharing raw data and regularly attending meetings
- The Police service have also played a key role in the EGYV agenda in each area of the 2012 cohort, including: strategy, the problem profile, analysing the trends, sharing quality raw data and attending meetings
- The Probation Service have been slightly less influential, although still play an influential role in eight out of ten areas, showing no improvement in the recent September 2015 survey.

- NOMS and the secure estate have been less influential, and only play a minor role in the EGYV agenda in two areas, showing no improvement in the recent September 2015 survey.

EGYV areas have identified a close working relationship between statutory agencies such as the probation service and the youth offending service as important catalysts in fostering exit pathways.

“If I know a young person is coming over to probation, I will link-in, work with the probation officer, attend hand-over meetings if needed, and co-working those cases with the probation officer, so if they need additional support I can help with that, as well as provide updated intelligence.”

- Early intervention play a role in the strategies and interventions of six areas of the 2012 cohort

Areas have used this opportunity as a catalyst to undertake preventative work in schools.

*“We do some preventative work, mainly through the YOS in tiers 1s and 2s- so kids not associated through gangs. We're doing a lot more preventative work in schools, we've also linked with trident with parents so we can send letters out to parents, so if you're concerned we can contact you for advice, but also to say you've got a responsibility in this, if your child is taking knives to school, it's about providing education about checking for knives and looking for changes in behaviour, before it becomes a professional issue. But there is a way forward of a lot more work with schools, in weapons awareness. We also have links with growing against violence, who are an organisation that go into schools for us, and do preventative work around gangs. We also have links with the jag- the joint action group, and also *** which is peer-on-peer abuse.”*

- Eight areas now have prevention and gang-exit strategies in place, which shows an improvement from six areas that areas indicated, were in place prior to entering the EGYV programme.

Areas involved in the EGYV programme have also developed specialist wrap-around approaches, which work holistically with individuals to foster gang-exit.

“The young people's aims are monetary gain but it's about changing the mind-set, getting them to understand the proper way to make money. When they get introduced to that level of money it's hard to get them to understand that it's not the right way to make money. There's lots we work with who know it's not right, and they're fertile enough for you to engage and persuade them, and we'll plough in a lot of support, so education and employment towards the right way of making money. Alongside encouragement and mentoring because 9-5 for a young person is a new experience and has its difficulties, and they might think there's easier ways to make money, so it's not just about that opportunity, but helping them through that process.”

“My role is the intervention worker, as an extra resource into how we can support that individual to exit that lifestyle. It can be seen as a mentoring role depending on what is needed.”

2014 Cohort

There is a similar picture of key statutory partnership involvement for the 2014 cohort:

- YOS are involved in six out of seven areas, including involvement in meetings, sharing data and the strategy.
- The Police play a key role in all seven identified areas in the 2015 survey, involved in planning, assessments, data sharing and regular meetings.
- The Probation service is mostly influential, with a key involvement in five of the seven areas.
- NOMS and the secure estate play a role in four of the seven areas, a marked improvement from the 2012 cohort.
- Four out the seven areas reported in September 2015 that early intervention services played an influential role in the EGYV agenda.

Areas have been able to identify ‘at-risk’ individuals, and have sought to implement services for young people, before they become entrenched in criminal behaviour.

(Area lead) ‘I’ve got a gang call-in event. We had an issue where historically we find groups of young people getting together during the summertime getting together: drink, bit of drugs, anti-social behaviour. This year we saw a real change in dynamic where whilst identifying right at the heart of it were some of our London gang members, a periphery wrapped around 20 people who were core historical anti-social behaviour, low level criminal behaviour, low level violence individuals, we’re wrapping around them and starting to establish rather than an organised crime group coming down it’s part of our urban street gang selling drugs, the makings of gang activity here and the wrapped around that were 20-30 young people who were fairly fluid associated into getting drawn into the behaviour who went from antisocial behaviour to robberies, high end violence intimidation. It was happening right across this area for a sustained period so we got the enforcement for that core, they are looking at criminal behaviour orders for that 15-20 wrapped around them that are consistent in the criminal justice system. Our calling event is 20-30 kids who are on the outside of that to stop them entering the criminal justice system. We’ve sent letters with parents, with parents to attend. What we’ve set up is the DofE award scheme specifically for these individuals which is higher intensity in terms of delivery in part. So they’ll get called in, go through the consequences of group offending behaviour and the impact of their behaviour, a bit of Intel. We’ve then got, the two youth centres, in terms of all the youth provision is a positive diversionary activity, sporting activity as well, as our DofE scheme that’s in place so the idea is we’ll get them signed up to some positive activity, ultimate goals, that’s in the long term programme of the DofE so it builds personal resilience, leadership skills,

citizenship and everything else just to break that cycle so that rather than a group of 60 offenders, I've also got a group of 20-30, I've got a core that can be targeted through proactive policing. Even if 2 don't go on to reoffend then we've saved thousands of pounds."

