To Members of the Sefton Safer Communities Partnership

Date: Friday 8 March 2019

Please contact: Caitlin Manion
Contact Number: 0151 934 2070
E-mail: caitlin.manion@sefton.gov.uk

Dear Member

SEFTON SAFER COMMUNITIES PARTNERSHIP - THURSDAY 14TH MARCH, 2019

I refer to the agenda for the above meeting and now enclose the following reports which were unavailable when the agenda was published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>Children's Commissioner Report February 2019</strong> (Pages 3 - 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports of the Children’s Commissioner Office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yours sincerely,

Caitlin Manion

Democratic Services
This page is intentionally left blank
The characteristics of gang-associated children and young people

Technical report

FEBRUARY 2019
Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Department For Education and Youth Offending Teams in England for providing the data used in this report and to CACI, Careworks, Capita One and Careervision for providing assistance to areas in extracting the Youth Offending Team data. Thanks also go to Sophie Riley and Chris Stevens at the Youth Justice Board, Camden, Nottingham, Southend and Ealing Youth Offending Services and Dr Tara Young for help in the initial scoping of this work. Any views, inaccuracies, or errors remain the responsibility of the author, not the Children’s Commissioner or other parties.
# Table of Contents

Introduction and aims .......................................................................................................................... 5
Data sources and cleaning ..................................................................................................................... 5
- Children in Need census data ........................................................................................................ 5
- Youth offending team data ............................................................................................................. 6
Overall sample demographic profile ................................................................................................. 6
- Age .................................................................................................................................................. 6
- Gender ........................................................................................................................................... 7
- Ethnicity .......................................................................................................................................... 7
Limitations of these datasets .............................................................................................................. 8
Analysis methods ............................................................................................................................... 9
Findings: Numbers of children identified .......................................................................................... 9
- Overlap between YOT and CIN samples ......................................................................................... 10
  - Currently CIN ............................................................................................................................. 10
  - Currently on CPP ......................................................................................................................... 10
  - Currently in care ......................................................................................................................... 10
  - Accommodated by local authority under section 20 ................................................................. 11
  - Total number of CYP identified by children’s services and youth offending teams .................. 11
Findings: Characteristics of gang associated CYP ............................................................................. 15
- Family factors ................................................................................................................................. 15
  - Parental substance use ................................................................................................................ 15
  - Parental alcohol misuse .............................................................................................................. 16
  - Parental mental health issues ....................................................................................................... 16
  - Domestic violence/abuse towards parent/carer ........................................................................... 17
  - Neglect ........................................................................................................................................ 18
  - Offending in the family ................................................................................................................ 18
  - Violence towards the young person ............................................................................................. 19
  - Any family factors ....................................................................................................................... 20
  - Any of the ‘toxic trio’ factors ....................................................................................................... 20
- Young person’s current housing ....................................................................................................... 20
  - Instability in CYP’s current housing ............................................................................................ 21
  - Safety of housing .......................................................................................................................... 21
  - Living in short term or temporary housing ................................................................................ 21
  - Any housing factors .................................................................................................................... 22
## Agenda Item 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal risks</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going missing/staying away</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE and sexual abuse</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence towards the young person from others</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative provision/PRU attendance</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year school moves + Exclusions</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence/participation</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and disability</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s mental health</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEND</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary

Summary .......................................................................................................................... 30

## Appendix A: Differences in characteristics by offending histories of gang associated CYP

| Method                                      | 31 |
| Choosing the number of groups              | 31 |
| 3 groups of gang associated CYP            | 32 |
| Preliminary analysis of differences in vulnerabilities by type of gang associated CYP | 33 |
| Demographics                               | 33 |
| Family factors                             | 34 |
| Personal risks                             | 34 |
| Health and disability                      | 35 |
| School factors                             | 35 |
| Concerns around how young person relates to others | 36 |

## Appendix B: Constructing local area measures of gang activity

References ......................................................................................................................... 38
Introduction and aims

This analysis aims to provide information on the scale of gang associated children and young people (CYP) identified by statutory services and their characteristics, with a particular focus on overlaps with other vulnerable groups. To do this we present analysis of two groups of CYP:

> CYP assessed by children’s services during the year to March 2018. This is taken from the Children in Need Census (CIN) collected by the Department for Education and is matched where possible to the National Pupil Database (NPD).
> CYP receiving an Asset Plus assessment in the 12 months to September 2018. This is a bespoke collection from Youth Offending Teams (YOT) in England and received responses from 130 out of 137 areas.

Both of these data sources have extensive information on the characteristics of the CYP assessed, including practitioner assessed markers of whether a child is gang associated or not. This allows us to examine the scale of children marked as being gang associated in both data sources and to examine differences between these gang associated CYP and other CYP assessed on other characteristics recorded in the datasets.

Data sources and cleaning

Children in Need census data

The basis for this cohort is children with a children’s services assessment that started during the 12 months to March 2018. As it is possible for children to be reassessed during the year, for example where they have had multiple episodes of need within the period or as part of ongoing assessment, information was taken from the child’s latest completed assessment. This is to provide the most amount of time for disclosures around gang involvement (and other vulnerabilities) to be identified by a practitioner.

This assessment data was then linked to information about the CIN episode, based on local authority child identifiers and date of referral. Children were excluded from this analysis where:

> Children had no factors identified at assessment
> Children were recorded as unborn
> Children were aged over 18 at the start of their assessment
> Children had assessment start dates recorded before their referral date and/or date of birth
> Children had assessment start dates recorded after the date of assessment completion
> Details of either assessment or referral dates were missing

This cleaned CIN sample was then linked to information held in the NPD, via the child’s unique pupil number (UPN). This includes information on exclusions, absence, school moves and SEN provision. During this matching, a small number of duplicate records were also excluded where UPNs matched multiple children with either different dates of birth or genders. The final match rate between this de-duplicated sample and the main pupil database for children aged 5-15 with any UPN recorded in the CIN census was 97%.

Overall, this cleaning process resulted in a final sample size of 374,580 children with any factors recorded at their latest assessment in 2017/18. Note: this is not comparable to published DfE statistics on factors at assessment as

---

1 Note: this is based on any match being found in the 12 months previous to their latest assessment
the published statistics count open episodes (rather than children) within a year and can include episodes with assessments carried out in a previous year.

**Youth offending team data**

Youth offending team data was sourced from Asset Plus assessments in the 12 months to September 2018. Asset Plus is a standardised assessment tool that YOTs administer to children receiving a caution or conviction. It should be noted that this data is primarily a tool for practitioner casework rather than a statistical collection and as such there is likely to be more variation in its use between practitioners and areas.

As with the CIN data, children can be reassessed during the year and so information was taken from the child’s latest assessment (where they were aged under 18) during the 12 months to September 2018 in order to give the most time for disclosures around gang involvement (and other vulnerabilities) to be identified by a practitioner. Cases were excluded where:

- No information was recorded about gang associations
- Children were recorded as aged over 18 at their earliest assessment in the year
- Information on the child’s age at an assessment was missing
- The date of the child’s latest assessment was missing

This resulted in a final sample size of 19,750 CYP. While not directly comparable, as a sense of scale the total YOT caseload in the year to March 17/18 was 26,681. The data quality varied by item returned and levels of missing data are reported with each table presented below.

**Overall sample demographic profile**

**Age**

CIN data:

*Table 1: Age profile of CIN sample.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at latest assessment</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>10 (650)</td>
<td>28 (102,480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>14 (960)</td>
<td>30 (109,370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>49 (3,360)</td>
<td>34 (123,240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>27 (1,870)</td>
<td>9 (32,650)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Source: Youth Justice Statistics 2017/18
**YOT data:** Table 2: Age profile of YOT sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at latest assessment</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>1 (20)</td>
<td>4 (400)</td>
<td>4 (250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>32 (770)</td>
<td>37 (3,860)</td>
<td>38 (2,650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>67 (1,620)</td>
<td>59 (6,050)</td>
<td>59 (4,130)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

**CIN data:**

Table 3: Gender profile of CIN sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34 (2,290)</td>
<td>49 (178,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66 (4,540)</td>
<td>51 (188,310)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOT data:**

Table 4: Gender profile of YOT sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8 (200)</td>
<td>16 (1620)</td>
<td>16 (1100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92 (2,220)</td>
<td>84 (8,680)</td>
<td>84 (5,930)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnicity**

**CIN data:**

Table 5: Ethnicity profile of CIN sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>7 (480)</td>
<td>8 (29,660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or black British</td>
<td>24 (1,620)</td>
<td>8 (27,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>13 (870)</td>
<td>8 (27,160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic groups</td>
<td>3 (180)</td>
<td>3 (9,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53 (3,500)</td>
<td>73 (258,790)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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YOT data:

Table 6: Ethnicity profile of YOT sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5 (130)</td>
<td>4 (410)</td>
<td>6 (440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31 (740)</td>
<td>7 (710)</td>
<td>11 (740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1 (30)</td>
<td>1 (140)</td>
<td>3 (190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>13 (320)</td>
<td>6 (620)</td>
<td>8 (560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (40)</td>
<td>1 (110)</td>
<td>2 (120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48 (1,150)</td>
<td>81 (8,260)</td>
<td>71 (4,940)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of these datasets

As with any analysis there are a number of limitations to these cohorts. Key limitations for both data sets are:

1. Children are recorded as gang associated based on practitioner judgement in both samples. We have not specified a particular definition of ‘gang associated’ and as such a variety of children and young people may be included.
2. Furthermore, the guidance for practitioners as to when to record gangs as a factor at assessment is vague. The factors at assessment guidance provides the following guidance:

   Being part of a friendship group is a normal part of growing up and it can be common for groups of children and young people to gather together in public places to socialise. Belonging to such a group can form a positive and normal part of young people’s growth and development. These groups should be distinguished from ‘street gangs’ for whom crime and violence are a core part of their identity, although ‘delinquent peer groups’ can also lead to increased antisocial behaviour and youth offending. Although some group gatherings can lead to increased antisocial behaviour and youth offending, these activities should not be confused with the serious violence of a gang.

3. As a result, it is not clear whether children flagged in the CIN data are involved in gang activity or at risk. It is likely a combination of the two given the age profile of the children included (for example there are a small number of under 5s). They are termed gang associated here for brevity, but it is likely that they are a wider cohort than the YOT sample.
4. Children receiving an assessment (in either sample) may be determined by local authority recording practices.
5. Data quality issues and missing data are common to both data sets. This is unavoidable in case management data and is reported where missing data is an issue or answers are based on free text responses. However, triangulating the two data sources helps with this.
Analysis methods

Results are presented below in two forms:

1. Simple cross tabulations are presented to provide overall percentages and overlaps between gang associations and other characteristics. Counts are rounded to the nearest 10 and any values less than 10 are suppressed.
2. Risk ratios after controlling for age, gender and ethnicity. These are calculated via a Poisson regression with cluster robust standard errors (see Zhou 2004). The use of these adjusted standard errors reduces the likelihood of correlations just being due to correlations within an LA/Youth Offending Team as well as allowing accurate standard errors for these risk ratios to be calculated.

These adjusted risk ratios are important to analyse as they allow the differences in demographic profile of gang members (older, more likely to be male and from black and minority ethnic backgrounds - see tables above) to be taken into account. For example, family factors are more likely to be identified among younger children.

Table 7: Differences in parental drug misuse by child age. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental drug misuse</th>
<th>Under 5 % (n)</th>
<th>5-9 % (n)</th>
<th>10-15 % (n)</th>
<th>16-17 % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85 (87,530)</td>
<td>88 (96,600)</td>
<td>91 (114,670)</td>
<td>94 (32,290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 (15,600)</td>
<td>12 (13,720)</td>
<td>9 (11,930)</td>
<td>6 (2,230)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result differences in rates of parental drug misuse among gang associated CYP may seem small compared to other CYP, simply because these children are on average older. However this rate may still be higher than we would expect for a group of children with this older age profile. To account for this, results are only presented below where they are statistically significant after taking differences in age, gender and ethnicity into account.

Furthermore, both samples are reasonably large and there are a large number of comparisons being performed. As a result the traditional p value threshold of less than 0.05 risks highlighting differences that are small in magnitude and increases the risk of a difference simply being the result of chance. To avoid this, differences are only highlighted as significant when p values are less than 0.0001. This is a slightly arbitrary adjustment but it ensures that only reliable differences are commented on.

Findings: Numbers of children identified

Key point:

> Regardless of the cohort examined, these groups encompass a small proportion of the 27,000 children estimated to be involved with gangs by the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW)

The two data sets provide indications of the current scale of children being worked with by children’s services and YOTs.

CIN census:

> 6,850 CYP aged under 18 had gangs identified as a factor at their latest assessment in 17/18 (5,230 aged 10-17). This is 2% of children with any factors identified.
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**YOT data:**

- 2,420 CYP aged under 18 were identified as gang associated at their latest Asset Plus assessment in the 12 months to September 2018. This is 12% of children assessed.

**Overlap between YOT and CIN samples**

**Currently CIN**

- 19% of children identified as gang associated at their latest Asset Plus assessment were currently identified as a child in need. This is significantly higher than the rate for other young offenders, though still only represents 1 in 5 gang associated CYP.

*Table 8: Children currently identified as a child in need in the YOT sample. Missing = 2%*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently identified as a child in need</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
<td>19 (460)</td>
<td>13 (1,330)</td>
<td>14 (900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td>79 (1,900)</td>
<td>85 (8,790)</td>
<td>82 (5,420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet to clarify</td>
<td>2 (40)</td>
<td>2 (180)</td>
<td>4 (270)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Currently on CPP**

- 11% of children identified as gang associated at their latest Asset Plus assessment were currently on a child protection plan. This is significantly higher than the rate for other young offenders, though still only represents 1 in 9 gang associated CYP.

*Table 9: Children currently on a child protection plan in the YOT sample. Missing = 4%*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently on a child protection plan</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
<td>11 (260)</td>
<td>6 (620)</td>
<td>7 (440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td>86 (2,030)</td>
<td>91 (9,210)</td>
<td>88 (5,730)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet to clarify</td>
<td>3 (70)</td>
<td>3 (290)</td>
<td>6 (380)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Currently in care**

- 13% of children identified as gang associated at their latest Asset Plus assessment were currently subject to a care order. This is significantly higher than the rate for other young offenders, though still only represents 1 in 8 gang associated CYP.
Table 10: Children currently subject to a care order in the YOT sample. Missing = 3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently subject to a care order</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
<td>13 (310)</td>
<td>10 (1030)</td>
<td>10 (640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td>86 (2,060)</td>
<td>89 (9,100)</td>
<td>88 (5,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet to clarify</td>
<td>1 (20)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>2 (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accommodated by local authority under section 20

Table 11: Children currently accommodated by voluntary agreement with parents (section 20). Missing = 3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently accommodated under s20</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
<td>13 (300)</td>
<td>10 (1000)</td>
<td>9 (610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td>86 (2,050)</td>
<td>89 (9,080)</td>
<td>88 (5,770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet to clarify</td>
<td>2 (40)</td>
<td>1 (140)</td>
<td>3 (210)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of CYP identified by children’s services and youth offending teams

The tables above demonstrate a degree of overlap in children known to youth offending teams as well as children’s services. Overall, 48% of gang associated CYP assessed by YOTs are recorded as currently being in contact with children’s services in any of the above forms.

Gap between survey estimated prevalence and identified gang associated CYP

Key point: Regardless of which estimate of identified gang associated CYP is used, this suggests a notable gap between the number of children who self-identify as gang members and those identified by children’s services or youth offending teams.

Adding together gang associated children (aged 10-17) amongst both the YOT and CIN cohorts and removing the overlap estimated above suggests that, overall, 6,480 children were in contact with either youth offending teams or children services. After upscaling this number to account for the 7 missing YOTs this gives a combined total of 6,560 gang associated CYP identified by either YOTs or children’s services.

