

AGENDA

SELECT COMMITTEE - KNIFE CRIME IN KENT

Tuesday, 11th June, 2019, at 10.00 am

Ask for: **Gaetano Romagnuolo**

**Darent Room - Sessions House
10:00 am – 1:00pm**

Telephone **03000 416624** -
gaetano.romagnuolo@kent.gov.uk

**Medway Room – Sessions House
2:00 pm – 3:35 pm**

Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting in the meeting room

Membership

Mr P V Barrington-King (Chairman), Mrs S Chandler, Mr I S Chittenden, Mr A Cook, Mr P C Cooper, Mr D Farrell, Mr A R Hills, Mr K Pugh and Mr A M Ridgers

Please note: that the unrestricted part of this meeting may be filmed by any member of the public or press present.

By entering into this room you are consenting to being filmed. If you do not wish to have your image captured please let the Clerk know immediately.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)

1 Apologies

10:00-10:45 Joanna Brennan, Head of Innovation and Engagement (South East & East), Youth Justice Board (Pages 3 - 8)

Motion to Exclude the Press and Public

That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

EXEMPT ITEM

During this item it is likely that the meeting will not be open to the press and public

- 11:00 - Alan Wood, Community Engagement Manager, Her Majesty's
11:45 Prison and Probation Service, Her Majesty's Prison/Youth
Offender Institution Stanford Hill (Pages 9 - 10)

Meeting re-opened to the Press and Public

- 12:00 - Tanya Gillett (Head of Service, Youth Offending Service, Essex
12:45 County Council) (Pages 11 - 14)

- 13:00 - BREAK FOR LUNCH
13:45

Medway Room - Sessions House

- 14:00 - Claire Ray (Head of Service, Education Safeguarding service,
14:45 Kent County Council) and Claire Ledger (South Kent Area
Safeguarding Adviser, Kent County Council) (Pages 15 - 32)

- 15:00 - John Coull (Detective Superintendent, Kent and Essex Serious
15:45 Crime Directorate Intelligence, Kent Police) and Guy Thompson
(Chief Inspector - Partnerships & Communities, Kent Police)
(Pages 33 - 88)

Benjamin Watts
General Counsel (Interim)
03000 416814

Monday, 3 June 2019

Kent County Council
Knife Crime Select Committee
Biography

**Joanna Brennan, Head of Innovation and Engagement (South East & East),
Youth Justice Board**

Joanna Brennan is the Head of Innovation and Engagement (South East & East) at the Youth Justice Board.

The Youth Justice Board's primary function is to monitor the operation of the youth justice system and the provision of youth justice services. As Head of Innovation and Engagement, Joanna works with local areas to lead, manage and shape strategic engagement with all key youth justice partners. Key roles include brokering improvements for poor performing local youth justice services, and the proactive collation and promotion of effective practice.

This page is intentionally left blank

Knife Crime Select Committee

Hearing Day 2

Tuesday, 11 June 2019

Witness Guide for Members

Below are suggested themes and questions. They have been provided in advance to the witnesses to allow them to prepare for the types of issues that Members may be interested to explore. All Members are welcome to ask these questions or pose additional ones to the witnesses via the Committee Chairman.

Themes and Questions

Joanna Brennan, Head of Innovation and Engagement (South East & East), Youth Justice Board

- Please introduce yourself and provide an outline of the roles and responsibilities of your post.
- Please describe the role and remit of the Youth Justice Board.
- Please explain how knife crime has impacted on the youth justice system.
- What strategies and initiatives have been implemented by the Youth Justice Board to tackle knife crime?
- What are the future priorities of the Youth Justice Board to help prevent knife crime?
- Please discuss the importance of multi-agency working to help safeguard young people from knife crime.
- How will Knife Crime Prevention Orders and other programmes help to address knife crime?
- In your opinion, what are the most effective initiatives and strategies that can be implemented to tackle knife crime?
- In your view, what should KCC do to help reduce the incidence and impact of knife crime in Kent?
- Are there any other issues, with relevance to the review, that you wish to raise with the Committee?

This page is intentionally left blank

- *In 2017/18 there were just over 65,800 arrests of 10-17 year olds. Just under half of these arrests (49%) were for drugs, robbery, violence or weapon possession offences, with violence against the person making up the largest proportion (26%).*
 - *Source: Youth Justice Statistics: 2017 to 2018*
- *In the last year, the number of arrests decreased for all offence groups except for possession of weapons, robbery and miscellaneous crimes against society. The most noticeable increase was for possession of weapons, which had 676 more arrests for this offence group than in the previous year (an increase of 22%).*
 - *Source: Youth Justice Statistics: 2017 to 2018*
- *There have been long term downward falls in the number of youth first time entrants (FTEs) to the youth justice system. However, when examined by offence group, the number of FTEs committing possession of weapons offences has been steadily increasing since 2013, although it has levelled off in the latest year. In the year ending December 2018, the proportion of FTEs committing possession of weapons offences was 15%, compared to 4% five years ago.*
 - *Source: Criminal Justice Statistics quarterly: December 2018*
- *In 2017/18, there were around 70,300 proven offences committed by young people. While this number has been falling year-on-year over the last ten years, the proportion of violence against the person offences has been increasing, and now accounts for 29% of all proven offences in 2017/18, compared to 19% ten years ago.*
 - *Source: Youth Justice Statistics: 2017 to 2018*
- *There were 4,430 knife or offensive weapon offences resulting in a caution or conviction committed by 10-17 year olds in the year ending December 2018. The vast majority of these (96%) were for possession of a knife or offensive weapon offence, with the remaining 4% for threatening with a knife or offensive weapon offence.*
 - *Source: Knife and offensive weapon sentencing statistics: October to December 2018*
- *Knife and offensive weapon offences committed by children resulting in a caution or conviction had been gradually increasing since the year ending December 2014, but in the latest year there has been a decrease of 2%.*
 - *Source: Knife and offensive weapon sentencing statistics: October to December 2018*

- *The rate per 10,000 population of knife offences resulting in a caution or conviction committed by children remains higher than that for adults (8.4 for children, 3.7 for adults).*
 - *Source: Knife and offensive weapon sentencing statistics: October to December 2018*
- *In 2017/18 there was an average of 894 children in the youth secure estate at any one time. This is an increase of 3% compared with the previous year, (although provisional data for 2018/19 shows this number has fallen again). Over the last five years there has been a decline in the average number of children held for each offence group, except for violence against the person. This offence group increased by 11% in the last year and accounts for 41% of the youth secure estate.*
 - *Source: Youth Justice Statistics: 2017 to 2018*
- *NHS data for England indicates that's there has been a 51% increase in the number of episodes of sharp object assaults since 2012/13 from 313 to 473.*

Kent County Council
Knife Crime Select Committee

Hearing Day 2

Tuesday, 11 June 2019

Witness Guide for Members

Below are suggested themes and questions. They have been provided in advance to the witnesses to allow them to prepare for the types of issues that Members may be interested to explore. All Members are welcome to ask these questions or pose additional ones to the witnesses via the Committee Chairman.

Themes and Questions

Alan Wood, Community Engagement Manager, Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service, Her Majesty's Prison/Youth Offender Institution Stanford Hill

Two residents of HMP Stanford Hill

- In your view, why is there a reported increase in knife crime?
- In your opinion, to what extent are gangs and "County Lines" having an impact on knife crime in Kent?
- In your opinion, what are the most effective initiatives and strategies that can be implemented to tackle knife crime?
- In your view, what can Kent County Council do to help reduce the incidence and impact of knife crime in Kent?
- Are there any other issues, with relevance to the review, that you wish to bring to the Committee's attention?

This page is intentionally left blank

Kent County Council
Knife Crime Select Committee
Biography

Tanya Gillett, Head of Service, Youth Offending Service, Essex County Council

Tanya Gillett is the Head of Service of the Youth Offending Service at Essex County Council.

The Service was recently rated “outstanding”. The inspection found a strong strategic and operational leadership and a well-functioning board that had a good understanding of performance and the challenges of practice.

Children and young people, together with their parents and carers, were found to be meaningfully involved at every stage and made a valuable contribution to quality assurance of cases. Inspectors also praised the relationships between partner agencies, and described the approach taken to quality assurance as "an exemplar of good practice".

The Youth Offending Service at Essex County Council is the second youth offending team in England to be rated outstanding under the current inspection framework - Hertfordshire being the other.

This page is intentionally left blank

Kent County Council

Knife Crime Select Committee

Hearing Day 2

Tuesday, 11 June 2019

Witness Guide for Members

Below are suggested themes and questions. They have been provided in advance to the witnesses to allow them to prepare for the types of issues that Members may be interested to explore. All Members are welcome to ask these questions or pose additional ones to the witnesses via the Committee Chairman.

Themes and Questions

Tanya Gillett, Head of Service, Youth Offending Service, Essex County Council

- Please introduce yourself and provide an outline of the roles and responsibilities that your post involves.
- Please discuss the strategies and elements of your Youth Offending Service that have contributed to the achievement of an outstanding rating.
- In what ways does your Service address knife crime?
- Please provide an account of the impact of gangs and “County Lines” in Essex. How are you dealing with this issue?
- What are the most effective initiatives and strategies that can be implemented to tackle knife crime?
- In your view, what should KCC do to help reduce the incidence and impact of knife crime in Kent?
- Are there any other issues, with relevance to the review, that you wish to bring to the Committee’s attention?

This page is intentionally left blank

Kent County Council
Knife Crime Select Committee

Hearing Day 2

Tuesday, 11 June 2019

Witness Guide for Members

Below are suggested themes and questions. They have been provided in advance to the witnesses to allow them to prepare for the types of issues that Members may be interested to explore. All Members are welcome to ask these questions or pose additional ones to the witnesses via the Committee Chairman.

Themes and Questions

Claire Ray, Head of Service, Education Safeguarding service, Kent County Council

Claire Ledger, South Kent Area Safeguarding Adviser, Kent County Council

- Please introduce yourselves and provide an outline of the roles and responsibilities that your posts involve.
- Please explain the statutory safeguarding responsibilities for schools.
- What is the role of KCC's Education Safeguarding service in supporting schools, with particular relevance to tackling knife crime?
- Please discuss the importance of multi-agency working for the Education Safeguarding service when dealing with issues such as knife crime.
- In your opinion, what are the most effective initiatives and strategies that can be implemented to tackle knife crime?
- In your view, what can KCC do to help reduce the incidence and impact of knife crime in Kent?
- Are there any other issues that you would like to raise with the Committee?

This page is intentionally left blank



Department
for Education

Searching, screening and confiscation

**Advice for headteachers, school staff
and governing bodies**

January 2018

Contents

Summary	3
About this departmental advice	3
Expiry or review date	3
Who is this advice for?	3
Key points	3
Searching	3
Confiscation	4
Schools' obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)	4
Screening	5
Searching with consent	6
Searching without consent	7
During the search	10
After the search	11
Further sources of information	15
Associated resources (external links)	15
Legislative links	15

Summary

About this departmental advice

This advice is intended to explain schools' powers of screening and searching pupils so that school staff have the confidence to use them. In particular, it explains the use of the power to search pupils without consent. It also explains the powers schools have to seize and then confiscate items found during a search. It includes statutory guidance which schools must have regard to.

Expiry or review date

This advice will be kept under review and updated as necessary.

Who is this advice for?

This advice is for:

- School leaders and school staff in **all** schools in England.
- For the purposes of this advice references to “maintained school” means a community, foundation or voluntary school, community or foundation special school. It also means Pupil Referral Units and non-maintained special schools.
- For the purpose of this advice references to “Academy” means Academy schools (including mainstream free schools) and Alternative Provision (AP) Academies (including AP free schools).
- Where particular provisions do not apply to a particular type of school we make this clear.

Key points

Searching

- School staff can search a pupil for any item if the pupil agrees.¹
- Headteachers and staff authorised by them have a statutory power to search pupils or their possessions, without consent, where they have reasonable grounds for suspecting that the pupil may have a prohibited item. Prohibited items are:

¹ The ability to give consent may be influenced by the child's age or other factors

- knives or weapons
- alcohol
- illegal drugs
- stolen items
- tobacco and cigarette papers
- fireworks
- pornographic images
- any article that the member of staff reasonably suspects has been, or is likely to be, used:
 - to commit an offence, or
 - to cause personal injury to, or damage to the property of, any person (including the pupil).
- Headteachers and authorised staff can also search for any item banned by the school rules which has been identified in the rules as an item which may be searched for.

Confiscation

- School staff can seize any prohibited item found as a result of a search. They can also seize any item, they consider harmful or detrimental to school discipline.

Schools' obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)

- Under article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights pupils have a right to respect for their private life. In the context of these particular powers, this means that pupils have the right to expect a reasonable level of personal privacy.
- The right under Article 8 is not absolute, it can be interfered with but any interference with this right by a school (or any public body) must be justified and proportionate.
- The powers to search in the Education Act 1996 are compatible with Article 8. A school exercising those powers lawfully should have no difficulty in demonstrating that it has also acted in accordance with Article 8. This advice will assist schools in deciding how to exercise the searching powers in a lawful way.

Screening

What the law allows:

- Schools can require pupils to undergo screening by a walk-through or hand-held metal detector (arch or wand) even if they do not suspect them of having a weapon and without the consent of the pupils.
- Schools' statutory power to make rules on pupil behaviour² and their duty as an employer to manage the safety of staff, pupils and visitors³ enables them to impose a requirement that pupils undergo screening.
- Any member of school staff can screen pupils.

Also note:

- If a pupil refuses to be screened, the school may refuse to have the pupil on the premises. Health and safety legislation requires a school to be managed in a way which does not expose pupils or staff to risks to their health and safety and this would include making reasonable rules as a condition of admittance.
- If a pupil fails to comply, and the school does not let the pupil in, the school has not excluded the pupil and the pupil's absence should be treated as unauthorised. The pupil should comply with the rules and attend.
- This type of screening, without physical contact, is not subject to the same conditions as apply to the powers to search without consent.

² Section 89 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 for all maintained schools, PRUs and NMSS and the Education (Independent School Standards) (England) Regulations 2010 for academy schools and alternative provision academies

³ Section 3 of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974

Searching with consent

Schools' common law powers to search:

- School staff can search pupils with their consent for any item.

