

From: Roger Gough, Leader of Kent County Council
Sue Chandler, Cabinet Member for Integrated Children's Services

To: County Council, 19 March 2020

Subject: County Council update on Knife Crime Select Committee and linked work across the Children, Young People and Education Directorate.

Classification: **Unrestricted**

Summary: This report is to update County Council members on progress against the seven recommendations from the Knife Crime Select Committee presented to the 17 October 2019 County Council and the Cabinet's commitment at that point to take the work of the Committee further.

The progress updates include information on proactive approaches in Elective Home Education and developments within the Kent County Council (KCC) Adolescent Service, including the development of a new multi-agency, multi layered approach to adolescent risk and new funding and developmental opportunities in youth provision.

The report will also identify areas for further action.

Recommendation(s):

County Council is asked to:

1. Note the progress to date against the seven Select Committee recommendations, including linked areas of work in Elective Home Education, Integrated Adolescent Service and Youth provision.
2. Endorse the suggested approach and further actions going forward.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 County Council members previously received the Knife Crime Select Committee Report on the 17 October. The Select Committee identified seven key recommendations, which County Council Members discussed at length at the October County Council meeting. Given the importance and timeliness of this issue, the Executive committed to bringing an update back to County Council including progress on the recommendations. The Knife Crime Select Committee Report including all recommendations is available online:
https://www.kent.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/100678/Knife-Crime-Select-Committee-report.pdf
- 1.2 The recently developed Kent Violence Reduction Unit (VRU) has now published the Kent Problem Profile. The analysis contained within the report presents a range of hypothesis and solutions relating to knife crime and violent crime, outlines risk characteristics and proposes 38 conclusions.
- 1.3 Conclusion 2: states that: *Nationally, Kent has among the lowest proportion of violent crimes involving knives of anywhere in England and Wales.*
- 1.4 Convictions for knife crime amongst young people in Kent has reduced year on year since 2016. Fewer than 1:10,000 young people 10-18 in Kent (age of

criminal responsibility) received a substantive outcome for a knife related offence in 2018.

- 1.5 Conclusion 5 states that: *the most striking feature of violent crime locations is the dominance of town centres. This is unsurprisingly and is clearly linked to the night-time economy.*
- 1.6 Nonetheless, many of the steps required to tackle knife crime correspond with those which address wider issues of disengagement and increased risk amongst young people, these issues are thoroughly addressed in the response to the Select Committee's Report. An all member briefing on knife crime took place on the 12 February 2020 to provide the opportunity to discuss with members progress to date and areas for further work.
- 1.7 Kent recognises the benefit of a Public Health approach to knife crime. However, in recognition of the Kent profile, we have focused our attentions wider than knife crime to also include violent crime and is centred on five foundations:
 - Starting with populations rather than individuals
 - Seeking to understand and address the "causes of the causes"
 - Championing prevention
 - Intelligent use of data and evidence
 - Organised effort by working in partnership and with communities
- 1.8 The purpose of this report is to update County Council members on progress, to set out further work to be undertaken and to provide information on proactive approaches in Elective Home Education and developments within KCC's Adolescent Service, including the development of a new multi-agency, multi layered approach to adolescent risk and new funding and developmental opportunities in youth provision.

2. Progress against Select Committee Report Recommendations

Recommendation 1: KCC should work with partner organisations to establish a multi-disciplinary, operational group which includes all the relevant, key agencies whose remit is to ensure the implementation and delivery of strategic objectives to address knife crime and violence through a public health approach.

A task that should be given priority is the development of a more efficient and effective information-sharing mechanism to build a more comprehensive picture of gang activities in the county, so that timelier and more targeted early interventions can be undertaken.

Progress to Date

Adolescent Risk Monitoring Framework

- 2.1 The Children, Young People and Education's (CYPE) new adolescent service is working in partnership with District Community Safety Partnerships, Community Wardens and Kent Police to develop a new multi-agency Adolescent Risk Management process which brings together both an operational and strategic

child level framework to reduce risks to young people identified as being at risk, including extrafamilial risk, risk of criminal exploitation and violent offending.