It could be argued that this is a lower bound estimate of the children identified by these services. Potential issues with this estimate are:

> Current gang associated CYP may have an open episode with children’s services/YOTs but have not been assessed during the year

\[\text{Calculated as } 5230 + 2420 \times \frac{137}{130} \times (1 - 0.48)\]
The time periods of the 2 data sources differ slightly
YOT data is missing 7 youth offending teams and rates may not be similar in these missing YOTs

To examine how much this is likely to matter we can look at broader estimates of the stock of gang associated children. This requires some assumptions given available data, however one estimate of this is:

Number of children (aged 10-17) with a CIN episode open at any point in the year to March 2018 where gangs has ever been identified as a factor at assessment. This is calculated based on:

- 0.96 (the ratio of children with gangs as a factor at assessment to their episodes in 2016/17) multiplied by
- the proportion of children with gangs as a factor at assessment aged 10-17 (76% - Table 1) multiplied by
- 8,650 open CIN episodes during 2017/18 where gangs was a factor at assessment.

PLUS

12% of the total YOT caseload for the year to March 2018 minus the 48% overlap between children services and youth offending teams estimated above.

This results in a slightly higher estimate of 7,980 children identified, though this is likely an over-estimate given that CIN assessments can have been several years previously.

The most recent available estimate from the Crime Survey for England and Wales suggests that 27,000 children aged 10-17 self-identified as members of a gang in the year to March 2017. However, this excludes those that may not self-identify as gang members but may still be at risk either through sibling relationships or through knowing a gang member and being involved in violence. Recent figures from ONS put the scale of these populations at:


Full calculation = (0.96*0.76*8650) + (0.12*26681*0.52)


> 34,000 know a gang member and have been a victim of violence in the last 12 months
> 60,000 either self-identify as a gang member or know a gang member who is a sibling

What is clear is that whichever estimates of prevalence and identified children are used, there remains a large gap between prevalence and those being identified by services (Table 12).

**Table 12: Gaps between prevalence estimates and estimates of gang associated children identified by services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children identified by services</th>
<th>Prevalence estimates</th>
<th>Prevalence estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-identify as gang members</td>
<td>Know a gang member and have been a victim of violence in the last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low estimate of identified children</td>
<td>Gap = 20,440</td>
<td>Gap = 27,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High estimate of identified children</td>
<td>Gap = 19,020</td>
<td>Gap = 26,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, it may also be that children are self-identifying as gang associated without being involved in illegal activity. The last available dataset to allow this to be tested was the Offending Crime and Justice Survey 2006 (OCJS). This survey asked much more extensive questions about the nature of groups children aged 10-17 identified as part of.

From this survey, we can estimate the prevalence of children aged 10-17 who report that they:

> Are in a group of 3+ people
> Commit violence or threats in order to rob, carrying knives/guns or selling drugs
> Realise the activities are illegal
> And think of the group as a gang

The lower bound estimate of this was 0.7%, which in 2006 equated to 36,000 children aged 10-17. As a result this prevalence figure would have had to have decreased by approximately a factor of 5 over the past 10 years for there to be no gap between this number and the number of identified gang associated CYP. The existing indicators of gang/youth violence do not suggest this is the case – see, for example, Figures 1 and 2 below.

---

9 Note: we have assumed that all those self-identifying as a gang member also know a gang member. The effect of this assumption is likely to be minor but means this is likely an under-estimate of the true size of this group. This is calculated as 0.109*percentages that knew a gang member in March 2017 estimates
Figure 1: Numbers of children aged 10-17 proceeded against for gang related offences since 2007. Source: MOJ Outcomes by offence data tool.

Figure 2: Numbers of children aged 10-17 admitted to hospital for assault with a sharp object 2006/07 - 2017/18. Source: Hospital Episodes Statistics. Note: rates pre 2012/13 have been calculated through pro-rating numbers of 0-14 and 15-59 yr olds using average proportions over the period 2012/13 to 2017/18.
Findings: Characteristics of gang associated CYP

Family factors

Key points:
> Consistently across the family factors examined, these vulnerabilities are at least as prevalent for gang associated CYP as for other young offenders/children referred to social services. This is particularly true when differences in demographics are accounted for.
> For both the CIN and YOT cohorts, parental substance use, neglect and violence towards the young person stand out as being of greater prevalence amongst gang associated CYP than those not gang-associated.
> YOT data provides information on additional family factors not covered in the CIN census. This suggests that offending in the family is much more common amongst gang associated CYP than other young offenders.

Parental substance use

> In both the CIN and YOT data parental substance misuse is significantly more likely to be identified as a concern by practitioners amongst gang associated children, particularly once demographics are accounted for.
> Gang associated CYP have similar rates of parental substance use concerns as other young offenders. However, this hides stark differences due to differences in demographic profile:

Table 13: Children with parental substance misuse concerns recorded at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/carer substance use</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91 (2,150)</td>
<td>93 (9,370)</td>
<td>94 (5,830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (210)</td>
<td>7 (690)</td>
<td>6 (390)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Once differences in age, gender and ethnicity are controlled for, this suggests gang associated children are 68% more likely to have this identified by practitioners as a concern, than would be expected in young offenders with similar demographics.
> The story is similar in the CIN data. Initially, there is no difference in rates of parental substance misuse concerns between gang associated CYP and other children in need until demographics are taken into account.

Table 14: Children with parental substance misuse recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/carer drug misuse</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88 (6,030)</td>
<td>88 (325,070)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (820)</td>
<td>12 (42,660)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After controlling for age, gender and ethnicity gang associated CYP are 41% more likely to also have parental/carer substance misuse identified as a factor at assessment than would be expected in a similar cohort of non-gang associated CYP.

Across both samples overall, 11% of gang associated CYP had parental substance misuse identified as a concern or a factor at assessment by practitioners.

### Parental alcohol misuse

The evidence for links with parental alcohol misuse are less clear though gang associated children are at least as likely to have this identified at assessment as other children in need/young offenders. Regarding parental alcohol misuse, rates are similar amongst gang associated and non-gang associated young offenders. However, once differences in demographic profiles are accounted for, this suggests gang associated CYP are 43% more likely to have this flagged as a concern. Gang associated CYP are slightly less likely to have parent/carer alcohol misuse identified as a factor at assessment, though again this difference becomes non-significant when differences in demographics are taken into account.

Table 15: Children with parental alcohol misuse recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/carer alcohol misuse</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91 (6,240)</td>
<td>87 (320,380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (610)</td>
<td>13 (47,360)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across both samples overall, 9% of gang associated CYP had parental alcohol misuse identified as a concern or a factor at assessment by practitioners.

### Parental mental health issues

The two samples differ on the relationship between gang membership and parental mental health issues, though together they suggest that once demographics are accounted for gang associated children are at least as likely to have parental mental health concerns identified by practitioners.

Once demographics are accounted for, gang associated CYP are 48% more likely to have parental mental health identified as a concern compared to non-gang associated young offenders.

Table 16: Children with parental mental health concerns recorded at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/carer mental health concerns</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81 (1,900)</td>
<td>85 (8,600)</td>
<td>87 (5,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19 (450)</td>
<td>15 (1,460)</td>
<td>13 (810)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amongst children assessed by children’s services, gang associated CYP are slightly less likely to have parental mental health identified as a factor at assessment. However, this difference becomes non-significant when age, gender and ethnicity are accounted for.
Table 17: Children with parental mental health recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/carer mental health concerns</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78 (5,360)</td>
<td>75 (274,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 (1,490)</td>
<td>25 (93,430)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Across both samples overall, 21% of gang associated CYP had parental mental health identified as a concern or a factor at assessment by practitioners.

**Domestic violence/abuse towards parent/carer**

Similarly, together these two samples suggest that once demographics are accounted for gang associated children are at least as likely to have domestic abuse towards a parent/carer identified as a concern by practitioners.

> 24% of young offenders flagged as gang associated were known to have witnessed domestic abuse. Once differences in demographics are accounted for this is 37% more common in gang associated CYP than other young offenders.

Table 18: Children known to have witnessed domestic abuse recorded at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known to have witnessed domestic abuse</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76 (1,800)</td>
<td>80 (8,080)</td>
<td>83 (5,120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24 (550)</td>
<td>20 (1980)</td>
<td>17 (1080)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> In contrast, gang associated children referred to children’s services are less likely to have domestic violence against a parent/carer identified at assessment. However, while initial rates are lower, this becomes small and borderline non-significant given the number of tests performed (p = 0.002) when demographics are accounted for.

Table 19: Children with domestic abuse where the parent/carer was the subject recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/carer subject to domestic violence</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79 (5,420)</td>
<td>69 (254,040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 (1420)</td>
<td>31 (113690)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
> Across both samples overall, 21% of gang associated CYP were known to have witnessed domestic abuse or had domestic abuse against a parent identified as a factor at assessment by practitioners.

Neglect

In both the CIN and YOT samples, neglect and the young person’s basic care needs not being met are significantly more prevalent amongst children that are gang associated than among those not gang associated.

Table 20: Children with concerns about their basic care needs not being met recorded at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young person basic care needs not being met</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89 (2,090)</td>
<td>93 (9,330)</td>
<td>93 (5,790)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (260)</td>
<td>7 (720)</td>
<td>7 (400)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Once differences in demographics are accounted for, gang associated CYP are 76% more likely to have their basic care needs not being met flagged as a concern than other young offenders.

Table 21: Children with neglect recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neglect identified at assessment</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78 (5,340)</td>
<td>83 (304,870)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 (1,500)</td>
<td>17 (62,860)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Similarly, CYP recorded as gang associated in the CIN census are 48% more likely to have neglect identified at assessment than other children of a similar demographic profile referred to children’s services.

> Across both samples overall, 20% of gang associated CYP had their basic care needs not being met as a concern or neglect as a factor identified at assessment by practitioners.

Offending in the family

Gang associated CYP are notably more likely to have family members who have offended and to be living with known offenders, compared to those who are not gang associated.

Table 22: Children with offending in the family recorded as a concern at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offending by family members</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69 (1,620)</td>
<td>80 (8,060)</td>
<td>81 (5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31 (740)</td>
<td>20 (2040)</td>
<td>19 (1200)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once differences in demographics are accounted for, gang associated CYP are 60% more likely to have this flagged as a concern in their latest Asset Plus assessment.

There is also evidence that these CYP are also more likely to be living with known offenders. Once differences in demographics are taken into account, gang associated CYP are 2x more likely to have concerns about them living with known offenders recorded by practitioners.

Table 23: Children where living with known offenders is recorded as a concern at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living with known offenders</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83 (1,910)</td>
<td>91 (9,160)</td>
<td>93 (5,840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17 (390)</td>
<td>9 (850)</td>
<td>7 (440)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violence towards the young person

In both the CIN and YOT samples violence towards the young person from family members is more prevalent amongst children that are gang associated than those not

Gang associated CYP are more likely to have parental violence or abuse towards them flagged as a concern by practitioners. After differences in demographics are taken into account, they are 41% more likely to have this recorded as a concern than other young offenders.

Table 24: Children where parental/carer violence towards the young person is recorded as a concern at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental/carer violence or abuse towards young person</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85 (1,990)</td>
<td>88 (8,870)</td>
<td>90 (5,560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 (360)</td>
<td>12 (1190)</td>
<td>10 (630)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a similar difference highlighted in the CIN data. After differences in demographics are taken into account, gang associated CYP are 39% more likely to have this recorded as a concern than other CYP referred to children’s services.
Table 25: Children where domestic violence where the child is the subject is recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic violence: child subject</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85 (5,830)</td>
<td>88 (323,180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 (1,020)</td>
<td>12 (44,560)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Across both samples overall, 15% of gang associated CYP had violence towards them from a parent or carer identified as a concern, or domestic abuse where the child was the subject identified as a factor at assessment by practitioners.

Any family factors

> 58% of gang associated young offenders have any of the above family factors recorded at their latest assessment. After differences in age, gender and ethnicity are accounted for, this is 42% more likely than other young offenders.

> Gang associated children are as likely to have any family factors identified at their latest children’s services assessment. 47% of gang associated CYP have any of the above family factors recorded at their latest children’s services assessment. This is slightly lower than the rate for non-gang associated CYP though this difference becomes small and borderline non-significant (p = 0.02) once age, gender and ethnicity are taken into account, suggesting this difference is explained by demographic differences.

Any of the ‘toxic trio’ factors

> Recently, the ‘toxic trio’ issues (combinations of parental mental health, parental drugs/alcohol misuse and domestic violence in the home) have been cited as a major driver of the increases on children’s services caseloads and the numbers of children being taken into care (ADCS, 2016), and have also been frequently cited as a factor in serious case reviews (Sidebotham et al., 2016).

> 36% of gang associated CYP included in returns from YOTs have any of the toxic trio factors recorded at their latest assessment. After differences in age, gender and ethnicity are accounted for, this is 39% more likely than other young offenders.

> Similarly to any family factors, gang associated children are as likely to have any of the toxic trio factors identified at their latest children’s services assessment. 36% of gang associated CYP have any of the above family factors recorded at their latest children’s services assessment. This is lower than the rate for non-gang associated CYP though this difference becomes notably smaller once age, gender and ethnicity are taken into account, suggesting this difference is largely explained by demographic differences.

Young person’s current housing

Key point:

> **YOT data suggests that gang associated CYP are at greater risk of housing related vulnerabilities than would be expected in other young offenders with the same demographic profile**

   – Note: the CIN census holds nothing on young people’s housing situation, so the analysis below is only possible for the YOT data.
Instability in CYP’s current housing

> 22% of gang associated CYP have housing instability identified as a concern by practitioners. When differences in demographics are taken into account, this is 62% more common than for other young offenders.

Table 26: Children where housing instability is recorded as a concern at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing instability</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78 (1,790)</td>
<td>85 (8,560)</td>
<td>86 (5,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 (510)</td>
<td>15 (1460)</td>
<td>14 (880)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety of housing

> 10% of gang associated CYP have unsafe or unhealthy housing identified as a concern by practitioners. When differences in demographics are taken into account, this is 87% more common than for other young offenders.

Table 27: Children where unsafe or unhealthy housing is recorded as a concern at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsafe or unhealthy housing</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90 (2,070)</td>
<td>94 (9,450)</td>
<td>94 (5,930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 (230)</td>
<td>6 (560)</td>
<td>6 (350)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Living in short term or temporary housing

> 14% of gang associated CYP have concerns about short-term/temporary housing identified as a concern by practitioners. When differences in demographics are taken into account, this is twice as common as for other young offenders.

Table 28: Children where short term/temporary housing is recorded as a concern at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term/temporary housing</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86 (1,990)</td>
<td>93 (9,340)</td>
<td>93 (5,840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 (320)</td>
<td>7 (680)</td>
<td>7 (440)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item 10

Any housing factors

- 32% of gang associated CYP have any of the above family factors recorded at their latest assessment. After differences in age, gender and ethnicity are accounted for, this is 68% more likely than for other young offenders.

Personal risks

Key point:

- As might be expected gang associated CYP are more likely to have risks to their personal safety identified by practitioners. There are particularly strong associations with going missing, drug/alcohol misuse, CSE and trafficking.

Going missing/staying away

- 26% of gang associated CYP have absconding or staying away listed as a concern by practitioners in their YOT assessments. After differences in demographics are taken into account, they are 2.2 times more likely than other young offenders to have this identified.

Table 29: Children where absconding/staying away is recorded as a concern at their latest assessment. Missing = 6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absconding /staying away</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74 (1,700)</td>
<td>88 (8,800)</td>
<td>89 (5,560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (600)</td>
<td>12 (1,220)</td>
<td>11 (720)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The difference is even more stark in the CIN data. After differences in demographics are taken into account, gang associated CYP are more than 9 times more likely to have going missing identified as a factor at assessment than other CYP referred to children’s services.