Also note:

- Schools are not required to have formal written consent from the pupil for this sort of search – it is enough for the teacher to ask the pupil to turn out his or her pockets or if the teacher can look in the pupil's bag or locker and for the pupil to agree.
- Schools should make clear in their school behaviour policy and in communications to parents and pupils what items are banned.
- If a member of staff suspects a pupil has a banned item in his/her possession, they can instruct the pupil to turn out his or her pockets or bag and if the pupil refuses, the teacher can apply an appropriate punishment as set out in the school's behaviour policy.
- A pupil refusing to co-operate with such a search raises the same kind of issues as where a pupil refuses to stay in a detention or refuses to stop any other unacceptable behaviour when instructed by a member of staff – in such circumstances, schools can apply an appropriate disciplinary penalty.

Searching without consent

What the law says:

What can be searched for?

- Knives or weapons, alcohol, illegal drugs and stolen items; and
- Tobacco and cigarette papers, fireworks and pornographic images; and
- Any article that the member of staff reasonably suspects has been, or is likely to be, used to commit an offence, or to cause personal injury, or damage to property; and
- Any item banned by the school rules which has been identified in the rules as an item which may be searched for.

1. Can I search?

- Yes, if you are a headteacher or a member of school staff and authorised by the headteacher.

2. Under what circumstances?

- You must be the same sex as the pupil being searched; and there must be a witness (also a staff member) and, if possible, they should be the same sex as the pupil being searched.
- There is a limited exception to this rule. You can carry out a search of a pupil of the opposite sex to you and / or without a witness present, but only where you reasonably believe that there is a risk that serious harm will be caused to a person if you do not conduct the search immediately and where it is not reasonably practicable to summon another member of staff.

3. When can I search?

- If you have reasonable grounds for suspecting that a pupil is in possession of a prohibited item.

Also note:

- The law also says what must be done with prohibited items which are seized following a search.
- The requirement that the searcher is the same sex as the pupil and that a witness is present will continue to apply in nearly all searches. Where it is practicable to

summon a staff member of the same sex as the pupil and a witness then the teachers wishing to conduct a search must do so.

4. Authorising members of staff

- Headteachers should decide who to authorise to use these powers. There is no requirement to provide authorisation in writing.
- Staff, other than security staff, can refuse to undertake a search. The law states that headteachers may not require anyone other than a member of the school security staff to undertake a search.
- Staff can be authorised to search for some items but not others; for example, a member of staff could be authorised to search for stolen property, but not for weapons or knives.
- A headteacher can require a member of the school's security staff to undertake a search.
- If a security guard, who is not a member of the school staff, searches a pupil, the person witnessing the search should ideally be a permanent member of the school staff, as they are more likely to know the pupil.

5. Training for school staff

- When designating a member of staff to undertake searches under these powers, the headteacher should consider whether the member of staff requires any additional training to enable them to carry out their responsibilities.

6. Establishing grounds for a search

- Teachers can only undertake a search without consent if they have reasonable grounds for suspecting that a pupil may have in his or her possession a prohibited item. The teacher must decide in each particular case what constitutes reasonable grounds for suspicion. For example, they may have heard other pupils talking about the item or they might notice a pupil behaving in a way that causes them to suspect that the pupil is concealing a prohibited item.
- In the exceptional circumstances when it is necessary to conduct a search of a pupil of the opposite sex or in the absence of a witness, the member of staff conducting the search should bear in mind that a pupil's expectation of privacy increases, as they get older.
- The powers allow school staff to search regardless of whether the pupil is found after the search to have that item. This includes circumstances where staff suspect

a pupil of having items such as illegal drugs or stolen property which are later found not to be illegal or stolen.

- School staff may wish to consider utilising CCTV footage in order to make a decision as to whether to conduct a search for an item.

7. Searches for items banned by the school rules

- An item banned by the school rules may only be searched for under these powers if it has been identified in the school rules as an item that can be searched for.
- The school rules must be determined and publicised by the headteacher in accordance with section 89 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 in maintained schools. In the case of academy schools and alternative provision academies, the school rules must be determined in accordance with the School Behaviour (Determination and Publicising of Measures in Academies) Regulations 2012. Separate advice on school rules is available in 'Behaviour and Discipline – advice for headteachers and school staff' via the link under Associated Resources.
- Under section 89 and the School Behaviour (Determination and Publicising of Measures in Academies) Regulations 2012 the headteacher must publicise the school behaviour policy, in writing, to staff, parents and pupils at least once a year.

8. Location of a search

- Searches without consent can only be carried out on the school premises or, if elsewhere, where the member of staff has lawful control or charge of the pupil, for example on school trips in England or in training settings.
- The powers only apply in England.

During the search

9. Extent of the search – clothes, possessions, desks and lockers

What the law says:

- The person conducting the search may not require the pupil to remove any clothing other than outer clothing.
- 'Outer clothing' means clothing that is not worn next to the skin or immediately over a garment that is being worn as underwear but 'outer clothing' includes hats; shoes; boots; gloves and scarves.
- 'Possessions' means any goods over which the pupil has or appears to have control – this includes desks, lockers and bags.
- A pupil's possessions can only be searched in the presence of the pupil and another member of staff, except where there is a risk that serious harm will be caused to a person if the search is not conducted immediately and where it is not reasonably practicable to summon another member of staff.

Also note:

- The power to search without consent enables a personal search, involving removal of outer clothing and searching of pockets; but not an intimate search going further than that, which only a person with more extensive powers (e.g. a police officer) can do.

10. Lockers and desks

- Under common law powers, schools are able to search lockers and desks for any item provided the pupil agrees. Schools can also make it a condition of having a locker or desk that the pupil consents to have these searched for any item whether or not the pupil is present.
- If a pupil does not consent to a search (or withdraws consent having signed a consent form) then it is possible to conduct a search without consent but only for the "prohibited items" listed above.

11. Use of force

- Members of staff can use such force as is reasonable given the circumstances when conducting a search for knives or weapons, alcohol, illegal drugs, stolen items, tobacco and cigarette papers, fireworks, pornographic images or articles that have been or could be used to commit an offence or cause harm. Such force cannot be used to search for items banned under the school rules.
- Separate advice is available on teachers' power to use force – see Associated Resources section below for a link to this document

After the search

12. The power to seize and confiscate items – general

What the law allows:

- Schools' general power to discipline, as circumscribed by Section 91 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, enables a member of staff to confiscate, retain or dispose of a pupil's property as a disciplinary penalty, where reasonable to do so.

Also note:

- The member of staff can use their discretion to confiscate, retain and/or destroy any item found as a result of a 'with consent' search so long as it is reasonable in the circumstances. Where any article is reasonably suspected to be an offensive weapon, it must be passed to the police.
- Staff have a defence to any complaint or other action brought against them. The law protects members of staff from liability in any proceedings brought against them for any loss of, or damage to, any item they have confiscated, provided they acted lawfully.

13. Items found as a result of a 'without consent' search

What the law says:

- A person carrying out a search can seize anything they have reasonable grounds for suspecting is a prohibited item or is evidence in relation to an offence.
- Where a person conducting a search finds alcohol, they may retain or dispose of it. This means that schools can dispose of **alcohol** as they think appropriate but this should not include returning it to the pupil.
- Where they find **controlled drugs**, these must be delivered to the police as soon as possible but may be disposed of if the person thinks there is a good reason to do so.
- Where they find **other substances** which are not believed to be controlled drugs these can be confiscated where a teacher believes them to be harmful or detrimental to good order and discipline. This would include, for example, so called 'legal highs'. Where staff suspect a substance may be controlled they should treat them as controlled drugs as outlined above.
- Where they find **stolen items**, these must be delivered to the police as soon as reasonably practicable – but may be returned to the owner (or may be retained or

disposed of if returning them to their owner is not practicable) if the person thinks that there is a good reason to do so.

- Where a member of staff finds **tobacco or cigarette papers** they may retain or dispose of them. As with alcohol, this means that schools can dispose of tobacco or cigarette papers as they think appropriate but this should not include returning them to the pupil.
- **Fireworks** found as a result of a search may be retained or disposed of but should not be returned to the pupil.
- If a member of staff finds a **pornographic image**, they may dispose of the image unless they have reasonable grounds to suspect that its possession constitutes a specified offence (i.e. it is extreme or child pornography) in which case it must be delivered to the police as soon as reasonably practicable.
- Where an article that has been (or is likely to be) used to commit an offence or to cause personal injury or damage to property is found it may be delivered to the police or returned to the owner. It may also be retained or disposed of.
- Where a member of staff finds **an item which is banned under the school rules** they should take into account all relevant circumstances and use their professional judgement to decide whether to return it to its owner, retain it or dispose of it.
- Any **weapons or items which are evidence of an offence** must be passed to the police as soon as possible.

14. Statutory guidance on the disposal of controlled drugs and stolen items

- It is up to the teachers and staff authorised by them to decide whether there is a good reason not to deliver stolen items or controlled drugs to the police. In determining what is a “good reason” for not delivering controlled drugs or stolen items to the police the member of staff must have regard to the following guidance issued by the Secretary of State:
- In determining what is a ‘good reason’ for not delivering controlled drugs or stolen items to the police, the member of staff should take into account all relevant circumstances and use their professional judgement to determine whether they can safely dispose of a seized article.
- Where staff are unsure as to the legal status of a substance and have reason to believe it may be a controlled drug they should treat it as such.
- With regard to stolen items, it would not be reasonable or desirable to involve the police in dealing with low value items such as pencil cases. However, school staff

may judge it appropriate to contact the police if the items are valuable (iPods/laptops) or illegal (alcohol/fireworks).

15. Statutory guidance for dealing with electronic devices

- Where the person conducting the search finds an electronic device that is prohibited by the school rules or that they reasonably suspects has been, or is likely to be, used to commit an offence or cause personal injury or damage to property, they may examine any data or files on the device where there is a good reason to do so. They may also delete data or files if they think there is a good reason to do so, unless they are going to give the device to the police. This power applies to all schools and there is no need to have parental consent to search through a young person's mobile phone if it has been seized in a lawful 'without consent' search and is prohibited by the school rules or is reasonably suspected of being, or being likely to be, used to commit an offence or cause personal injury or damage to property.
- The member of staff must have regard to the following guidance issued by the Secretary of State when determining what is a "good reason" for examining or erasing the contents of an electronic device:
- In determining a 'good reason' to examine or erase the data or files the staff member should reasonably suspect that the data or file on the device in question has been, or could be, used to cause harm, to disrupt teaching or break the school rules.
- If an electronic device that is prohibited by the school rules has been seized and the member of staff has reasonable grounds to suspect that it contains evidence in relation to an offence, they must give the device to the police as soon as it is reasonably practicable. Material on the device that is suspected to be evidence relevant to an offence, or that is a pornographic image of a child or an extreme pornographic image, should not be deleted prior to giving the device to the police.⁴
- If a staff member does not find any material that they suspect is evidence in relation to an offence, and decides not to give the device to the police, they can decide whether it is appropriate to delete any files or data from the device or to retain the device as evidence of a breach of school discipline.
- All school staff should be aware that behaviours linked to sexting put a child in danger. Governing bodies should ensure sexting and the school's approach to it is reflected in the child protection policy. The UK Council for Child Internet Safety

⁴ Section 62 of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 defines prohibited images of children. Section 63 of the Criminal Justice and Immigrations Act 2008 defines extreme pornographic images.

(UKCCIS) Education Group has recently published the advice - [sexting in schools and colleges - responding to incidents and safeguarding young people](#)

Also note:

- Teachers should also take account of any additional guidance and procedures on the retention and disposal of items that have been put in place by the school.

16. Telling parents and dealing with complaints

- Schools are not required to inform parents before a search takes place or to seek their consent to search their child.
- There is no legal requirement to make or keep a record of a search.
- Schools should inform the individual pupil's parents or guardians where alcohol, illegal drugs or potentially harmful substances are found, though there is no legal requirement to do so.
- Complaints about screening or searching should be dealt with through the normal school complaints procedure.

Further sources of information

Associated resources (external links)

- [Use of Reasonable Force - advice for headteachers, staff and governing bodies Behaviour and Discipline in Schools](#)
- [Behaviour and Discipline in Schools - advice for head teachers and school staff](#)
- [Information Commissioner for advice on the Data Protection Act](#)
- [Keeping children safe in education statutory guidance for schools and colleges](#)
- [UK Council for Child Internet Safety- UKCCIS Sexting in schools and colleges - responding to incidents and safeguarding young people](#)

Legislative links

- [The Education Act 1996](#)
- [Education and Inspections Act 2006](#)
- [Education \(Independent School Standards\) \(England\) Regulations 2010](#)
- [The Schools \(Specification and Disposal of Articles\) Regulations 2012](#)
- [School Behaviour \(Determination and Publicising of Measures in Academies\) Regulations 2012](#)
- [Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974](#)



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2018

This publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/publications

Reference: DFE-00034-2014



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk

Kent County Council
Knife Crime Select Committee
Biographies

John Coull

**Detective Superintendent, Kent and Essex Serious Crime Directorate
Intelligence, Kent Police**

John Coull is a Kent Police Officer with 24 years' service, predominantly within crime investigation and intelligence. With extensive experience in dealing with proactive and serious crime investigation in East and North Kent, including Medway Council, John has led on murder, serious sexual assault and serious violence investigations.

Prior to joining the Kent and Essex Serious Crime Directorate in 2016, John was the lead officer for the Margate Task Force, responsible for the delivery of multi-agency, multi-disciplinary service to diverse and complex communities in Thanet. This included facilitating the first Home Office Ending Gangs and Youth Violence peer review in the County.

John contributed to the development of the Kent and Essex Gang and County Lines strategies, and assisted in the development of the Kent and Medway Gangs Strategy.

John has portfolio responsibility for Gangs and County Lines in Kent and Essex, and for support on the Serious Violence Strategy for Kent.

Guy Thompson

Chief Inspector – Partnerships & Communities, Kent Police

Chief Inspector Thompson joined Kent Police in 1993 and has been involved in Community Policing and Community Safety for most of his service at different ranks. He is a qualified crime reduction officer and has recently been the Community Safety Inspector for Dover District.

More recently, as Chief Inspector, Thompson was given the professional lead for Community Safety Units across Kent, and is the Force lead for Neighbourhood Policing, Hate Crime, Drugs Prevention and Licensing. He also has portfolio responsibility for Young People, Youth Justice, Community Cohesion, and is Chair of the Kent Community Safety Team working group.