- All seven areas reported having early intervention and preventative strategies in place to help foster gang-exit.

However, areas from the 2014 cohort involved in the EGYV process, identified the CJ Pathway as an area of development, and felt that a lack of preventative work is a particular gap.

(Police officer) 'There isn't as much preventative work as they're used to be. We need mentors for young people who don't have a father figure to teach them basic young skills, because the time they get to 12-13 they seem to think they are the big man of the house, and there's a real pattern around this. I think we need more work on parenting on educating parents. It would take years, but in time it would make a huge difference. Because by the time I get to meet young people- they're already in a gang, they already have a way of thinking, and it's harder for them to walk away'.

Mobilising Communities

Summary

Building a trusting and supportive relationship with local communities has been identified as crucial for an effective gang and youth violence reduction programme. EGYV areas have mixed results in community relations; however areas are proactive in communicating information with community groups and recognise the importance of good relations for gathering intelligence, and utilising the local community in several initiatives.

The 2012 cohort have progress to make on further integrating and mobilising communities into the EGYV agenda. Intelligence sharing is positive, and many areas have involved their communities involved in delivering services, however there are gaps in involving local communities in strategic planning, victim work and advising on individual cases.

The 2014 cohort have made progress on mobilising communities since entering the EGYV programme, and local communities seem involved in the agenda. The use of local communities in: strategic planning, consultation and advice appear positive. As this cohort continues to progress more work could be undertaken on involving the community in delivering interventions.

2012 Cohort

- Local area involvement within the EGYV process has shown little improvement. Six areas reported that prior to entering the programme that their local area was influential, asked again in September 2015, six areas again gave the same response.

Areas recognise that a relationship with the local community is an area for improvement, but understand the importance that mobilising communities can play in the EGYV agenda.

“Something we need to improve on. There is an element of fear mongering, so media can often portray gang crime as rife, which isn’t a true reflection, so there is something about reaching out.”

(Police officer) *“Work in progress really. It’s difficult, because no one wants to talk to the police.”*

- In regards to what local communities level of involvement consisted of, five areas currently report this involves strategic planning, whereas six areas felt local areas already had this involvement prior to entering the programme.
- Five areas indicated that their local community was involved in consultation, showing no increase from prior to joining EGYV.
- Similarly five areas reported that their local community played an advisory capacity on individual cases. Again, prior to joining the programme five areas also reported this, showing no change.

One area has incorporated a model that specifically encompasses the community voice to hold gang nominals to account.

(Probation practitioner) *“Initially the whole model was based on the Boston model from America. So it looked at the three strands of enforcement, intervention and the community voice. It was based on police Intel and other agency Intel, identifying those who are involved in gangs, working with those who want to exit that gang lifestyle. So initially we used to do call-in meetings with gangs members and their parents. At that meeting would be other interventions, including the police, and someone from the community, someone who’s been a victim of gang violence, or through anti-social behaviour. At that meeting the young person would be told that their behaviour is a concern for the community, the police would talk about the consequences. But it was focused on wanting to help people and showing people what the possibilities are to help people to move on. So it was initially based on that model.”*

- There have been improvements in the 2012 cohort using their local communities for gathering intelligence, with eight areas in September 2015 reporting the use of intelligence from the local community, an increase from 6 prior to joining the EGYV programme.

Several areas were able to identify key positives examples of community involvement, and have an understanding of the importance of forging a close partnership with members of the community in regards to gathering intelligence.

“The information I get is predominantly from young people and sometimes from parents in despair. Information sharing is pretty good, for me personally I live in the area, I see young people outside work

hours, which helps as it humanises me and builds a sense of community. But different areas have their own mini communities, we have to tap into that, because a lot of issues that come from communities end up as gang-related violence, or robberies.”

- Eight areas also report that their local communities were involved in delivering interventions, an improvement from six prior to entering the programme.

Areas had experienced difficulty in being able to find community groups that are able to consistently deliver but are implementing plans to reach-out to the community.