Table 30: Children where going missing is recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Going missing</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64 (4,390)</td>
<td>97 (357,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36 (2,460)</td>
<td>3 (9,930)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Across both samples overall, 35% of gang associated CYP had absconding/staying away identified as a concern or going missing identified as a factor at assessment by practitioners.

Drug/alcohol use

- 81% of gang associated CYP have substance misuse concerns identified by practitioners at their latest YOT assessment. After differences in demographics are taken into account, this 34% more likely than amongst other young offenders.
Again, this difference is even more stark in the CIN data. 46% of gang associated CYP have drug misuse identified as a factor at assessment. After differences in demographics are taken into account, this 8 times more likely than for other CYP referred to children’s services.

There is a similar association with alcohol misuse. After differences in demographics are taken into account, this nearly 6 times more likely to be identified among gang associated children than among other CYP referred to children’s services.

Across both samples overall, 53% of gang associated CYP had any substance misuse concerns identified as a factor at their latest assessment by practitioners.

CSE and sexual abuse

22% of gang associated CYP also have risk of sexual exploitation identified at their latest YOT assessment. This is 67% more likely than for other young offenders, once differences in demographics (particularly the over-representation of males) are taken into account.

These differences are larger in the CIN data. Gang associated CYP are 5 times more likely to have CSE identified at assessment than other children referred to social services, once demographic differences have been accounted for.
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Across both samples overall, 23% of gang associated CYP had were either judged to be at risk of sexual exploitation or had sexual exploitation recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. This rate is notably higher amongst girls than boys, with 40% of gang associated girls across the 2 samples having CSE recorded as a risk or factor at assessment compared to 15% of boys.

There is also an additional risk of sexual abuse for female CYP associated with gangs, compared to female CYP not associated with gangs amongst those assessed by children’s services. For two girls of the same age and ethnicity, one associated with gangs is 2.4 times more likely to have sexual abuse identified as a factor at assessment than a girl not associated with gangs.

Younger children are also at particular risk of CSE. After accounting for gender and ethnicity, a child under 13 years old that has gangs identified as a factor at assessment is 3.1 times more likely to also have CSE identified at their latest children’s services assessment compared to a non-gang associated child under 13.

Trafficking

Interestingly trafficking is not directly addressed on the Asset Plus assessment. However, the CIN data suggests that gang associated CYP are nearly 11 times more likely to have this identified at assessment than other children referred to children’s services, though the prevalence is small.

Table 33: Children where trafficking is recorded as a factor at their latest assessment. Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trafficking</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94 (6,440)</td>
<td>100 (366,570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 (410)</td>
<td>&lt;1% (1,160)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violence towards the young person from others

The YOT data provides information on violence/abuse directed towards the young person from non-parents. Once demographics are accounted for, gang associated CYP are 65% more likely to have these concerns identified by practitioners at their latest assessment.

Schooling

Key point:

Gang associated CYP are more likely to be in alternative provision, are more likely to have suffered school instability (either through exclusion or mid-year school moves) and are more likely to be absent from school.

Note: schooling measures are quite different between the two samples, so they cannot be combined reliably.

Alternative provision/PRU attendance

Gang associated CYP over-represent amongst children with any time in a PRU in the previous 12 months compared to other children assessed by children’s services (note: this excludes children under 5 and those over 15 as coverage in the NPD becomes more limited).

9% of gang associated CYP have any contact with a PRU in the 12 months before their latest assessment. Once differences in demographics are accounted for, this is nearly 6 times more likely than for other children assessed by children’s services.
Table 34: Children with any time in a PRU in the 12 months prior to their assessment. Missing = 3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any PRU contact in 12 months prior to assessment 5-15</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91 (3,190)</td>
<td>99 (190,030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (300)</td>
<td>1 (1,760)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gang associated CYP also over-represent when compared to other young offenders assessed by YOTs in terms of proportions currently in alternative provision.
- Amongst those where any information on employment training or education was recorded under the age of 16 (n=7,700), 67% of gang associated CYP were in alternative provision at their latest assessment. This is 33% more likely than for other young offenders after differences in demographics are accounted for.

Table 35: Children where alternative provision is recorded as their current education, training or employment status. Missing = 8%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently in alternative provision 10-15</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33 (260)</td>
<td>50 (2,060)</td>
<td>50 (1,230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67 (510)</td>
<td>50 (2,040)</td>
<td>50 (1,220)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mid-year school moves + Exclusions
- Gang associated CYP are more likely to have experienced school disruption either through school moves or exclusion.
- 45% of gang associated CYP (aged under 16) have concerns related to previous school disruptions recorded at their latest assessment. Once demographics are accounted for, this is 59% more likely than for other young offenders.
- The CIN data allows us to separate out disruptions that are due to moving school mid-year and those due to exclusions. Both are more common amongst gang associated CYP (aged 5-15) than among other children assessed by children’s services. 13% of gang associated CYP experienced a mid-year school move in the 12 months prior to their latest assessment. Once demographics are accounted for, they are 55% more likely to experience a mid-year move than other CYP assessed.
Table 36: Children experiencing a mid-year school move in the 12 months prior to their assessment. Missing = 3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any mid-year school moves in the previous 12 months 5-15</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87 (3,040)</td>
<td>92 (175,870)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13 (450)</td>
<td>8 (15,920)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They are also more likely to have been permanently excluded in the previous 12 months. 5% of gang associated CYP had a permanent exclusion in the 12 months prior to their latest assessment. Once demographics are accounted for, this is 5 times more likely than for other children assessed by children’s services.

Absence/participation

- Gang associated CYP are more likely to have attendance/participation issues than non-gang associated CYP.
- Linking the CIN data to the NPD allows us to look at rates of unauthorised absence. Gang associated CYP have notably higher rates of unauthorised absence than non-gang associated CYP in the year prior to their assessment. Gang associated CYP on average missed 25 sessions due to unauthorised absence, compared to 11 amongst non-gang associated children assessed by children’s services. This difference remains significant once differences in demographics are controlled for.

Table 37: Average numbers of unauthorised school sessions missed amongst those with any absence during 2016/17. Base = 177550

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gangs</th>
<th>Mean number of unauthorised sessions missed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gang Associated</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar pattern is also seen in the YOT data, though the measure is more limited. 67% of gang associated CYP had attendance/participation issues recorded at their latest assessment. Once demographics are accounted for, they are 37% more likely to have these issues recorded than other young offenders.

10 This is a more pertinent measure than persistent absence, which will include authorised sessions missed.
Table 38: Children aged 10-15 where attendance/participation issues are recorded as a concern at their latest assessment Missing = 15%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance /participation issues 10-15</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33 (240)</td>
<td>48 (1,730)</td>
<td>48 (1,170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67 (480)</td>
<td>52 (1,860)</td>
<td>52 (1,250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health and disability

> Key point: mental health concerns recurrently over-represent amongst gang associated CYP. They also over-represent amongst those with SEN but without a statement.

Child’s mental health

> In both the YOT and CIN data sets, mental health concerns are more frequently recorded amongst gang associated CYP than would be expected for a cohort with that demographic profile.

– Some evidence from the YOT data that these gang associated CYP are more likely to have mental health concerns identified but this is not reflected in those with contact with MH services or formal diagnoses than other young offenders.

> 67% of gang associated CYP had any mental health concerns identified at their latest YOT assessment. Once demographics are accounted for, they are slightly (14%) more likely to have these issues recorded than other young offenders.

Table 39: Children with mental health concerns recorded at their latest assessment Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental health concerns</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29 (700)</td>
<td>32 (3,280)</td>
<td>30 (2,120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67 (1,620)</td>
<td>65 (6,730)</td>
<td>58 (4,070)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet to clarify</td>
<td>4 (100)</td>
<td>3 (290)</td>
<td>12 (830)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> However, they are also slightly less likely to have any contact with mental health services recorded than other young offenders. This difference is non-significant and remains so when demographics are accounted for (p=0.004).
Agenda Item 10

Table 40: Children with any contact with mental health services recorded at their latest assessment Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any contact with mental health services</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59 (1390)</td>
<td>56 (5,780)</td>
<td>58 (3,830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40 (940)</td>
<td>42 (4,310)</td>
<td>38 (2,470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet to clarify</td>
<td>2 (40)</td>
<td>2 (170)</td>
<td>4 (240)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They are also slightly less likely to have any formally diagnosed mental health condition. This difference is non-significant when demographics are taken into account.

Table 41: Children with any diagnosed mental health condition services recorded at their latest assessment Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any formally diagnosed MH condition</th>
<th>Gang associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
<th>Yet to clarify % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86 (2,040)</td>
<td>82 (8,420)</td>
<td>82 (5,350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (270)</td>
<td>16 (1610)</td>
<td>13 (880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet to clarify</td>
<td>2 (60)</td>
<td>2 (230)</td>
<td>5 (310)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in identified concerns is greater amongst the CIN data set. 26% of gang associated CYP had their mental health identified as a factor at their latest assessment. Once demographics are accounted for, they are 77% more likely to have these issues recorded than other CYP assessed by children’s services.

Table 42: Children with their mental health recorded as a factor at their latest assessment Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child mental health identified as factor at assessment</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74 (5,100)</td>
<td>88 (324,490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (1,750)</td>
<td>12 (43,240)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across both samples overall, 31% of gang associated CYP had mental health concerns identified as a factor at assessment by practitioners.

There are also notably higher rates of self-harm identified as factors at assessment for gang associated CYP. Once demographics are taken into account, gang associated CYP are 2.1 times more likely to have self-harm recorded than other CYP assessed by children’s services.
Table 42: Children with their mental health recorded as a factor at their latest assessment Missing = 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-harm identified as factor at assessment</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89 (6,080)</td>
<td>96 (352,020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (760)</td>
<td>4 (15,710)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Younger children associated with gangs are also at particular risk of mental health issues and self-harm compared to children of a similar age. A child under 13 years old that has gangs identified as a factor at assessment is 2.7 times more likely to also have self-harm identified at assessment compared to a non-gang associated child aged under 13.

- Gang associated children aged under 13 are 80% more likely to have their mental health identified as a factor at assessment compared to non-gang associated children aged under 13.

**SEND**

Key point:

- Gang associated CYP have higher rates of identified Social, Emotional and Mental health difficulties. There are also limited indications that gang associated CYP may be less likely to get statements or EHC plans, when SEN is identified.
  - Note: this analysis is based on CYP with SEN information in the spring census 2017/18.

- Gang associated CYP over-represent on children with social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) difficulties. 23% of gang associated CYP have SEMH identified as their primary SEN type. Once demographic differences are accounted for this is 95% more than other children assessed by children’s services.

- Gang associated CYP are as likely to have any identified SEN as other children assessed by children’s services, once differences in demographics are taken into account.

Table 43: Children assessed by children’s services with valid SEN information in January 2018. Base =211,420

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any identified SEN</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60 (2,020)</td>
<td>66 (136,740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40 (1,360)</td>
<td>34 (71,300)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- However, when gang associated CYP do have SEN identified, they are less likely to have a statement or EHC plan. Of the 40% of gang associated CYP with identified SEN, 80% do not have a statement or EHC plan compared to 70% amongst other children in need. This difference is not fully explained by their demographics or mix of primary SEN types (p<0.0001).
Table 44: Primary SEN type of children assessed by children’s services with any SEN identified in January 2018. Base = 72,670

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEN without statement</th>
<th>Gang Associated % (n)</th>
<th>Not % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20 (280)</td>
<td>30 (21,120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80 (1,080)</td>
<td>70 (50,190)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This analysis provides the most complete picture of the characteristics and scale of currently identified gang associated CYP in England, using datasets that have not been analysed before. It echoes previous work from the Early Intervention Foundation\textsuperscript{11} and Local Government Association\textsuperscript{12} (amongst others) in demonstrating that these are a highly vulnerable group of young people. They repeatedly over-represent on:

- Family related vulnerabilities
- Housing issues
- Personal risks faced
- Being outside of mainstream education
- Issues related to health and disability

There is also evidence that where a need is identified (for example SEN), gang-associated CYP may be less likely to meet thresholds for support. However, this analysis must be caveated by the fact that most measures are subject to variations in practitioner judgement and local area recording practices. This is particularly the case given that there is no consistent definition of a gang association used across areas (this variation amongst gang associated CYP is explored further in Appendix A below). This analysis has done what is possible to account for these local variations, but it remains a limitation of analyses in relation this population.


Appendix A: Differences in characteristics by offending histories of gang associated CYP

- **Key point:** the YOT data allows us to investigate how vulnerabilities differ between gang associated CYP involved with different types of offending.
- This analysis presents a typology of gang associated CYP based on their offending histories, that can be used to provide a summary profile of gang offending in a local area
- Interestingly rates of vulnerabilities are similar across the groups found

**Method**

Youth offending teams also supplied details of the young people’s offending histories alongside the concerns identified by practitioners. This provides indications of the criminal activities that gang associated CYP are involved in, including historic offences, those linked to a current disposal as well as outstanding charges.

Latent class analysis (LCA) provides a data led way of grouping together gang associated CYP with similar offending histories. This has the advantage of allowing the number of groups formed to be guided by patterns in the data. It also provides a predictive model for group membership that can be applied to further samples to be used and/or validated on other cohorts.

To avoid the effect of any duplicate entries in the offending histories, the indicator variables used were whether a gang associated child had any of each of the following types of offence recorded:

- Weapons
- Violence with injury
- Robbery
- Drugs production/trafficking
- Drugs possession

Age was also incorporated into the model as it is likely to be a key determinant of the offending histories of the children, simply because older children are likely to have more extensive histories.

**Choosing the number of groups**

LCA requires that the analyst specify the number of groups and model fit indices are then used to determine whether this number of groups appropriately summarises the patterns of offending histories in the data.

Here, the number of groups was varied from 1 to 9 Figure 3 below demonstrates that the Bayesian information criterion is minimised at 3 groups suggesting this is the most appropriate summary of the offending histories...
The G squared statistic is also non-significant for this number of groups (p = 0.21), providing further evidence for a good fit for 3 groups. Finally, residual correlations between indicators are also low for a 3 group model, suggesting correlations between items are well explained.

It is worth noting that entropy values (a measure of how well separated the groups are) are quite low for this 3 group model (entropy = 0.45). This suggests the groups are not perfectly separated and that there is some uncertainty in the classification of some individuals. To preserve this uncertainty and avoid biasing estimates, the proportions presented below are based on the summed probabilities of each gang associated child being a member of each of the 3 groups.

3 groups of gang associated CYP

- Younger (10-15 yr old) gang associated CYP (51% of the sample) - below average rates on all types of offending except for violence with injury and robbery
- Drug offending gang associated CYP (17% of the sample) - average or below average rates on all types of offending except for drugs possession and drugs trafficking/supply
- Extensive offending gang associated CYP (32% of the sample) - above average rates on all types of offending except for drugs trafficking offences
Preliminary analysis of differences in vulnerabilities by type of gang associated CYP

- Overall the differences in vulnerabilities between CYP involved in different patterns of offending are small, regardless of patterns of offending. They are also nearly always higher than for non-gang associated CYP suggesting that all 3 groups are comparatively vulnerable.

- There are some small but notable differences however:
  - Younger group - at greater risk of sexual exploitation than other 2 groups and highest rates of family concerns
  - Extensive offending group - particular concerns around living with known offenders and schooling
  - Drug offending group - comparatively low rates on most vulnerabilities, with the exception of susceptibility to exploitation and drug misuse concerns.

Demographics

There are notable differences in the gender and ethnic profiles of these 3 groups.