Kent County Council

Knife Crime Select Committee

Hearing Day 2

Tuesday, 11 June 2019

Witness Guide for Members

Below are suggested themes and questions. They have been provided in advance to the witnesses to allow them to prepare for the types of issues that Members may be interested to explore. All Members are welcome to ask these questions or pose additional ones to the witnesses via the Committee Chairman.

Themes and Questions

John Coull, Detective Superintendent, Kent and Essex Serious Crime Directorate Intelligence, Kent Police

Guy Thompson, Chief Inspector – Partnerships & Communities, Kent Police

- Please introduce yourselves and provide an outline of the roles and responsibilities that your posts involve.
- Please discuss the issues around crime recording and their impact on the increase in reported crime.
- What are the trends of serious violence crime in Kent? What is the response of Kent Police to serious violence crime?
- Please provide an account of the impact of gangs and “County Lines” in Kent.
- What are the most effective initiatives and strategies that can be implemented to tackle knife crime?
- In your view, in what ways can different KCC services help to reduce the incidence and impact of knife crime in Kent?
- Are there any other issues, with relevance to the review, that you wish to bring to the Committee’s attention?

This page is intentionally left blank



College of
Policing

college.police.uk

Page 37

Knife crime

Evidence briefing

Abigail McNeill and Levin Wheller



Contents

What is the purpose of this briefing?	1
Key findings	1
Understanding the causes of knife crime	1
Motivations for carrying weapons	1
Risk factors associated with knife crime	1
Is there a link between gangs and knife crime?	2
Developing interventions to reduce knife crime	2
General violence or weapon-related interventions with greatest potential to reduce crime	3
Pulling levers	3
Early intervention and prevention programmes	3
Restorative justice	4
Specific knife crime interventions with limited crime reduction evidence	4
Knife amnesties	4
Community and educational interventions	4
Enforcement interventions where evidence suggests careful use	5
Stop and search	5
Sentencing	5
Conclusion	6
References	7

© College of Policing Limited (2019)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, modified, amended, stored in any retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior written permission of the College or as expressly permitted by law.

Anyone wishing to copy or re-use all or part of this document for purposes other than expressly permitted by law will need a licence. Licence applications can be sent to the College of Policing lead for IPR/licensing.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright material, you will need permission from the copyright holders concerned.

The College of Policing is committed to providing fair access to learning and development for all its learners and staff. To support this commitment, this document can be provided in alternative formats by emailing contactus@college.pnn.police.uk

Any other enquiries about the content of the document please email contactus@college.pnn.police.uk

College of Policing Limited
Leamington Road
Ryton-on-Dunsmore
Coventry
CV8 3EN



What is the purpose of this briefing?

This briefing may usefully inform decisions about approaches to tackling knife crime following the increasing number of these types of offences over the last few months. The paper provides police and crime reduction partners with a summary of the evidence on factors associated with, and strategies and interventions to tackle, knife crime. Evidence has been identified through a non-systematic search of the literature, taking reliable sources and government strategy and research reports as a base, and consulting with subject matter experts to ensure the synthesis presents a rounded picture. It is not intended to review all of the available research evidence, nor present a formal assessment of its quality.

Page 39

Key findings

- The motivations for and factors associated with an individual's involvement in knife crime are varied, meaning tailored approaches are most likely to be effective in tackling specific problems.
- Approaches such as problem-oriented policing, focused deterrence strategies, targeting high risk offenders and early preventative work aimed at supporting potentially 'at-risk' individuals are most likely to be effective.
- Evidence suggests the most effective approaches tend to be multi-agency and multi-faceted, requiring collaboration from different fields in 'diagnosing the problem, analysing underlying causes, examining what works and developing solutions'.

Understanding the causes of knife crime

Motivations for carrying weapons

Evidence suggests there are three broad explanations as to why people carry knives¹:

- Self protection and fear ('defensive weapon carrying'), particularly for individuals who have previously been a victim of crime.²
- Self-presentation, particularly for individuals who want 'street credibility' and 'respect'.³
- Utility (offensive weapon carrying), particularly for individuals who use weapons to facilitate other behaviours⁴ such as theft, sexual assault, injury and serious harm.

Evidence also suggests a lack of trust in the police can potentially lead victims to becoming perpetrators, as they may use violence to seek revenge instead of relying on police procedures.⁵

Risk factors associated with knife crime

There is some evidence that the following factors may be associated with increased risk of violence and/or weapon carrying:

- Gender – males are more likely to commit serious violence and carry weapons.⁶

¹ Brennan, 2017.

² Lemos, 2004.

³ Silvestri et al., 2009.

⁴ Brennan, 2017.

⁵ Silvestri et al., 2009; Bradford, 2015; Brennan, 2018.

⁶ Home Office, 2018a; Brennan, 2018.



- Age – self-reported weapon carrying peaks around the age of 15.⁷
- Adverse childhood experiences – including abuse, neglect, parental criminality and/or substance abuse, being taken into care.⁸
- Educational attainment – school exclusion and low attainment.⁹
- Ethnicity – recent analysis of data collected in the UK indicates that there is no statistically significant relationship between ethnicity and weapon carrying.¹⁰

Is there a link between gangs and knife crime?

Evidence suggests that gang related knife crime, although more likely to result in injury or fatality, makes up only a small proportion of total knife crime with injury (only five per cent in 2016).¹¹ Some subtle differences have been identified between individuals who carry a knife and those who become involved in gang crime.¹² Analysis suggests a stronger link in London between gangs and knife crime since 2016.¹³

⁷ Home Office, 2018a; Brennan, 2018.

⁸ Dobash et al., 2007; Hales et al., 2006; Home Office, 2018a

⁹ Hales et al., 2006; Home Office, 2018a; Ministry of Justice, 2018a.

¹⁰ Brennan, 2018.

¹¹ MOPAC, 2017.

¹² McVie, 2010.

¹³ Kirchmaier & Villa Llera, 2018.

Understanding patterns of knife crime

Analysis of data including homicide statistics and the Metropolitan Police Service's Public Attitudes Survey found murder locations were positively correlated with the percentage of the previous years' young black respondents (aged 24-35) who believed knife crime was a major concern in that area.¹⁴ Effective engagement with young black respondents may provide intelligence to help reduce knife-related murders.

Developing interventions to reduce knife crime

The range of risk factors and motivations outlined above indicate that knife crime and weapon carrying cannot be solved by criminal justice measures alone. Strong conclusions about 'what works' to reduce knife crime are difficult to draw due to the lack of robust evaluations of programmes and interventions.¹⁵ However, the best available evidence suggests the most effective approaches tend to be multi-faceted and involve prevention at the earliest opportunity and multi-agency collaborative working.

In recent years, there has been a growing recognition of the value of public health approaches to addressing violence,¹⁶ for example in Scotland. Public health approaches require collaboration from different fields and multi-agency involvement in 'diagnosing the problem, analysing underlying causes, examining what

¹⁴ Kirchmaier & Villa Llera, 2018.

¹⁵ Silvestri, 2009.

¹⁶ Bellis et al., 2012.



works and developing solutions'. In Scotland, the development of an approach involving the police, social services, youth and community services, offending and probation teams, the NHS and local voluntary organisations, seems to be achieving results, with violent crime reaching a 41 year low in 2017.¹⁷ The Scottish Violence Reduction Unit has developed a range of interventions focusing on preventing the onset and progression of violence, rehabilitating offenders, developing criminal justice approaches to reduce offending, and changing attitudes and behaviours on a societal, community and personal level.

General violence or weapon-related interventions with greatest potential to reduce crime

Page 41

Pulling levers

Well-implemented problem-solving and focused deterrence strategies such as the US-based 'pulling levers' approach can have a positive impact on reducing violence.¹⁸ These strategies target prolific or repeat offenders, combining improved access to support with strict enforcement (sometimes called a 'carrot and stick' approach). There is evidence from the US through Operation Ceasefire, and encouraging evidence from Scotland through the Violence Reduction Unit, of a positive effect of

these types of approaches on violence and homicide (US) and knife carrying (Scotland).¹⁹ Successful implementation of these approaches involves:

- multi-agency working involving a range of partners, including law enforcement, social services and community-based practitioners
- analytical work to identify key offenders, groups and behaviour patterns
- developing a response to offenders that uses a variety of interventions, both access to services and support and criminal justice processes
- directly and repeatedly communicating with offenders to make them understand why they are receiving this special attention.

A similar focused deterrence approach has been piloted in three London boroughs. No effect was found on violent offending, but there were implementation weaknesses which highlighted the need to have mutual understanding, cooperation and support from all agencies.²⁰

Early intervention and prevention programmes

Programmes aimed at changing norms and values towards violence at a young age have shown some promising effects.²¹ In the UK, these programmes are typically aimed at children aged 13 and over, however there are calls for programmes to work with children as

¹⁷ Linden, 2018.

¹⁸ Braga et al., 2018; Braga & Weisburd, 2012; Braga et al., 2001.

¹⁹ Williams et al., 2014.

²⁰ Davies et al., 2016.

²¹ Ross et al., 2011.



young as eight²², due to the increasing number of children carrying knives.²³ Early intervention programmes that have shown promising effects include:

- child skills training²⁴ – teaching social and emotional skills, problem solving and anger management
- behavioural parent training – supporting parents to reinforce good behaviour
- mentoring²⁵ – with an emphasis on emotional support and role modelling
- after school recreational activities²⁶ – teaching skills in a structured and supervised environment.

Restorative justice

Restorative justice²⁷ conferences – meetings between victims, offenders and sometimes family or community members – can reduce reoffending. Evidence suggests these approaches have a particularly significant effect on violent crimes, and that victims are significantly less likely to seek revenge against the offender.²⁸

²² Kinsella, 2010.

²³ Youth Justice Board and Ministry of Justice, 2018.

²⁴ See more about social skills training on the [Crime Reduction Toolkit entry](#)

²⁵ See more about mentoring on the [Crime Reduction Toolkit entry](#).

²⁶ See more about after school clubs on the [Crime Reduction Toolkit entry](#).

²⁷ See more about RJ interventions on the [Crime Reduction Toolkit entry](#).

²⁸ Strang et al., 2012; Livingstone et al., 2013.

Specific knife crime interventions with limited crime reduction evidence

Knife amnesties

Little research has accompanied the often large scale knife amnesties across the UK. Police data shows their impact is often limited or short term,²⁹ indicating that removing a proportion of knives from the streets does not address issues of availability, or the motivations underlying an individual's decision to carry knives.³⁰ Schemes such as **Bin a Blade** and **Word 4 Weapons** provide knife amnesty or surrender bins while helping to raise awareness of the dangers of knife carrying, though little is understood about who surrenders knives and their motivations for doing so, meaning our knowledge around the effectiveness of amnesties is currently limited.

Community and educational interventions

There are several programmes across the country aiming to tackle knife crime, which are not necessarily early interventions, because they can be applied at various ages or stages of entry to the criminal justice system. Primarily centred on changing attitudes and behaviours towards knives,³¹ they provide people with conflict resolution and emotional communication skills, diversionary activities such as sport, and other educational support.³² Many projects that aim to divert young people away

²⁹ Metropolitan Police Service, 2006.

³⁰ Eades, 2007.

³¹ Silvestri et al., 2009.

³² Barry et al., 2018.



from knife crime and violence are often run by small charities at a local level, and are rarely evaluated.

Enforcement interventions where evidence suggests careful use

Stop and search

Stop and search is a police power which has the potential to reduce crime through immediate detection or confiscation of a weapon, or deterrence by raising the perceived risk of detection. Previous research has estimated that over 80 per cent of all arrests for offensive weapons in the Metropolitan Police Service resulted from a stop and search.³³ Such offences often only come to light as a result of officers searching people they suspect to be in possession of weapons. While the number of searches has declined nationally in recent years, the proportion that result in an arrest has increased to its highest ever level (17 per cent).³⁴ In 2017/18, of all those searches that led to an arrest, 14 per cent were for offensive weapons.

In terms of deterrence, there is consistent evidence to suggest that an everyday level of police activity, including stop and search, reduces crime.³⁵ Beyond this level, there is limited evidence to show increases in activity reduce crime. Analysis over a ten year period suggests stop and search has a marginal deterrent effect on violent

crime rates overall,³⁶ while an evaluation of a stop and search initiative aimed specifically at knife crime found no statistically significant crime reduction effects,³⁷ although the authors were not able to consider local targeting. Focused police patrol activity, including stops and stop and search, has been found to reduce crime in targeted violence hotspots in the US.³⁸

While intelligence helps the targeting of stop and search, people's willingness to provide information is likely to be affected by how fair they perceive the police to be in their use of this power.³⁹ Young people, the economically disadvantaged, and people from some minority ethnic groups are significantly more likely to be stopped, and to be dissatisfied with police treatment during a stop.⁴⁰ If contact with officers is felt to be unfair, analysis also suggests it can undermine young people's perception that the police are 'on their side', reducing their willingness to comply with the law, and is associated with increased risk that they consider violence to be an option in achieving certain goals.⁴¹

Sentencing

Despite recent changes to sentencing guidelines for knife offences aimed at deterring would-be offenders through increasing the severity of sentences, 72 per cent of those

³⁶ Tiratelli et al., 2018.

³⁷ McCandless et al., 2016.

³⁸ Ratcliffe et al., 2011; Weisburd et al., 2015; MacDonald et al., 2016.

³⁹ Bradford, 2015.

⁴⁰ Bradford, 2017.

⁴¹ Jackson et al., 2012.

³³ Fitzgerald, 1999.

³⁴ Home Office, 2018b.

³⁵ Boydston, 1975; Bradford, 2011.



convicted for knife and offensive weapons offences in the year ending March 2018 were first-time knife and weapons offenders.⁴² It is very difficult to measure 'what levels of punishment produce what levels of general deterrence',⁴³ and the impact of custodial sentences on knife crime will need longer term evaluation.

For juveniles (10–18 years), prison alone has been found to significantly increase reoffending, compared to non-custodial sanctions such as community supervision with victim reparation, and community surveillance and aftercare.⁴⁴ Evidence also shows that educational attainment is lower for children with knife possession offences, which has been shown to be a risk marker for serious violence later in life.⁴⁵

address the root causes of violence. Public health approaches, involving multiple agencies to develop a range of interventions, including prevention work for at-risk groups, as well as law enforcement activity directed at offenders, have been shown to have a positive impact.