- 2.2 The framework has the following four strands of connected partnership collaboration, building on existing meetings in order to reduce duplication:
- Strategic county oversight of emerging trends, patterns and themes in contextual safeguarding for young people at county, regional and national level via the Joint Exploitation Group meeting, supported by the VRU
 - Divisional strategic forums which consider the effectiveness of district responses to contextual risks, as well as emerging county and regional issues, supported by VRU analytics
 - District contextual safeguarding meetings which utilise partnerships (including youth workers) to respond to local 'hot spots' in order to engage young people and enhance their safety
 - Current multi-agency meetings about individuals (core group, team around the family), enhanced by the contribution of adolescent services expertise to help understand and manage risk

New Joint Exploitation Group

- 2.3 The Kent and Medway Gangs Strategy was signed off in 2018 and brings together strategic partners and stakeholders to effectively manage risks and share information regarding gangs and County Lines. The new Joint Exploitation Group will receive updates via the Integrated Adolescent Service in relation to the District and Police Divisional Vulnerability meetings. The Joint Exploitation Group reports to the Kent and Medway Children Partnership Boards, Kent and Medway Adult Safeguarding Board and Kent Community Safety Partnership.

North Kent and Medway Pilot and information sharing

- 2.4 A bid to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MCHLG) made jointly between KCC, Medway and Kent Police was successful in securing £1.3m to support a pilot programme of initiatives in North Kent and Medway to reduce knife crime. The programme will start formally on 1st April 2020 and will be evaluated both locally and nationally.
- 2.5 The North Kent and Medway Serious Youth Violence project will help develop an evidence-based information and support package with partners, which will raise awareness of issues relating to gangs and serious youth violence. The project is collaborating with the police to co-design these resources with young people. Resources will be delivered in schools, Pupil Referral Units, in universal and targeted youth provision, and amongst community partners.
- 2.6 KCC is the lead authority to the partnership which has agreed to work with the Kent Police led VRU to deploy public health, police and KCC analysts to develop a broader based model of effective information sharing across Kent, Medway, the Met Police and Kent Police. A County Lines Collaboration Meeting is also now operational with representation from the Met Police.
- 2.7 These new information sharing arrangements will build on the good information sharing protocols already in place with police to support our joint work to reduce

first time entrants into the criminal justice system and the new Kent Police Youth Engagement Officers put in place as part of Kent Police's new Child Centred Policing approach.

- 2.8 The Youth Engagement Officers team already works with KCC staff to help identify young people at risk of harm and identify geographical areas of risk. They also work with groups of young people in school settings to identify the risks of criminal exploitation of young people including knife crime. These new resources will help to develop a more robust model of information sharing across the spectrum of adolescent risk embedded within our adolescent service.
- 2.9 Adolescent Services are currently working closely with the police to maximise the utilisation of Police Schools Coordinators within the Police Crime Commissioners Office, and the Youth Engagement Officers, to ensure key messages to schools are consistent and evidence based.
- 2.10 The North Kent pilot will also help build on the available evidence base and local knowledge and practice to devise tools (such as a Child Criminal Exploitation and a Gangs Toolkit) for professionals and parents which will supplement the new strategic and operational framework for adolescent risk management. The team have worked closely with the MHCLG to agree the scope of the work which will enhance the front-line resource and CYPE are proud of the service design co-production activity that has already taken place with young people in Cookham Wood Young Offenders Institute (YOI), Young Offenders and Care Leavers.
- 2.11 The focus of the pilot programme will be to work with statutory services to help reduce risk, working alongside CYPE in-house and commissioned service delivery. The service will provide intensive and flexible (weekend and evening) support to those young people at highest risk of, or already engaged in gang activity; those who have been caught (whether charged or not) with carrying weapons/knives; and those deemed to be at risk of exploitation.
- 2.12 This project will enhance current service delivery, including that from Early Help, Children's Social Work and Adolescent Services. Integrated Adolescent Services brings together case holding services; Youth Justice, Adolescent Social Work and Adolescent Early Help, to reduce transitions for young people and to work flexibly outside of typical organisational boundaries to engage and support adolescents.