- The younger group are notably more likely to be female and of white ethnicity than the other 2 groups
- The extensive offending group are most likely to be male and of black or mixed ethnicity
Table 45: Demographic differences between 3 groups of gang associated CYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Younger group</th>
<th>Extensive offending group</th>
<th>Drug offending group</th>
<th>Not gang associated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family factors

Overall family factors do not strongly differentiate between the three groups. However, there are some small differences that are noteworthy.

- The extensive offending group have notably higher rates of concerns around living with other known offenders than the other 2 groups.
- The drug offending group have the lowest rates of concerns across all family factors.
- The younger group have the highest rates across the majority of other family factors, though this is likely due to their younger age profile.

Table 46: Differences in identified family factors between 3 groups of gang associated CYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family factor</th>
<th>Younger group</th>
<th>Extensive offending group</th>
<th>Drug offending group</th>
<th>Not gang associated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living with known offenders</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offending by family members</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/carer substance use</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent carer alcohol use</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/carer mental health</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental/carer violence or abuse towards young person</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing domestic violence or abuse</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young person basic care needs not being met</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal risks

There are also some small differences in the risks faced by these gang associated CYP.
The younger group are at notably higher risk of sexual exploitation than the other 2 groups. These have the lowest rates of absconding and drug misuse.

The drug offending group are less at risk of violence directed towards them than the other 2 groups. However, they have equally high risks of drug misuse and going missing as the extensive offending group.

Table 47: Differences in identified personal risks between 3 groups of gang associated CYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal risk</th>
<th>Younger group</th>
<th>Extensive offending group</th>
<th>Drug offending group</th>
<th>Not gang associated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absconding/staying away</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the young person at risk of sexual exploitation</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance misuse concerns</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence abuse towards the young person from others</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health and disability

There are few differences between these groups on health and disability related factors. The one clear pattern however is that the drug offending group seem to under-represent on all factors in comparison to the other 2 groups whose rates are similar.

Table 48: Differences in identified health concerns between 3 groups of gang associated CYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health concern</th>
<th>Younger group</th>
<th>Extensive offending group</th>
<th>Drug offending group</th>
<th>Not gang associated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about unidentified undiagnosed need or difficulties</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have any special educational needs been identified</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health concerns</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mld (base = any identified SEN)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semh (base = any identified SEN)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spld (base = any identified SEN)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified learning difficulties (base = any identified SEN)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School factors

Differences on available schooling factors are clearer.

- The extensive offending group over-represent on both attendance concerns and concerns around school moves and exclusions.
- The younger group are most likely to currently be in alternative provision
- The drug offending group have low rates across the factors included
Table 49: Differences in identified schooling concerns between 3 groups of gang associated CYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schooling concern</th>
<th>Younger group</th>
<th>Extensive offending group</th>
<th>Drug offending group</th>
<th>Not gang associated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance participation issues</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex history e.g moves, disruptions, previous exclusions</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending alternative provision</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerns around how young person relates to others

The YOT data also provides practitioner judgements on concerns relating to how the gang associated CYP relates to others. Again there are differences between the 3 groups:

> The extensive offending group have higher rates of fear of others and controlling Behaviours than the other 2 groups
> The younger group have the highest rates of concerns around giving in to pressure from others
> The drug offending group have comparatively low rates on all concerns, with the exception of concerns around susceptibility to exploitation

Table 50: Differences in identified concerns around how children relate to others between 3 groups of gang associated CYP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Younger group</th>
<th>Extensive offending group</th>
<th>Drug offending group</th>
<th>Not gang associated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear mistrust of others</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives in easily to pressure from others</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over assertive controlling</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susceptible to manipulation/exploitation</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of bullying</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B: Constructing local area measures of gang activity

Currently there are no centrally collected measures of gang activity at a local level in England. However, there are a number of available proxy measures in both recorded crime statistics and children’s services data. Factor analysis is a useful technique for combining together known proxy indicators into summary measures in a data led fashion - rather than having to specify the relative importance of indicators.

Factor analysis assumes that we can’t directly measure gang activity - it acts as an underlying (latent) factor. However, we do have proxies and that the joint variation (correlation) in these proxy measures can be explained by changes in underlying gang activity plus some level of error. This lets us set up a model to predict levels of these
proxy indicators in each local authority if correlations between indicators were explained by this underlying factor. We can then assess how well this model fits based on how well it recreates the observed patterns of these proxy indicators.

It may be though that 1 factor is not sufficient to explain the variation in these proxies and so this model can be varied to have multiple underlying factors, until a good fit is found. However, interpretation is important here as well as indicators of how well the model fits.

The following proxy indicators for gang activity at upper tier local authority level were included in this model:

Recorded crime offences (offences per 1,000 people - source: CSP level police recorded crime open data tables aggregated up to LA level)

> Assault with intent to cause serious harm offences
> Possession of knives offences
> Possession of firearms with intent offences
> Drugs trafficking offences

CIN factors at assessment (all rates per 1,000 children - Source CIN underlying data):

> Going missing
> Gangs
> Socially unacceptable behavior

Table 51 below demonstrates common fit indices for a 1 and 2 factor solution. This suggests that a 2 factor solution is a notable improvement on a single factor:

Table 51: Fit indices for 1 and 2 factor solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of factors</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>BIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2838.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2780.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a geomin rotation, there is a clear interpretation of the 2 factors, which are highly correlated ($r = 0.501$, p<0.001):

1. Police recorded crime indicators of relevant offences
2. Children’s services indicators of children vulnerable to/associated with gangs
These loadings were then used to produce factor scores for local authorities on both summary factors. These scores were calculated in MPlus via an Exploratory Structural Equation Model and the regression method Asparouhov & Muthen 2007. Local authorities were included on the shortlist of areas for surveying if their factor scores were in the top 25% of local authorities on either measure, alongside local intelligence.
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Introduction from Anne Longfield, Children’s Commissioner for England

The Serious Case Review into the death of 14-year-old “Chris” tells a tragic story of a damaged childhood: domestic violence in the home, years in temporary accommodation, serious problems in primary school leading to exclusion from secondary school and grooming by criminal gangs. It describes how by the age of 13, Chris was ordering a Rambo knife and bullet-proof vest from the internet for protection, telling his Mum he was being pressured into selling drugs. In September 2017, he was shot at close range in a playground in East London, and he died later in hospital.

The review into his death makes clear that a system designed to keep vulnerable children like “Chris” safe had failed. This report shows there are thousands of children just like him, putting themselves in the same kind of danger. If we are to turn around their life chances and tackle the scourge of serious violence, county lines drug running and gang activity, we need to know more about who these children are and why they are members of gangs - and how we can keep them safe.

This report investigates what it means to be a child gang member in England. It estimates how many children in England are in gangs, and looks at the risks factors which make it more likely for a child to end up being groomed for gang membership. Finally, it questions whether those responsible for safeguarding children are responding adequately to the rise in gang violence and how children can better be kept safe.

I have been shocked to discover that many of those responsible for the protection of children in their local areas seem to have no idea where to start, despite hundreds of thousands of children being at risk. In this, I draw parallels with CSE a decade ago – before children being sexually exploited were recognised as victims and not perpetrators, and the adults supposed to protect them stopped turning a blind eye to widespread abuse.

Our research presented here estimates there are 27,000 children in England who identify as a gang member, only a fraction of whom are known to children’s services. Their experiences vary widely. For some, being in a gang entails little more than putting a hashtag on social media. For others it can be far more serious and dangerous. Many of the children who identify as gang members feel they have no choice or no better options. Some are groomed and exploited by gangs but never identify as members. Often it is these children, described to me once as ‘collateral’, who are the most vulnerable and at risk.

What our research shows is the vulnerability in these children’s lives. Often they come from families with substance or alcohol abuse problems or where there is domestic violence. They may grow up neglected, in poor housing, sometimes with family members who are associated with gangs or criminal activity. These are children who are more likely to suffer from poor mental health and are more likely to have Special Educational Needs. They are also more likely to be excluded from school. And far from the bold and aggressive stereotype image of a gang member, I have been struck by how visibly fragile many appear in person. It is very clear to me that we are not doing enough to protect them from harm.

Last year, the inspectorates of the police, health, probation and children’s services made a joint call to agencies responsible working with children to “learn from the mistakes of child sexual exploitation” by “treat[ing] children as victims not perpetrators” and “not to underestimate the levels of criminal exploitation in their local areas”. This report shows that those calls have not been heeded. Instead, I find that all the mistakes that led to serious safeguarding failings in relation to CSE in towns up and down the country are

now being repeated. Local areas are not facing up to the scale of the problem, they are not taking notice of the risk factors in front of them, and they are not listening to parents and communities who ask for help.

Tackling gang exploitation needs a paradigm change in thinking, which stops treating these children as criminals responsible for their own situation and instead sets out to protect them.

New local safeguarding arrangements, with a focus on contextual safeguarding, have the potential to make this happen, yet there are few signs that any adequate plans are in place. When we asked 25 Safeguarding Boards in ‘high risk’ areas what they knew about the number of children involved in gangs or in danger of being drawn in, the response was deeply concerning. Not one of them was able to give adequate answers to all of our questions, while several areas with the highest indicators of gang violence had no estimate at all of levels of gang violence in their area. Our data also shows that less than half of child offenders involved in gangs are being supported by children’s services.

The Government needs to face-up to the scale of this challenge, and ensure both the priority and resources are given to helping these children.

The parents I talk to whose children are in gangs are desperate for help - first shocked and then exasperated by the daily calls to one service or another, told repeatedly that nothing can be done to protect their children. The implication is that services will only be able to intervene when things get much worse. One parent told me her child had ended up in A&E with stab wounds, yet still they weren’t offered any help from children’s services. “How much worse does it have to get?” she asked.

These children, whose lives are exploited and whose futures are heading in the wrong direction, do not have a voice. When they do speak privately they say they want to get out. I have even heard of children on cross-country trains carrying drugs to a market town who have deliberately got themselves caught, just so that the nightmare will end. Others have no idea where to look for the escape route. Exploited and manipulated by professional adult criminal gangs, we need to help these children.

It is the duty of politicians and those agencies working with children to look out for the most vulnerable. No child should end up as a headline about gangland murder or the subject of a Serious Case Review simply because nobody thought it was their job to keep them safe.

Anne Longfield OBE
Children’s Commissioner for England
Research methodology

This report draws on the following work undertaken by the Children’s Commissioner and her team over the past 12 months:

- An extensive programme of engagement with children, their families and the professionals working with them in a range of settings including schools and alternative provision, gang diversion programmes, youth custody and family support programmes.
- A bespoke data collection from every Youth Offending Team (YOT) in England asking about the children they are working with and their characteristics. This information provides the biggest sample of known gang members in England currently available.
- A statutory data request made to the Chair of Local Safeguarding Boards in 25 areas with high-levels of suspected gang activity, asking about the information they hold in relation to children and gangs in their local areas.
- A bespoke analysis of the ONS British Crime Survey enabling us to examine the characteristics of self-identifying gang members and those in close proximity to them.
- Examination of data collected in relation to children’s services, schools and education, policing and children’s services relating to known or suspected gang activity.
- Learning from the Serious Case Reviews conducted when a child has died as a result of gang violence.
- Learning from existing research conducted into gangs and child exploitation including joint research from Ofsted, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS), the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP); as well as reports from the Early Intervention Foundation and the Local Government Association, cross-referenced with data collected as part of the Children’s Commissioner’s Vulnerability Framework to enable us to develop a detailed portrait of the children at risk of gangs in England.
Executive summary

1. What does it mean to be a child gang member in England?

Gang membership is complex. For some children, it represents little more than a loose social connection - a hashtag for Instagram. Yet this is the exception. The criminal gangs operating in England are complex and ruthless organisations, which use sophisticated techniques to groom children and chilling levels of violence to keep them compliant. They prey upon marginalised children who have often been let down by multiple agencies. As well as gang members, there are many gang associates and others on the periphery, not given the status of membership but being groomed and exploited by gangs. Many of these children don’t feel that they have any choice about their situation.

2. How many children in England are in gangs?

British Crime Survey data held by the Office of National Statistics suggests that there are 27,000 children in England who identify as a gang member. However, this is not the full story. There are also children who are being groomed and exploited by gangs, but who would not identify as gang members. New analysis by the Children’s Commissioner’s Office of these children on the periphery of gang membership shows:

313,000 children aged 10-17 know someone they would define as a street gang member. Within this group, the following groups are particularly vulnerable:

> 33,000 children who are the sibling of a gang member
> 34,000 children who have been the victims of a violent crime in the past 12 months and either are a gang member, or know a gang member

The group we think that authorities should be most concerned about are the group who are either in a gang or on the periphery of a gang and have experienced violence in the past 12 months. This is 34,000 children in England.

Only a tiny fraction of these children are known to authorities; just 6,560 gang members or associates are known to children’s services or youth offending teams. This means there are more than 27,000 children in England believed to be experiencing gang violence but who are not identified by the authorities.
3. What are the characteristics of children involved in gangs?

While it is important to remember that all children can fall victim to gangs and criminal exploitation, the analysis in this report shows that on the whole gang members are highly vulnerable children with a range of factors increasing their risk of being drawn into gangs.

Comparing children in gangs who are assessed by children’s services with other children referred to children’s services (an already vulnerable cohort) reveals that children in gangs are:

- 95% more likely to have social and emotional health issues
- More than twice as likely to be self-harming
- 41% more likely to have a parent or carer misusing substances
- Eight times more likely to be misusing substances themselves

Comparing children in gangs within the criminal justice system to other young offenders reveals that children in gangs are:

- 76% more likely not to be having their basic care needs met at home (as assessed by a practitioner)
- 37% more likely to have witnessed domestic violence
- 37% more likely to be missing/absent from school

4. Who are the children most at risk of being groomed and exploited by gangs?

Gangs set out to prey on vulnerable children and to exploit their weaknesses. Identifying the factors that make children more susceptible to gangs enables us to identify which children are at the greatest risk: the children who have multiple interlinked vulnerabilities – both at the individual level (such as mental health or special educational needs) and the family level (such as abuse and neglect). These vulnerabilities cause children to act out, or may make them susceptible to gang inducements or threats. These risks can be moderated or exacerbated by whether and how services respond when the child’s needs first emerge. In particular, a child being excluded of off-rolled from school increases their susceptibility to gang violence.

The diagram below shows how gangs exploit children experiencing three particular risk factors:

- Risks around their home environment
- Issues such as mental health
- Children at risk because of a failure of institutions to respond adequately, for example children excluded from school or deprived of much-needed mental health support.
Trends

Across the board data shows that leading indicators – potential ‘early warning signs’ – of gang-based violence have been on the rise in recent years.

- Referrals to children’s services where gangs are identified as a factor at assessment rose 26% between 2015/16 and 2016/17 (from 5,200 to 6,570)
- Permanent exclusions are up 67% compared to 2012/13 (from 4,630 to 7,720)
- Hospital admissions for under-18s who have been assaulted with a sharp object rose 20% between 2015/16 and 2016/17 (from 399 to 483)
- Nationally, the number of 10-17 year olds cautioned/convicted for possession of weapons offences rose 12% between 2016 and 2017 (from 2,763 to 3,088)

5. How have those responsible for safeguarding children responded to the rise in gang violence?

The Children’s Commissioner’s Office (CCO) asked 25 Local Safeguarding Children Boards in ‘high-risk’ areas about their response to gang violence and criminal exploitation – requesting working estimates of the number of children in gangs, on the periphery of gangs and at high-risk of being drawn into gangs and how each group was defined. Responses showed:

- Many areas had no information on the levels of gang activity and risk among children in their area. It was often the areas with the highest indicators of gang violence that had the least knowledge
- Most areas had identified only a handful of children who they believed to be in gangs or at risks of gangs.
- Only one area had a population-level estimate of gang membership - the others based their estimates entirely on individual children who had come to the attention of authorities.
Safeguarding boards also appear to be failing to investigate deaths or serious injuries to children where gang violence is a factor. The lack of serious case reviews following violent the deaths of children killed in gang violence are being properly investigated to ensure that lessons are learnt in terms of protecting other children.