Conclusion

Knife crime perpetrators and victims are most likely to be males in late adolescence. Risk factors for serious violence and weapon carrying include adverse childhood experiences and poor educational attainment. Ethnicity has been found to have no significant effect on weapon carrying in the UK.

The most successful approaches to reducing violence include well-implemented problem-solving and focused deterrence strategies, such as the US-based 'pulling levers', which aim to

⁴² Ministry of Justice, 2018b.

⁴³ Halliday et al., 2001.

⁴⁴ Marsh et al., 2009.

⁴⁵ Ministry of Justice, 2018a.



References

Barry, M.M., Clarke, A.M., Morreale, S.E., & Field, C.A. (2018). A Review of the Evidence on the Effects of Community-based Programs on Young People's Social and Emotional Skills Development. *Adolescent Research Review*, 3(1), pp.13-27.

Bellis, M.A., Hughes, K., Perkins, C. & Bennett, A. (2012). Protecting people, Promoting health: A public health approach to violence prevention for England. Liverpool: Centre for Public Health. Online access: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/216977/Violence-prevention.pdf.

Birmingham Race Action Partnership (BRAP) (2012). STUCK: Current approaches to the design and delivery of interventions to address gang-related violence in Birmingham, A Research Report.

Boydston, J. (1975). San Diego field interrogation: Final report. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Bradford, B. (2011). Police Numbers and Crime Rates – A Rapid Evidence Review. London: HMIC.

Bradford, B. (2015). The unintended consequences of stop and search, in: Delsol, R. and Shiner, M. (eds). Stop and search: The anatomy of a police power. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bradford, B. (2017). Stop and search and police legitimacy. Abingdon: Routledge.

Braga, A.A., Kennedy, D.M., Waring, E.J., and Piehl, A.M. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 38(3), pp.195-225.

Braga, A.A., Weisburd, D. (2012). The Effects of 'Pulling Levers' Focused Deterrence Strategies on Crime. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 2012:6. Online access: <https://campbellcollaboration.org/library/pulling-levers-focused-deterrence-strategies-effects-on-crime.html>.

Page 46
Braga, A.A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), pp.205-250.

Brennan, I.R. (2017). High Stakes: Offender decisions about weapon carrying and weapon use, in: Bernasco, W., Elffers, H., van Gelder, J-L, (eds). *Oxford Handbook of Offender Decision Making*. Oxford: OUP.

Brennan, I.R. (2018). Weapon-Carrying and the Reduction of Violent Harm. *British Journal of Criminology*. Online access: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azy032>.

Davies, T., Grossmith, L., & Dawson, P. (2016). *Group Violence Intervention London: An Evaluation of the Shield Pilot*. MOPAC Evidence and Insight. Online access: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gvi_london_evaluation270117.pdf

Dobash, R., Emerson Dobash, R., Cavanagh, K., Duncan S., & Medina-Ariza, J. (2007). Onset of offending and life course among men convicted of murder. *Homicide Studies*, 11 (4), pp.243-271.

Eades, C., Grimshaw, R., Silvestri, A., & Solomon, E. (2007). 'Knife Crime': A Review of Evidence and Policy. Centre for Crime and Justice Studies. Online access: <https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/publications/knife-crime-review-evidence-and-policy-2nd-edition>.

FitzGerald, M. (1999). *Searches in London: Under s1 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act*. London: MPS.

Foster, R. (2013). *Knife Crime Interventions: 'What Works?'*. Glasgow: SCCJR. Online access: http://www.sccjr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/SCCJR_Report_No_04.2013_Knife_Crime_Interventions.pdf.

Hales, G., Lewis, C. and Silverstone, D. (2006). *Gun Crime: The Market in and Use of Illegal Firearms*. London: Home Office.

Halliday, J., French, C. and Goodwin, C. (2001). *Making Punishments Work: Report of a Review of the Sentencing Framework for England and Wales*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (2009). *Tackling Youth Knife Crime: Practical Advice for Police*. London: Home Office. Online access: <http://www.knifecrimes.org/youth087a.pdf>.

Home Office. (2018). *Serious Violence Strategy*. London: Home Office.



Home Office. (2018b). Police powers and procedures, England and Wales, year ending 31 March 2018. London: Home Office.

Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Stanko, B. and Hohl, K. (2012). Just authority?: Trust in the police in England and Wales. Cullompton: Willan.

Kinsella, Brooke. (2010). Tackling Knife Crime Together – A Review Of Local Anti-Knife Crime Projects. London: Home Office.

Kirchmaier, T. and Villa Llera, C. (2018). Murders in London. Centre for Economic Performance, LSE: London.

Lemos, G. (2004). Fear and fashion. The Use of Knives and Other Weapons by Young People, Bridge House Trust.

Linden, W. (2018). Last year, 39 UK youths were fatally stabbed. None were in Scotland. Why? https://apolitical.co/solution_article/last-year-80-londoners-killed-knives-glasgow-nobody/

Livingstone, N., Macdonald, G. and Carr, N. (2013). Restorative justice conferencing for reducing recidivism in young offenders (aged 7 to 21). Cochrane Systematic Reviews, 2013: 2. Online access: <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD008898.pub2/epdf/full>

Marsh, K., Fox, C. and Sarmah, R. (2009). Is custody an effective sentencing option for the UK? Evidence from a meta-analysis of existing studies. Probation Journal, 56(2), pp.129-151.

MacDonald, J., Fagan, J. and Geller, A. (2016). The effects of local police surges on crime and arrests in New York City. PLoS ONE, 11(6), pp.1–13.

McCandless, R., Feist, A., Allan, J. and Morgan, N. (2016). Do Initiatives Involving Substantial Increases in Stop and Search Reduce Crime? Assessing the Impact of Operation BLUNT 2. London: Home Office.

McVie, S. (2010). Gang Membership and Knife Carrying: Findings from the Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime. Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.

Metropolitan Police Service (2006). Knife Amnesty Impact on Knife-Enabled Offences, London: MPS. Online access: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/06_12_06_knife_amnesty.pdf.

Ministry of Justice. (2018a). Examining the Educational Background of Young Knife Possession Offenders. London: Ministry of Justice. Online access: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/716039/examining-the-educational-background-of-young-knife-possession-offenders.pdf.

Ministry of Justice. (2018b). Knife and Offensive Weapon Sentencing Statistics, England and Wales – year ending March 2018. London: Ministry of Justice. Online access: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/716277/knife-offensive-weapon-sentencing-jan-mar-2018.pdf.

MOPAC (2017). The London Knife Crime Strategy. London: MOPAC. Online access: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/mopac_knife_crime_strategy_june_2017.pdf.

MOPAC, Ministry of Justice, London Councils (2018). Working Towards Justice Devolution to London: Memorandum of Understanding between the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime, the Ministry of Justice and London Councils. Online access: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_justice_mou_final.pdf.

Office for National Statistics (2018). Crime and Justice Bulletins, Crime in England and Wales: year ending March 2018. London: ONS. Online access: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/crimeinenglandandwales/yearendingmarch2018>.

Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C., Hollis-Peel, M.E., & Lavenberg, J.G. (2013). 'Scared Straight' and other juvenile awareness programs for preventing juvenile delinquency. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2013:5. Online access: http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/media/k2/attachments/Petrosino_Scared_Straight_Update.pdf.

Ratcliffe, J. H., Taniguchi, T., Groff, E.R., & Wood, J. (2011). The Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment: A randomized controlled trial of police patrol effectiveness in violent crime hotspots. *Criminology*, 49(3), pp.795-831.

Ross, A., Duckworth, K., Smith, D.J., Wyness, G., and Schoon, I. (2011). Prevention and Reduction: A review of strategies for intervening early to prevent or reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour. London: Department for Education. Online access: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/182548/DFE-RR111.pdf.

Scottish Government (2018). Policy: Crime Prevention and Reduction: Violence including knife crime. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Online access: <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Justice/policies/reducing-crime/reducing-violence>.

Sentencing Council. (2018). Bladed Articles and Offensive Weapons. London: Sentencing Council. Online access: <https://www.sentencingcouncil.org.uk/publications/item/bladed-articles-and-offensive-weapons-definitive-guideline/>.

Silvestri, A., Oldfield, M., Squires, P. and Grimshaw, R. (2009). Young people, knives and guns: a comprehensive review, analysis and critique of gun and knife crime strategies. London: Centre for Criminal Justice Studies. Online access: <https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/sites/crimeandjustice.org.uk/files/YP%20knives%20and%20guns.pdf>.

Silvestri, A. (2009). Young people, 'knife' and 'gun crime': policy in an evidence vacuum? Arianna Silvestri examines the evidence available to support interventions in this high-profile area. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 76(1), pp.48-49.

Strang, H., Sherman, L.W., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D. and Ariel, B. (2013). Restorative Justice Conferencing (RJC) Using Face-to-Face Meetings of Offenders and Victims: Effects on Offender Recidivism and Victim Satisfaction. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2013:12. Online access: <https://campbellcollaboration.org/library/restorative-justice-conferencing-recidivism-victim-satisfaction.html>.

Tiratelli, M., Quinton, P. and Bradford, B. (2018). Does stop and search deter crime? Evidence from ten years of London-wide data. The British Journal of Criminology, 58(5), pp.1,212–1,231.

Violence Reduction Unit. (undated). Glasgow's Community Initiative to Reduce Violence. Glasgow: Strathclyde Police. Online access: http://actiononviolence.org/sites/default/files/CIRV_2nd_year_report.pdf.

Weisburd, D., Wooditch, A., Weisburd, S. and Yang, S-M. (2015). Do stop, question, and frisk practices deter crime? Evidence at microunits of space and time. Criminology and Public Policy, 15(1): pp.31–56.

Williams, D.J., Currie, D., Linden, W. and Donnelly, P.D. (2014). Addressing gang-related violence in Glasgow: A preliminary pragmatic quasi-experimental evaluation of the Community Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV). Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19, (6), pp.686-691.

Youth Justice Board and Ministry of Justice. (2018). Youth Justice Statistics 2016/17: England and Wales. London: Ministry of Justice. Online access: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/676072/youth_justice_statistics_2016-17.pdf.

About the College

We're the professional body for everyone who works for the police service in England and Wales. Our purpose is to provide those working in policing with the skills and knowledge necessary to prevent crime, protect the public and secure public trust.

Page 50

college.police.uk



Follow us
@CollegeofPolice



Safeguarding children and young people in education from knife crime

Lessons from London

This report summarises our findings and recommendations from a research project in London on knife crime in education. The research was carried out in 29 schools, colleges and pupil referral units in London and included focus groups with parents and children. We have condensed our findings into recommendations that focus on six areas of practice and policy that need further consideration from central government, local government and school leaders.

No single agency, including schools, can solve knife crime on its own. But there are some areas of focus for schools and wider agencies individually, and together, that can be tightened to keep children and young people safer. The areas for consideration include:

- improving partnership working and strategic planning in London
- sharing and promoting good practice in relation to exclusions and managed moves
- coordinating early help and prevention
- improving information-sharing
- teaching the curriculum and supporting children to achieve.

Published: March 2019

Reference no: 190005



Contents

Introduction	3
Context	4
Purpose of the research	7
Methods	8
Recommendations	10
Improving partnership working and strategic planning	11
Exclusions and managed moves	16
Early help and prevention	21
Improving information-sharing	23
Teaching the curriculum	26
Conclusion	30
Appendix 1 – The recommendations	31
Appendix 2 – School survey	33
Appendix 3 – Expert advisory panel	37

Introduction

1. Agencies and political leaders across London want to do more to protect children from knife crime and they are searching for answers. Many are acting independently or in partnership to do the right thing, but it is difficult, not least because London's leaders are each managing competing (and sometimes conflicting) priorities, each acting largely with autonomy but within rules set out in statutory guidance.
2. London has thousands of schools, colleges and pupil referral units (PRUs) across 33 local authorities (LAs). Our education system is complex. There is a mix of academies, free schools and maintained schools. Also, the Metropolitan Police Service is by far the largest police service in England.
3. All these groups want to do more to address knife crime, but coordination across these agencies is difficult – not least because the resources available to them are finite. Our research points to some of the views held by schools, parents and children about how knife crime is handled by schools and some of the different approaches being taken.
4. Knife crime has a huge impact on children and the communities in which they live, and not just in London but nationally. It is a societal problem and it cannot be tackled by schools or single agencies alone.¹ It is important that the findings of this report are read in that context. Schools can only do so much. They must identify, support, help and protect children on the school site, and they can do their best to teach them about the dangers of knives and related dangers. They can also teach them to read, write and add up, allowing them to achieve in school and experience success. But children need everyone in society – the police, LAs, health, youth services, welfare services, housing services, local communities, their parents, social media providers and so on – to work together and to put children first and protect them from county lines, gangs, knives, drugs and from adults who pose a risk to them.
5. The findings from this report are based on data from London, but much in the recommendations applies equally across the country.
6. Our recommendations focus on the areas that school leaders, parents and children told us needed more joined-up working, particularly in a fragmented system; recognising the need for schools to have autonomy but within limits. Our hope is that the insight into schools provided by this report, along with the overwhelming desire by different agencies to reduce the prevalence of knife crime, will create a momentum across London to agree protocols and ways of working that better protect vulnerable children.

¹ When we refer to schools throughout this report, we are referring also to colleges and pupil referral units, with which we also carried out fieldwork.

7. The recommendations in this report should be interpreted broadly and we have deliberately refrained from being too specific about how they should be implemented. The recommendations are focused on the areas that school leaders told us need more joined-up working, which includes schools working better together. They also focus only on those things that would help create the conditions for schools to fulfil their roles as best they can. This report should not be read as a definitive list of solutions to knife crime.

Context

8. Knife crime is a term used commonly in the media to refer, primarily, to street-based knife assaults and knife-carrying. However, there are many different criminal offences relating to knives. For example:
 - it is an offence to threaten or cause harm to a person with a bladed weapon
 - some bladed weapons are prohibited from being sold or purchased, including to anyone under the age of 18
 - offences such as robbery or assault can be aggravated if a knife is involved
 - it is also an offence to carry a knife in a public place without good reason.²
9. In this report, when we refer to knife crime, we are referring both to the use of knives against children either to threaten or to wound them and to instances when children may have been carrying or using knives for a range of purposes.³
10. In the 12 months to September 2018, knife crime had increased by 68.4% across England and Wales (excluding the Greater Manchester Police area) compared with 12 months up to September 2014 and by 55.5% across the Metropolitan Police Service area of London over the same period.⁴ Public perception of knife crime being a problem in London has increased and 26% of respondents to the London Public Attitude Survey 2018 felt that knife crime was a problem compared with 20% a year earlier.⁵ The number of sharp instruments found on school property has increased. Data from 21 police forces in England and Wales obtained through a freedom of information request showed that 363 sharp instruments were found on school property in 2017–18.