“After the riots there were a lot of initiatives, we were working with different groups. We need good community organisations, who do what they say they do. The work with organisations has filtered off. We need a task to get someone to go out and map all those organisations who could be an asset to us, so knowing the organisations, but knowing organisations who are able to deliver. Because if we refer someone to an organisation and they don’t do what they say they can do, then that organisation is gone. We need organisations that are able to deliver. It has dropped off, because there may be organisations that work with young people that we don’t know about. So maybe there might be people from the pathways meetings is missing, a community person who can liaise with community organisations.”

- The September 2015 survey showed that five areas remain involved in supporting victims, showing no change from the original survey from 2012.
- Four areas now feel that the local community plays an influential role in the EGYV agenda; only two areas gave the same response before joining the programme.

2014 Cohort

- The 2014 cohort has made some tentative improvements in community relations and expanding the role the community plays in the EGYV agenda. Four areas out of seven indicate that the local community are involved in EGYV, increasing from two areas when originally asked prior to joining.
- Six areas feel that their local community has a role to play in strategic planning, a significant increase from one area that originally indicated this.
- In regards to consulting local areas on interventions, five out of seven areas have involved their local community in September 2015, only three areas had done so prior to entering the EGYV programme.

However, work has been done to locate suitable organisations, and areas are keen to communicate on EGYV issues.

“In terms of the community, one of our workers sit in the sexual health clinic, so in terms of getting out there. So schools know about us, and we

have good relationships with them. So we work with families and carers to work with those who are affected.”

“They’ve commissioned Chelsea’s Choice which have gone around schools. And there’s been a pack going around to schools which covers the issues. They’ve been doing work with taxi drivers and licensed premises, there’s a lot going on.”

- Similarly five areas now involve the local community to advise on individual cases, only three areas indicated this was something in place before the onset of EGYV.
- Intelligence sharing with the local community is also strong, with six areas reporting that this is regularly undertaken in September 2015, where five areas had this involvement before joining the programme.

2014 areas also recognised the importance of working closely with the local community on sharing intelligence and the clear benefits this can have to tackling gang related issues.

“You get some stuff in. we had a young lady last year who was recruited and dealing. We had members of the public concerned about her ringing in, saying there was a young girl out at night, so you will get people ringing with concerns, being able to be consistent with young people you are able to build up relationships with young people and get information form them as well. So we had an incident this week with a young person, and the young person gave us information about a stash of weapons in a park, so we went there and found knives, poles and blocks of wood with knives in them, and we’ve taken them off the street. So it’s that type of work we can do. With our work with schools we get a lot of intel, if you work with them and support them you get that information coming through.”

- There is a mixed picture in working with the local community to deliver interventions, four areas indicated this was something that already took place prior to entering the programme, and four areas gave the same response in September 2015, indicating no change in this area.

Another area has developed a model of good practice with the local community, with the use of neighbourhood responsibility panels, and ‘street weeks’ that have been developed to both involve the local community and communicate with them to establish local issues.

“Neighbourhood responsibility panels, because we’ve been running them we’re getting that independently evaluated in terms of the effectiveness of that. It gives us that relationship with some really challenged individuals. We do street week here, which the taskforce perspective is a collective of agencies, identify locations and pockets of multiple need and deprivation. On thematic issues, using agency data, identifying micro locations with our hotspots. This week was domestic violence for example, wrapped around where we have heat-maps on domestic

violence, housing issues and poverty. We're going around child poverty and elderly poverty next week, we'll do that and we're engage effectively with areas, and areas that are impacted by drug supply, so warrants for the misuse of drugs act, by criminalities associated with violence and drug dealing and gang activity, we're getting into communities, we will go as agencies and knock on every door, identify what the issues are within the community, identify what the issues are within the fabric of the building, and that person's as well. We've done over 5,000 engagements from a person perspective. So we do that continuingly in terms of understanding the community, but also we engage really well with community groups and organisations. So we set-up a better >>> which is a community organisation in >>> which looks at regeneration and some of the issues that cause the cyclical decline in the area itself, and we are tied in with the community centres and within the team itself, we've got somebody from the c2 network, a community voluntary sector specialist within the team itself, to help us do that network and engagement. So we do that side of it."

- Improvements have been made in the local communities' response to the support of victims. Five areas now undertake this according to the September 2015 survey. This was only done by two areas before entering EGYV.
- Lastly, three areas now feel their local community is influential within the EGYV process; just one area from the 2014 cohort had this response previously.