6. What has been the response of national government?

In response to rising levels of youth violence, there have been numerous Government initiatives, and multiple funding streams to try and prevent youth violence. However:

- There are too many small funding pots, all involving large amounts of bureaucracy, with none of the funding streams alone being commensurate with the level of need
- Fragmentation between different Government departments involved in delivering the policy response is hampering national-level initiatives being translated into frontline changes. The Serious Violence Strategy is being led by the Home Office, but much of the delivery is within the responsibility of the Department for Education or Health. Better co-operation is needed.
- In particular there is a need to ensure that resources are available for the family-level interventions the Government have identified as most effective, including ‘Early Help’ within children’s services and the Troubled Families programme.

There are two areas where there is a particular gap between the evidence about what is effective at mitigating gang violence and the current Government response

- Services delivered by health professionals, including CAMHS and family-based therapeutic approaches
- Early-years initiatives to promote healthy child development and good parenting.

7. How can children be kept safe from gang violence?

Once a child is within a gang, extricating them is very hard. While gangs may entice children with money and bribes, once children are involved, they use threats, violence and intimidation to keep children under their control. These children may need a range of interventions, but the single most important thing is for them to have a relationship with at least one trusted adult who can help divert them away from gangs and access other services. Because of this, the children most at risk are those who are isolated and invisible to the authorities, generally let down by multiple agencies.

This report identifies four steps that are needed to stop this happening:

1. Step one is taking a life-course approach. This means recognising that while a child may be drawn into a gang as an adolescent, the underlying reasons they were susceptible to this, almost certainly appeared years earlier. Interventions are needed across a child’s life.
2. Step two is ensuring those agencies in contact with children at each point, are doing their job.
3. Step three is putting in place the local-level co-ordination that ensures steps-one and two occur. This should be responsibility of Local Safeguarding Boards and their successor bodies. There should be a particular focus on identifying the cohort of children in gangs or at greatest risk.
4. Step four is a national coordinated response from Government, as outlined below.
Key Recommendations to Government

Overall, we have found that the Government’s response to serious violence has identified what is needed, but has not yet done enough to ensure that the necessary services are put in place. These are the actions we believe are needed to plug the gaps in what has been provided to date:

1) The Government needs to be clear that child criminal exploitation is a national priority, and lay-out clear expectations for all the organisations working with children - including the police, schools, children’s services and NHS bodies - as to their role. While the Department for Education has put in place the structures to achieve this, the practice is yet to match the theory. To address this the department should:
   a. Be much more explicit about the role of Local Safeguarding Childrens Boards (LCSBs), and their successor bodies, in relation to gangs.
   b. Put more resources into improving knowledge of best practice around interventions for children in gangs, including adolescents at high-risk of absconding from care.
   c. Respond to the forthcoming Exclusions Review by ensuring that schools realise the safeguarding implications of excluding children, and are held responsible for these.

2) The joint inspections from Ofsted, HMIC, the CQC and Probation Inspectorate have been invaluable in identifying what is needed in terms of combating child criminal exploitation. This report recommends that the joint inspections be rolled-out to all areas, starting with the high-risk areas who were unable to respond to our data request for this report. The Department for Education and Home Office should provide the funding to enable this.

3) There needs to be a much greater focus on the early years within the Serious Violence Strategy. Specifically the Department for Education should set a clear target for reducing the number of children beginning school with very low levels of development, along with a strategy for how this can be done, and introduce a national plan for improving SEND identification in the early years.

4) The NHS and Public Health England needs to recognise the importance of health-delivered interventions for combatting youth violence. Health bodies need to be proactive safeguarding partners, working to reduce risks, not just reporting them to other agencies. Specifically, there needs to be: specific referral processes to prioritise CAMHS services for those at risk of gang membership and exclusion; greater focus on CAMHS access and services for under-11s (who may have conduct problems or issues with emotional regulation which may not be recognised by existing services) and processes in place to ensure that services are commissioned for families, including family therapy approaches for young children.

5) The forthcoming closure of the Troubled Families programme represents a serious threat to the support offered to many of the families with greatest gang risk. The government urgently needs to commit to the programme for 2020/21 to stop closure processes beginning from March 2019. Long-term, the future of a family-based approach needs to be ensured and developed.

6) The Department for Education needs to review what level of youth services are required to meet the needs of adolescents at risk of gang violence, many of whom will fall within the remit of Section 17 of the Children’s Act 1989, and ensure that local authorities have the resources necessary to provide this.

7) The Department for Education needs to recognise the importance of ‘Early Help’ services within children’s services, and ensure local authorities have the resources available to provide early help to those with high gang risks. This starting point for this needs to be an understanding of how many families are currently in receipt of early help services, and what those services are.
Question 1: What does it mean to be a gang member in England?

The criminal gangs that are exploiting children are large, complex and ruthless organisations. For the vast majority, vulnerable children who can be used and, if necessary, discarded, are an integral part of their business model. The National Crime Agency estimates that the county lines element of this industry – where drug gangs go outside of their local area to expand their reach – is alone worth more than £500m.

The link between these large, sometimes international networks, and the localised street gangs children encounter is often complex.

This report draws on first-hand accounts of the tactics these gangs use to ensnare children, the sophisticated and fast-evolving techniques of recruitment, invariably backed up by threats and serious violence.

For many children, involvement in these gangs is not a voluntary act. In some areas children are considered members of a gang based purely on their location, their family or their wider associations. One child told us that he was considered in Gang X simply because of the street he lived on. This then determined which streets he could and could not safely travel down and even how he could get to school. If violence broke out between gangs, he would be a target.

In one Alternative Provision unit we attended, the headteacher estimated half of the pupils would consider themselves gang ‘members’. Another third were considered gang ‘runners’, and these tended to be very vulnerable children who could be “collateral”. In one sense, gang membership offered some protection. Yet this does not mean children were exercising their own agency in affiliating with a gang. We met three boys in Merseyside who were close friends at school, but at the end of the school day would have to be put into three different taxis because they were considered to be in separate gangs. Not only could these children not travel home together, not one of them had a safe route home without traversing areas associated with a rival gang.

As gangs have sought to expand their reach, they have also looked to expand their recruitment. When the police become better at spotting traditional gang members, and disrupting their activities, gangs have then recruited a more diverse membership. We have been told that younger children, particularly girls, are being recruited by gangs because their profile makes them less likely to be noticed by the authorities. The techniques for recruiting these children are very similar to grooming for sexual abuse. They will normally start with inducements. In one case, we heard of a written manual, with a clear timeframe for entrapment.

This started with the giving of gifts or praise, the overtures of friendship. On day two, they would protect the child from some danger – real or contrived. By day five, the child would be running an errand, a simple drop in return for some money. On this errand, the gang would arrange for the child to be mugged. The child would lose the money, and would therefore be considered to be ‘in debt’ to the gang.

This “debt bond” has been a common theme of all the gangs we’ve heard about through our research. One particularly disturbing element has been the notion that children who are arrested, and therefore have either money or drugs confiscated from them, are then considered to be “in debt”. We learnt of a child being stabbed in revenge for failure to repay a “debt” arising from an arrest. We have also been told of children in prison still being pursued for their “debt”.

Gangs often exploit the response of agencies to help them gain control of children. For example, when children are arrested or excluded from schools, gangs tell the child that they now have no prospects of getting an education or normal job, and therefore their only choice is continuing with the gang. We have encountered cases where children have lost opportunities to study, to take up an apprenticeship and even

---

2 The relationship between organised crime and urban street gangs is discussed in more detail under Question 2.
to join the Army because of criminal sanctions imposed for relatively minor crimes. Each time this happens, it closes off a route out for the child involved.

We have heard from children who, having been arrested, have been asked for information by the police, and believe that they need to provide this information to reduce their punishment. Yet these children were conscious of the risks associated with doing this - they believed that the gangs were deliberately feeding false information to different children, so that if it was acted on by the police they would know the “snitch”. For those children suspected of being a “snitch” redistribution could be brutal, against either them or their families. The murder of Abraham Badru⁴ is believed to have been in retribution for having prevented the gang-rape of a girl ten years previously.

The threat of violence is a recurrent issue for children hoping to extricate themselves from gang association. Often for children who have been extensively involved in gangs, they must face up to the threat of reprisals, while also dealing with fractures in their home life and education resulting from their gang activity. Frequently, these children have no stability in any aspect of their lives, so staying in a gang appears to be their only option.

Most of these children have parents desperately trying to keep them safe. A recurrent theme of our visits was the frustration of parents who had asked for help which was refused. When they had recognised warning signs – their child having new things, staying out after school or even going missing – agencies had dismissed their concerns. We spoke to parents who had raised concerns for years, but had been given little or no help while they watched as their children received gifts from a suspicious neighbour, then began to miss school, and were then excluded. One mother told us she had asked for help when she found large amounts of cash on her 13-yr old son, but the police believed his explanation that he had made this money stacking crates in a warehouse. Crates his mother pointed out he could not have lifted. Again and again these parents had sought help but found that the first time agencies engaged with them was when their child was arrested. One parent told us of the relief when her son was arrested because finally someone professional was taking an interest. This relief was tempered by the knowledge that her son’s criminal record could seriously undermine his life-time prospects.

In more serious cases, we have been contacted by parents who believe their child is in serious and imminent danger, including cases where children have been the victims of serious assaults and stabbings. Yet they still do not feel that they are being helped to protect their child.

Case study: Chris, London

Chris grew up in London. His early childhood was highly disrupted, with the family frequently moving between different types of emergency accommodation provided by the local authority, across his home borough and other parts of London. He lived with his mother and sister, contact with his father having stopped when Chris was 9, after a long history of domestic violence. There were also allegations that Chris’ mother hit him.

Chris had extensive special educational needs, including ADHD and a conduct disorder. This led him to act up and self-harm while at primary school. Despite these challenges, the primary school provided a range of specialist support to help Chris manage. Unfortunately this support did not follow Chris to secondary school, where there was “little evidence that his SEND (special educational needs and/or disabilities) needs were fully understood or met”⁵ and therefore Chris’ behaviour became increasingly difficult as he struggled to manage his own temper. He received multiple fixed-term exclusions; at age 13 he was transferred to a
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⁴ https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-43894344
pupil referral unit. Chris did have appointments with a clinical psychologist for his ADHD, who also tried to get support for his family in the form of referrals to talking therapy and substance misuse support.

Shortly after starting at the Pupil Referral Unit, police became aware that Chris was associating with older, known gang members. This, combined with concerns about Chris’ behaviour led police to refer Chris to children’s services who decided not to hold a child protection conference but to refer Chris to the Youth Offending Team. He was aged 13. Police reports from the time report that Chris was believed to be being targeted by gangs because he was easily influenced. Shortly after this Chris was arrested for a sexual assault. The police did not take this forward but did again refer him to children’s services. They in turn referred Chris to family support services, who closed the case after one visit. In the same month Chris’ school also asked for help with his behaviour, with a particular concern that he was interested in knives. This was referred to the Youth Offending Team, who visited once but then also closed the case.

A few weeks later, Chris went missing from his mother’s home for a week. His mother called the police and children’s services. On his return home, the police spoke to Chris who refused to say where he had been. After a fight with his mum shortly after, children’s services again made an assessment but did not intervene and Chris went to live with his uncle.

At this point Chris was not attending school, but rather was a “virtual pupil” at his PRU. He told his mother that he has been pressured into selling drugs and his mother found, and then disposed of, £600 of Class A drugs. Children’s services record that Chris believed his life was in danger. The Metropolitan Police raided Chris’ house and recovered items connected to several robberies. They recorded Chris on the gangs matrix. However, because Chris was now living with his uncle in a different borough, all support was withdrawn. Neither children’s services nor the youth offending team continued to work with Chris, and he was not attending school. Despite the extensive evidence of gang-related criminal activity, Chris was not referred to either children’s services or the youth offending team in his uncle’s area.

Chris’ mother reached out to children’s services for help, saying she was fearful for her son’s life; she asked her housing association if she could be moved so Chris could live with her away from the gangs. This did not occur. Instead, at this point Chris entered a spiral of violence and increased criminality, including possession of a knife, and then of acid; both times Chris said he needed to carry these for his own protection. Chris’ relationship with his uncle broke down and he moved back to his home borough, despite telling authorities he feared for his life because of gangs. He was shot and killed less than two months later. He was still only 14.

By the time of his death, Chris had been known to 12 agencies. Yet it appears that the last time Chris had a stable and supportive relationship with any professional was when he was at primary school. After that, numerous organisations from schools to children’s services to the police failed to understand his needs and failed to give him stability, support or protection. Numerous different agencies failed to provide Chris with the type of sustained relationship that may have diverted him for danger. Despite all the warning signs, there was no sustained attempt to get Chris away from gangs or to keep him safe.

The details of Chris’s story are taken from the Serious Case Review into Chris’ death, commissioned by Newham Local Safeguarding Board and is available at http://www.newhamlscb.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Serious-Case-Review-Chris-.pdf
Question 2: How many children in England are in gangs?

Identifying the total number of children in gangs poses both practical and conceptual problems. The children we want to identify are those for whom being in a gang is a defining characteristic, such that it dictates large elements of their behaviour, and in turn exposes them to huge risk, both in the short and long term. This is not all children who identify as gang members. Some children use the term “gang” to signify a simple social association.

The Government guidance “Safeguarding children and young people who may be affected by gang activity”⁶ (published in 2010) distinguishes between:

- ‘Peer Group’ – a relatively small and transient social grouping which may or may not describe themselves as a gang depending on the context
- ‘Street Gang’ – “groups of young people who see themselves (and are seen by others) as a discernible group for whom crime and violence is integral to the group's identity”
- ‘Organised Criminal Gangs’ – “A group of individuals for whom involvement in crime is for personal gain (financial or otherwise). For most crime is their ‘occupation’”

The relationship between these different layers is complex. ‘Street Gangs’ as defined here will often recruit from particular ‘peer groups’ to the degree that in many areas any form of peer group will involve some loose association with a ‘street gang’. This situation can be extremely fluid, as different gangs jostle for control of areas or merge, meaning there is often a large degree of flux⁷. It is often the children on the periphery who are groomed by gangs, and end up in the greatest danger, but may not ever either consider themselves, or be considered full gang members.

Though the exact form of ‘street gangs’ may vary, three elements are almost invariably present: violence, drugs and geographical definition⁸. It is often these elements which form the basis of the link back to the organised criminal gangs who are those providing the supply of drugs and are those making huge money from the violence on our streets.

Notwithstanding the challenges outlined above, it is vital that we get the most accurate possible estimation of the number of children who are at real risk of harm in street gangs, or on the periphery of such gangs.

The starting point for estimating this group is the number of children who identify themselves as being in a street gang. **There are 27,000 children in England who identify as a member of a street gang** (aged 10-17⁹). This definition of street gang is based on a group of young people who hang around together and:

- have a specific area or territory;
- have a name, a colour or something else to identify the group;
- possibly have rules or a leader;
- who may commit crimes together.

---


⁷ For an interesting discussion of these issues see Home Office research conducted with Community Safeguarding Partnerships https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/491802/horr88.pdf

⁸ See above

However, we have to recognise that not all children who are involved in street gangs are involved in serious violence or criminal activity. More importantly, we also have to recognise that there are many children involved with gangs and being exploited who do not self-identify as gang members. These are likely to be drawn from the much larger group of 313,000 children who know someone they would define as a street gang member. Within this group, we can also identify:

- 33,000 children who are a sibling of a gang member
- 34,000 children who are either a known gang member or know a gang member and have been the victim of violent crime in the past 12 months.