Violence Reduction Unit

- 2.13 The office of the Police and Crime Commissioner was awarded £1,160,000 from the Home Office in 2019 to set up a VRU across Kent and Medway. Kent has been identified by the Home Office as one of the 18 Counties across England and Wales where funding is being provided for a VRU. This offers Kent Police, KCC, Medway Council, Health and the National Probation Service the opportunity to pool the data that each organisation holds, and through this to start to understand how people living in the county are affected by violence.

2.14 The creation of the VRU allows KCC to develop a shared multi-agency data set that can be used by all professionals to enhance and improve the services delivered to communities, and will help services to see where communities are most affected by violence and then work with local residents to find ways to increase safety. The problem profile that has been written and developed by i-three analytics on behalf of the Kent VRU is the first step in developing an innovative, intelligent and informed approach to violence reduction. The work is the start of a multi-agency collaboration that is hoped will transform how agencies work together and deliver services across Kent and Medway.

Further Actions

2.15 Further actions include to consider the additional benefit to community cohesion and community safety which Community Wardens could bring to the new workings of the Community Safety Partnerships.

2.16 Additional opportunities to further increase and develop detached youth work provision have been identified and are being explored further. These include use of Section 106 funding and the recently agreed budget amendment for youth provision.

Recommendation 2: KCC's Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Education should write to the Secretary of State for Education, on behalf of the Select Committee, and urge him to update statutory guidance to schools to help them manage pupils' poor behaviour and reduce exclusions.

Progress to Date

New Funding and Accountability Framework for School Inclusion

3.1 Kent exclusions are currently amongst the lowest in the country. The Director of Integrated Children's Services has worked with schools and the Schools Funding Forum to develop a new funding and accountability framework for school inclusion, which sharpens the arrangements and agreements for the use of Alternative Provision, reducing the use of non-inclusive practice such as elective home education, the use of part time timetables and unlawful off-rolling of students. This is currently being signed off by headteachers.

Inclusion Toolkit for Schools

3.2 CYPE has also developed and tested an inclusion toolkit for use by schools. Following testing, the toolkit has now been provided to all schools and is already starting to be used by schools to evidence their inclusive practice as part of the new Ofsted Inspection framework for schools.

3.3 Further use and promotion of this toolkit will help build on the developing evidence base coming out of the learning from the London and national Serious Youth Violence pilots, our own learning from the South Kent Adolescent risk pilot and new adolescent service; the evaluation and learning which will emerge from the north Kent and Medway pilot and the academic research into our contextual safeguarding approach.

- 3.4 KCC's Cabinet Member for Integrated Children's Services wrote to the Secretary of State for Education on 5 February 2020. The Minister of State for School Standards responded in a letter dated 24 February 2020, in which it was acknowledged that "engagement in full-time, quality education is a strong protective factor against children's risk of involvement in serious violence".
- 3.5 In his letter, Rt Hon Nick Gibb MP also highlighted the important role of high-quality Alternative Provision (AP) and noted that the Government is taking forward an "ambitious programme of action on behaviour, exclusion and reform of AP that will improve support for those at risk of exclusion, back headteachers' powers to exclude as a last resort and ensure those who do access AP get the support and education they need to reduce their vulnerability". In his letter, Nick Gibb MP also confirmed Departmental officials will be in contact with the Cabinet Member to arrange a meeting to discuss further.

Further Actions

- 3.6 CYPE will work with the Cabinet Member to develop a robust evidence base to inform packages of training for staff and pupils, and work with 'The Education People' (TEP) to support the delivery of this across Kent schools and services.

Recommendation 3: KCC should review all the training on knife crime and violence that is currently delivered in Kent schools to assess the extent to which it is informative, consistent and balanced. This evaluation should clarify whether KCC needs to promote and commission the delivery of a high-quality, standardised programme.