5. Conclusion

Assessment results

This assessment provided an examination of what has changed in a sample EGYV local areas since joining the programme and sought to assess what impact the EGYV programme has had locally from 2012 to 2015. Data from areas in both the 2012 and 2014 cohort was analysed and six of the 20 local areas were examined in depth. 39 qualitative interviews were undertaken and analysed.

The assessment focused on the seven principles outlined in the original 2011 report and identified that there had been significant movement and action on the recommendations made by earlier Peer Reviews in each area. Within each Peer Review each area was also given recommendations on how to improve their approach to gang and youth violence.

For the 2012 cohort a total 94 formal recommendations were made across nine participating areas. Of these 94 recommendations, 84 (89%) have been implemented - 51 (54%) fully implemented and 33, (35%) partially implemented. Only 10 recommendations, (11%) have not been implemented.

For the 2014 cohort a total of 63 formal recommendations were made across seven participating areas. Of these 63 recommendations, 45 (71%) have been implemented, 19 (30%) fully implemented and 26 (41%) partially implemented. Only 18 recommendations, (29%) have not been implemented.

Where recommendations were not implemented the most common reasons given were financial, resourcing or capacity issues.

Above and beyond the take up and actioning of Peer Review recommendations, the EGYV programme has impacted the areas in a variety of ways across each of the seven headline areas identified as the seven principles.

In terms of leadership the EGYV programme has helped ensure that the gangs' agenda remains in focus and prioritised.

The importance of multi-agency strategies and taskforces is evident, and the role of a SPOC has been identified as crucial. Many areas however identified the centrality of personal relationships in driving forward the EGYV agenda locally and the importance of elected Member support was said to be key.

Partnership approach is reliant upon passionate people so sustainability is an issue. What happens if they move on? Must be wider and then mainstreamed. We need a team approach.

The 2012 cohort have widened out their strategic development of their strategies to include a wider array of partners who are now involved, including: DWP, housing, Probation and early intervention. These partnerships appear, in most cases, to be maturing and enduring, though in some places key gaps remain.

The 2014 cohort now all have strategies in place and appear to have benefited from the learning of the 2012 cohort and sought engagement from a wider array of

partners from the outset, though again the picture is varied across the areas, with some areas reporting wider engagement and involvement of partners than others.

Effective partnership working remains fundamentally key within the EGYV agenda. Sharing resources, data and intelligence is crucial in gaining any successes in ending gang violence. Areas have experienced significant improvements in these areas of partnership working. All areas hold regular multi-agency meetings where cases are discussed. Since entering the programme EGYV areas have more partners involved and more intelligence sharing takes place.

For many areas the presentation of neighbourhood gangs or street gangs and the challenges they present has evolved since the commencement of the EGYV programme and now include aspects of child sexual exploitation, missing persons, county drug lines, etc. For others issues of displacement are now key. Whilst this agenda continues to evolve and diversify, it is encouraging that all areas in the evaluation were sighted on this evolving agenda and were seeking to engage and address it.

In many areas recent evolution in the gangs' agenda is reflected in the arrival and engagement of new partners in local operational and strategic groups, including for example representatives from DWP, Troubled Families, Missing Persons, Public Health, Early Intervention, NOMS/ Secure Estates. The recognised shift in the agenda has been addressed in many areas as a greater awareness of aspects of vulnerability, and an improved understanding of the issues of risk and threat. This has led to the more effective and quicker identification of children and young people at risk of exploitation.

Partnerships to address the EGYV programme appeared on the whole to be healthy although one or two voiced concerns familiar to all long running partnerships - that momentum and partner engagement could at times be an issue. In some areas silo working of partners is still all too recognisable and in places remains an obstacle. In some areas there had been a slight contraction of partnership working which was often thought to be temporary whilst other partnerships appeared thriving and recently enthused by the arrival of fresh partners with fresh perspectives. The engagement of health partners however remains a general weakness. Partners from Adults Services, health and mental health, Education, and voluntary organisations tend to be under-represented in many local partnerships. Areas however recognise this and many are finding ways of trying to improve engagement, for example by illustrating gaps in data to bring partners on board. One area is using the approach of undertaking a cost-benefit analysis to illustrate potential cost savings for earlier partner involvement.

Some areas are finding it more effective to group their partnership work under the umbrella of safeguarding arrangements for children, or a multi-agency safeguarding Hub.

The evolved agenda and arrival of new partners has in places generated new data and most partnerships were finding their way around these new data sets and generating new ways of analysing problems and mapping the issues. EGYV areas are showing they are better equipped in analysing the changes as they emerge, are able to respond quicker to issues such as exploitation and put strategies into place,

such as effective preventative work. More agencies are working closely together and sharing good-quality information. Some areas however reported a reduced analytical capability which they felt had negatively impacted upon their work.