The latter group is of particular importance. As discussed under Question 1, gang association is complex. Children on the periphery of gangs may be the most vulnerable, equally not all children who identify as gang members are at risk of violence or exploitation. Therefore, the group we think that authorities should be most concerned about are the group who are either in a gang or on the periphery of a gang and have experienced violence in the past 12 months. This is 34,000 children in England.

Identification of gang members

We have compared these population-level estimates of gang association with numbers of children identified. Gang members may become known to either children’s services or the criminal justice system (through the police, but handled by the Youth Offending Team). For the purpose of this report, we have combined data from youth offending teams and children services:

1. Children referred to children’s services with an assessment in the 12 months to March 2018, using data from the Children in Need Census.
2. Children assessed by YOTs in the 12 months to September 2018 using the Asset Plus process. This is previously unanalysed data sourced from 130 of 137 Youth Offending Teams in England.

This has enabled us to identify:

- 5,230 children aged 10-17 who are known to children’s services and had gangs identified as a factor at their latest assessment
- 2,420 children aged 10-17 were identified as gang associated by their Youth Offending Team (YOT).
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10 Note that this has been estimated pro rata for all 10-17 year olds, but is based on 10-15 and 16-24 year olds in the CSEW, year to March 2017 (link).
11 Both of these figures are estimated pro rata for all 10-17 year olds, but are based on 10-15 year olds in CSEW March 15/16 – March 17/18. Source: ONS, (link). The figure is for children who know a gang member and report having been a victim of violence. We cannot exclude from this known gang members, and as all gang members will also know a gang member, we have presumed this figure will include some gang members.
12 Asset plus is a standardised assessment framework used by Youth Offending teams (YOTs) in England and Wales. This assessment is required for all children receiving either an out of court disposal or a court sentence. These are regularly reviewed and includes practitioner recorded information on (amongst other things):
   - Child’s demographics
   - Any known gang associations of the child
   - Personal, social and family factors affecting the child – including school, housing and health related vulnerabilities
   - Child’s offending
13 The methodology for this is explained in greater detail under question 4.
14 The figure is 6850 children if we include all children. However we excluded children under 10, on the assumption that the gang risk identified at assessment was more likely to relate to parents or siblings than the child themselves.
When we combined these figures and remove overlaps, this results in a cohort of 6,560 children who are involved in gangs and known to the authorities.

This means that just 1 in 4 gang members is identified by authorities. In reality the under-identification is likely to be greater still. Both YOTs and children’s services identify ‘gang association’, this is any situation where a gang poses a risk to a young person, this could be a gang member, gang sibling or gang associate. The group of children at highest risk are the gang members or associates who have also experienced violence. There are 34,000 such children in England, even if we assume all those identified (6,560) fit within this category, this still leaves more than 27,000 children in England thought to be experiencing gang violence but not known to authorities.

Figure 1, below, outlines what the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) reveals about the total population of children in England who are either in a gang, or known to a gang member, combined with Children’s Commissioner’s Office analysis of the gang members identified by local areas. It shows that those children identified by the authorities represent only a tiny proportion of the overall number of children who are either in gangs, or exposed to risk from gangs.
Question 3: What are the characteristics of children involved in gangs?

The data collection from Youth Offending Teams and examination of the Children in Need census represents the most up to date information available on children identified by YOTs and children’s services and the largest sample of known gangs associates in England. This data also enables us to compare these children to others assessed by social services/youth offending teams to examine vulnerabilities that are more common amongst gang associated children even when compared to other already vulnerable children.

It builds on recent work by the Early Intervention Foundation, the Local Government Association as well as others and gives the most complete picture of the scale and characteristics of the group of children identified as gang associated in England today.

In both cohorts, information on gang association was taken from the child’s latest assessment during the period. This is to give the maximum amount of time for gang association to be identified by a practitioner.
Key Findings from this analysis

1. **The scale of those identified is relatively small compared to estimated prevalence.** As discussed under Question 3, the 6,560 children in gangs who are known to either or both of children’s services and YOTs, is less than 1 in 4 of the estimated number of child gang members.

2. **Gang risk is still a small element of children’s services and YOTs’ workload:**
   - Just 2% of children known to children’s services have gangs identified as a factor
   - Just 12% of young offenders have are identified as gang associates.

Less than half – 48% – of children assessed by YOTs as being gang associated are also currently known to children’s services in some form\(^{15}\).

3. **Children in gangs are generally extremely vulnerable.**

Children in or associated with gangs are some of the most vulnerable in the country. Even compared to other children known to children’s services, they are at greater risk of from factors relating to their family or home environment. Gang associated children are more likely to experience\(^{16}\):

   - **Parental substance misuse:** 68% more likely to have this identified than other young offenders and 41% more likely than other children assessed by children’s services
   - **Neglect:** 76% more likely to have their basic care needs not being met flagged as a concern than other young offenders, 48% more likely to have neglect identified at assessment than other children assessed by children’s services.
   - **Violence towards them within the home:** 41% more likely to have violence from a parent identified as a concern than other young offenders; 39% more likely to have domestic violence where the child is the subject recorded as a factor at assessment than other children assessed by children’s services.
   - **Offending in the family:** 60% more likely to have this flagged as a concern than other young offenders and twice as likely to be living with known offenders.
   - **Housing instability:** twice as likely to have short term/temporary housing listed as a concern than other young offenders.

Gang associated children are also more likely to be vulnerable due to their schooling situation:

   - **School instability:** 55% more likely to experience a mid-year school move in the 12 months prior to their assessment than other children assessed by children’s services and 5 times more likely to have had a permanent exclusion in the previous academic year (aged 5-15).
   - **Alternative Provision attendance:** 6 times more likely to currently be in alternative provision in the 12 months prior to their assessment than other children assessed by children’s services (aged 5-15).

Gang associated children are also at greater risk of mental health difficulties:

   - **Mental health:** 77% more likely to have the child’s mental health identified as a factor at assessment than other children assessed by children’s services. They are also 95% more likely to have Social, Emotional and Mental health issues identified as a primary SEN need than other children assessed by children’s services.

---

\(^{15}\) This includes those recorded as currently a child in need, subject to a child protection plan, under a care order or accommodated under Section 20 at their latest assessment.

\(^{16}\) Note: all comparisons presented are relative risks after differences in age, ethnicity and gender are taken into account.
> **Self-harm**: Twice as likely to have self-harm recorded as a factor at assessment than other children referred to social services

There is some evidence that they are less likely to be receiving support for these difficulties:

> Only 20% of gang associated children with any SEN have a statement or Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan, compared to 30% of other children assessed by children’s services with an identified SEN.

These vulnerabilities are also coupled with considerable personal risk:

> **Substance misuse**: 81% of gang associated children have substance misuse identified as a concern at their latest asset plus assessment, this is 34% more likely than amongst other young offenders.
> **Going missing**: 36% of gang associated children have “going missing” identified as a factor at assessment. This is 9 times more likely than other children assessed by children’s services
> **Child sexual exploitation or abuse**: 23% of gang associated children have child sexual exploitation recorded as a factor at assessment. This is 5 times more common than other children assessed by children’s services.

Limitations

This analysis provides the most complete picture of the scale and vulnerabilities of children identified as gang associated in England today. However, it is limited by the quality of the data sources. Key issues with both data sources are:

1. The lack of consistent definitions as to when a child should be recorded as gang associated. Currently this is determined by practitioner judgement.
2. Children receiving an assessment (in either sample) may be determined by local authority recording practices. This is likely more of an issue with the Asset Plus data, whereby some YOTs divert gang associated children to preventative programmes rather than criminalising them.
3. Both datasets suffer from missing data, which may bias results. More detail on this is available in the technical report accompanying this report.
Question 4: Who are the children most at risk of being groomed and exploited by gangs?

Figure 2 on the following page, shows summaries of the risk factors that have been shown to be associated with a greater likelihood of participating in gangs or youth violence. The first table is from research carried out by the Early Intervention Foundation (EIF), while the second is from research by the Local Government Association (LGA). For each table of risk factors, we have overlaid figures from our annual study of childhood vulnerability,\(^\text{17}\) which tracks how many children in England are growing up with different vulnerabilities. The figures provide the best available estimates of the numbers of children living with the risk factors identified.

Some of these factors are themselves indicators of gang involvement – such as previous criminality or a close association with delinquent peers – but many other factors are underlying risks present in the home during childhood, such as family violence and abuse. Our study of childhood vulnerability has found that 2.1 million children in England are living in a household where there is some kind of complex family or parental issue. Among this group are an estimated 100,000 children living with a parent suffering from severe mental health issues, alcohol or drug dependency and domestic violence\(^\text{18}\).

What this shows is that very large numbers of children in England are growing up exposed to risks which could pull them into gangs, and that it is possible to identify the cohorts of children and families where risk is higher. Furthermore, most of these risks can be reduced with the right support at the right time.


\(^{18}\) As above
Figure 2. Risk factors for gang and youth violence, combined with statistics from Children’s Commissioner’s Vulnerability Framework


- **Domain**
  - **Overlapping risk factors**
    - **Individual**
      - Hyperactivity
      - Lack of guilt and empathy
      - Physical violence/aggression
      - Positive attitude towards delinquency
      - Previous criminal activity
    - **Family**
      - Family poverty
      - Family violence and abuse
      - Broken home/change in primary carer
      - Anti-social parents
    - **School**
      - Academic underperformance
      - Low commitment to school
      - Frequent truancy
    - **Peer group**
      - Delinquent peers
      - Commitment to delinquent peers
      - Peer rejection
    - **Community**
      - Neighbourhood disorganisation
      - Availability of drugs

- **Statistics**
  - **471,000** children in material deprivation & severe low income
  - **825,000** children in households affected by domestic abuse
  - **385,000** children who have been physically abused
  - **73,000** children looked after
  - **50,000** children on Child Protection Plans
  - **86,000** children of prisoners
  - **408,000** children in ‘Troubled Families’
  - **740,000** children persistently absent from school
  - **313,000** children who know a gang member
  - **1,090,000** children with an emotional/mental health issue
  - **56,000** children reported missing during the year
  - **167,000** children excluded from school
  - **825,000** children in households affected by domestic abuse
  - **385,000** children who have been physically abused
  - **73,000** children looked after
  - **50,000** children on Child Protection Plans
  - **469,000** children whose parents use substances problematically

The children most at risk have multiple interlinked vulnerabilities – both at the individual level (such as mental health or special educational needs) and the family level (such as abuse and neglect). These vulnerabilities cause children to act out, or may make them susceptible to gang inducements or threats. These risks could be moderated or exacerbated by whether and how services respond when the child’s needs first emerge. For example, a child could be supported within school instead of off-rolled or excluded, they could receive mental health support instead of being turned away, or they could have their special educational needs recognised (and receive appropriate support) instead of being left to struggle.

It is important for agencies to understand that gangs exploit the confluence of these inter-linked factors to recruit or exploit children. Understanding gang risk is therefore about understanding how these factors inter-relate, not just to each other, but also the cohorts of children already in gangs or on the edge of gangs. The Venn diagram in Figure 3 shows the relationship between all of these factors.

**Figure 3. Venn diagram of children at risk of gangs and gang-associated children**

**Trends in vulnerability over recent years**
Across the board data shows that leading indicators – potential ‘early warning signs’ – of gang-based violence have been on the rise in recent years.

- Referrals to children’s services where gangs are identified as a factor at assessment **rose 26% between 2015/16 and 2016/17** (from 5,200 to 6,570)
- Hospital admissions for under-18s who have been assaulted with a sharp object **rose 20% between 2015/16 and 2016/17** (from 399 to 483)
- Nationally, the number of 10-17 year olds cautioned/convicted for possession of weapons offences **rose 44% between 2014 and 2017** (from 2,139 to 3,088) – see Figure 4 below.
> Permanent exclusions rose by 67% between 2012/13 and 2016/17 (from 4,630 to 7,720) – see Figure 5 below.

**Figure 4. Cautions or convictions for possession of weapons**

![Graph showing increase in cautions or convictions for possession of weapons from 2014 to 2017](image)

Source: Ministry of Justice, Outcomes by offence data tool

**Figure 5. Permanent exclusions in England, 2012/13 to 2016/17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary schools</th>
<th>Secondary schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>3,905</td>
<td>4,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>5,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>5,445</td>
<td>6,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>6,385</td>
<td>7,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department for Education, Permanent and fixed-period exclusions in England: 2016 to 2017,
Connecting Gangs and School Exclusions

There is extensive evidence linking school exclusions with gang involvement. According to the Local Government Association:

“The targeting of young people excluded from secondary schools is a major feature in the profile of ‘county lines’. ... In some areas, PRUs become the arena for gang rivalries ... PRUs are also viewed as the place where already vulnerable young people get first hand exposure to and experience of crime (drug dealing /violence/intimidation/ recruitment for ‘county lines’).”

The number of permanent exclusions has increased by 67% from 2012/13 to 2016/17, and has almost doubled among primary schools, as shown in Figure 5 above. Previous research has found that children excluded from school at age 12 are 4 times more likely to be in prison by age 24, and that more than 4 in 5 boys in Young Offender Institutes have been permanently excluded. Furthermore, figures that we have obtained from the Office for National Statistics show that:

- Self-reported gang members aged 10-15 are 5.5 times more likely to have been excluded or suspended in the last year, compared to children aged 10-15 who do not identify as gang members (16% vs 3%)
- Children aged 10-15 who carry knives are 7 times more likely to have been excluded/suspended in the last year, compared to children aged 10-15 who have not carried a knife (23% vs 3%)

Often it is involvement in gangs which prompts a child to be excluded. We have encountered children who have been permanently excluded from school because of poor attendance. At least one of these children was subsequently found by the National Referral Mechanism to have been criminally exploited in these periods.

However, it is equally important to recognise that the act of excluding a child in itself makes that child more vulnerable to gang violence. Being in school places a structure around a child. It provides a child with a set place to be, as well as relationships with trusted adults and peers. Schools have a range of safeguarding responsibilities, which they discharge within the school or by notifying other agencies. All this is lost when a child is excluded or off-rolled. Parents have repeatedly identified this to us as a trigger point, which caused their child to go from some involvement with gangs to full membership. We have heard how being removed from schools has caused children to spend more time with other gang members, allowed children to go missing for long periods and become involved in every more dangerous activities and criminality. We have also seen very different approaches within alternative provision. Some alternative provision provides excellent gang diversion programmes through an innovative and engaging curriculum. Others inadvertently become gang grooming grounds, where children are exposed to other gang members and often placed on part-time curriculums or even become ‘virtual pupils’ – meaning that most of the day they are free to associate with other gang members.

---


Question 5: How have those responsible for safeguarding children responded to the rise of gang violence?

Children in, or being groomed by, gangs are nearly always at significant and immediate risk of harm. The exact nature of this harm may vary, but accounts of gang involvement invariably include some or all of: coercion, emotional abuse, sexual violence, school absence, enforced criminality and physical assaults of various types. All of these forms of harm are recognised in statutory guidance as sufficient to warrant a response from safeguarding authorities.

Primarily, the responsibility sits with local authorities, who are required under the Children’s Act 1989 to protect children at risk. But effective safeguarding needs a multi-agency approach. There is an equally important role for police, health bodies, schools and youth services.

Co-ordinating these bodies is the responsibility of the Local Safeguarding Children’s Board, whose primary responsibility is to “co-ordinate what is done by each person or body represented on the Board for the purposes of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the area”\(^\text{19}\). Specifically, the Board has responsibility for ‘Developing’ policies and procedures for keeping children safe’; ‘communicating’ this to all relevant partners, ‘monitoring’ what is being done and reviewing serious incidents when children have come to harm\(^\text{20}\).