Progress to Date

CYPE/The Education People and Training in Schools

- 4.1 Academy trusts are their own entity and admissions authority and as such, KCC does not have the authority to mandate any training to any school, regardless of designation. This responsibility lies with the governing body (or committee etc.) to ensure the school meets the requirements of safeguarding which includes training.
- 4.2 However, TEP do provide training programmes as part of their packages of purchased support. As part of TEP, the Education Safeguarding Service (ESS) deliver a range of training courses, reaching circa 8000 school and early years staff each year. Delegates come from a variety of schools and settings, regardless of designation, including grammar schools, academies, local authority maintained and schools within the independent sector. As such, the service has a relationship with a significant proportion of education providers across Kent. The ESS are therefore trusted by providers to deliver consistently good training.
- 4.3 Due to the amount of content already within the TEP offer, the core safeguarding training delivered by the service does not focus specifically on knife crime. However, it does explore vulnerability including how this can lead to young people being criminally exploited. All of the training delivered by the

service is paid for directly by schools and Early Years settings, as opposed to being funded by KCC or other sources.

- 4.4 Further to the work of CYPE and TEP, as part of the VRU programme Kent Police are currently working with all Kent primary schools to deliver a programme of knife crime awareness. Although in its infancy, initial feedback is positive, and it is anticipated that there will be Kent specific learning which will help inform the direction of travel for future engagement with schools.

Further Actions

- 4.5 Given the positive and established relationship between KCC, schools and the ESS, it is likely that schools would recognise the benefits and be open to specific training if recommended and/or delivered by the service. The ESS would be able to help contribute or write, and deliver, a high-quality training package, which would be bespoke to Kent schools, including raising awareness of local initiatives. This would however require additional funding and agreement by the schools.

Recommendation 4: KCC's Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Education should write to all Kent schools to encourage them to deliver high-quality training on the dangers associated with knife crime, from primary school (Year 5 and Year 6) to all types of secondary school.

Progress to Date

- 5.1 Research shows us that young people who are at risk of being drawn into knife crime are also likely to be vulnerable to other types of exploitation, isolation and exclusion. It is therefore important to ensure that training within schools and community settings is part of a balanced approach to explore vulnerability and criminal exploitation in general rather than focus solely on knife crime.
- 5.2 Understanding and addressing the issues which make children vulnerable to exploitation helps school staff to understand the contextual and safeguarding aspects of knife crime as opposed to seeing it solely as a criminal issue, or something that happens to "certain types of children."
- 5.3 Although guidance on what training would be helpful is welcomed by schools, the reality is that unless it is funded externally, or a statutory requirement, budget constraints may mean schools are not able to partake.
- 5.4 KCC's Cabinet Member for Integrated Children's Services wrote to all Kent schools via the Kent Education Learning and Skills Bulletin, dated 31 January 2020, to reflect on the findings of the Knife Crime Select Committee, acknowledge the challenges that schools face, recognise the significance of transitions in a child or young persons life and how this affects them, and highlight the opportunities for important learning and workforce development. The message to schools also included details of the Kent Police Youth Engagement Officers (as referenced under Recommendation 2).

Further Actions

Primary to Secondary Transition

- 5.5 An integral part of the service is Youth Work, which delivers both universal and targeted services. Youth are currently reviewing their core offer to enhance their response to adolescent risk management.
- 5.6 Open Access youth settings currently support the transition from primary school into secondary school settings in some schools. However, not all schools avail themselves of this opportunity. CYPE will consider the role that transitions play in the successful integration of pupils into secondary settings and work with schools to demonstrate and promote the value of this work and associated risks.
- 5.7 The co-design activity with the VRU, partners and young people in March aims to develop a training and awareness product about gangs and knife crime which will be available for free across Kent and Medway. This should support schools to deliver consistent and high-quality messages.

Recommendation 5: KCC's Children, Young People and Education Directorate should conduct a feasibility study to evaluate the effectiveness of a scheme involving the recruitment and training of volunteers to provide long-term mentoring for young people at risk of offending.

- 6.1 CYPE has a well-established relationship with the voluntary sector and commissions, trains, supports and works with volunteers across a wide range of service areas. In September 2018, CYPE Early Help Services received the 'Recognition of Excellent Volunteer and Management Practice' award from Stronger Kent Communities for its approach to working with volunteers across Kent.

Current Activity

- 6.2 In developing a mentoring programme, it is important to consider the support and training needs for both staff and volunteers alongside the cost and impact of any intervention model. Through the HeadStart Programme funding, CYPE currently commissions volunteer mentors to work with schools.