² Prevention of Crime Act 1953; www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Eliz2/1-2/14/contents.
Restriction of Offensive Weapons Act 1959; www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Eliz2/7-8/37/contents.
Criminal Justice Act 1988; www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/33/contents.
Offensive Weapons Act 1996; www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1996/26/contents.
Knives Act 1997; www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/21/contents.

³ There are examples in this report of incidents involving knives, bladed weapons or other weapons that are not, or were not, responded to as criminal offences.

⁴ Police recorded crime and outcomes open data tables to September 2018 – Knife crime open data; www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-recorded-crime-open-data-tables.

⁵ MOPAC weapon enabled crime dashboard; www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/data-and-statistics/weapon-enabled-crime-dashboard.

This is a rise from 269 in 2013–14.⁶ Research also shows that pupils who self-report as being a victim of knife crime are twice as likely to carry a knife themselves compared with non-victims.⁷ Therefore, as we see an increase in victims or fear of knife crime, we can expect to see an increase in perpetrators of knife-carrying and knife crime among both adults and children.

11. It is clear that knife crime is an increasing safeguarding risk to children, both at school and in their local communities. While we have not sought to answer the question of the causes of knife crime, leaders told us that, in their experience, children are in three categories of risk of knife-carrying:

- The highest level of risk is for those children who have been groomed into gangs, for the purposes of criminal exploitation.⁸
- Underneath this lies a group of children who have witnessed other children carrying knives, have been the victim of knife crime or know someone who has carried a knife for protection or status-acquisition or who are encouraged to believe knife-carrying is normal through the glamorisation of gangs and knives on social media.
- Then there are children who carry knives to school as an isolated incident. For example, they may carry a penknife that a grandparent has gifted them.

12. Knife crime is just one issue among many faced by children that leaders in schools have to understand and manage on a daily basis. As one designated safeguarding leader put it:

‘If you asked a teacher who was in charge of knives, they wouldn’t know: I’m the drug woman, the knife woman and the sex woman’.

It is important to remember that knife crime does not exist in a vacuum and children who are victims or perpetrators may also be experiencing multiple vulnerabilities.

13. The common denominator of pupils who are found carrying bladed objects into school is their vulnerability. Leaders were clear that, almost invariably, these children have experienced poverty, abuse or neglect or are living within troubled families. They may also experience social exclusion due to factors such as their race or socio-economic background. School leaders said that all the pupils who have been permanently excluded because of a knife-related incident

⁶ Ben Butcher and Rachel Schraer, ‘How do we know how many children are in gangs?’, 28 February 2019; www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-47388890.

⁷ ‘Youth Survey 2008: young people in mainstream education’, Youth Justice Board, 2009; www.most.ie/webreports/march2010/MORI_08_fullreport_EDU.pdf and ‘Youth voice survey 2018’, Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC); www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/youth_voice_survey_report_2018_final.pdf.

⁸ Exploitation is defined in Modern Slavery Act 2015, part 1, section 3; www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/30/section/3/enacted.

had at least one of these characteristics. School leaders also told us that those involved were also more likely to be low attainers academically compared with their peers.

14. Staff and school leaders are generally confident that children are safe from knife crime at school and children confirmed this. Leaders say that they keep pupils safe on the premises through policies and practice, their zero-tolerance approach to bladed objects, their clear expectations of pupils' behaviour, good levels of supervision at the start and end of the school day, including on the school gate and at the bus stops, and the visibility, albeit reduced, of a police officer at the school. Examples of knife incidents at school contained in this report tend to be several years old. According to our sample, they occur infrequently.
15. The most dangerous time for children is shortly after school, between 4pm and 6pm.⁹ So, while children might be safe on site, their safety after school is a concern for children, their parents and their teachers. Several schools told us that they endeavour to keep pupils safe on arrival and departure from school by ensuring staff presence at the bus drop-offs and supervision there until the pupils have left. Leaders also set high expectations regarding pupils' behaviour on the buses and out of school. Indeed, several of the permanent exclusions for knife-related incidents that leaders talked about resulted from incidents that took place outside school or at the weekends.
16. It is clear that children need help and support to prevent them becoming either victims or perpetrators of knife crime. As such, local responses to knife crime are being framed within the context of the government's Serious Violence Strategy¹⁰ and in London by The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime's (MOPAC) London Knife Crime Strategy.¹¹ Both strategies identify that, in addition to law enforcement, multi-agency and partnership work with children is crucial to addressing knife crime that affects them.
17. It is important to note that the issue of relative poverty is an important factor in knife crime among children and young people. The underlying socio-economic drivers behind knife crime cannot be ignored. Wider considerations of the lived experiences of children growing up in poverty and, in particular, in areas with

⁹ S Mayor, 'Under 16s are at highest risk of being stabbed going home from school, UK study finds', British Medical Journal 2018; 363 doi, November 2018 (behind paywall); www.bmj.com/content/363/bmj.k4721.

¹⁰ 'Serious violence strategy', Home Office, 2018; www.gov.uk/government/publications/serious-violence-strategy.

¹¹ 'The London knife crime strategy', MOPAC, 2017; www.london.gov.uk/mopac-publications/mayors-knife-crime-strategy-putting-stop-knife-crime-london.

disorder problems, must form part of a multi-agency response to knife crime.¹² This is no easy task.

18. The context within which multi-agency and partnership working takes place means agencies face many challenges. LA children's services are dealing with increasing demand to support the most vulnerable children and many have significantly reduced budgets for preventative services in order to protect specialist social care services.
19. In recent years, the role of LAs in education has changed with the growth of academies. LAs, partners and schools are having to reconfigure the way they join up their response to safeguarding across all education settings in their area. The voluntary and community sectors, which are often well placed to make an important contribution to multi-agency and partnership work, have encountered increasingly short-term funding that makes it difficult for them to plan their contributions for the long term.¹³ In short, the environment in which agencies are trying to respond effectively to rising knife crime is challenging.

Purpose of the research

20. All of those charged with keeping children and communities safe and preventing violent crime and exploitation agree that there are many complexities involved in addressing the issue of knife crime. This research does not intend to address the whole spectrum of factors that can contribute to keeping children safe from crime but seeks to identify ways in which policy makers and school leaders in London can support practice in schools more effectively.
21. The research has been carried out in London, but the findings are intended to assist national policy makers and school leaders in considering their current and future approaches to tackling knife crime in London and across the country. The causes of knife crime may differ across the country, but there are some common themes as to how schools can best be supported and best tackle the issue.
22. This research project explored three broad questions:

¹² 'Young people and crime: findings from the 2005 offending, crime and justice survey', Wilson, D., et al., London: Home Office, 2006; <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/6902>.

'Young people and street crime', Fitzgerald M. and Stockdale, J., London: Youth Justice Board, 2003; <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/14045>.

¹³ 'Death of public sector grants will damage people and communities', Directory of Social Change, 2016; www.dsc.org.uk/content/death-of-public-sector-grants-will-damage-people-and-communities. 'Youth Work Inquiry: recommendations and summary', All-Party Parliamentary Group on Youth Affairs, October 2018; www.nya.org.uk/appg-report-2018.

- What are schools, colleges and PRUs in London, under their safeguarding duty, doing to safeguard children/learners from knife crime while on school premises?
 - How are schools, colleges and PRUs in London giving children the knowledge and skills to stay safer in their local communities?
 - How are exclusions being used when children bring knives to school?
23. Last year, we completed related work, in conjunction with Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS), the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) in November 2018, and published our joint report, 'Protecting children from criminal exploitation, human trafficking and modern child slavery: an addendum'.¹⁴ The questions for this research were designed to look more closely at the role of schools than at the role of social care or partner agencies. The reports are best read in conjunction with one another.

Methods

24. To restrict the project to a manageable size, we decided to limit the research to secondary education, alternative provision and further education, in other words children aged 11 and upwards. That does not mean that children under this age, or at primary school, are unaffected. In fact, they very much can be. All primary schools and partner agencies should ensure that they are carrying out preventative work with this age group. It is something many of the secondary school leaders involved in this research felt strongly about also.

Expert panel group

25. We formed an expert panel group to test our ideas, provide help and support and provide challenge to our methods and findings. This group was made up of academics, charitable organisations, headteachers, parents, youth workers and ex-gang members, all of whom have expertise in peer-on-peer violence, knife crime, policing, criminal exploitation or all of the above. The group met twice, at the beginning of the study and at the end of evidence collection, to inform both the methodology and to assist us in framing the findings.¹⁵

¹⁴ 'Protecting children from criminal exploitation human trafficking modern slavery: an addendum', Ofsted, Care Quality Commission, HM Inspectorate of Probation, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, and HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, November 2018; www.gov.uk/government/publications/joint-inspections-of-child-sexual-exploitation-and-missing-children.

¹⁵ See Appendix 1 for a list of the organisations who participated in the expert panel group.

Survey to schools

26. First, we developed and circulated a survey to all secondary schools, alternative provision and further education colleges in London (circa 600).¹⁶ The purpose of this survey was to give us an overview of some of what schools are doing with regards to knife crime to help us develop our research questions further and to design the rest of the study. This survey also gave us our sample, because school leaders were given the option at the end to put themselves forward to take part in the second phase: visiting their school and carrying out semi-structured interviews with school leaders on the topic of knife crime.
27. We felt that it was important that schools had the choice to put themselves forward. This is a particularly sensitive issue for schools in London – some will have lost pupils to knife crime. Additionally, the purpose of this research was not to get a representation of absolutely everything that schools are doing, nor was it to evaluate how well schools are doing it. We wanted to understand from schools, particularly those who are very engaged with the issue, from their perspective what is working and what is not, as well as what more they think is needed.

Interviews and focus groups

28. We received 107 responses to our survey, from which we chose 29 schools to visit. That included six PRUs, six further education colleges and 17 secondary (both academy and maintained) schools.¹⁷ We visited each school and completed 29 in-depth interviews (approximately two hours each) with school leaders, including headteachers, principals and designated safeguarding leads.¹⁸ We asked a range of questions covering four key areas:

- school policy and procedure on knives
- knife crime in the curriculum
- safeguarding children from knife crime
- working with other agencies.

The data from these interviews was analysed using thematic analysis using standard qualitative software.

29. We decided not to speak to children in the schools about knife crime, for ethical and safeguarding reasons. Children may have had friends or family injured or killed by knife crime, may be very fearful of it or may be concerned that other pupils would know they have spoken to us, which could put them in danger

¹⁶ See Appendix 2 for a copy of the survey.

¹⁷ Across a total of 18 LAs.

¹⁸ We had asked to speak with headteachers and principals, some of whom chose to bring their designated safeguarding lead or other leaders who had responsibilities that were relevant to the research.

outside of school. Instead, we contacted our headteachers reference group in the London region, which arranged four focus groups with approximately 12 children per group. The headteachers were careful to ensure that the groups were representative and that they had considered the ethical issues above.

30. Additionally, we held a small focus group with four parents facilitated by one of our expert panel members. All four mothers had sons of around the same age who had been groomed into criminal exploitation and who had been both perpetrators and victims of knife crime over many years. The parents, although acquainted through a support group, were from different communities and different areas of London.

Ethics and safeguarding

31. Details of our ethics and safeguarding procedures will be published on our website soon.

Limitations of the research

32. The limitations of the research include:
 - It is not representative of all practices in schools across London and should not be read as such. We have explored, in detail, the complexities that some schools are facing.
 - The sample of schools were self-selecting and, therefore, not a random sample.
 - We have not aimed to explore the causes or solutions to knife crime. The findings are limited to what improvements could be made that would help schools to do the work they are doing more easily or effectively.

Recommendations

33. We have identified five policy and practice areas that we feel need further consideration by policy leaders and school leaders to help to create an environment in which they can work as effectively as possible to keep children safe. The five areas are:
 - improving partnership working and strategic planning
 - the use of exclusions and managed moves
 - early help and intervention
 - teaching the curriculum and supporting children to achieve
 - working with parents.

Improving partnership working and strategic planning

Recommendation 1: Local community safety partnerships should fully involve schools, colleges and PRUs in developing and implementing local strategies that aim to address knife crime and serious youth violence.

34. The Mayor's knife crime strategy sets out the need to have a local plan to address knife crime in every LA area. The plan should be led by the Metropolitan Police Service, involving partners and overseen by local community safety partnerships.¹⁹ Additionally, the Association of London Directors of Children's Services (ALDCS) has as one of its core principles that:

'Directors of Children's Services have a crucial role to play in acting as systems leaders to ensure that responses to serious youth violence and interconnected issues are effective, collaborative and multi-faceted'.²⁰

35. However, there was a wide variation in how school leaders felt about the leadership and planning in their local areas to address knife crime. Some school leaders reported a lack of direction in their local area on tackling knife crime and they did not feel supported despite the Mayor's knife crime strategy. ALDCS noted in its review of LA responses to knife crime in 2018, that:

'while partnerships between various services within the local authority and the Police were common, fewer respondents mentioned the presence of education and health partners on the Board'.²¹

36. The schools in our sample felt that they were often acting in isolation in developing a curriculum response to the risk of knife crime, keeping children safe at school and managing children who are at risk of offending. This is despite the evidence of what works in violence prevention and government guidance, which points to the importance of a multi-agency approach and information-sharing.^{22,23}

¹⁹ 'The London Knife Crime Strategy', MOPAC, 2017; www.london.gov.uk/mopac-publications/mayors-knife-crime-strategy-putting-stop-knife-crime-london.

²⁰ 'The response of London children's services to serious youth violence and knife crime', ALDCS, May 2018; www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/34040.

²¹ 'The response of London children's services to serious youth violence and knife crime', ALDCS, May 2018; www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/34040.

²² 'Knife crime interventions: what works?', The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, 2013; www.sccjr.ac.uk/publications/knife-crime-interventions-what-works.