As concern has grown about the need to protect children from gang violence and criminal exploitation, a joint report was issued last year by all the relevant inspectorates: Ofsted, HMI Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS), the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and HMI Probation. The inspectorates were stark in their warning to agencies “not to underestimate the risk of child criminal exploitation in their areas”\(^\text{21}\). It went on to call on local agencies to learn the lessons from sexual exploitation; to treat children as victims, not perpetrators and to remember that all children are at risk.

To look at the local safeguarding response, we issued a statutory data request to the Chairs of 25 Local Safeguarding Boards in areas which we deemed to be “high-risk” of gang violence and criminal exploitation. We asked the boards to provide us with their estimates for:

a) The number of children in their local area who are in gangs

b) The number of children in their local area who are related to gang members

c) The number of children in their local areas who are at high-risk of gangs

In addition, for each group we asked how it was defined, and how many of the children or families within the group were being supported.

As we can’t directly measure gang crime in an area (no national dataset is available) the 25 areas were identified by creating two summary proxy measures based on known risk indicators:

1. Recorded crime offences all offences\(^\text{22}\)
   > Assault with intent to cause serious harm offences
   > Possession of knives offences
   > Possession of firearms with intent offences
   > Drugs Trafficking offences


\(^{22}\) Per 1,000 people. Source: 2017/18 CSP level police recorded crime open data tables aggregated up to LA level, year to March 2018.
2. Children in Need (CIN) factors at assessment
   > Going missing
   > Gangs
   > Socially unacceptable behaviour (where ASB and offending gets flagged at assessment)

The 25 areas, and how they responded, are listed below in order of the level of gang risk we identified. Of the 25 areas where we formally requested data, only 16 responded, including 4 that responded to say they held no relevant information. In nine areas, the Chairs of the LCSB failed to comply with their duty to respond. Others were only able to answer some of the questions posed (marked below as a partial response). As the table below shows, it was often the areas with the greatest gang risk that either failed to comply or had the least information on gangs in their area. Areas which were only able to answer some of the questions are marked as ‘partial responses’.

It is important to note that the responses below only reflect the response of the LCSBs. It is possible that individual safeguarding agencies on the board, such as the local authority or the police, may have collected additional information and this is not known by the LCSB. Therefore a poor response to our request does not necessarily mean a poor safeguarding response across the area, but it does suggest a lack of leadership and co-ordination on the part of the LCSB. Given the complex nature of criminal exploitation, and the need for a multi-agency response, the LCSB should be the body co-ordinating this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Responded to say they had no data on gangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>Failed to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tameside</td>
<td>Very limited information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>Failed to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>Failed to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>Failed to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Responded to say they had no data on gangs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Partial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Full response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Partial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough and Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Partial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Failed to Respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent &amp; Staffordshire</td>
<td>Full response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>Partial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>Full response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Partial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>Partial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Full Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Partial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>Failed to Respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>Very limited information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend-on Sea</td>
<td>Very limited information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Failed to Respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Failed to Respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>Full response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 All rates per 1,000 children. Source: 2017/18 Child in Need Census, underlying data, year to March 2018.
Of those authorities who did respond, the quality of responses varied considerably. The most comprehensive information was provided by Liverpool, who were able to provide a detailed response which broke down gang identification between ‘Organised Crime Groups’ and ‘Urban Street Gangs’. Liverpool had mapped known affiliates of both, and often siblings, across different agencies. Similar definitions were used by Knowsley and Birmingham.

These tended to be the exception. Some areas disputed whether this was a relevant issue for them. None of Manchester, Tameside, Salford, Southend and Hull had a current estimate of gang members in their area. One area said they could not provide any estimates because, while they had a population of children known to be associated with gangs, they could not distinguish between “perpetrators and victims” – in direct contradiction to the Ofsted/HMICFRS guidance that agencies need to recognise that children involved in gangs, in either capacity, were at risk.

Across London and the regional South East areas, we found that local areas did have a working definition of gangs, and were aware of children who were meeting this definition and what agencies they were in contact with. This tended to be small numbers of children, and is discussed in more detail below. Some areas were also able to provide estimates for the number of siblings of these gang members, and some had a small cohort of children whom they knew to be on the fringes of gangs.

Staffordshire was alone in estimating a larger population of children as gang members.

Overall, the responses we received show that very small numbers of gang members are being identified locally. Some London boroughs with high-levels of gang violence estimated gang membership at a dozen children. Some large counties known to be hubs of county-lines activity identified less than twenty. Even large cities only estimated gang membership in the dozens. Staffordshire alone provided a much larger estimate of the number of children in gangs. Almost universally, local safeguarding boards based their estimate of gang membership on the number of children in contact with statutory agencies, normally Youth Offending Teams or Children’s Services. Our responses showed very little attempt to create a population level estimate of gang members within local areas.

Only some areas had made an attempt to identify siblings. Some areas, such as Liverpool, were able to map what contact families had with different agencies. This meant they did know siblings, but only the relatively small numbers who were in contact with statutory agencies. Other areas provided a basic estimate based on known gang members.

Identifying the wider population of gang members again proved problematic, with the estimates provided by local areas being universally low. In addition to Staffordshire, Birmingham, Essex and Croydon all identified a much larger population of children at the edge of gangs or at high-risk of criminal exploitation. A few areas, such as Reading, did identify and quantify the known risk indicators of criminal exploitation, such as registered missing episodes, but these had not been translated into an estimate for an at risk of population. We found little evidence that local areas have a working estimate of the number of children who are at heightened risk of gang exploitation.

Because local areas base their estimates of gang members on the number of children in gangs who are accessing services, universally, local areas reported that 100% of their gang population is being supported by agencies. All areas responded that Youth Offending Teams and Children’s Services worked with gang members, within children’s services most areas specifically recognised the role of ‘early help’ and ‘troubled families’. The other agencies identified as part of the response was more varied. Only four areas identified the voluntary sector as being part of the response to gang risk. Given that some of the most effective interventions working directly with families and providing diversionary activities and support for teenagers are normally delivered by the voluntary sector, this is a particular concern.
Similarly, no response identified any interventions being provided or funded through public health, suggesting either a complete absence of a public-health approach, or a failure to co-ordinate between public health and safeguarding, despite both responsibilities sitting with local authorities. This is despite the national focus on the need for a ‘public health’ approach, building on the perceived success of the model adopted in Glasgow24, and the strong evidence behind a number of health-based interventions.

Responding to Serious Incidents

In addition to pro-actively coordinating a safeguarding response, local safeguarding boards also have a statutory duty to investigate when something has gone wrong, and a child has experienced serious harm or died. The death of any child has to be reviewed, and review occurs “so that bereaved families are supported in their grief, that other siblings and the wider public are protected from similar circumstances, and that reasons for the death are investigated”25. How this process works is in the process of change. The Children and Social Work Act 2017 introduced a new child death review process26, alongside replacement for Local Safeguarding Board, however the old process was in place for most of the period we have investigated.

Under both systems, the type of review, and who leads it will depend on the circumstances in which the child dies. Normally, this will be either the Clinical Commissioning Group or local authority. Immediate oversight of this process is done by the ‘Child Death Overview Panel’, who in turn report to the Local Safeguarding Children’s Board (or its successor). Where a child either dies, or experiences serious harm, and abuse or neglect is suspected, then the Local Safeguarding Boards can instigate a serious case review (which has become a ‘Local child safeguarding practice reviews’). These are detailed investigations, led by a senior independent professional, who undertakes to find out the circumstances of a child death, and, crucially, what lessons agencies can learn to prevent future deaths occurring. These reviews are published, reviewed by the Department for Education27 and should be added to the NSPCC’s depository28 of serious case reviews. From April 2019 data on all child death reviews will be collated by NHS Digital.

Serious case reviews are normally for deaths in a domestic situation, to review the response of safeguarding agencies. But they should apply equally to gang related deaths where previous abuse of the child involved is known or suspected. The statutory guidance on what constitutes abuse and neglect is explicit that it includes abuse or neglect outside the home, specifically including gangs and criminal exploitation. The current guidance states: “Children may be vulnerable to neglect and abuse or exploitation from within their family and from individuals they come across in their day-to-day lives. These threats can take a variety of different forms, including: sexual, physical and emotional abuse; neglect; exploitation by criminal gangs and organised crime groups; trafficking; online abuse; sexual exploitation and the influences of extremism leading to radicalisation.”29

Sadly, over recent years there have been a number of violent deaths linked to gang violence30. Given the complexity of gang violence, and the high-levels of harm associated with gang affiliation, it is likely that any

28 https://learning.nspcc.org.uk/case-reviews/national-case-review-repository/
30 A central figure is not available. Child Death Overview data shows that in the year to March 2017 (the latest period for which data is available) there were 47 child deaths from deliberately inflicted injury or abuse and a further 210
death caused by gang violence would meet the threshold for a serious case review. Yet there have been just four serious case reviews published into gang-related killings since 2015\textsuperscript{31}. One of these, the case of Chris, is summarised under Question 1 of this report. There are many common themes between the issues picked up by Chris’s serious case review and others. In all of the cases, the children had chaotic and unstable home lives, frequent but usually sporadic\textsuperscript{32} contact with different agencies and a complex set of emotional health issues, usually combined with SEND. All of the case reviews show how agencies could, and should, have identified and responded to risk factors earlier.

While the Serious Case Reviews that have been conducted are extremely useful, it is not clear why more have not been conducted. The case reviews to date have all involved children with a long and complex history of involvement with agencies, not all children in gangs are on the radar to the same degree, and learning from these cases may be particularly helpful. There may be reviews underway which have yet to be published. Serious Case Reviews are complex and therefore lengthy, it is not uncommon for them to take in excess of 12-months to be published. Going forwards, there is a new system of oversight of these reviews, ahead of new child death review process entirely from April 2019\textsuperscript{33}. \textbf{Nevertheless, we are concerned that the lack of serious case reviews since 2015 suggests that children who are killed by gangs are not always having their deaths properly investigated.}

In recognition of the particular issues posed by safeguarding adolescents engaged with gangs, the Department for Education has announced that the newly-established Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel, will conduct its first national thematic review on ‘adolescents in need of state protection from criminal exploitation’. Specifically, this national review will seek to learn from the serious case reviews and ‘local child safeguarding practice reviews’ and use these reviews to improve national-level understanding of the necessary response.

\textsuperscript{31} There were a total of 15 Serious Case Reviews published from 2015 to present where gangs were identified as a factor. Of these 4 related to child sexual exploitation, 4 to homicides, 2 to suicides and 1 to a drugs overdose. Two others were in respect of parental gang involvement being a factor in the death of an infant and one was conducted when a child killed an adult through gang involvement. Criminal exploitation did not come up in any serious case reviews.

\textsuperscript{32} The exception being two of the case reviews which related to children in care.

\textsuperscript{33} \url{https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/child-death-review-statutory-and-operational-guidance-england}
Question 6: What has been the national response to youth violence?

As gang violence and criminal exploitation has increased over recent years, there have been a series of Government initiatives. The Serious Violence Strategy was published in April 2018, and the Serious Violence Taskforce has met monthly since. The Serious Violence Strategy alone identifies six different pots of funding. These include:

- £11 for a new Early Intervention Youth Fund
- £2m for a ‘Community Fund’ across 2018/19 and 2019/20
- £3.6m funding the National Crime Agency and National Police Chiefs Council to develop a National County Lines Co-ordination Centre
- £40m of Big Lottery funding, delivered through the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to boost local ‘open access’ youth provision in six areas.
- £90 million of dormant accounts money to support disadvantaged and disengaged young people with their transition to work
- £13m over four years for the Trusted Relationships Fund to pilot approaches which provide support to young people at risk of child sexual exploitation, gang exploitation and peer abuse.

Subsequently, the Government has also announced:

- £200m for a Youth Endowment Fund, “a 10 year investment to support interventions steering young people away from becoming involved in violent crime or reoffending,” overseen by the Home Office.
- A £5m ‘Supporting Families Against Youth Crime’ fund, overseen by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.
- £2m for a research unit to look at child exploitation, trafficking, modern slavery and child sexual exploitation, overseen by the Department for Education.

While each of these projects is well-intentioned, it is not clear how this money is being translated into frontline action. We have heard numerous reports of stifling levels of bureaucracy connected to accessing funding. In one case, the Government is still running the bidding process, to appoint the organisation who will then administer the bidding process for areas wanting to access the funds. One local authority reported to us months of negotiations to decide whether they would meet the eligibility criteria for another funding stream. All of this is taking valuable time and resource, both from those applying for and distributing the grants.

Alongside the announcements, the Serious Violence Strategy also contained substantial research showing the need to invest in early intervention, prevention and therapeutic approaches to reducing youth violence. In particular, the report highlighted the effectiveness of:

35 This was subsequently reported to be £17m in the Government press release announcing the Youth Endowment Fund, see below.
38 The Department has pledged £2m for a research unit to look at child exploitation alongside child sexual exploitation, trafficking and modern slavery.
39 The Home Office has announced a bidding process for organisations to apply to be the bid organisation for the Youth Endowment Fund. The bid organisation will then have to determine the exact process for bid applications.
> Pre-school programmes
> Multi-systemic therapy family therapy for families of children aged 12-17 with behaviour problems

While the funding streams above may fund a few pilot schemes, the amount of funding provided to date is not commensurate with the number of families who need help. Moreover, the provision of such services would generally be delivered by local authorities’ children’s services teams or the NHS. Yet neither the Department for Education nor the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) have made commitments in these areas within the Serious Violence Strategy.

The Serious Violence Strategy is one of many sources to identify the importance of health services for reducing violence. In 2012, a Department of Health report found that youth violence costs the NHS £2.9bn a year, and stated that “programmes that support parents and families, develop life skills in children, work with high-risk youth and reduce the availability and misuse of alcohol have proven effective at reducing violence. Measures to ensure appropriate identification, care and support mechanisms are in place are important in minimising the harms caused by violence and reducing its recurrence.” Yet we have found no evidence that either NHS England, Public Health England or DHSC have taken steps to ensure that advice is translated into services being commissioned by health bodies in local areas.

There are similar issues with the approach taken by the Department for Education, which is responsible for children’s services and safeguarding. The department has identified the approach required, but has not taken all the steps necessary to implement them. For example, it has recently updated the statutory safeguarding guidance, ‘Working Together’. The updated guidance places a much greater emphasis on external threats, including gangs and criminal exploitation; explicitly it recognises the need for “early help for a child who ... is showing signs of being drawn into anti-social or criminal behaviour, including gang involvement and association with organised crime groups”\(^\text{41}\). The new guidance also stresses the importance of ‘contextual safeguarding’, which can be broadly defined as threats outside of the home, alongside domestic issues.

The department has also taken steps to reform Local Safeguarding Children’s Boards. The new arrangements, which will come into effect in different areas from the beginning of 2019/20, are a safeguarding partnership between health, local authorities and the police. This partnership, into which other education providers can be co-opted, has been set up to co-ordinate “their safeguarding services; act as a strategic leadership group in supporting and engaging others; and implement local and national learning including from serious child safeguarding incidents”\(^\text{42}\). All of these measures put local institutions on a better footing to protect children from gang violence.

Again, however, there are resourcing issues, limiting the degree to which these measures are translated into frontline action. While it is welcome that the Department for Education recognises the importance of ‘early help’\(^\text{43}\), it has not ensured that local authorities have the resources to provide this. Children’s services are extremely stretched at present, with the Local Government Association forecasting a £3bn funding gap by 2025\(^\text{44}\). Within the context of limited budgets, the Department for Education has focused on the provision of statutory services, not early help, which is excluded from the ‘activity data’ which the

---

\(^{41}\) Working Together, pg 14  

\(^{42}\) http://www.workingtogetheronline.co.uk/chapters/chapter_three.html#sg_part

\(^{43}\) Within children’s services, ‘early help’ is a broad term to cover support given to children or families who have not reached the threshold for statutory intervention.