The 2012 cohort of areas showed a marked improvement in data capture since joining the EGYV programme and this ability to generate, capture and present data is considered to be a real strength of the EGYV programme. More areas have a problem profile in place and use this to map emerging issues and analyse local gangs within the constantly changing gang's agenda. More data is being shared by agencies, including: adults and children's services, YOS, education, health, DWP, Probation and voluntary community services. The 2012 cohort areas now also report successes in mapping issues of exploitation, which have been hugely significant in putting strategies in place for prevalent issues such as; County Lines, missing children and CSE.

The 2014 cohort also report a marked rise in number of areas obtaining good quality partner data. This includes better recognition of the issues presenting in their localities. Significantly, more areas also now have a problem profile in place that are now able to map specific cases and analyse trends and common issues. Areas have used these improvements to efficiently target more preventative work with young people.

The ability for partners to quickly identify issues as they emerge and put in place a robust and effective response through assessment and referral procedures has been identified as a key asset of the EGYV process. This is now facilitated via the wider array of appropriate partners communicating effectively and sharing data. Emergent good practice indicates a markedly improved response to identifying gang nominals alongside children and girls at risk of exploitation, as well as improvements in referral pathways for these cohorts.

Both the 2012 and 2014 cohort report improvements in their ability to identify gang nominals, girls associated to gangs, and children at risk of violence and exploitation. Both cohorts have also shown improvements in referral pathways for gang nominals, with a broader range of partners involved in this process. These improvements include earlier identification, faster action and much improved targeting of bespoke referral pathways. Again here an improvement in partnership understanding of the links between issues is evident. The wider range of partner engagement now means the provision of more holistic assessments.

Similar improvements are reported in both cohorts regarding targeting and effective interventions that are both timely and effective. Improvements were also reported by areas since joining the EGYV programme in their ability to identify the needs of gang nominals, young people at risk of gang involvement and females associated with gangs with many EGYV areas now reporting an increased range of targeted interventions varying from enforcement to gang exit. Moreover, EGYV areas were able to demonstrate examples of good practice here.

Positive outcomes were identified for the 2012 cohort for targeted and effective interventions with key needs for individuals actively involved in gangs identified by all participating EGYV areas alongside provision of appropriate bespoke interventions. Capacity building for these individuals requires some improvement as does ensuring

the right interventions are in place for other individuals identified. The 2014 cohort also returned positive responses on this issue with areas reporting they are largely meeting the needs of gang nominals with interventions targeted at the right people. Again use of interventions and capacity building requires further work.

Recognition of the need to work with new groups of individuals including girls and young women is however a major success for the EGYV programme, although there remains further work to do as regards the full and effective engagement of voluntary sector organisations in addressing and servicing those needs.

In terms of criminal justice pathways out of gang and youth violence, and gang exit, positive work was identified in several locations including: preventative work with schools, gang-exit programmes, female specific programmes and effective partnership work with relevant criminal justice agencies. In both the 2012 and 2014 cohorts key partners such as the police, YOS and probation are actively involved in the EGYV agenda however newer partners such as NOMS and the Secure Estate currently play a less significant role. Early intervention involvement is improving in many areas, playing an increasingly influential role, while areas from both cohorts report to have gang-exit interventions in place for gang nominals.

Building a trusting and supportive relationship with local communities has been identified as crucial for an effective gang and youth violence reduction programme. Here however the assessment can report more mixed results. Some areas are proactive in communicating information with community groups, tenants and residents groups, and the local public and recognise the importance of good relations for gathering intelligence, and utilising the local community in several initiatives. The 2012 cohort have more progress to make on further integrating and mobilising communities into the EGYV agenda. Intelligence sharing is positive, and many areas involving their communities in service delivery. Despite this, there remains a general lack of local community involvement and participation in strategic planning, victim work and advising on individual cases. Interestingly, slightly better progress is reported by the 2014 cohort who appears to have made some advance on mobilising communities since entering the EGYV programme. Community involvement in strategic planning, consultation and advice appear positive. As this cohort continues to progress, more work could be undertaken on involving the community in delivering interventions.