Current Research – Early Intervention Foundation

- 6.3 CYPE's approach in taking forward the Select Committee recommendations and in the approaches being taken in other areas of work linked to these issues is to draw on the existing evidence base to develop models within Kent.
- 6.4 The Early Intervention Foundation informs that most of our knowledge about "what works" to prevent youth violence, crime and associated factors comes from the USA. Among the most robustly evaluated and effective approaches are skills-based and family-focussed programmes which aim to foster positive changes as well as prevent negative outcomes. The detail of these programmes is attached in Appendix 2.

6.5 According to the Early Intervention Foundation, there are approaches that look promising but have limited evidence, including mentoring and community-based interventions. Many strategies aiming to prevent/reduce gang involvement exist but very few have been robustly evaluated.

a. Mentoring

- community-based mentoring can improve behavioural, socio-economic and academic outcomes,
- but relationships ending within three months may have adverse effects on at-risk youth.
- a review of school-based mentoring found minuscule effects
- some of the positive findings of mentoring for at-risk and high-risk youth are based on low-quality studies and did not persist after the mentoring ended
- a small number of studies have found negative effects

b. Community Engagement

- data sharing and partnership building have a role in prevention,
- but community-based programmes lack robust evaluation.
- sports programmes in the community have been studied weakly and produced preliminary evidence of some potential to reduce crime and violence

c. Gang-specific Approaches

- have limited evidence of effectiveness on crime-outcomes

6.6 Evaluation has established that some approaches do not ‘work’ – that is, are not associated with less reoffending than doing nothing. Deterrence and discipline-based approaches such as ‘Boot camps’ and ‘Scared Straight’ type programmes have been robustly evaluated. They consistently indicate (Reconciling Desistance and What Works, HMIP, 2019, and Early Intervention Foundation) either no impact or a negative impact on participants’ justice outcomes.

6.7 Evidence suggests that at risk young people, when grouped together, can encourage ‘deviant’ behaviour. Research suggests that group intervention may be more effective when at-risk young people are together with pro-social young people.

6.8 The North Kent and Medway Serious Youth Violence project is co-designing the service specification with young people who are gang affiliated or vulnerable to gang affiliation, including those who have committed knife offences. This co-design work is currently focusing on young people’s feedback on what qualities and skills adults need to engage and support them to develop a non-offending identity.

6.9 We are consulting with young people to understand whether mentoring, or the voluntary nature of mentoring, is important to engage this cohort, compared with the effectiveness of trauma-informed professional approaches such as delivered by Youth Justice services.

Further Actions

- 6.10 Following full implementation of the new Adolescent Risk Model, the CYPE Innovation Unit will help develop a Kent approach to understanding the research and evidence base. Key Performance Indicators will be monitored, including criminal exploitation of children, missing episodes, anti-social behaviour and incidents of violent crime and knife crime.
- 6.11 Following this they will develop a theory of change model to inform consideration of long-term mentoring, together with costings indicative outcome measures/deliverables. Theory of change is a specific methodology for planning, participation, and evaluation that is used in the philanthropy, not-for-profit and government sectors to promote social change. Theory of Change defines long-term goals and then maps backward through causal linkages to identify necessary preconditions.
- 6.12 Joint Targeted Area Inspections: Youth Justice Inspections and Contextual Safeguarding are identifying emerging good practice in working with adolescent risk. There is growing recognition that the Child Protection system is not appropriate for adolescents who experience risk of harm outside of the family home.
- 6.13 We continue to develop our adolescent workforce in trauma-informed, strengths-based approaches, built on the theories of desistance and relationship-based intervention. These models are embedded in our new Adolescent Risk Management framework and are explicit in our commissioning service specification for the North Kent and Medway Serious Youth Violence and Prevention Project.
- 6.14 We are working with Dr Carlene Firmin and the University of Bedfordshire to develop a Kent specific understanding of contextual safeguarding and enhancing the capacity of our youth services to respond to contextual risks, and to support young people, vulnerable to exploitation and abuse, to develop a sense of control and empowerment through improved wellbeing, self-esteem, self-efficacy, resilience and critical thinking skills.