\(^{44}\) https://www.local.gov.uk/about/campaigns/bright-futures/bright-futures-childrens-services/childrens-services-funding-facts
Department collects. This means that the Department for Education does not know how many families receive early help, how this is changing, or whether expanding or maintaining early help costs or saves money.

Alongside early help, some families with children involved in, or at risk of involvement in, gangs will be supported by the Troubled Families programme. This was identified by the Serious Violence Strategy and highlighted by several of the local safeguarding boards from whom we requested data. There are over 400,000 children in families who received some support through the Troubled Families programme last year. However, all funding for the programme is due to end at the end of the next financial year. As the scheme is funded and administered by local authorities, they have reported to us that they need to plan for the closure of the scheme (including redundancy costs) out of their budgets for 2019/20.

The other area where there has been a lack of action from the Government has been in early years. Research from both the Early Intervention Foundation as well as the Serious Violence Strategy have both highlighted the effectiveness of interventions before children start school in preventing future engagement in youth violence. Yet these have not been central to the policy response from Government. Previous research by the Children’s Commissioner has identified two serious issues within the pre-school population which mean that too many children start school at a significant disadvantage compared to their classmates:

1) Around 13% of children meet fewer than half of the expected development indicators upon starting school. This indicates low levels of development across both physical and emotional development, which place children at a huge educational disadvantage and increases their risk of marginalisation within and beyond education.

2) Very poor levels of SEN identification prior to children starting school. This means that many conditions which could be effectively treated or supported before a child falls out of the school system, are effectively being missed.

There are many effective interventions which could these include parenting programmes, systemic family therapy and speech and language therapy. The latter has been the intervention most often raised with us in the course of this research. About 9% of 5 year olds have a speech or communication problem: 80% of which stem from a child’s environment. Untreated, the inability to communicate often develops into frustration, poor emotional regulation and then emotional health problems. There is clear research showing the impact this has on in-school and life-time attainment. More than 60% of children in Young Offenders Institutes have a diagnosable communication problem. The provision of speech and language therapy is a shared responsibility between the NHS and local authorities, through arrangements that have been heavily criticised by the CQC and Ofsted. In addition to funding, many local areas have told us they are restricting access to speech and language therapy because of staff shortages. The Children’s Commissioner is currently undertaking the first ever nationwide audit of the provision of speech and language therapy to understand what is provided by whom, does it varies across the country. This will be published in 2019.

---

48 See both the EIF research above and the Serious Violence Strategy (as before)
Translating these numerous national-level initiatives into practical change to improve the lives of vulnerable children is undermined both by fragmentation between the numerous different project streams, and between government departments. While the Home Office leads on county lines, gang violence and criminal exploitation, the government’s own research suggests that it is health and family-level interventions which have the greatest impact, and the Department for Education holds the national lead for protecting children. While the Home Office has established the Serious Violence Taskforce to bring together ministers from key department with other stakeholders, this Taskforce now has to bring about the cohesive national action plan which was envisaged when it launched.

The joint inspectorates of Ofsted, HMI Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS), the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and HMI Probation have demonstrated that more cohesive working between national bodies is possible. These agencies have come together to produce excellent research on what is needed to keep children safe. This report was informed by joint area inspections in three areas, looking at the response of all agencies. Given the response from local areas we received to inform this report (see discussion under Question 5), we believe there is a clear need for these joint-area inspections to continue.

---


Question 7: How do we keep children safe from gang violence?

As this report shows, gangs will exploit any vulnerabilities that a child or their family possess. Combatting this is complex, and will depend on the child. There will be a range of different responses needed. But the basic premise from which all these interventions work is an understanding of the child’s situation and at least one person working with them consistently. The children who are most vulnerable are either those invisible to authorities, or those like Chris, whose case we discuss under Question 2, who was known to numerous agencies none of which had developed a relationship with him.

This report outlines the system-level response needed to identify these children and to ensure they are not left isolated and invisible. Crucial to this is recognising the importance of direct and trusting relationships which enable children to change their behaviour and seek help. The box below explains this.

“Good gang prevention work is like losing weight”

Children involved in gangs often make poor decisions in terms of who to hang out with and what actions to take. Often, they are just taking the easiest decision available to them. But once they enter a gang’s orbit, they enter a spiral where the decisions that will withdraw them from the gang become harder and harder to make.

Vulnerable children are not alone in making poor decisions. As one professional pointed out to us, most office workers know they should stay away from the biscuit tin, but that does not mean they do it. Most office workers can take the odd biscuit without developing a problem, just as most children can be naughty occasionally, and take a risk, without ending up in gang.

But there are a minority for whom those decisions have very poor consequences. The morbidly obese for whom food becomes a real threat. The vulnerable children for whom a series of bad decisions becomes a lifestyle. These people need help in changing their behaviour. Yet in neither situation does castigating the individual work. Instead, we have to promote positive behaviour, and provide clear alternatives. Effective weight-loss programmes work because it offers that alternative, along with the belief and encouragement that it can be done. The same needs to be offered for children in gangs.

Crucial to success is the social aspect, where groups of adults offer encouragement to one another. Yet vulnerable children often don’t have this. Their relationship with family is often fractured, and once isolated within school or excluded, they don’t have a trusting professional relationship – while their peers are encouraging dangerous activity. The case of Chris, covered under Question 1, showed a child known to multiple agencies but without a trusted relationship with any one of them.

If we want to empower children to be resilient to the lure of gangs and make different choices, we need to ensure they have a relationship that enables positive decisions. The choices children will need to make are hard. Avoiding a gang may mean forgoing an entire social life, becoming isolated and enduring the risk of physical violence. Vulnerable children won’t make these choices alone. There are numerous gang intervention projects which can work: they might use youth work, sports clubs, music or education settings in which to develop these relationships.

The task for the authorities is to identify what types of interventions work, and ensure they are available to the children who need them.
Step 1: Take a life-course approach

As this report shows, gang membership is complex, and those recruiting children are ruthless. Once a child is within a gang, extracting them is not straightforward. It is much easier to stop children becoming involved in gangs than it is to get them out. To achieve this we need a ‘life-course’ approach recognising that while a child may be drawn into a gang as an adolescent, the underlying reasons why they were susceptible almost certainly appeared years earlier. Below are some of the key points for intervention:\n
| Early Years | ▪ Parental mental health is vital for babies and young children’s development.  
▪ Conduct problems can emerge as early as 2-3 years old and are closely related to poor emotional regulation. They are estimated to account for 80% of crime.\n▪ Less than half of the children with special educational needs have these identified before primary school, which often makes conditions harder to treat.  
▪ There are a whole range of family-based programmes to help children with emotional regulation and mental health. The Serious Violence Strategy estimates that for each £1 spent on the programme £1.61 of benefits were estimated split between increased earnings, reduced crime and improved educational outcomes.\n| The start of school | ▪ About 9% of 5 year olds have a speech or communication problem: 80% of which stem from a child’s environment.  
▪ 13% of children have such low levels of development that they fail to meet more than half of their development checks at the beginning of primary school.\n| Primary school | ▪ Permanent exclusions from primary schools have risen by 67% since 2012/13. Children excluded from school by age 12 are 4 times more likely to be in prison by age 24.\n▪ Research from the Early Intervention Foundation found that emotional health at age 7 was a key predictor of future gang involvement. The Series Violence Strategy emphasises the importance of family-therapy approaches for this age group.  
▪ Schools report to us that young children are routinely turned away from CAMHS because they are not deemed to have a diagnosable mental health condition, even if they display extreme symptoms.\n| Secondary school | ▪ Vulnerable children often find the transition to secondary school hard, as the limited number of close relationships at primary school are replaced by a large number of much briefer relationships.  
▪ There were 6,385 permanent exclusions from secondary school in 2016/17; up from 3,905 since in 2012/13  
▪ Youth services have been cut by 60% since 2010. Yet children aged 13-15 are the most likely to be spending large amount of times sedentary or online. Children tell us this often because of a lack of safe-spaces or activities to play in.\n▪ Less than a third of children with a diagnosable mental health condition are receiving support from CAMHS.\n| 16-18 | ▪ The education leaving age is now 18; yet nationally 5% of children aged 16-18 are not in education of training. In some cities it twice this.\n
\n53 All figures are from elsewhere in this report unless otherwise referenced.  
54 https://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/the-chance-of-a-lifetime  
56 https://www.ed.ac.uk/news/2013/exclusionprison-280213  
60 Children’s Commissioner, Growing up North, as above.
Step 2: Make contacts count

There are many points where support for a child or family can reduce the risk of them joining a gang. At each of these points there are services tasked with working with these families, and the key is ensuring these services are used.

> **Maternity**: improving mental health access for new mothers and parents of young children is crucial to helping a child’s development.

> **Health visitors** need to identify vulnerable families, develop supportive relationships and refer families into other support when needed.

> **Pre-School**:

1. **Nurseries**: The 40% most disadvantaged 2 year olds, and all 3 year olds, are eligible for some free childcare we need to make these contacts count, and use the early-years learning identified in the Serious Violence Strategy.

2. All children should now have a **health-check aged 2½**, this check could include Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaires (SDQ) to screen for emerging emotional health or behavioural problems, as well as looking for communication issues.

3. To improve school readiness and help vulnerable children we need to improve SEND identification **pre-school**. Nurseries and health-visitors have a key-role to play in this.

> **Schools** need to keep children in school by responding to challenging behaviour and additional needs. Action needs to be taken to combat schools who persistently exclude or off-roll.

> For children who are **out of school**, local authorities needs to respond swiftly with a plan to get kids back into education, **including** 16-18s.

> When **children go missing** the ‘return home interview’ needs to be better utilised to understand why a child has gone missing and where they have been.

> **CAMHS** play a central role in stopping children becoming marginalised and isolated due to mental health problems, anxieties or problems with emotional regulation. The NHS should focus on:

4. **Improving access** so fewer children are turned away.

5. Ensuring that services are commissioned which meet the needs of **under 11s**.

6. Providing **family based approaches** – like systemic family therapy – which have a strong evidence base.

> **Youth services** can be a vital safety net for children out of other services, or needing diversion from gang activity.

> **All children need safe activities, and space to play**. Sports clubs are particularly important.

> **Looked after children** are particularly vulnerable to grooming from gangs, and this is even more so when they experience placement upheaval, and end up out of school.

> The police need to **understand what is going on within communities** so that local level intelligence on crime, anti-social behaviour and threats informs a cross-system safeguarding approach.

> Once children end up within **the youth justice system** we focus on what happens to them on release from custody.
Step 3: Local-level identification and co-ordination

Co-ordinating all the agencies working with children and families is the responsibility of local children’s safeguarding boards (LCSB), and their successors. Most of the bodies who need to act are statutory ones, meaning they need to co-operate with the LCSB and comply with the Working Together safeguarding guidance referenced in this report, which explicitly states the importance of protecting children from gangs.

Putting this into practice requires a paradigm shift in the way agencies consider children involved with gangs. We need widespread recognition that children at risk from gangs are a safeguarding concern and need the protection of the law, in the same way as children at risk from within the home or from child sexual exploitation. For this to happen, local areas need to:

Recognise gangs as a key issue

There are statutory agencies and structures in place for both safeguarding and public health with clear structures, processes and responsibilities. These bodies to recognise that gang violence and criminal exploitation is part of their core business.

Identify the children in need

As this report has exposed, those responsible for safeguarding have identified a tiny fraction of the estimated number of children in or on the periphery of gangs. Knowing how many children are in danger is the vital pre-requisite for planning and co-ordinating the response. Local areas need to:

1. Use local level indicators\(^61\) to devise a population level-estimate of the number children in gangs, on the periphery of gangs or being criminally exploited by gangs. This should be done as part of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessments that all local authorities are required to produce.
2. Map this against the known population of gang-associated children to estimate the number of ‘invisible’ children: those who are in gangs but not known to those who need to keep them safe.
3. Work with partners – schools, health and community organisations – to identify who these invisible children are.

Know what is happening

The way vulnerable children are treated by the state will have a big impact on the likelihood of them entering a gang. Excluding children from school, off-rolling them, turning them away from CAMHS, and failing to diagnose and treat special educational needs, all exacerbate children’s risks. The contribution of health bodies is crucial in mitigating these risks and it vital they realise this responsibility. Safeguarding boards needs to know what is happening and challenge the agencies who are not stepping-up. The new safeguarding oversight bodies have much greater power to do this than their predecessors.

Co-ordinate the implementation

As this report shows, it is when children fall through the gaps in the system (school exclusion, missed SEND, etc.) that they become most vulnerable. The only way to counter this is effective joint action between the different agencies working with children. Schools, children’s services, police and the NHS need to be working together proactively, not passing children from agency to agency. In particular, it is important that a vulnerable child has consistency of relationships throughout this process, and therefore it is the children outside of the system, without this consistency, who will require bespoke provision to help them access other services and gain some stability.

---

\(^{61}\) This could include survey-data on gang membership along with key risk indicators such as children going missing, child victims of crime, or involved in criminality, attendance at A&E etc.
Step 4: National level response

Overall, we have found that the Government’s response to serious violence has identified what is needed, but has not yet done enough to ensure that the necessary services are put in place. These are the actions we believe are needed to plug the gaps in what has been provided to date:

1) The Government needs to be clear that child criminal exploitation is a national priority, and lay out clear expectations for all the organisations working with children - including the police, schools, children’s services and NHS bodies - as to their role. While the Department for Education has put in place the structures to achieve this, the practice is yet to match the theory. Individual agencies need to be proactive partners not just passive refers. To achieve this, the Department should:
   a. Be much more explicit about the role of Local Safeguarding Childrens Boards (LCSBs), and their successor bodies, in relation to gangs.
   b. Put more resources into improving knowledge of best practice around interventions for children in gangs, including adolescents at high-risk of absconding from care.
   c. Respond to the forthcoming Exclusions Review by ensuring that schools realise the safeguarding implications of excluding children, and are held responsible for these.

2) The joint inspections from Ofsted, HMIC, the CQC and Probation Inspectorate have been invaluable in identifying what is needed in terms of combating child criminal exploitation. This report recommends that the joint inspections be rolled-out to all areas, starting with the high-risk areas who were unable to respond to our data request for this report. The Department for Education and Home Office should provide the funding to enable this.

3) There needs to be a much greater focus on the early years within the Serious Violence Strategy. Specifically the Department for Education should set a clear target for reducing the number of children beginning school with very low levels of development, along with a strategy for how this can be done, and introduce a national plan for improving SEND identification in the early years.

4) The NHS and Public Health England needs to recognise the importance of health-delivered interventions for combatting youth violence. Health bodies need to be proactive safeguarding partners, working to reduce risks, not just reporting them to other agencies. Specifically, there needs to be: specific referral processes to prioritise CAMHS services for those at risk of gang membership and exclusion; greater focus on CAMHS access and services for under-11s (who may have conduct problems or issues with emotional regulation which may not be recognised by existing services) and processes in place to ensure that services are commissioned for families, including family therapy approaches for young children.

5) The forthcoming closure of the Troubled Families programme represents a serious threat to the support offered to many of the families with greatest gang risk. The government urgently needs to commit to the programme for 2020/21 to stop closure processes beginning from March 2019. Long-term, the future of a family-based approach needs to be ensured and developed.

6) The Department for Education needs to review what level of youth services are required to meet the needs of adolescents at risk of gang violence, many of whom will fall within the remit of Section 17 of the Children’s Act 1989, and ensure that local authorities have the resources necessary to provide this.

7) The Department for Education needs to recognise the importance of ‘Early Help’ services within children’s services, and ensure local authorities have the resources available to provide early help to those with high gang risks. This starting point for this needs to be an understanding of how many families are currently in receipt of early help services, and what those services are.