The EGYV programme

Participation in the Ending Gang and Youth Violence programme was entirely voluntary, with local areas often approaching the Home Office for inclusion and support to help them address an issue already identified but possibly not widely perceived or understood in their area. This reality runs counter to some reports which claim the EGYV programme was simply a reactionary response to the English riots of 2011. Indeed many of the councils in the assessment reported that they already had work underway to address a nascent or expanding issue of street gangs and neighbourhood gangs in their areas prior to their engagement with the EGYV programme. Despite having identified and experienced some gang related issues locally, they often however lacked clarity as to how to address the issues; what worked in terms of reduction and prevention; what constituted good advice or best practice; benchmarking against others experiencing similar issues; how to tap into

wider support. Councils often felt isolated in their approach and struggled to deliver a challenging agenda which was often deemed to be their own localised problem.

The majority of the 2012 cohort reported having strategies in place and resources allocated to tackling gang and youth violence prior to joining the EGYV programme (nine out of ten). Similarly three out of the seven areas in the 2014 cohort reported strategies in place for tackling gang and youth violence prior to joining the programme. This statistic indicates that the emerging gang agenda had been previously identified through the local Community Safety Strategies or local Strategic Assessments in many local authorities. This is important as it illustrates that most areas joined the EGYV programme for a range of reasons, e.g. to access advice, support, training and networking.

'The EGYV and Peer Review was really useful. Back in 2013/14 we had a Community Safety Report saying that this was needed'.

'EGYV? – Overall good for us. It helped to raise the profile of issues in the area. Principles are right and the role of support to area is positive self –sufficiency and having the right roles. It secured uncertain areas and also uncertain partners'.

One area commented upon the fact the EGYV programme supported local officers who had been struggling to raise concerns about gangs or youth violence or alert councillors about an emerging problem. The programme therefore provided the opportunity to bring political consensus and support:

'It gave permission to accept that they do have a problem. Politicians now are behind this because of EGYV in the area whereas before they were not. So EGYV has helped here. Xxxxx for example remains in denial – they appreciate the agenda but do not accept some of the issues affect or relate to them'.

The areas from both cohorts reported that the EGYV programme had had a positive impact upon them and the way they worked. Whilst some still had reservations about their initial engagement with the programme which several found demanding, intrusive and something of a burden; the overall views of the programme and the peer review were positive.

'EGYV yes its helped us understand a lot more of what is going on. Cos we are working now with the xxxxxx Task Force we see and understand a great deal more. EGYV has brought resources and training and been very helpful overall. My team are up for more activity. Overall EGYV has been a big benefit to us all'.

For many areas, EGYV was the catalyst which brought the gangs agenda partners together and helped to focus both action and commitment, rather than talk:

'EGYV however got it all started. It lends legitimacy to the start of a programme otherwise it would be slow or a non-starter'.

'Gangs coming up from London causes us a few problems. Also tackling drugs supply. Would there be enough of an imperative here without EGYV? Not sure. So EGYV has brought this imperative as they illustrated how someone could get killed within all this. So it was a real driver for action. Many people thought it's the police role – so it gave legitimacy to all groups to actually work together'.

Several areas were very positive about the direct impact that joining the EGYV programme had on their overall understanding of the gang agenda in their locality:

"Partnership improved massively. Partnership working with schools improved massively. The Safeguarding Board now understand the issues such as CSE. This understanding has evolved and developed.

'EGYV has helped yes and the funding has been important. Been championing the gangs message here and actually the area has listened to us. When we did the Mapping and county Lines they listened to us and what we said. So in this way EGYV has helped to raise awareness of issues'.

Others were very positive about the direct impact upon ways of working locally and the engagement and improved effectiveness of partnership working:

"HO did a review – just by doing this review it brought everyone together and this prompted that aspect. I arrived 2011 and took over in 2012 the crime unit – I was having safeguarding conversations then but it was not fully understood.

For others the EGYV programme was instrumental in bring them to the partnership table and for supporting isolated elements of the partnership that had hitherto been a lone voice:

'How has EGYV programme helped? Well me personally, it bought the YOS in, at the time the programme started I was looking into the YOS and improvements in the YOS. But (EGYV) meant that we were actually part of a bigger programme- not just about what we were doing as a single agency or single service, but that we need to be more plugged-in to what's happening. So for me it bought the YOS more central to the gangs' arena'.

One area remarked positively that EGYV had helped their partnership develop and grow:

'Peer review? I think it feels to me, as a partnership we have evolved and developed. We've learnt from our own experiences, how we've placed people out of the area, how that effected the county lines- we've learnt from that. I think we've evolved. Some of the recommendation from the peer review was food for thought, and it was a bit of a catalyst, especially the mapping exercise'

For some areas the opportunity to link into and gain access to high level expertise has been of value:

"Yes this has been of benefit. EGYV and Trident and MOPAC and CSP and Governance. Feel the gang's agenda is a big one with CCG, police, CSP all involved but we do have a good oversight by the police area"

'I find the published points and research really helpful- more of that is always useful'.