'What works to prevent gang involvement, youth violence and crime: a rapid review of interventions delivered in the UK and abroad', Home Office/Early Intervention Foundation, 2015; www.eif.org.uk/report/what-works-to-prevent-gang-involvement-youth-violence-and-crime-a-rapid-review-of-interventions-delivered-in-the-uk-and-abroad.

'European report on preventing violence and knife crime among young people', World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, 2010; www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/european-report-on-preventing-violence-and-knife-crime-among-young-people.

Evidence, guidance and support on searching

37. One of the clearest examples of the lack of school involvement in the design and implementation of a strategy is the different approaches the schools in our sample had to searching children for the possession of weapons on entry to school (or indeed, and perhaps more commonly of concern, for drugs). Under the Violent Crime Reduction Act 2006, teachers were given the power, once only held by the police, to stop and search children on entry to school.
38. While some proponents, and indeed schools in our sample, firmly believe that searching children on entry to school keeps children safer, others do not.²⁴ Interestingly, in one of our focus groups with children, in a school that did not search children for knives, one child who opposed the idea of searching said:

‘we’re at school, not in prison.’

Conversely, some schools that had introduced searching said that their children felt safer as a result, and once embedded in a normal routine, being searched in the morning on the way into school was just an ordinary part of the day.

39. Some leaders who used wands to carry out searches believed they had a ‘massive impact’. One headteacher said:

‘We did it three or four times and found drugs for personal use, some weapons which we passed to the police and discussed this with young people. After this we found nothing in subsequent searches. We are confident the message has got out to students.’

It is clear that searching, done sensitively, can be done without ostracising children.

‘Tackling youth knife crime: practical advice for police’, Home Office, 2009; www.knifecrimes.org/youth087a.pdf.

‘Protecting people, promoting health: a public health approach to violence prevention for England’, Department of Health, 2012; www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-public-health-approach-to-violence-prevention-in-england.

‘Ending gang and youth violence: a cross-government report’, HM Government, 2011; www.gov.uk/government/publications/ending-gang-and-youth-violence-cross-government-report.

²³ While a decade ago Glasgow was called the ‘murder capital of Europe’, now knife crime in Scotland is at a 42-year low. Scotland approached knife crime as a ‘public health’ issue, which meant that the police, social, health and school sectors worked closely together along with Scottish-funded violence reduction units to address it.

‘About us’, Violence Reduction Unit, retrieved 13 December 2018; www.actiononviolence.org.uk/about-us.

²⁴ ‘Knife crime: sister of murdered teacher makes plea for schools to resist scanners’, iNews, January 2018; <https://inews.co.uk/news/uk/knife-crime-sister-murdered-teacher-makes-plea-schools-resist-scanners>.

40. On the other hand, one college had abandoned the use of knife arches, believing it to be detrimental to the students and to the reputation of the college. Students found ways to notify each other of checks, including those coordinated by the borough commander at tube stations. The principal there said:

‘We need a broader approach, not just in the borough, but a London approach.’

41. In our sample, we heard of several different approaches to searching for knives:
- no routine searches: searches are intelligence-led, relying on third-party information
 - searching pupils randomly either termly, fortnightly or weekly: this could involve knife arches, wands, bag searches or pat-downs; consent is either obtained by the pupils individually at the point of search or agreed with pupils and parents in the behaviour policy on enrolment
 - searching pupils daily on entry to school, as above (most common in PRUs)
 - searching pupils multiple times per day (most common in PRUs)
 - perimeter searches of the surrounding area of the premises, sometimes carried out by police liaison/safer schools officers (SSO) and sometimes teachers/staff.
42. The Department for Education (DfE) has set out guidance for schools in relation to ‘Searching, screening and confiscation at school’.²⁵ Meanwhile, the Mayor’s Office has committed to supporting schools by ‘offering the use of knife wands in areas where knife crime is most prevalent’.²⁶ However, only 250 schools in London have taken up the offer of a knife wand.²⁷
43. What appears to be missing is a dialogue between local safeguarding partners and schools about the purpose of searching, the impact on staff and pupils and evidence of the impact on knife-carrying. While some schools told us that they had been offered wands, for example, they did not use them because the wands can only detect metal – as opposed to drugs or other banned items or substances that pupils might bring to school. Additionally, some schools were wary of beginning to search children in case it sent the wrong message to parents – that suddenly their children were less safe – or because the school

²⁵ ‘Searching, screening and confiscation at school’, Department for Education, 2014 (updated January 2018); www.gov.uk/government/publications/searching-screening-and-confiscation.

²⁶ ‘The London knife crime strategy’, MOPAC, 2017; www.london.gov.uk/mopac-publications/mayors-knife-crime-strategy-putting-stop-knife-crime-london.

²⁷ ‘Most young Londoners feel safe in the capital, new survey reveals’, MOPAC, January 2019; www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/most-young-londoners-feel-safe-in-the-capital.

100 yards away did not. This was particularly a concern for colleges, which felt that it would make them look less safe than competing schools in their area.

44. Searching pupils, while encouraged by the government when necessary, is an example of a strategy that has been adopted in a piecemeal way across schools in London. There are examples of searches in schools being carried out in an acceptable way, and body checks are common as a security measure in public places. It is not clear why such searches, if done sensitively and without bias, could not be successful in acting as a deterrent and encouraging discussion about issues, including knife crime.
45. Schools want to know what works, including what works in different contexts. They need strong local leadership in London that drives the implementation of local strategies that are regularly reviewed, and they need to be involved and to engage actively with the strategy development from the outset.

Criminalisation of young people carrying knives

46. School leaders have very different approaches to involving the police in incidents of knife-carrying. The approach varied widely between schools.
47. Some school leaders had a strong ethos against criminalising children, or calling the police, in response to a child bringing a bladed article into school. Others were firmly of the opinion that it is an offence and should be treated as such. But within these two approaches was a vast grey area in which school leaders made decisions, knew other leaders made decisions or said that they would potentially make decisions about contacting the police based on a variety of factors. Some of those factors included:
 - whether the child is vulnerable
 - whether it was a first offence
 - the history of the child's behaviour more generally
 - whether the child was thought to be, or known to be, affiliated with a gang
 - the reason for which the child was carrying a knife, for example for protection or with the intention of harming someone
 - whether the child was looked after or not²⁸
 - whether the child had any connections to adults with a history of violence or criminality in their family or family friends
 - whether other children were aware that the blade had been brought to school
 - the nature of the weapon, for example a compass, a corkscrew, a penknife, a kitchen knife, etc.

²⁸ A child is 'looked after' if they are in the care of the LA (for more than 24 hours).

- the relationship the school had with the child or parents
 - the child's prior attainment.
48. School leaders had conflicting views about whether it was a criminal offence to carry a knife into school at all. They also reported that police officers do not take a consistent approach to children when making decisions to charge. One said they had been advised by their SSO that schools are not public places and so carrying a knife was not a criminal offence. Another school had called the police in response to a child carrying a small, sharp metal object (not a knife) for self-protection on the way to and from school when there was clear evidence that the child was in fact at risk during their journey. This child was arrested and charged.
49. This variation in practice may be contextual. Responding to individual circumstances is important, but schools would appreciate examples of when charges may or may not be brought. Almost all school leaders told us that it would depend on the circumstances, or factors listed above, as to whether they chose to call the police or not. What is concerning here is that this lends itself to a huge potential for bias – children who have a certain demeanour, a particular type of relationship with their teacher or a type of background may likely be criminalised for the same actions that other children would not, depending on which school they go to, and even within the same school.
50. Senior leaders and school staff must understand the law on knife-carrying and knife offences generally so that there is a common approach across London to responding to such incidents. These approaches will need to be flexible so that decision-makers can take all the information into account. However, the underlying principles cannot rely too heavily on individual leaders, teachers or police officers making decisions about how deserving or undeserving of prosecution children are based on their vulnerabilities, as opposed to the risk they present.²⁹

Coordinating access to services

51. Aside from simply searching children, as ALDCS has highlighted, 'schools are very often the focus for both universal and targeted prevention activity'.³⁰ ALDCS, in 2018, had identified 'some' central LA support in delivering targeted and preventative activities in relation to gangs and gang prevention. What is apparent, however, is that the development of local area strategies and how much or how well schools are involved in these differs across LAs in London.

²⁹ Guidance on this issue can be found here: 'Searching, screening and confiscation at school', DfE, 2018; www.gov.uk/government/publications/searching-screening-and-confiscation.

³⁰ 'The response of London Children's Services to serious youth violence and knife crime', ALDCS, May 2018; www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/34040.

52. Each LA/community safety partnership also has its own approaches to knife crime and related issues, its own types of support services and organisational structures reflecting its differing resources and assessment of needs. School leaders, particularly those working in schools where children came from many different LAs, told us that they struggle to know what services they can access for children and how best to do that, because the systems are so dependent on the LA in which that child lives. Under 'Keeping children safe in education', 'all [school] staff should be aware of their local early help process and understand their role in it'. Local safeguarding partnerships should coordinate their efforts to ensure that these processes are as clear and easily accessible to schools as possible across, and between, boroughs.
53. Some school leaders told us that there was no specific training provided to staff on how to deal with any incidents when a knife is detected, nor on how to deal with the aftermath of any incidents. In other schools, staff have had extensive training specifically on knife crime funded by the school, and in some boroughs on contextual safeguarding led by the LA or local safeguarding partnerships. When it had taken place, training delivered by the LA, police or Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) was highly regarded, well received and valued.
54. The biggest barrier schools and other agencies face is cost, whether they are trying to fund extra resources to keep a child from being excluded, or to keep alternative provision open, or seeing reductions in the number of SSOs and police community support officers (PCSOs), who provided valuable support. Some are struggling to fund school-based early help services or find the same services that were once free for a cost they can afford, while others are using pupil premium to commission outside services to teach parts of the safeguarding curriculum. School leaders say they are struggling to do more with less. As one leader put it,

'A plea from me would be to have a much more coordinated response. There is not a quick cure – it's about prevention and we need to look at a prevention strategy and then an intervention strategy. These might look different at primary, secondary and further education'.

Exclusions and managed moves

Recommendation 2: All schools and academies in London should ensure that their exclusion policy reflects the practice set out in the Department for Education's statutory guidance. Local authorities should have a strategic response to permanent exclusions. They should also, in conjunction with regional schools commissioners, challenge schools and multi-academy trusts when exclusions do not appear to be in line with statutory guidance.

55. School leaders and LAs should follow the DfE 2017 statutory guidance on exclusions that says that the 'headteacher should take account of any contributing factors that are identified after an incident of poor behaviour has

occurred' and that in addition to early intervention to address underlying causes of disruptive behaviour, 'the headteacher should consider what extra support might be needed to identify and address the needs of pupils from [groups with disproportionately high rates of exclusion] in order to reduce the risk of exclusion'.³¹

56. This guidance on exclusions applies to exclusions because of knife-carrying as much as to any other behaviour management issue. Whether schools have a flexible approach or a more hard-line approach, all contributory factors as to why a child has carried a knife into school should be considered before they carry out an exclusion.
57. Headteachers we spoke to have different approaches as to whether they retain, exclude or move children to a different school who have been found to be carrying knives on the premises of a school or in the community. These can broadly be split into two:
 - The first approach considers the circumstances of the individual child and the intention the child had for carrying a knife. This approach tends to result in the child being retained at the school until all other possible options have been exhausted.³²
 - The second approach prioritises the welfare or safety of the majority of children in the school and so leaders tend to immediately permanently exclude or they will encourage the parent and child to consider a managed move to another setting. Some schools told us that they have adopted a zero-tolerance approach³³ that they believed reflected an LA-led strategy/policy. In other cases, headteachers had chosen this approach as a deterrent to children who may otherwise carry knives into school.
58. While we did not review the detail of every exclusion, and many were clearly appropriate and correctly managed, there were also examples given by headteachers where they had or would exclude children immediately without considering early intervention and support to remain in the school. The most striking examples were of teenage girls being excluded for carrying a knife for the purposes of self-harm. In those examples, headteachers were clear that, if other children had seen the knife, they would undermine their zero-tolerance deterrent if they did not exclude. There were also examples of children who

³¹ 'Exclusion from maintained schools, academies and pupil referral units in England: statutory guidance for those with legal responsibilities in relation to exclusion', DfE, 2017; www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-exclusion.

³² We are currently carrying out research into how schools manage behaviour more generally, which is coming in the summer term 2019.

³³ In this report, we are using the term 'zero-tolerance approach' in the same way that the headteachers we spoke to used it. It means that the school policy is to immediately and permanently exclude a child who has been involved in carrying or using a knife against others, either at school or in the community. Schools that do not move to immediately exclude are also intolerant of knives, but they do not necessarily immediately seek to exclude children.

had been excluded for serious incidents, such as bringing a kitchen knife to school, but where the school had not made a safeguarding referral to the LA.

59. Schools with zero-tolerance policies provided examples of when they have avoided permanent exclusions despite pupils meeting the exclusion criteria regarding bladed objects. For example, one pupil stole a sharp implement from a classroom with the clear intent to cause harm. The school imposed a fixed-term exclusion but kept the pupil on roll, learning in the inclusion unit, so that she could complete her GCSEs. The school felt that it could do this without undermining its position in front of other pupils because no other pupils knew of the incident.

60. Other settings were stricter in their approach to zero-tolerance and exclusions. As one principal said:

‘We have an absolute zero-tolerance policy and students have a very clear understanding that if they are caught with a knife they will receive a permanent exclusion. It does not matter if they say it wasn’t their knife or if they have a reason for carrying it... there is no leeway’.

61. While, in general, the intention that the pupil had in carrying a knife was the key factor in determining whether or not a child would be excluded, being gang-affiliated (in secondaries and colleges, not PRUs) was also a trigger for expulsion. Leaders said things like: ‘it just wasn’t manageable to keep him in college’.

62. A child who is a risk to other children in one school is likely to be a risk to children in others and outside of school. Children who are excluded from school to PRUs have self-reported higher instances of knife-carrying than children who are not excluded. The 2018 MOPAC youth survey found that:

‘When looking at PRU attendees, 47% (92 of 196) say they know someone who has carried a knife with them, compared with 25% of non-PRU attendees (1188 of 4673). Once again, it is a similar picture for exposure to gangs, with 46% of PRU attendees saying they know someone in a gang (87 of 191) compared with 22% of non-PRU attendees (1022 of 4585)’.³⁴

63. However, it is not possible to conclude from this that exclusions are the cause of these behaviours, or even that they increase their likelihood. What it does tell us is that these children are more at risk.