Recommendation 6: KCC's Trading Standards service should devise and evaluate a pilot scheme involving a more proactive approach to the promotion of the responsible sale of knives by local retailers.

Progress to Date

- 7.1 Following Trading Standards presentation to the Select Committee in June 2019, where they were invited to create a responsible trader scheme, Trading Standards continued to develop intelligence led test purchase operations in response to increased public awareness on knife crime.
- 7.2 Trading Standards conducted underage sales test purchases on retailers where they had specific intelligence, resulting in three sales which prompted further investigations. Trading Standards also conducted challenge 25 operations in an identified area of Kent with concerns over knife crime. These Challenge 25

Operations are purchases by over 18 volunteers, to assess the retailers checks in preventing the illegal sale of knives.

- 7.3 During these operations, Trading Standards involved BBC Radio Kent who used the experience in their broadcast on knife crime, which included a live interview with Trading Standards, and interview the following week for online knife sales. Having received confirmation that funding for the proposed scheme (£27,000 for a part time project officer) was available, Trading Standards have now begun the process for recruitment in the new financial year.
- 7.4 Trading Standards are currently liaising with Kent Police and looking at enforcement activities to ensure that the scheme is developed to meet all stakeholder priorities and achieves a successful outcome.

Recommendation 7: KCC should pilot a scheme such as the Youth Zone to extend youth service provision in the county. The pilot should take place in a particularly deprived area of Kent and should be combined with an evaluation to assess its effectiveness and to inform future policy.

Progress to Date

- 8.1 Onside Youth Zones currently operate a number of centres in the North West of England and since 2008, one in Wolverhampton. Within the past three years, three similar centres have opened in three London Boroughs: Barnet, Croydon and Barking and Dagenham.
- 8.2 To further explore the opportunities for developing a Youth Zone in Kent, KCC officers and Members met with Jamie Masraff, Director of Youth Zone Development for South England and his staff. Visits have also taken place to London Youth Zones, with further visits planned during this month.

Onside Youth Zone Model

- 8.3 Central to the model is that each new Youth Zone is developed as a brand-new capital venture and that development is predicated around a new purpose-built capital project.
- 8.4 Each Youth Zone operates as a registered charity and the model of charitable status allows for Youth Zone to be funded through a unique blend of public and private funding, with half of the capital cost provided by the Local Authority and half through private investment.
- 8.5 The Youth Zone charity are given ownership of the building and a 100-year lease on the land, without break clauses, for which the Youth Zone pays a peppercorn rent.
- 8.6 Typically, young people pay 50p per visit and £5 annual membership; hot meals are served for £1. Income is included in the OnSide income projections which if not realised would fall to the Local Authority.
- 8.7 OnSide advised the delegation that the initial capital investment needed to develop a new Youth Zone in one area of Kent would be circa £8.5m. Half of

the initial capital cost is provided by KCC and half is raised through private partnership investment. It is worth noting that the Chorley model was £7.2m, with a reduced running cost of £900k per annum, although staffing costs are the same. The new build is provided to OnSide on a 100-year peppercorn rent basis. The District/Borough Council would not be able to charge KCC or OnSide for the site beyond that of the initial capital purchase.

- 8.8 Revenue costs for Kent were identified as circa £1.3m per annum, with the Local Authority expected to commit £400k per annum and the rest being raised through private partnership arrangements, room rental, membership costs per young person and activity fees charged to young people.
- 8.9 OnSide expect £40k income per annum from room hire in their London schemes. Fundraising is led by OnSide who also require a minimum 3-year commitment to revenue funding from the Local Authority.
- 8.10 The model is one of universal activity provision, with centres open whenever schools are closed, and seven days a week during school holidays. Centres provide a minimum offer of 40 hours open access and at least 20 different activities are available at every session. The size of the provision is relative to the population catchment, but the feasibility and the scale of the schemes necessitate a catchment of no less than 50,000 young people with a density of 1,900 per km sq. The success of a scheme relies on transport being available for young people to attend.