'The continued engagement with the EGYV monthly phone ins, also that contact, being able to bounce ideas and getting pushed the network to try and identify if what we are doing is right, if we're seeing similar issues elsewhere, to accelerate information back and forth has been really positive for us'.

When asked what more could the EGYV programme do for the areas the following comments were made:

'What else can EGYV do? They have staff limitations. They have no capacity to do more. Joining up silos in the Home office is now key.

'EGYV needs more capacity and reps from other parts of business in their team – Possibly for EGYV to now reflect the partnership working internally with new reps from CT, LST; from business?'

Other identified the need for sustainability of the EGYV programme:

'Sustainability – worry if xxxx left what then? The cycle of staff change is a problem'

The Peer Reviews

The Peer Review process was also positively praised by all areas in the assessment. Within each EGYV area Assessment, Section Two focussed on the implementation of the Peer review recommendations that were made in either 2012 (for the 2012 cohort) or in 2014 (for the 2014 cohort). Further details on these recommendations are held within the Peer Review reports for each area/district.

The high level of implemented recommendations is testament to the value of the Peer Reviews.

Positive comments from several areas about the Peer Review identified the roles played by the Peer Review and its contribution towards the development and improvement in partnership working to tackle gangs and group offending:

- **Central influencing**

"Peer Review from the Home Office – brought it all together!"

- **Galvanising into action**
'EGYV galvanised people and drives things forward. [Gangs] only became a visible issue (to agents) not the public, it had been building in 2014 so it was a little early in the process. Majority of others were working on gangs for 10 years. But for us we have only been doing it for 8 months. It's been an excellent opportunity to galvanise and raise the issue. So several interviewed and really behind closed doors. Only police, council and Social services know what was taking place and there was little evidence of it. It is not really publicly known or acknowledged'.
- **Education and influence**
'Peer Review helped educate us all re safeguarding issues and helped us to refocus. Shared knowledge and learning now'

"I was also involved in the Peer Review – the learning and Peer Review I would say we have moved forward since then. This includes increased awareness of key issues; Moving forward on the whole agenda; Safeguarding is now identified and action planned; Children and YP Services Plan now has gangs included in it all; We link in with YOS and this is strong; The agenda is taken seriously'
- **Help in naming the issue**
'Yes the peer Review was very important. We were in denial re gang issues. Community Safety not fully sighted on this. Nov 2011 fatal shooting was a wakeup call. We went from nothing to full-on issues straight away. The signs of course were there but were not picked up'.

'Well it put the issues on the radar; made us less complacent; Reset the importance of the agenda; [Its been] Healthy for us and made us think re the analytical problems, risk and threat so we became more effective; Finding allowed broader engagement; To be more strategic re risk and threat'
- **Acknowledging and confirming the issue**
'The review focussed people to acknowledge the issue that was upon us and really did give us the momentum to push forward and I think we have achieved quite a lot in the year on the basis of the report and just raising the awareness in the first instance which has led to a lot of opportunities for us to push the agenda and change or amend as required. Recommendations in the Peer Review report played a key role'.
- **Benchmarking**
'A peer review is always helpful because you use it to benchmark and measure re actions and gaps'