64. One factor that schools, LAs and central government need to consider further is that children who are being groomed by gangs to deal drugs and/or carry knives may be being coached by dangerous adults to get themselves excluded.

³⁴ ‘Youth voice survey 2018’, MOPAC;
www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/youth_voice_survey_report_2018_final.pdf.

In our focus group with parents of children who have been both perpetrators and victims of knife crime, parents told us that their children had been encouraged by adult gang members to carry weapons into school for the sole purpose of triggering an exclusion. Once excluded, children may have fewer protective factors,³⁵ including access to trusted adults such as their teachers, depending on what happens to them as a result. If they are not admitted into another mainstream school or good-quality alternative provision or PRU, this can make them more vulnerable to potential criminality. Schools across London should ensure that they are working in tandem to both safeguard perpetrators and victims of knife crime. A child may be both at the same time.

65. School leaders are concerned, as are we, that some schools are not following practice as set out in DfE exclusions guidance. PRU headteachers in particular have concerns about rising numbers of younger pupils being excluded, as well as pupils with special educational needs/disabilities (SEND) and vulnerable girls. Many of the school leaders we spoke to were concerned that when accepting a child who had been excluded, they were not always being given all the information they needed to ensure that they could meet the needs of excluded children.
66. For some children, therefore, it seems that schools are not following practice as outlined in statutory guidance on school exclusions in terms of providing early help, assessing the wider needs of the child or considering the context in which the child lives fully enough.³⁶
67. Given that permanent exclusions in secondary schools have been rising since 2012/13³⁷ and that there is a shortage of provision for excluded children, schools and LAs need to work together, with a clear strategy in place, to improve education and other preventative work to reduce the need for exclusion and to keep those who are excluded in education, training or employment.³⁸
68. Permanent exclusions are a necessary and important sanction but there is a balance to be found when taking this most serious action. Schools should consider the best interest of pupils at risk of exclusion alongside the need to maintain safety in school and for exclusion to act as a deterrent. It is not acceptable to exclude without considering the impact on and the risks to the

³⁵ 'The response of London children's services to serious youth violence and knife crime', ALDCS, May 2018; www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/34040.

³⁶ 'Exclusion from maintained schools, academies and pupil referral units in England: statutory guidance for those with legal responsibilities in relation to exclusion', DfE, 2017; www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-exclusion.

³⁷ 'Permanent and fixed-period exclusions in England: 2016 to 2017', DfE, July 2018; www.gov.uk/government/statistics/permanent-and-fixed-period-exclusions-in-england-2016-to-2017.

³⁸ 'The response of London children's services to serious youth violence and knife crime', ALDCS, May 2018; www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/34040.

child being excluded, especially when their behaviour does not present a risk to others.

Recommendation 3: The Department for Education should collect data from schools about managed moves in the same way in which it collects information on permanent and fixed-term exclusions.

69. Information is collected by central government about the number of, and reasons for, permanent and fixed-term exclusions to allow it, and LAs, to monitor disruption to children's mainstream education. However, school leaders spoke more often about using managed moves as a response to children's knife-carrying than they did about exclusions, in other words about moving children in a planned way to an alternative school rather than formally excluding them. Most often, these managed moves were permanent to another mainstream school, but sometimes they were to PRUs, and sometimes for only a limited or trial period.
70. We do not think that any single body has a clear picture, either in London or nationally, of the number of children who are 'managed-moved' to different schools, how long for and where to or for what reason. We also do not know what the educational outcomes for those children are, or whether managed moves do in fact effectively safeguard those children or keep them in mainstream education in the long term.
71. We heard several examples of pupils being 'manage-moved' because of knife incidents. One pupil who was carrying a knife who feared travelling to and from school because he lived in another borough was moved to a school that required a different route. The difficulty with this type of move is that we do not know if moving the child solved the problem in the short term or for good.
72. There is currently little evidence on the efficacy of managed moves. That is not to say that they are not effective in safeguarding children or ensuring that they continue, with as little interruption as possible, in their education. That may indeed be the case for many of the children who are subject to managed moves, and we know that in some cases they are used as an alternative to permanent exclusion. However, further evidence and research is needed before central and local government, headteachers and other stakeholders can be assured that managed moves are being used in the best interests of children, are keeping them and other children safe, and are leading to improved outcomes for the children concerned.³⁹

³⁹ T Messeter and A Soni, 'A systematic literature review of the 'managed move' process as an alternative to exclusion in UK schools', in 'Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties', Volume 23(2), 2018, pp. 169–185; www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13632752.2017.1383676 (behind paywall). K Hoyle, 'Secondary school pupils' experiences of managed moves: an interpretative phenomenological analysis', PhD thesis, University of Essex, 2016; <http://repository.essex.ac.uk/17469> (behind paywall).

Early help and prevention

Recommendation 4: Safeguarding partners should involve school leaders at a strategic level in assessing the needs of children and young people in their area, and in planning and delivering early help services in response to those needs. Schools need to participate actively in local arrangements as required under 'Keeping children safe in education' statutory guidance.

Recommendation 5: Local safeguarding partnerships should facilitate all agencies including schools and colleges in challenging each other's practice if they believe any agency is failing to contribute to the local strategy to protect pupils from knife crime.

73. The DfE's statutory guidance ('Working together') on inter-agency working to safeguard and promote the welfare of children⁴⁰ requires local areas to have 'a comprehensive range of effective, evidence-based services in place to address assessed needs early'. This should draw on a local-needs assessment. Typically, these might involve early help services such as parenting programmes, support for children's mental health, domestic abuse, drug or alcohol misuse and responses to concerns in extra familial contexts.
74. Spending per head on early help and preventative services fell by over 60% in real terms between 2009–10 and 2016–17.⁴¹ ALDCS identify that directing resources towards preventative services is 'extremely difficult'.⁴² The short-term nature of some of the available funding can be a restrictive factor. It is important, therefore, that all agencies use their resources as efficiently as possible, which includes involving all agencies in the planning of early help services in local areas and, individually, for families.
75. There was a wide variation in the responses from school leaders as to the perceived quality of support and intervention from LAs and other partners. Equally, it was clear that some schools were more actively engaged in local partnerships than others. Some schools felt that they had an excellent relationship with their LA, with one leader praising their LA's 'remarkable leadership'. They said:

'The secondary heads meet regularly. The local authority's approach to violence crime supported by the school... [they have]... a "public health approach" to reducing violent crime that involves a) identifying the problem b) establishing the risks, protective factors and causes c) developing and evaluating interventions and scaling up policies and programmes and d) re-starting the cycle'.

⁴⁰ 'Working together to safeguard children', DfE, 2018;

www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-together-to-safeguard-children--2.

⁴¹ 'Public spending on children: 2000 to 2020', Children's Commissioner/Institute for Fiscal Studies, 2018; www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/publication/public-spending-on-children.

⁴² 'The response of London children's services to serious youth violence and knife crime', ALDCS, May 2018; www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/34040.

76. Other school leaders in the sample we spoke to perceive that the quality of early help support from the LA is poor. Some reported that the availability of early help and support services for children and their families has reduced in recent years. Where it remained, some believed it was more difficult to access. As one headteacher said:

‘early help needs to be much earlier [than secondary school], more effective and more intense’.

77. A few reported that LA referral thresholds for early help have become so high that the school is left to deal in isolation with serious concerns when, in the past, they would have had more support.
78. In line with the requirement to do so, many schools do much themselves to support children and their families at the early onset of problems, providing early help services. Some are targeting work at groups of pupils that they identify as being particularly vulnerable to criminal exploitation.
79. Some schools provide workshops for parents on drugs and on domestic violence. They work with a range of external providers to support parents. They also provide information to parents on the characteristics of pupils who are more likely to be drawn into criminal or unsafe behaviour. Many schools have also worked with Safer London, which they have valued.
80. However, despite leaders having very clear views about their ability to identify problem families and, consequently, the pupils who are most likely to be drawn into drug-related crime and knife crime, not all schools in our sample appeared to offer enough preventative work to the parents of potentially vulnerable pupils. As such, these schools were not using the detailed knowledge they had about pupils to inform preventative work. Some leaders were open to this as an observation during our visits, but some also reflected on the sensitivities of targeting support at vulnerable families in this way and the risk of being seen ‘to label’.
81. ‘Keeping children safe in education’ states:
- ‘Safeguarding incidents and/or behaviours can be associated with factors outside the school or college and/or can occur between children outside the school or college. All staff, but especially the designated safeguarding lead (and deputies) should be considering the context within which such incidents and/or behaviours occur. This is known as contextual safeguarding, which simply means assessments of children should

consider whether wider environmental factors are present in a child's life that are a threat to their safety and/or welfare.⁴³

82. However, schools and PRUs alone are unable to provide all the early help support that children and families need, nor should they be expected to. All schools need to be aware of the offer provided by LAs and wider partner agencies. Schools can contribute valuable information to assessing the needs and planning for children pre- and post-statutory social care or youth justice intervention. Schools and partner agencies need to continue to work hard to make sure this consistently happens.

Improving information-sharing

Recommendation 6: Schools and colleges should share full information with one another when pupils and learners move schools, pupil referral units or alternative provision or move to further education, to safeguard them and other pupils and learners.

Recommendation 7: Pan-London safeguarding partners should provide challenge to schools and colleges and, when necessary, drive improvement in how well schools and colleges share information with others to promote children's safety when those children move schools or begin further education, including via a managed move or when they are permanently excluded.

Recommendation 8: The Metropolitan Police Service needs to establish a clear and consistent protocol and memorandums of understanding with schools that ensure that it and schools routinely share information about children for the purposes of safeguarding.

Information-sharing between schools

83. 'Keeping children safe in education' states:

'Where children leave the school or college, the designated safeguarding lead should ensure their child protection file is transferred to the new school or college as soon as possible...'

and that

'the designated safeguarding lead should also consider if it would be appropriate to share any information with the new school or college in advance of a child leaving. For example, information that would allow the

⁴³ For further information on contextual safeguarding, see: 'What is contextual safeguarding?', the Contextual Safeguarding Network, 2018; www.contextualsafeguarding.org.uk/about/what-is-contextual-safeguarding.

new school or college to continue supporting victims of abuse and have that support in place for when the child arrives'.⁴⁴

84. School leaders expressed concerns about being able to trust the information provided to them from other schools about a child, including when children transition from primary school, move between secondary schools, into PRUs and onto college. Information about children's safeguarding and wider welfare needs is not always complete or not received in good time. In particular, college leaders reported that they found it very difficult to get accurate and helpful information from secondary schools about pupils and learners progressing to college. Equally, school leaders also observed that it can be difficult to secure full-time education for a child, particularly when they are known to be affiliated to gangs or have been found carrying knives or drugs in the past.
85. College leaders believe that information on safeguarding matters, including information that they receive from schools, can be unreliable. This includes information on learners with child protection plans but also beyond this group to include looked after children, those in need and those who have targeted support through, for example, the youth offending service.
86. Some college leaders told us that they often have to rely on what students themselves choose to disclose about their personal circumstances. Typically, when a prospective student declares a conviction or other information that means they may need additional support, this is followed up by college staff with agencies such as the local youth offending services or children's social care. However, if a child makes no declaration, and the LA, previous school or the youth offending service does not inform the college then staff are not well placed to promptly and adequately secure the additional support that these students need.
87. Senior leaders in PRUs reported that information-sharing from schools about permanently excluded pupils was an area of concern for them. Although they receive information about the reasons for permanent exclusion, more detailed information about previous school history and the involvement of other agencies is not always received in a timely way. More generally, senior leaders stressed the importance of good information-sharing across agencies so that they can put in place measures to safeguard individual children, the wider cohort of children and inform curriculum planning.
88. School leaders also reported that there is no systematic way in which information is collected from secondary schools by the LA or police. Some schools were actively involved in discussions regarding those young people at the highest risk of gang involvement. Others had more limited knowledge and

⁴⁴ 'Keeping children safe in education', DfE, 2018; www.gov.uk/government/publications/keeping-children-safe-in-education--2.

were also unsure what information was held by their SSO. Schools often have a great deal of knowledge of the links between different pupils and families and could assist in assessing children who may be at risk of harm, but they did not always feel involved in discussions between partner agencies that would facilitate them sharing information for safeguarding purposes.

Information-sharing across partner agencies

89. Schools, including academies, have a responsibility to appropriately share information with partner agencies for the purposes of safeguarding children or preventing crime within the statutory guidelines. Although academies are not accountable to LAs in the same way as schools maintained by the LAs, they are required to share information with LAs for the purposes of safeguarding children and with the police to prevent crime.
90. Leaders recognised that there are difficulties that would make it hard to devise a mechanism that would make information-sharing easier. That does mean, however, that they may not always be aware that youth offending teams are working with particular children or that they belong to the 'Troubled Families' programme. Some of this will be for reasons of consent. However, some schools and LAs appeared to be further ahead than others. One school had adopted a new electronic recording system (not seen) for safeguarding using specialist software. The school reported that this helped it build a holistic picture of the circumstances of pupils and includes information from the school and from other agencies such as information from children's social care, youth services and the SEND team. Leaders believe that this helps them keep pupils 'safe and well'.
91. School leaders have very different experiences of information-sharing with the police across different boroughs in London. Their experiences could generally be categorised under the following:
 - Schools had an SSO who was on site regularly throughout the week, who was embedded within the school, knew the children well and with whom information for the purposes of safeguarding was shared regularly. The SSO also shared information with the school, for example about any incidents from the night before that were relevant to the school and had safeguarding implications. This helped the staff to put in place any relevant safeguarding both for the individual pupil and the school.
 - If schools did not have an SSO full time, but on an ad-hoc basis, it seemed to depend on the relationship between senior school leaders and the individual SSO as to whether the relationship facilitated effective information-sharing.
92. In the case of knife crime, a child may have witnessed a traumatising incident the night before, or may know that a friend was hurt, or may themselves have hurt someone. It is important for the well-being of any children who have been harmed, or could be harmed, that school staff are aware of any incidents.

93. Some school leaders told us that the most effective agency they work with is the police. They value highly the presence at school of a local police officer. They also said although that now that this role is no longer ring-fenced, officers are not at the school as much as before and that, like all other services, the police are sometimes slower to respond to schools' needs than in the past.