Timescales

- 8.11 Identification of a site takes around one year, taking into consideration the three key criteria of prominence, access and neutrality. Once a site has been identified and a business case to proceed has been approved via an Executive Decision, it takes a further 2.5-3 years to open the Youth Zone (sign-off to opening took 3.5 years in Croydon). It is unclear as to whether negotiations or the identification of a district or area will increase these timescales.

Further Action(s) following the meeting with Youth Zone England:

- A Feasibility Study will be carried out to consider:
 - i. The total cost of a Youth Zone in Kent
 - ii. The potential for match funding
 - iii. A potential District to support the initiative (including review of population data)
 - iv. An analysis of changes in the current targeted offer
- CYPE will undertake reach analysis and accessibility analysis
- Youth Zone England will provide evidence of impact

9. Detached Youth Work Developments

- 9.1 On 13 February 2020, County Council accepted a budget amendment, presented by the Labour Party. The amendment agreed is to allocate £500k to deliver detached youth work (four nights per week) in each District (this includes £100k to be spent on any associated infrastructure/equipment costs).

- 9.2 KCC currently has a pot of Section 106 funding accrued over a period of years allocated to 'youth provision'. KCC has secured this £1.3m from local property developer contributions where these contributions are tied to geographical areas. Historically this funding stream has been badged against capital expenditure only. However, recent developments have opened up opportunities for these Section 106 monies to be used to support a mixture of revenue and capital streams.
- 9.3 It is planned that the Section 106 money will be utilised to enhance the detached youth work offer, through the introduction of four dedicated area-based youth work teams aligned to support emerging risks identified through the work of the VRU and the new adolescent risk model.
- 9.4 At the time of writing this report, the proposals for use of the Section 106 funding, as outlined above, are awaiting a Key Decision, with a report due to be presented at CYPE Cabinet Committee on 11 March.
- 9.5 The primary intended aim of the new Section 106 monies outlined above at (i) was to offer enhanced outreach capacity to the new adolescent service to support our approach to adolescent risk in targeted urban areas as part of the new adolescent risk model framework. This would be in the form of four area-based detached youth work teams.
- 9.6 It is proposed that the targeting of this new resource is aligned to the new adolescent risk model which is helping to identify risks of criminal exploitation and sexual exploitation of children, as well as police intelligence as part of the new VRU analysis which states that:
- Analysis by location and time confirms that certain drivers are highly predictive of violent crime. Some locations are seeing 'more than their fair share' of violence but this tends to be restricted to specific times of the day/week making it potentially amenable to tackling the issues if partners work collaboratively. Most strikingly there is very strong evidence linking violence to licenced premises among older offenders (offenders in their mid-20s and 30s) and the hour after school for youth violence. (Kent VRU Analysis Dec 2019)*
- 9.7 Further information provided by the VRU states that: Deprivation, poor quality housing, substance misuse and isolation are the highest predictive factors for violence. The 20 Lower Layer Super Output Area's with the highest concentration of violence risk-factors are centred around town-centre groupings: 1) Dartford, Swanscombe and Gravesend, 2) Chatham, Rochester and Gillingham, 3) Maidstone, 4) Sheerness and 5) Margate and Ramsgate.
- 9.8 Given the £500k allocation to youth provision through the agreed Budget Amendment, there are opportunities to ensure that this provision is delivered across all districts in a way which increases, focusses and maximises the reach of the youth offer.
- 9.9 The plans for the structure and implementation of this provision are being explored, with the anticipated aim that:

- i. the Section 106 funded youth teams (subject to Key Decision approval) will be deployed to support youth provision within urban areas identified with higher risk profiles and supported by findings from the Violence Reduction Unit Problem Profile and local intelligence from the adolescent risk management process.
- ii. The detached youth work, funded by the £500k budget amendment, is aligned to the existing in-house offer and is delivered in the rural areas, where Kent has a lower risk profile, which is therefore less likely to receive the targeted Section 106 funded provision.