- **Providing impetus to partnership working**
'Speeded things up by a huge amount. Meant now addressing problem quickly rather than catching up late. More on front foot now'
- **Trigger for action and commitment:**
'The nice thing about the EGYV programme was we went through this Peer Review process. It comes out with an Independent set of recommendations. The community safety manager is monitoring this re delivery. What has come from this is increased support from other metro area, the HO team, the NCA (we have attended meetings on county Lines at the NCA), the forming of a recent gangs conference where we invited every agency across xxxx and presented to them with workshops on key issues. Info-sharing is tied into this – we are working on improving this. This is all generated from that process being a bit of a trigger, providing us with enough leverage to get these things moving forward. We are there with the Early Intervention Foundation as well who EGYV are linked into around the Family Support panels. And monthly meetings re what are emerging trends and what is happening across the piece'
- **Driving change and reflection**
'Yeah, the Peer Review process was helpful because what it did was – for us in the multi-agency team we knew what has to change – but by the EGYV team coming in to interview the separate agencies and asking them those challenging questions which caused them to reflect on their role – and then coming up with an action plan. It gets a lot more commitment from other agencies. That has been evident'
- **Access to advice and expertise/ building political commitment**
'The peer review process has been absolutely vital in terms of having the multiple standards of experts and advice, on how to start questioning the partners in terms of what the response is. Organically we knew there was gang issues, it was impacting on all services, but really policing was the lead agency and aware of all the issues because we're right up against it, because it was a drug driven issue. Other partners less so, getting the EGYV peer review has bought it into the local political- county and district council agendas, and given us the opportunity to take that conversation to other key partners like health and education and schools. It legitimised the opportunity to have an open discussion about it and it allowed us to also put it onto the community partnership plan'
- **Useful recommendations**
'EGYV Helped?: I think some of the recommendations were really helpful, implementing some of those recommendations, things like; implementation of the multi-agency safeguarding hub, which has been implemented with the local police, that means there is better information sharing when a referral is made, so various agencies are able to do search around their database, bring that information about that child or family, there's better decision making at that stage, so we can decide

should we go down the route of safeguarding or child protection, should we look at early help, or refer the family to a different service, so early intervention by a single agency, so the implementation of MASH also was a recommendation on better information sharing, and better data sets. I think that's is more maybe we can do around, but I think there's been significant progress'

Finally one area recognised that the Peer Review, though valuable, was some time back and reported that the gang's agenda has evolved again:

'Peer Review? Really useful, but since then the landscape has completely changed. Was more gang involved then – now a decrease re gangs in a structured setting. Focus now changed from active gang members – now more sophisticated but they are not on the radar. Also more Asian gangs as opposed to black/white gangs than before. Possibly more OCGs'.

Appendix One: Further detail on methodology

In depth assessment

The in depth assessments were undertaken in six separate locations utilising a qualitative approach. To determine the locations a sifting process was undertaken which was governed by the following principles:

- Light touch analysis to reflect short timescales
- A desire not to add to the burden of delivery of areas
- Practicalities and expedience of engagement and ability to participate in the process (i.e. some locations had recently lost their gang lead)
- Availability of staff and expressed willingness to be part of an assessment

Across the broad group of 20 potential case study locations it was important to ensure a representation of both the 2012 and 2014 cohorts. In addition it was important to obtain a geographical spread and not simply to focus on inner London. Moreover, the sift sought to include and then capture data from those locations whose performance were considered to be strong or better than expected and those whose performance were thought to be weaker or still in development.

To address this, a sift matrix was established for all 20 potential candidate locations. A review of literature and data was then undertaken across all 20 areas. This included a review of available quantitative and qualitative data on each area submitted to and called by the Home Office under the existing EGYV programme. This data included problem profiles and position statements; Peer reviews and accompanying reports; frontline team reports; survey data and focus group data. Assessments of this data were made against all seven headline principles for each area and scored into the sift matrix. Evidence of strong performance was scored highly and evidence of gaps, or weaker performance achieved a lower score. In this way the sift matrix identified those locations where overall performance on the EGYV agenda (i.e. evidenced progress against all seven of the thematic principles) was either better than expected or weaker than expected or still in development. A final selection was then made for each cohort to reflect geographical spread and evidenced performance as stronger, middling or weaker than expected. A total six areas were then selected and approached to participate in the assessment.

The practicalities, expediency of participating in the assessment and lack of staff availability prevented two areas from participating at the time. They were substituted by two similarly scoring areas and a final six case study locations were then identified. These are listed below.

Qualitative interviews were undertaken with a wide range of participants. These averaged around eight interviews per area with the exception of one area where only a smaller number was achievable. In each location the interviewees included the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) nominated as the area lead for the EGYV programme. The SPOC constructed a schedule of interviews to include a range of partners who were engaged participants in the EGYV programme. The list of interviewees was not proscribed but was determined by the SPOC in relation to staff

availability and participation in the programme. This schedule of interviews included participants from the following partners:

Police Officers, Probation Practitioners, YOS gang workers and area managers, women safety project workers, Missing person's workers, housing officers, mental health practitioners and community safety officers.

Interviews were conducted by two Middlesex University researchers and subsequently transcribed and analysed under each of the seven thematic principles. Alongside these interviews the researchers undertook an analysis of two sets of surveys that the six participating areas had completed (when entering the EGYV programme and then in September 2015). The answers areas gave to these questions were compared and quantified to show where areas had made improvements under the EGYV agenda and where there are areas for improvement.