94. As one principal said:

'We do not have a PCSO any longer. This role had a big impact on students, it is the uniform that makes all the difference. There was an incident in school with a craft knife and the PCSO had an input with the student. We do not have access to that anymore and dealing with these incidents internally does not have the same effect – this is a negative for us. The PCSO used to do assemblies but doing it ourselves does not have the same impact on the students'.

Teaching the curriculum

Recommendation 9: School leaders should consider how their personal, social, health and economic education (PHSE) curriculum reflects local safeguarding issues and trends, including knife crime.

Recommendation 10: Pan-London bodies should consider ways in which they can support schools in ensuring that external organisations that are delivering anti-knife crime and gang affiliation sessions can provide a high-quality and impactful contribution to the school PHSE curriculum.

Recommendation 11: Safeguarding partnerships and school leaders should raise awareness of the dangers of grooming and criminal exploitation among both parents and children.

95. Many school and college leaders we spoke to were trying to educate children about the dangers of knife crime, and associated risks of grooming and exploitation. A few leaders identified tensions for them in delivering this work. For example, one commented:

'In an education market we are balancing the need to have a full school and deliver results. We don't want to be seen as a problem school where parents don't want to send their children... If you go too hard at it parents will question whether this is a problem school. We can go too far or not enough.'

96. Others were less concerned about how they were perceived and were transparent in their intention to deliver a curriculum that reflected what they saw as the realities of life outside of school for children and their families. One school leader said:

'Honesty is the key. The challenge is to not sweep it under the carpet. It will touch every school in London. There's pressure to get young people

through the door. We acknowledge it (youth violence) here. Parents and pupils appreciate it. We acknowledge that problems exist and deal with them. Parents want us to be honest and this builds a better relationship. If your job is to protect the reputation of the school, having students' backs will protect your school.'

In these settings, school leaders were considering how to plan curriculum activity that reflected local safeguarding issues and trends.

97. In a few instances, school leaders had identified groups of children whom they had concerns about, who were at increasing risk of exploitation and grooming. In line with the guidance in 'Working together', they were developing a bespoke set of activities aimed at these children. For example, one was working with a third-sector organisation to provide mentoring for a group of Year 10 boys who they had identified as at risk of gang involvement. Another targeted at-risk pupils in key stage 3 who attend after-school sessions to help them deal with conflict and manage their emotions. School leaders here report a reduction in fixed-term exclusions and improved behaviour in school for those children involved.
98. In the settings we visited, educating children about the dangers of knife crime formed part of their wider PSHE curriculum. A few schools candidly admitted that their curriculum was less well developed than they would like and that it was lagging behind young people's experiences. Others were struggling to identify external agencies with a proven track record with whom they could work. School leaders were keen to ensure that the curriculum content was age-appropriate.
99. There is a range of different ways that schools are educating children on the dangers of knife crime through the curriculum including, for example, through the delivery of core subjects, using case studies/facts about knife crime, using drama productions and supporting regional campaigns against knife-carrying, assemblies and tutorials. Within a well-thought-through approach to delivering the curriculum, any and all of these are valid methods to help children develop the knowledge and skills they need to keep themselves safe. There is little high-quality research on the effects of education programmes to prevent violence and knife crime among young people,⁴⁵ although some approaches have stronger evidence of success than others.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ 'European report on preventing violence and knife crime among young people', World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, 2010; www.euro.who.int/en/publications/abstracts/european-report-on-preventing-violence-and-knife-crime-among-young-people.

⁴⁶ 'Preventing youth violence and gang involvement: practical advice for schools and colleges', Home Office, 2013; www.gov.uk/government/publications/advice-to-schools-and-colleges-on-gangs-and-youth-violence.

100. Some schools favoured using outside agencies to lead on the curriculum in this area and see these agencies as having greater credibility among young people, better knowledge of the subject area and, as a result, having more impact on children's learning. In one setting where ex-gang members delivered work, staff said:

'It was amazing to watch. They could discuss music, had similar backgrounds, used the same language as our students. It was a shock to students to find out that after prison, ex-gang members struggled to get a mortgage, a bank account and couldn't travel to America. They talked about when they were 16 and 17 and that it [joining a gang] seemed the coolest thing to do. It was a real eye opener for our students'.

101. School leaders are balancing the risks of engaging outside agencies against the costs associated with commissioning them and need assurances that what they pay for will be of good quality, appropriate for their children and effective. Leaders should be careful to monitor the activities to ensure they have the desired impact. Some school leaders voiced their concerns about the quality of externally commissioned work. As one said:

'you get a very different experience depending on who is delivering. Some sensationalise and don't set the tone we want. You just can't tell what the quality will be like. Some cannot relate outside of their own experiences. So, we worked with the police who focused on facts and the law. Students found this boring. They're not teachers. So now we are writing our own scheme of work because it needs to be taught properly.'

102. Research evidence suggests that there are benefits to interventions being delivered by people with direct experience with knife crime, but that it needs to be delivered sensitively. 'Scaring children straight' may in fact have negative effects and lead to more offending behaviour.⁴⁷ Evidence points towards the importance of those delivering interventions being experienced at working with young people.⁴⁸

103. School leaders identified a range of mechanisms and ways in which they evaluate the effectiveness of their implementation of the curriculum. The most commonly cited way to judge effectiveness was through feedback gathered from children and staff. Other indicators of the quality of the delivery of the curriculum came from direct observations of teaching and learning. A number

⁴⁷ 'Knife crime interventions: what works?', The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, 2013; www.sccjr.ac.uk/publications/knife-crime-interventions-what-works.

⁴⁸ 'Knife crime interventions: what works?', The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, 2013; www.sccjr.ac.uk/publications/knife-crime-interventions-what-works.

'What works to prevent gang involvement, youth violence and crime: a rapid review of interventions delivered in the UK and abroad', Home Office/Early Intervention Foundation, 2015; www.eif.org.uk/report/what-works-to-prevent-gang-involvement-youth-violence-and-crime-a-rapid-review-of-interventions-delivered-in-the-uk-and-abroad.

of school leaders used GCSE results and the attendance, behaviour and exclusions of pupils as indicators that the curriculum was having a positive impact. These measures may be useful when tracking the impact of the curriculum on small groups of children who have been part of a bespoke curriculum but are less useful in making judgements on the quality and effectiveness of the curriculum more widely.

104. In a few settings, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the curriculum was underdeveloped and school leaders were unaware of the impact of the curriculum on pupils' ability to keep themselves safe. It is important that across the education sector interventions and initiatives such as these are properly researched and evaluated.

Working with parents

105. We saw a mixed picture as to how well parents are being engaged by schools and often a lack of work to educate parents about the dangers of gangs, knife crime and grooming. Schools should consider how well they are alerting parents to the dangers of knife crime, its causes and the preceding signs of exploitation.
106. In seeking to engage with parents, some schools have considered their approach well and are implementing their strategies effectively. For example, one school's parent engagement programme builds trust with parents through regular meetings that cover a range of relevant topics, such as drugs awareness, and inform parents of the support services that they can call on. These meetings help build a dialogue with parents and help build positive, trusting relationships between the school staff and the community.
107. Too often, though, a strategy to better engage parents had not been thought through by school leaders. Some school leaders adopt a 'don't want to alarm parents' approach because, in their view, they do not have a problem with knife crime in their area. This approach helps neither parents nor children. It is not conducive to a preventative approach that builds children's knowledge and skills so that they are well supported to keep themselves safe as they grow up in and travel around London.
108. A key aspect of strategic, multi-agency planning must include awareness-raising among both children and parents of the dangers and causes of knife crime. The parents in our focus group were unanimous in their call for policy-makers and local leaders to raise awareness among parents of grooming, gangs, child criminal exploitation and their links to knife crime for children. Parents described how they had been aware that their child was unhappy for some time and were attributing their increasingly challenging behaviour to parental divorce or, in one case, suspecting that their child was being sexually abused. None of the parents had considered that their children were being criminally exploited

because none of them had heard of county lines.⁴⁹ They all believed they would have been able to prevent their children perpetrating or becoming victims of knife crime if they had had more information about its causes and contexts.

Conclusion

109. In this report, we have made recommendations in an attempt to overcome some challenging issues. This is not a definitive list of answers – far from it. We recognise that this report contributes to an ongoing conversation and we hope that it brings more schools around the table to discuss and plan better ways of working together to protect young people. We have tried, whenever possible, to respect the different approaches taken by schools, particularly in regard to contested issues like exclusion and searches, but we have not backed away from calling out some of the consequences of some of the more extreme approaches taken.
110. While there are actions for schools, there is also the need for some coordination. London is complex, but it also has influential Pan-London bodies that can take a leading role in coordinating appropriate information-sharing and managing places for the most difficult children.
111. The Mayor of London has long spoken about an accreditation system for schools and colleges working to keep children safe from knife crime. We hope this report helps frame some of the requirements for such an accreditation and that schools see full engagement as a sign of strength and determination, rather than an admission of being a 'problem school'.

⁴⁹ 'Protecting children from criminal exploitation, human trafficking and modern slavery: an addendum', part of the 'Joint inspections of child sexual exploitation and missing children' collection, Ofsted, November 2018, www.gov.uk/government/publications/joint-inspections-of-child-sexual-exploitation-and-missing-children.

Appendix 1 – The recommendations

Improving partnership working and strategic planning

Recommendation 1: Local community safety partnerships should fully involve schools, colleges and PRUs in developing and implementing local strategies that aim to address knife crime and serious youth violence.

Exclusions and managed moves

Recommendation 2: All schools and academies in London should ensure that their exclusion policy reflects the practice set out in the DfE's statutory guidance. Local authorities should have a strategic response to permanent exclusions. They should also, in conjunction with regional schools' commissioners, challenge schools and multi-academy trusts if exclusions do not appear to be in line with statutory guidance.

Recommendation 3: The Department for Education should collect data from schools about managed moves in the same way in which it collects information on permanent and fixed-term exclusions.

Early help and prevention

Recommendation 4: Safeguarding partners should involve school leaders at a strategic level in assessing the needs of children and young people in their area, and in planning and delivering early help services in response to those needs. Schools need to participate actively in local arrangements as required under 'Keeping children safe in education' statutory guidance.

Recommendation 5: Local safeguarding partnerships should facilitate all agencies including schools and colleges in challenging each other's practice if they believe any agency is failing to contribute to the local strategy to protect pupils from knife crime.

Improving information-sharing

Recommendation 6: Schools and colleges should share full information with one another when pupils and learners move schools, PRUs or alternative provision or move to further education, to safeguard them and other pupils and learners.

Recommendation 7: Pan-London safeguarding partners should provide challenge to schools and colleges and, when necessary, drive improvement in how well schools and colleges share information with others to promote children's safety when those children move schools or begin further education, including via a managed move or when they are permanently excluded.

Recommendation 8: The Metropolitan Police Service needs to establish a clear and consistent protocol and memorandums of understanding with schools that ensure that it and schools routinely share information about children for the purposes of safeguarding.

Teaching the curriculum

Recommendation 9: School leaders should consider how their personal, social, health and economic education (PHSE) curriculum reflects local safeguarding issues and trends, including knife crime.

Recommendation 10: Pan-London bodies should consider ways in which they can support schools in ensuring that external organisations that are delivering anti-knife crime and gang affiliation sessions can provide a high-quality and impactful contribution to the school PHSE curriculum.

Recommendation 11: Safeguarding partnerships and school leaders should raise awareness of the dangers of grooming and criminal exploitation among both parents and children.


Appendix 2 – School survey

Introduction

Majority of responses were from headteachers but some were from other senior leaders.

Seventy-five per cent of responses were from secondary schools; the remainder were from further education colleges and pupil referral units.

The total number of respondents were 103 but not all participants answered every question.



Does your borough have a knife crime strategy?

Response	Number	%
I do not know	47	46%
No	10	10%
Yes	45	44%
Total	102	100%

**What procedures for detecting knives does your setting have in place?
(please select all that apply)**

Response	Number of instances	%
Knife detection wands	56	55%
Knife arches	26	26%
Body scanners	4	4%
Stop and search	52	51%
Anonymous reporting procedures	59	58%
None	6	6%
Don't know	0	0%
Other	6	6%
Total	101	

Has your setting facilitated any work with children and young people about knife crime?

Response	Number	%
No	10	10%
Yes	93	90%
Total	103	100%

**How does your setting teach children and young people about knife crime?
(please select all that apply)**

Response	Number of instances	%
As part of a subject syllabus	49	54%
During in-school enrichment activities	47	52%
In specialist workshops focused on knife crime	68	76%
During extracurricular activities and clubs	12	13%
Children and young people are not taught about knife crime at our setting	1	1%
Don't know	1	1%
My setting does not teach children and young people about knife crime	0	0%
Other	1	1%
Assemblies	23	26%
Total	90	

**Which local partners does your setting work with about knife crime?
(please select all that apply)**

Response	Number of instances	%
Safer schools officers	81	90%
Local police officers	49	54%
Education welfare officers	19	21%
Local paramedics	7	8%
My setting does not work with any local partners about knife crime	1	1%
Other	24	27%
Total	90	

What support does your setting facilitate for children and young people affected by knife crime? (please select all that apply)

Response	Number of instances	%
Counselling	81	90%
Acceptable behaviour contracts	36	40%
Mediation of conflicts	44	49%
Family support	49	54%
Victim support	38	42%
Integrated offender management	5	6%
Peer mentoring	33	37%
The setting does not facilitate any support for children and young people affected by knife crime	1	1%
Don't know	2	2%
Other	21	23%
Total	90	

Total number of exclusions at your setting during 2016/17

Sum of fixed term	3,258
Average number of fixed-term exclusions per setting	47.2
Average number of fixed-term exclusions per school as a result of a knife incident	0.8
Sum of permanent	181
Average number of permanent exclusions per setting	2.4
Average number of permanent exclusions per setting as a result of a knife incident	0.5

Appendix 3 – Expert advisory panel

The Children's Society

The Difference

Red Thread

St Giles' Trust

Dr Carlene Firmin, University of Central Bedfordshire

Dr Fred Cram, Cardiff University

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS)

Safer London

Two ex-gang workers

Missing People

One parent of a child affected by knife crime

One paramedic



The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, further education and skills, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for children looked after, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may reuse this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted.

Interested in our work? You can subscribe to our monthly newsletter for more information and updates: <http://eepurl.com/iTrDn>.

Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 1231
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.gov.uk/ofsted
No. 190005

© Crown copyright 2019