10.A Proactive Approach in Home Education

Revision of Kent's Elective Home Education Policy and Improved Working Practices

- 10.1 It is recognised that high numbers of home educated children are from vulnerable groups and being out of school-based education is a risk factor that must not be ignored. Through revision to Kent's Elective Home Education (EHE) policy following the publication of the DfE guidance; strategies have been put in place so the EHE Support and Advice Officers can more quickly identify and support those who may not be in receipt of an education and to further protect those with vulnerable characteristics. However, it is important to state that there is no identified correlation specifically between Elective Home Education and knife crime.
- 10.2 Kent continue to champion the need for change and clarity of legislation and duties relating to home education. Kent's contribution has been pivotal to the resulting changes to the Department of Education Elective Home Education Guidance for Local Authorities and Parents, promoting a nationally aligned approach to Elective Home Education. As one of the largest authorities in the country, Kent are highly regarded for their contribution that has changed how the idea of home education is perceived.
- 10.3 Capturing, sharing and publishing undeniable data, which evidences the true picture of Elective Home Education in England. The data collated provides irrefutable evidence that the majority of home educators registered in Kent have not taken the option to home educate as a lifestyle choice, more a coerced alternative to exclusions or fines for non-attendance in school.
- 10.4 The revision of DfE guidance has provided the platform for Kent to review its own policy and tighten working practices in alignment with recommendations. It has provided clarity regarding the roles and responsibilities of both parties when a parent removes a child from a school to home educate.
- 10.5 Kent can report that during the academic year 2018-19, that 56% of the cohort had received support by Early Help or Children's Social Work Services. To ensure we maximise the join up between Elective Home Education support and safeguarding interventions, school off-rolling information is now routinely shared at the Front Door.

Further Actions

- 10.6 Kent will continue to evolve, working with dedicated home educators to develop practices and procedures to prevent children from being denied

access to the education to which they are legally entitled. It will ensure that Kent continue to influence change and policy.

- 10.7 The County Access to Education Manager in Fair Access, Chairs the South East of England Elective Home Education Officer (SEEHEO) group, is a board member of the Association of Elective Home Education Professionals (AEHEP) and as a valued contributor, has recently been asked to represent AEHEP on the board of the Association for Education Welfare Management (AEWM), thus providing Kent with an excellent platform to share good practice on the national stage.

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 The findings of the Knife Crime Select Committee and the subsequent County Council resolution of 17 October 2019 have been welcomed by KCC services as an opportunity to have a focused response to the concerns of knife crime in Kent.
- 11.2 The work being undertaken to respond to recommendations is an important strand to the complete Kent offer for young people and our work with partners and is complimented by key areas of work highlighted within the report, including enhancing the youth outreach offer, taking a proactive approach to Elective Home Education and developing the Integrated Adolescent Service and Adolescent Risk Model.

Recommendation(s):

County Council is asked to:

1. Note the progress to date against the seven Select Committee recommendations, including linked areas of work in Elective Home Education, Integrated Adolescent Service and Youth provision.
2. Endorse the suggested approach and further actions going forward.

Background documents:

Appendix 1 – [Knife Crime Select Committee Executive Summary Report](#)

Appendix 2 – Learning and Research Sources:

- i. [Beyond Youth Custody \(NACRO, 2017\)](#)
- ii. [Desistance and Young People \(HMIP, 2016\)](#)
- iii. [What Works in Managing Young People Who Offend? A Summary of the International Evidence \(Ministry of Justice, 2016\)](#)
- iv. [Knife Crime Evidence Briefing \(College of Policing, 2019\)](#)
- v. [What Works to Prevent Gang Involvement, Youth Violence and Crime \(Early Intervention Foundation, 2015\)](#)
- vi. [Reconciling 'Desistance' and 'What Works' \(HMIP, 2019\)](#)

Contact details

<p>Report Author: Stuart Collins Name and job title: Director Integrated Children's Services – West Kent Telephone number: 03000 410519 Email address: stuart.collins@kent.gov.uk</p>	<p>Relevant Director: Stuart Collins Name and job title: Director Integrated Children's Services – West Kent Telephone number: 03000 410519 Email address: stuart.collins@kent.gov.uk</p>
	<p>Relevant Director: Sarah Hammond Name and job title: Director Integrated Children's Services – East Kent Telephone number: 03000 411488 Email address: sarah.hammond@kent.gov.uk</p>